



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 147 • NUMBER 200 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, April 24, 2015

—

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 24, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ANTI-TERRORISM ACT, 2015

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-51, An Act to enact the Security of Canada Information Sharing Act and the Secure Air Travel Act, to amend the Criminal Code, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act and the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

• (1005)

[*English*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): There are 66 motions in amendment standing on the notice paper for report stage of Bill C-51. Motions Nos. 1 to 66 will be grouped for debate and voted upon according to the voting pattern available at the table.

[*Translation*]

I will now put Motions Nos. 1 to 66 to the House.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting the long title.

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting the short title.

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 2.

[*English*]

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP), seconded by the member for Edmonton—St. Albert, moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-51, in Clause 2, be amended

(a) by replacing line 21 on page 5 with the following:

“information that is necessary to protect Canada against activities that undermine the security of Canada and that is disclosed under subsection”

(b) by replacing line 25 on page 5 with the following:

“restrictions and prohibitions, while respecting any caveats on, and originator control over, shared information.”

[*Translation*]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 4.

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 5.

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 6.

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 7.

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 8.

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 9.

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 10.

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 11.

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 12.

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 13.

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 14.

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 15.

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 16.

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 17.

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 18.

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 19.

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 20.

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 21.

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 22.

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 23.

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 24.

Motion No. 27

Government Orders

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 25.
Motion No. 28

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 26.
Motion No. 29

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 27.
Motion No. 30

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 28.
Motion No. 31

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 29.
Motion No. 32

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 30.
Motion No. 33

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 31.
Motion No. 34

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 32.
Motion No. 35

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 33.
Motion No. 36

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 34.
Motion No. 37

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 35.
Motion No. 38

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 36.
Motion No. 39

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 37.
Motion No. 40

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 38.
Motion No. 41

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 39.
Motion No. 42

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 40.
Motion No. 43

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 41.
Motion No. 44

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 42.

• (1010)

[*English*]

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP), seconded by the member for Edmonton—St. Albert, moved:

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-51, in Clause 42, be amended by replacing line 29 on page 49 with the following:

“enforcement power, including the power to perform the duties that are the primary responsibility of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.”

• (1015)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 43.

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 44.

Motion No. 48

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 45.

Motion No. 49

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 46.

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 47.

Motion No. 51

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 48.

Motion No. 52

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 49.

Motion No. 53

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 50.

Motion No. 54

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 51.

Motion No. 55

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 52.

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 53.

Motion No. 57

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 54.

Motion No. 58

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 55.

Motion No. 59

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 56.

Motion No. 60

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 57.

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 58.

Motion No. 62

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 59.

Motion No. 63

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 60.

Motion No. 64

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 61.

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting Clause 62.

Motion No. 66

That Bill C-51 be amended by deleting the Schedule.

She said: Mr. Speaker, thank you for accepting the amendments that the official opposition wants to make to Bill C-51.

These amendments did not come out of nowhere, and I will comment on that in my speech. After the Conservative government introduced Bill C-51, we, the official opposition, took the time to do the work that the government should have done. We consulted the people and experts in various fields affected by this bill.

Most of the Canadians who have been following the debate on Bill C-51 realize that it has some serious flaws. We are not the only ones to have identified those flaws; many other members of our society have as well. These include important leaders in our first nations communities, eminent constitutional law professors, former Supreme Court justices, former prime ministers and community leaders. The Canadian Bar Association also testified before the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security about the serious flaws in Bill C-51.

We have taken the time to study the bill, unlike the Liberals, who immediately said they would support it, even though it is a bad bill. The official opposition did its job. We read the bill carefully and realized that we unfortunately could not support it. That is why today, after examining it rather closely in committee and consulting with a number of stakeholders and citizens, we must present these amendments. That is the most sensible thing to do, given that in committee we were told to go back to the drawing board.

Government Orders

For my colleagues who were unable to attend, let me give a brief overview of the evidence we heard on Bill C-51 at the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. There were nine committee meetings to hear evidence, including one with the Minister of Public Safety and the Minister of Justice. At the other eight meetings, the vast majority of the witnesses were there at the government's request, but there were also a few that appeared at the request of the official opposition or the third party. Forty-five of the 48 witnesses who appeared before the committee said we should amend Bill C-51, or scrap it altogether and go back to the drawing board, and, as I said, most of the witnesses were there at the government's behest.

The Minister of Public Safety and the Prime Minister must realize that Bill C-51 is perhaps not the best solution. The right thing to do would be to listen to the official opposition and the various civil society stakeholders, go back to the drawing board and come back with real anti-terrorism legislation. Such legislation should not violate our rights and freedoms, the fundamental rights of first nations, or the right of various groups in civil society to protest, as Bill C-51 does, just to give a few examples.

The opposition did its work in committee. We examined Bill C-51 and heard from witnesses who identified its shortcomings. About a hundred amendments were proposed to Bill C-51 by the various opposition parties and they were debated for several hours, but we once again witnessed the Conservative government's lack of openness in that regard. One after the other, each of the amendments was rejected, often with no explanation from the government. It was likely simply because they were not proposed by the Conservatives.

Three amendments were adopted, but they were minor amendments proposed by the Conservatives. We are therefore not surprised at the government's blatant failure to listen during the committee meetings. We heard extremely important testimony and time was limited. As a result, many witnesses appeared at the same time. We often heard from three or four witnesses in one hour, and unfortunately, we had very little time to ask them questions and continue the debate with them.

• (1020)

I did not want to send Bill C-51 to committee. I would have preferred it if we had scrapped that bill and all of the parties had worked together to come up with something else, a good collective response to terrorism and radicalization. Unfortunately, that did not happen.

We proposed amendments in committee in good faith. We heard from excellent witnesses from all sides. The Conservatives did not listen to them at all. They really should have listened, because I am not sure that Bill C-51 will even stand up in court, which is fundamental when a government proposes a bill.

Unfortunately, the Canadian Bar Association and eminent professors who are extremely knowledgeable about constitutional law came and explained that to us. In fact, I asked them directly whether Bill C-51 was constitutional. The answer was a categorical no. Large parts of Bill C-51 are not at all constitutional and will not stand up in court. It is a government's primary duty to get legal opinions confirming that the bills it introduces are constitutional.

That is fundamental, but Bill C-51 is not even constitutional. The members opposite did not do their job properly.

There was talk of the need to provide law enforcement agencies with new tools, but a number of the RCMP and police services representatives that we talked to told us they already have the tools they need to deal with terrorism. The problem is with resources. They do not have the resources they need. The RCMP set aside almost 200 criminal cases in order to assign all its officers to tackling terrorism. There is a serious lack of resources right now, but we do have the tools we need to take action and deal with terrorism.

When the budget was presented to us this week, nearly two months late, I was hoping to at least see a decent allocation for fighting terrorism. I saw that it was included in the budget and I looked at the amounts. To my great surprise, no money was allocated at all. For the Canada Border Services Agency, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the envelope is a little less than \$300 million over five years. Before 2017, these agencies combined will get less than \$20 million to deal with terrorism. This is a drop in the bucket and an insult to the work of our police services. They are being squeezed and are forced to move their staff in order to do the work being asked of them. Now, this budget is giving them peanuts for their work.

When a government claims that it is there to protect its communities, cities and the entire country, to serve its citizens and protect national security, it must turn words into action. It has to allocate the necessary money. It has to provide the money and give it to our law enforcement agencies so that they have the means to act. That is not in Bill C-51 or in the 2015 federal budget tabled by the Conservative government.

I am extremely disappointed with the government's lack of leadership and its failure to take seriously the fight against terrorism and radicalization. There are a lot of holes in the Conservatives' botched approach. For example, it would have been productive for the Conservatives to propose measures against radicalization. Various stakeholders have talked about this. Efforts are being made to counter radicalization in some of our regions and communities, and this work has even been adapted in the United States. That is the first suggestion.

The American government is currently working very hard on devising a national strategy to combat radicalization and is achieving some success. Communities are working with law enforcement agencies on a national strategy to counter radicalization. Quite frankly, we should have followed that fine example. The NDP suggested it at the outset.

Unfortunately, once again, I cannot support Bill C-51 as proposed by the Conservative government. That is why the amendments moved today by the official opposition are so important.

• (1025)

We have to go back to the drawing board, draft a bill together, ensure that we have a national strategy to counter radicalization and stop terrorism once and for all.

Government Orders

[English]

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will admit that I do enjoy working on the committee with my colleague from the NDP. I do notice she took a little side slap at the Liberal Party. That is fine, that is politics. In reality, the Liberal Party on this bill is the only party in the House of Commons that has a responsible and reasonable position. We are trying to find the balance on both sides. On the one hand, the government does not care a smidgen, it seems, about the civil liberties of Canadians. On the other hand, the NDP does not seem to care a smidgen about the public safety of Canadians. There is a place where this Parliament can find balance. Some are in the NDP amendments, as they were in the Liberal amendments.

We did have quite a number of witnesses. Although the majority of witnesses had concerns about the civil liberties side of the issue here, they also recognized that there need to be some measures and provisions to ensure the national security and public safety of Canadians.

My question to the member this. Does she not see what those witnesses who indicated that there is a need for greater public safety and national security provisions said? Does she not agree that what they said was important? Why do the New Democrats not seem to care about that side? I know they care about national security, but their position is strange.

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, if there is one party that has a strange position on Bill C-51, it would unfortunately have to be the third party in the House, for several reasons.

When Bill C-51 was introduced, the Liberal leader claimed that he had concerns—before he had even read it—but then immediately said that he would vote in favour of the bill. The Liberals are giving the Conservatives a blank cheque.

Why? Because at the time, the majority of Canadians supported the bill. However today, two-thirds of Canadians reject Bill C-51.

Furthermore, what intrigues me the most about the Liberals' position on this, aside from the fact that they use the polls to form their opinion on Bill C-51 or to decide on any position they may take, is that as it stands right now Bill C-51 will not comply with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

I have some questions that I would have liked to ask my Liberal colleague. I hope he will make a speech so I can ask him the following question: why do the Liberals want to vote against the charter by supporting a bill as flawed as Bill C-51?

• (1030)

[English]

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her excellent discourse and her hard work with respect to this difficult situation. As she mentioned, even the Conservative witnesses who were called opposed this bill, and the vast majority of the witnesses were called by the Conservatives.

It is passing strange what we have heard from the Liberals. The Liberal leader is an example and we have to make mention that the

only reason he was voting for the bill is because he was worried that the Conservatives would use his opposition to the bill in a future campaign against him. That is what he said. Those are not our words, they are his, and the polling at the time was supportive of Bill C-51.

I have seen many bills pass through this House in my 11 years, but I have never seen a bill for which constituents were coming to me mentioning the number and the name of the bill and suggesting that we need to do everything we can to stop it.

My question is very direct. What exactly is it today that the NDP are trying to do in order to stop this terrible attack on our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, as has clearly been demonstrated by former Supreme Court justices, former prime ministers, and virtually every security and constitutional expert that we were able to hear from?

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Skeena—Bulkley Valley, who raised some very important points.

What we are trying to do with respect to Bill C-51 is a matter of principle. We are a party of principles, and nothing could make us vote in favour of a bill that violates our rights and civil liberties as much as Bill C-51 does. We are people of principle.

Early on, the polls did not support our position, not at all. We stood up anyway. Our leader, a very principled man, stood up and decided that, no, we would not support something that is an attack on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and an attack on our fundamental rights. Frankly, this is partisan politics.

This is putting partisanship before principles, which we will never accept. We will not get involved in the Conservatives' game or the Liberals' when our rights and civil liberties are being attacked.

I am proud to stand up today with my caucus colleagues to once again support the amendments we are proposing. The government needs to go back to the drawing board and come up with a solution that works for all Canadians, instead of introducing a botched bill like Bill C-51.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues.

Not only is Bill C-51 appalling, it is also dangerous.

[English]

I want to pause for a moment, because this is not an ordinary debate, this is not an ordinary bill, and this is not about politics anymore. This is about the soul of the country and whether we understand what Canada stands for, for ourselves and what we represent around the world.

We just bowed our heads in prayer. The Supreme Court is taking a look at bowing our heads in prayer, and we may be visiting that some day. However, we just, through the words of the Speaker, prayed that we make good laws and wise decisions. If we meant that prayer and then passed Bill C-51, our words would be blasphemy, because this is not a good law, nor is it wise.

Government Orders

The story the Prime Minister would like to have Canadians believe about this law is that in this place, some members of Parliament, the ones in the Conservative Party, want to protect Canadians from terrorism, and other members of Parliament—namely Greens, New Democrats, the Bloc, and Independents, and I certainly hope in future the Liberal Party will come to its senses and join us—who will vote against Bill C-51, do not care about security.

Certainly in the course of clause-by-clause, various Conservative members of that committee actually said what a shame it was that the Green Party was willing to “privilege” the rights of terrorists over the those of Canadians, I think were the words used. That is the story Conservatives want Canadians to hear, to think that we are so concerned about rights and freedoms and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and civil liberties that we would turn a blind eye to the threat of terrorism.

The bill was initially launched at a campaign style rally in Richmond Hill, Ontario, and not in this place, something we are becoming all too familiar with as sort of a routine contempt of Parliament. The Conservatives launch big initiatives and laws outside of Parliament, with cheering crowds and campaign banners. When this was first launched, the Prime Minister said, “Violent jihadism is not a human right; it is an act of war”.

It is an extraordinary thing to say, as if anyone had ever suggested that violent jihadism was a human right. It set up a frame in which those of us who oppose Bill C-51 are somehow associating ourselves with violent jihadism.

In response to that torqued campaign rhetoric, we have the words and the advice of some of the country's leading constitutional, legal, and operational security experts in relation to this notion of an act of war. We have the words of professors Craig Forcese from the University of Ottawa and Kent Roach from the University of Toronto, who said: “False analogies between crime and war can contort law”.

We need to look at this bill, which is an omnibus bill of five different sections, five different laws, thrown together and rushed through Parliament and rushed through committee, and ask this question: Does this make us safer? I ask my colleagues not to fall into the trap of saying it is civil liberties versus protecting us from terrorism. Does the bill make us safer? Does it actually confront terrorism in a fashion that makes Canadians safer? Then we can have a discussion about whether we are willing to make compromises about civil liberties because the bill will make us safer.

We see how cleverly the Conservatives' spin puts us wrong-footed before we even begin.

The assumption is that the bill makes us safer, and I want to spend most of my time this morning at report stage to persuade as many colleagues as I can that the bill is dangerous because it makes us less safe. There are the losses of civil liberties the bill represents, the violations of privacy, and indeed, the most unprecedented, anti-constitutional, anti-democratic provision in any law that has ever come before this place, a law to allow a CSIS agent, in a secret trial before a judge, where the only evidence presented would be from the government, and the existence of the hearing would never be known

to the public, to get a warrant to violate our Constitution. It is astonishing. It would be a constitutional breach warrant.

However, let us look at the question of whether the bill would make us safer?

• (1035)

After the rush of witnesses through the House, they began the hearings in the Senate. Before we have completed our review of the bill in this place, and here we are at report stage, the other place has already begun its review.

I think some of the most powerful testimony yet on Bill C-51 came up in the Senate from a British security expert who has worked as a liaison officer within the Canadian security establishment. In other words, he is an operational spy. He has worked for MI5 in security, and he has worked in Canada as a liaison officer with Canadian security. He is an expert in what we need to do to make us safer, which is to find and stop terrorist plots. His name is Joe Fogarty. He introduced himself to the Senate, and I have his testimony before me, from which I will quote.

He said, “The question I was asked to address was why it appeared to be the case that the relationship between the police service and MI5 in the United Kingdom was so close, with such easy sharing of information and with such a consistently strong outcome in terms of arrests, prosecutions and convictions in national security cases”.

In contrast, since 2001 in Canada, there have been 30 terrorism-related arrests, whereas in the U.K., there have been some 2,000, and these figures do not include Northern Ireland. It could just be that we do not have very much terrorism activity here, but it could also be that we have set up silos, with security services and police operations, which do not work with each other and actually can trip each other up.

In that sense, Mr. Fogarty gave further testimony, which I found quite shocking. He said that this is all on the public record but is not that easy to find. These examples were put forward. These are recent:

“CSIS discovered the location of a suspected terrorist training camp inside Canada.... it decides not to tell the RCMP about it”.

Here is another example:

“CSIS realized that the RCMP was following the wrong targets. So having identified certain people who are believed, by that stage, to be threats to public safety, realizing that the RCMP was following the wrong people, CSIS decided not to say anything”.

This evidence from Mr. Fogarty, which I will come back to, is directly relevant to testimony the House of Commons committee heard.

John Major, former Supreme Court Justice, who chaired the Air India inquiry, pleaded with the committee not to pass the bill in its current form and not to pass it without oversight.

Government Orders

Part 4 of the bill would create for CSIS new powers of disruption, and as I mentioned earlier, would allow it to get a warrant from a judge to break domestic law and to violate the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. However, nowhere in Bill C-51 are CSIS agents required to share information with the RCMP.

Now, we will hear from Conservatives that we should not worry, because part 1 of the bill is all about information sharing. Yes, the words “information sharing” are used, but they are not about sharing information between CSIS, Canada Border Services Agency, CSEC, and the RCMP. Those are the four different agencies that are collecting information and have a role in disrupting terrorist plots, but there is no oversight. There is no pinnacle command. There is nobody watching what each entity is doing, and there is no requirement to share information. On the contrary, we have set up a system where there are disincentives to sharing information.

Mr. Fogarty testified very clearly that in the U.K., due to a law that was passed back in 1996, a situation was created under that legislation that “all national security material is afforded third-party status in criminal proceedings as a matter of statute”.

With that assurance, in the case of the U.K., the police work with MI5. In Canada, we do not do that. Our current system lacks any oversight. I cannot say that clearly enough. We have a review committee in SIRC, but that is not oversight.

Here we have a situation where a security expert came before Parliament and to the Senate committee and said:

“At the minute...with the greatest of regret, if you continue with the situation in which your security intelligence agency is reluctant, for very good reasons, to share with your law enforcement team, this is the equivalent of sitting on top of a tragedy waiting to happen”.

He went on:

“I was asked this question a number of years ago.... I was asked to have a look at which bits of the Canadian operational relationship I would incorporate into the U.K. because, as liaison officers, you were very acquisitive and looking for best practices all over the world.... with the greatest of respect, I wouldn't incorporate a single aspect of it, at the minute, because it's dangerous”.

•(1040)

Here we are being told by the Conservatives and the Prime Minister that we must accept a bill that would trample on the Constitution, trample on our rights and freedoms, and violate our privacy rights because it would make us safer. Here is the big lie: it would not make us safer. It is dangerous. It would make us less safe. It would create circumstances in which CSIS and the RCMP operate in silos. That led to the Air India disaster.

I plead with my colleagues to reject this bad law.

Mr. John Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear my friend and colleague from Saanich—Gulf Islands refer to my former political science professor and others, but aside from that, I take umbrage with much of what she said. The bill is designed to bring our government up to the level of other western democracies. It is modest in the changes it would make, given the threats we as Canadians confront.

I would ask two questions. First, I would ask if my friend has to be confronted personally by a knife-wielding terrorist for her to understand that the threat really is out there and that Canadians need to face it. Second, why would she oppose a bill that seeks to bring judicial overview of the kinds of measures we are looking at as opposed to the executive approval used in other democracies, which is much less cumbersome and unwieldy than judicial oversight?

•(1045)

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, my friend from West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country misunderstands if he thinks that I said in my speech that I do not take terrorism seriously. I take it seriously. The Conservatives do not, because they have put forward a bill that would create a situation in which we are less safe.

As for the specific circumstances of the words “judicial oversight”, let us be clear. This bill does not contain a single element of judicial oversight. It would allow a CSIS agent to go to a judge and obtain a warrant, but would that judge have the overview and oversight to continue to monitor the way that warrant is used?

No other modern democracy, none anywhere, would allow a judge in a secret hearing to give a warrant to violate the Constitution. It is unheard of in the democratic world. It is unheard of period, and Parliament should not stand for it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for her speech. She raised some very serious objections related to the dangers of Bill C-51.

When the Standing Committee on Finance was studying terrorism financing and in related conversations, I had the opportunity to talk to the Privacy Commissioner of Canada, Daniel Therrien. He confirmed the impression I had that some federal agencies and departments affected by the bill, such as the Canada Revenue Agency, could end up freely sharing information from individuals' tax records. Mr. Therrien said that was indeed the case.

Can the member elaborate on other examples of information sharing allowed by this bill that would be excessive or potentially inappropriate?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. I myself was appalled when I found out that the Privacy Commissioner of Canada had not even been invited to appear before the committee. I know that because I was there when the NDP members tried to invite him.

What are we to make of the intentions of a government that prevented the Privacy Commissioner of Canada from testifying? It is clear that this bill is dangerous and will violate Canadians' rights.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has indicated that one of the biggest omissions from this legislation is parliamentary oversight, something we believe is absolutely critical. However, we recognize that there is some value to the legislation. Even the New Democrats have indicated that if they were elected to government in the fall, they would not repeal the act.

Does the member see any value in the legislation? Is there any valuable aspect of the legislation she thinks would be of benefit to Canadians?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, there is virtually nothing.

The one thing in here that would be of value would be the ability to stop someone from boarding a plane. On the no-fly list right now, it is restricted to people who pose a danger to the flight, as opposed to someone seeking to leave Canada to join foreign fighters.

Other than that, this entire bill is so bad that neither opposition party in this House, should they ever form government, should imagine that it could be fixed with amendments. I hope that the horror of this bill will not pass in this place. I still think that if the Liberals were to vote with the rest of the opposition parties that there are enough Conservatives of conscience that this would not pass. However, if it does pass, after the next election it must be repealed, and then the small change to the no-fly list could be made.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a privilege to have the opportunity to speak with respect to Bill C-51, anti-terrorism act, 2015.

As we have seen in Canada, the new national jihadist movement has declared war, and Canadians are being targeted by those terrorists simply because they hate our society and the values it represents. It does not matter what the opposition may say and what members may say, it is a present reality. It is a fact, and we only need to look back over the past number of weeks at the terrorist attacks in Ottawa, Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, as well as attacks upon Australia and Paris, to see that the threat of radical Islamic extremism is a very real threat that needs to be dealt with, that needs to be confronted.

I do not need to mention that here in this House we were not only witnesses, but were directly involved with events that took place. That certainly shattered the innocence of this House and many Canadians. I think it struck a chord with Canadians that someone has to do something, has to take some immediate steps to address what is happening. We need to be sure that the law enforcement agencies and other agencies have the tools they need to deal with this new situation.

It was interesting. The first speaker misspoke by saying initially that the agencies needed “the tools”; then she said “I meant to say the funds”. They need the funds, and we have provided for those funds. More important, we need to be sure as legislators that we provide the tools to the law enforcement agencies and other agencies that have to deal with the security of Canadians.

These threats are real. They require a strong response and strong action. That is why, under the strong leadership of our Prime Minister, our government took action and brought forward the protection of Canada from terrorists act and the anti-terrorism act,

2015, which take steps to protect Canadians against jihadi terrorists who seek to destroy the very principles that make Canada the best country in the world to live.

When the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands says that the bill does not in any way enhance our security and protection, that simply is not so. I will certainly point out in the course of my discussion of the bill that indeed it does do that very thing.

Canadians understand that their freedom and security go hand in hand. Canadians expect us to protect their privacy, to protect their freedom, but also to protect them. There are protections in this legislation to do exactly that.

The fundamental fact is that our police and national security agencies are working to protect our rights and freedoms. They are not working against us; they are working against the terrorists. We have to remember that these are jihadi terrorists who endanger our security and take away our freedoms in a very fundamental and barbaric way.

Providing national security agencies with new tools will ensure that gaps in sharing information about suspected terrorists does not limit their ability to prevent attacks on or against Canadians. We, as politicians, do not enforce the law, but we do have the duty and responsibility to make sure that law enforcement agencies, security agencies, have the necessary tools to keep Canadians safe. Canadians expect no less. Canadians want to be sure that we are confronting the terrorists, confronting the danger to us in the best we can, and that those in positions of authority who have to do that have the tools and resources.

It is a coming of age for Canada to file a comprehensive anti-terrorism bill in the face of terrorism threats and activity. This is activity that has already taken place. It is my view that there is no more fundamental role for a government than to protect its country and its people.

In today's world of global travel, sophisticated communications, and the use of Internet, it is timely and appropriate for the government to get up to speed and to ensure that we have the ability to counter, disrupt, and, where possible, eliminate the threat of terrorism and the threat that may be imminent to Canadians. This is especially so when activities that undermine the security of Canada are often carried out in a clandestine, deceptive, or hostile manner, and are increasingly global, complex, and sophisticated. They often emerge and evolve rapidly, and we need to be sure that our security forces can also adapt and react rapidly and do what we need to do to counter those threats.

● (1050)

The proposed legislation is therefore timely, and provides the tools and flexibility to keep pace with evolving threats and better protect Canadians.

The legislation would criminalize the advocacy for promotion of terrorism in general, and would give the courts authority to order the removal of terrorist propaganda online. That is a sensible thing. Most Canadians would expect them to have the ability and power to do that.

Statements by Members

As a member of Parliament, I find it remarkable that we have to date not had specific legislation to authorize the sharing of information between government institutions having to do with the security of Canada and ensuring that the threshold to do so is not unduly onerous. How is it that we have a government department that has to do with security that does not share that information with another department that has to do with security? For anyone to say that to allow them to do that is somehow not helping to better protect Canadians, I do not understand where they are coming from.

With respect to air travel, it is only reasonable to be able to screen and prevent individuals from boarding an aircraft if they pose an immediate threat. There are provisions to give the minister certain powers to do that. Surely that is a direct protection of Canadians.

The legislation allows the Canadian Security Intelligence Service to not only gather information, but to intervene and disrupt terror plots while they are in the planning stages. If it can gather information and know there is a plot but not disrupt it, are Canadians safer? Of course they are not. If we know there is a plot, we do what we can to disrupt it. We make sure that our security agencies have the ability to do that. That would indeed make Canadians safer. Canadians expect that much. They expect our governments to ensure that our agencies can do that. Of course, it does not give CSIS the power to enforce; that is left to the police.

The legislation would also enhance the ability of law enforcement agencies to detain suspected terrorists before they can harm Canadians. The ability to detain those who might harm me, anyone in the House, or any Canadian, is a fundamental ability. That is an obvious positive thing in the legislation.

The legislation would enhance the ability for law enforcement agencies to detain suspected terrorists before they can harm Canadians. It would ensure that a recognizance can issue, with conditions, in peace bond provisions. Judges can require persons to surrender their passport or not leave the jurisdiction.

The legislation would lower the threshold to obtain a recognizance with conditions in circumstances where a peace officer believes on reasonable grounds that a terrorism activity “may” be carried out, as opposed to “will” be carried out. It is lowering the threshold. He must have reasonable grounds to believe that a terrorism activity “may” be carried out as opposed to “will” be carried out, and actions would be taken.

For the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, I would point out that this specific legislation would indeed protect Canadians. Under one threshold that recognizance may not be issued; under this threshold, the recognizance would be issued and would prevent a dangerous event from happening that would harm an innocent Canadian.

It also replaces the requirement that a recognizance is “necessary to prevent” with the words “is likely to prevent”. Anyone who knows that something is “likely” to prevent ought to take steps to ensure that it is prevented. It is a lower threshold, but it is there for the purpose of protecting Canadians, not for the purpose of protecting terrorists.

It would also allow for an increase in the period of incarceration from three days to a possible seven days, with periodic judicial

review. The need for these types of provisions is very obvious. It is a coming of age for Canada and Canadians as a whole.

I am sure most Canadians would say that it is about time we tackled terrorism head-on, not watching on the sidelines, not hoping that someone will look after us, but actually putting legislation in place that will protect us, that will enhance the security and protection of Canadians. I think all Canadians expect us to do that, and I would ask the opposition to get behind the bill.

• (1055)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): The hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain will have five minutes for a period of questions and comments when the House next returns to debate on the question.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1100)

[English]

GOLDMAN ENVIRONMENTAL PRIZE

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in this House today, within the same week in which we celebrated Earth Day, to mark the accomplishments of some global leaders, real eco-heroes around the world, who is in this week received the 2015 Goldman Environmental Prize.

These prizes are given out annually. They are significant awards. They recognize heroism, grassroots work, often people who are fighting for change in their communities in very difficult situations, in which they face threats to life and limb.

We celebrated one of those heroes many years ago when Colleen McCrory, from the Kootenays, won the prize for her work in British Columbia in protecting the wilderness.

Another British Columbia has been nominated and has received the award this year. My congratulations go out to the former chief of the Xeni Gwet'in First Nation, Marilyn Baptiste, who has received global recognition for her work in fighting the proposed gold and copper mines that would have destroyed Fish Lakes. Congratulations.

* * *

THE BUDGET

Mr. Brad Butt (Mississauga—Streetsville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, economic action plan 2015 is great news for the people of Mississauga—Streetsville.

Statements by Members

First, our government has tabled a balanced budget. We are increasing the annual contribution limit to a tax-free savings account to \$10,000. We are supporting seniors by reducing the minimum withdrawal requirements for registered retirement income funds. We are introducing the home accessibility tax credit to help with renovation costs so seniors and disabled persons can live independently and remain in their homes.

We are increasing and expanding the universal child care benefit and introducing income splitting that benefits every single family in Mississauga—Streetsville with children. Members of the Streetsville Business Improvement Association will benefit from a reduction of the small business tax rate to 9% by 2019. We are creating the public transit fund and providing over \$5 billion per year for infrastructure through the new building Canada fund.

People in Mississauga—Streetsville are better off because of this Conservative government.

* * *

CANADIAN LEGION BRANCH 4

Mr. Tyrone Benskin (Jeanne-Le Ber, NDP): Mr. Speaker, 2015 marks the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Ypres.

This Sunday I will again be participating in the commemoration of this important event. As always, this remembrance ceremony will be hosted by Canadian Legion branch 4, in Verdun.

Legion 4 is the only Legion branch in Canada that steadfastly continues to remember the contribution and sacrifices of Canadian service members in this important battle.

[*Translation*]

Let us take a moment to remember those who risked their lives and fought to protect our rights and freedoms. We must take care of our veterans by bringing in better measures to protect their health.

[*English*]

Veterans in this country fought for the freedoms we now hold dear. Let us in this House honour their spirit and sacrifice by protecting those freedoms, for if we sacrifice those freedoms out of fear, then what did they fight to protect? Lest we forget.

* * *

CHILDREN'S DAY CELEBRATIONS

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on April 23, 1920, the national assembly of the Turkish republic was established.

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, founder of the Turkish republic, dedicated April 23 to the children of the country because they would be the future of the new nation. Turkey's children's day showed the world the importance he placed on the health and education of young people.

Years later, UNICEF decided to recognize April 23 as International Children's Day. Since 1979, National Sovereignty and Children's Day in Turkey has been celebrated with guest children from around the world. They are housed in Turkish homes and interact with kids from other nations, and learn about each other's cultures. When these children participate in a special session of the

parliament, a truly international assembly is formed, where children pledge their commitment to international peace and friendship.

Turkish Canadians are rightly proud that their country of origin was the initiator of the world's first national children's holiday. Children's day in Canada is celebrated with numerous multicultural children's activities and events that focus on our children, our future.

* * *

NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE AND ACTION ON MASS ATROCITIES

Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the fifth anniversary of the unanimous adoption by this House of a resolution establishing a National Day of Remembrance and Action on Mass Atrocities, of which the worst is the crime which name we should even shudder to mention: genocide.

Today, we mark the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, as last week we observed Yom HaShoah, Holocaust Remembrance Day. Yesterday also marked the 67th anniversary of the State of Israel, born out of the ashes of the Holocaust.

It is sometimes said that if there had not been a Holocaust, there would not have been a State of Israel, but it is the other way around. If there had been an Israel, there might not have been a Holocaust or the horrors of Jewish history.

Yesterday was also the birthday of former prime minister and Nobel Peace Laureate, Lester Pearson, who was an early advocate for the establishment of a Jewish state and in whose memory the resolution was established. May I close, in his memory, with the biblical prayer:

[*Member spoke in Hebrew, as follows:*]

Oseh shalom bimromov Hu ya'aseh shalom aleinu v'al kol Yisrael v'imru amen.

May God, who establishes peace on high, grant peace for all of us in the State of Israel. Amen.

* * *

●(1105)

WORLD MENINGITIS DAY

Ms. Lois Brown (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, meningitis is a serious infection caused by inflammation of the lining around the brain and spinal cord. It can strike any time and within hours, and it can result in lifelong disability or death.

Meningitis Relief Canada was established in 2012 with a vision to improve the lives of individuals and families afflicted by the complication of meningitis by providing means to heal and rebuild.

Statements by Members

Last December, Meningitis Relief Canada shared beautiful images by world-renowned photograph Anne Geddes of children around the world affected by meningitis. It opened my eyes, and those of my colleagues, to how serious this disease is and that we can do more to raise awareness and prevent it.

Today is World Meningitis Day. I ask everyone here to recognize World Meningitis Day and let us all work toward sparing the heartache of losing one more loved one to this devastating disease.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE

Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the federal budget was an opportunity for the Conservatives to repair the damage they have done to science since forming a majority government. However, we see that the Conservatives have not changed their formula.

They keep promoting industrial research to the detriment of basic research. However, between 2006 and 2014, Canada went from ranking 16th to 22nd among the 34 OECD countries in terms of business investment in research and development, which means that the Conservative strategy is not even working.

The Conservatives closed a number of research institutes, which are a treasure trove of knowledge in Quebec, including the francophone scientific library at the Maurice Lamontagne Institute. They also jeopardized funding for other institutes such as the Mont-Mégantic observatory.

I am working hard in Ottawa to counter the Conservative government's short-sighted vision. The NDP understands the importance of preserving our scientific heritage.

* * *

[*English*]

ARMENIA

Mr. Joe Daniel (Don Valley East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, perpetrated by the Ottoman empire between 1915 and 1923. After 100 years, it is now widely accepted as the first genocide of the modern era.

In Canada, our Parliament, in 2004, acknowledged the Armenian genocide of 1915 and condemned this act as a crime against humanity. In 2006, the government affirmed this resolution that the 1.5 million Armenians who died during those years were in fact subjects of the genocide.

All across Canada today, and in my riding of Don Valley East, Canadian Armenians are holding commemoration ceremonies to mark this tragic event in history.

On this solemn anniversary, I recognize the great work of the Armenian Genocide Centennial Committee of Canada, an organization that unites Canadians and Armenians right across our great country.

SECOND BATTLE OF YPRES

Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon (Mississauga East—Cooksville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second battle of Ypres, which started 100 years ago on April 22, marks a pivotal moment in Canadian military history.

Ypres was a battle of firsts for Canadians. It marked the Canadian Expeditionary Force's first significant engagement of the First World War and, despite the horror of the first chlorine gas attacks, adversity was turned into triumph at Kitchener's Wood, which marked Canada's first victory on European soil.

Treating the wounded and dying at Ypres inspired Canadian physician Lieutenant Colonel John McCrae to pen the poem *In Flanders Fields*, which, to this day, urges us to remember this sacrifice and to hold the torch of remembrance high.

Today, and every day, we honour those brave Canadians who fought and died during the second battle of Ypres. We hold high that torch of remembrance for all who have sacrificed in the struggle for enduring peace and freedom throughout the world.

* * *

● (1110)

ARMENIA

Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan (Scarborough—Rouge River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. A century ago, the world stood silent, while more than 1.5 million Armenians were killed.

In recognizing this terrible event 11 years ago, the House passed a motion to acknowledge the Armenian genocide of 1915 and to condemn this act as a crime against humanity. On this 100th anniversary, we again remember the suffering of those men, women and children, and mourn their loss.

This dark period of our history cannot be forgotten. Nor can we look aside from the ongoing suffering of countless other atrocities and crimes against humanity around the world.

Today, we join with thousands of Canadians of Armenian origin to remember the victims of this tragedy and to recommit to protecting fundamental human rights and dignity for all. Together, we stand united.

[*Member spoke in Armenian*]

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Parm Gill (Brampton—Springdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my constituents in Brampton—Springdale are concerned about the Liberals' new mandatory pension payroll tax that could force a family of two workers in the home to pay as much as \$3,200 per year. This is what Liberals consistently do: force Canadians to pay higher taxes.

We know the Liberal leader approves of the plan to raise payroll taxes. Our government does not believe in forcing Canadians into a single compulsory one-size-fits-all approach or reaching into the pockets of hard-working, middle-class Canadians and reducing their take-home pay.

Under our government, there will be no mandatory job-killing, economy-destabilizing or pension tax hike, not for employees, not for employers. We will continue to support the vital small business sector, the creation of jobs and growth with our low-tax, balanced budget.

* * *

CANADA-U.S. BORDER SECURITY

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the friendship of the communities of Stewart, British Columbia and Hyder, Alaska represent the best of our friendship with our American cousins. The towns are interwoven and deeply connected.

However, on April 1, the Conservative government decided to close the vital border crossing between Stewart and Hyder for eight hours a day, cutting off these two intertwined communities, one from the other. The Conservatives did not consult with the local community or businesses and the government admitted it would not even save any money by this action.

The local businesses in the region have been clear that it will cost jobs in tourism, mining and other pillars of that small community. If the situation does not sound ridiculous enough already, last week the state of Alaska voted to offer to pay Canada to keep the border open 24 hours a day.

When it comes to respecting our friendship with the United States and protecting the jobs and safety of northern communities, the Conservatives are an embarrassment. The people of Stewart and Hyder deserve better. Conservatives must change this idiotic decision, but rest assured, a New Democratic government will come through for the people of Stewart and Hyder when we form government a little later this year.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Gerald Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I urge the NDP to actually read the budget, because this week the Minister of Finance tabled a great budget for middle-class Canadians. It is a balanced budget, just as we promised, and it cuts taxes for Canadians, just as we promised. For example, the new family tax cut and enhanced universal child care benefit will benefit 100% of families with kids, including in NDP ridings, the vast majority of these benefits going to low and middle-income families.

The Liberals and the NDP will take this away and raise taxes on small businesses and workers. Under our government, there will be no mandatory job-killing, economy-destabilizing, pension tax hike, not for employees and not for employers.

Statements by Members

ALASDAIR GRAHAM

Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with heavy hearts, we note the passing of a great Nova Scotian. The Honourable Alasdair Graham was an inspiration to so many people in Nova Scotia, across Canada and around the world.

Born and raised in the coal mining town of Dominion on Cape Breton Island, he never forgot where he came from. A champion of Liberal International and president of the Nova Scotia Liberal Party and in the Liberal Party of Canada, he served in the Chrétien government as leader of the government in the Senate and regional minister for Nova Scotia.

Throughout his career in radio, at Devco and in parliament, he was a voice for the downtrodden and disenfranchised, a voice for social progress. He had a deep love of his family and took great pride in their achievements. He delighted to be with them, and our hearts go out to them.

Al Graham was full of stories and jokes and fun and laughter. He was full of life.

Goodbye my friend. He will be missed.

* * *

● (1115)

ROUGE NATIONAL URBAN PARK

Mr. Paul Calandra (Oak Ridges—Markham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 1972, the then Trudeau Liberal government seized thousands of acres of class 1 farmland in my community, separating farmers from the lands they had farmed for generations. Yesterday was truly an historic day as the Governor General provided royal assent to the Rouge National Urban Park. It is a great day.

In 2008, I promised to find a way to reverse what the Liberals had done to farmers and yesterday we did that, thanks to the hard work of the Minister of the Environment and other members of Parliament on this side of the House. This park will guarantee our farmers the right to farm with long-term leases. It also creates a national urban park for the first time under a model which can be used not only in Canada but globally.

In creating this park, we consulted with over 150 municipal, provincial and aboriginal partners, and we took over 15,000 comments. The park will have the highest level of protection it has ever had, which far exceeds the protections the current provincial Liberal government gives.

I am so proud of the work we have done to get this done and I am proud of the community that made this park a reality.

* * *

[Translation]

ETHICS

Mr. Pierre Dionne Labelle (Rivière-du-Nord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Mike Duffy's journal reads like a bad crime novel: it contains corruption, scandal and a failed attempt to hide Duffy's dubious lobbying of Enbridge managers.

Oral Questions

However, the Conservatives have always had a tendency to give a free ride to leaders of major corporations. As was the case with the last budget, they are again attacking the most vulnerable by taking \$2 billion from the unemployed instead of making CEOs contribute by limiting their ability to pay themselves with stock options. In any event, it is of no consequence to the Conservatives: they will pass the burden on to our children and grandchildren.

Our children deserve better. They deserve a Canada where no one is left behind. That is what Canada will get in October 2015. Their parents and grandparents will vote for the only party that stands up for families: the NDP.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mrs. Kelly Block (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my constituents of Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar were very pleased to see our Conservative government continue to lower taxes for Canadians with our balanced budget. Families all across Saskatchewan are looking forward to receiving the benefits from the family tax cut and enhanced universal child care benefit. These benefits will leave 100% of families with kids with more money in their pockets.

The Liberals and the NDP would take this away and raise taxes on small businesses and workers.

Under our government, there will be no mandatory job-killing, economy-destabilizing pension tax hike, not for employees and not for employers.

Our Conservative government is lowering taxes on the middle class and lowering taxes for all Canadians.

Mr. David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the Conservatives have a no-tax plan for the wealthy and everybody else has to pay for it. They have a TFSA time bomb that funnels billions to the richest. They have kept loopholes to let CEOs skip out on millions in taxes. They have an income-splitting scheme that rewards the wealthy, but does nothing for 85% of Canadians, yet the Conservatives have failed to invest even a cent in affordable child care.

Why are the Conservatives proposing a budget that passes along the costs of their election promises to our children and grandchildren?

Mr. Andrew Saxton (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are proud to introduce a balanced budget and a plan for job creation and economic growth while keeping taxes low. Thanks to our low-tax plan, the average Canadian family of four now has an extra \$6,600 in their pockets every year.

Here is what the opposition is not telling people: The Liberals and the NDP want high taxes on middle-class families, high taxes on middle-class seniors, and high taxes on middle-class consumers. That is their plan: higher taxes for the middle class.

Our Conservative government is lowering taxes on the middle class and lowering taxes for all Canadians.

* * *

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

THE BUDGET

Mr. David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it seems the finance minister let the cat out of the bag the other day that this budget will take billions from working families and give it to the wealthy few, leaving a massive burden for future generations, but the Prime Minister said that consequences be damned; who cares if our grandkids have no money for health care, roads or pensions.

The Conservatives are determined to funnel money to the wealthy no matter what the cost. Why do they think hard-working Canadians should pay more so that their insider friends can pay less?

Mr. Andrew Saxton (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our family benefits will help 100% of families across Canada with kids, with the vast majority of the benefits going to low- and middle-income Canadians. There are 11 million Canadians who have a tax-free savings account, with the vast majority of accounts belonging again to low- and middle-income earners.

The Liberals and the NDP want high taxes on middle-class families, high taxes on middle-class seniors, and high taxes on middle-class consumers.

● (1120)

ETHICS

Mr. David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, while their budget was a most blatant example of electioneering, let us remember what the Conservatives are really trying to hide from: questions about the Prime Minister's appointment of Mike Duffy to the Senate. Senate appointments are the sole responsibility of the Prime Minister, not someone else, as the parliamentary secretary keeps incorrectly claiming.

Could the parliamentary secretary explain how the Conservatives could be the only people in Ottawa that did not know Mike Duffy lived in Ottawa?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have answered this question on a number of occasions.

The member is quite right, though, in the sense that it is only the Conservatives who understand how hard Canadian families work. That is why we are putting more money back in their pockets with the policies that have been brought forward by the Minister of Finance.

Oral Questions

At the same time, the New Democrats could help. They could help by repaying the \$2.7 million that they illegally used to fund illegal offices in Montreal, offices that they said they were creating in Ottawa with employees who actually lived in Ottawa. However, we know that was a lie because they actually lived in Montreal and worked in Montreal, against the rules of this House. They should pay back the \$2.7 million they owe the taxpayers.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Constitution states that for a senator to be appointed, “He shall be resident in the Province for which he is appointed.”

That is a requirement that the Prime Minister has a duty to verify, since he is the one who appoints senators. However, we know that did not happen, since Mike Duffy has lived in Kanata, Ontario, for years.

What, exactly, made the Prime Minister think that Senator Mike Duffy was indeed a resident of Prince Edward Island?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, the constitutional practice on this has been clear for almost 150 years.

It is also clear that it is against the rules of the House to use taxpayer money for partisan purposes. There are 68 NDP members who used taxpayer money in violation of the rules of the House, and I encourage all NDP members to do the right thing and repay taxpayers.

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the more the Conservatives avoiding answering, the more Canadians have questions about this affair. It is rather simple. Either the Prime Minister was not aware of Duffy's place of residence—which shows that he really did not do his job—or else he was aware, in which case he should not have appointed Mike Duffy as a senator for that province.

How does the Prime Minister explain his appointment of Mike Duffy as a senator for a province in which he did not even reside?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have answered that question many times.

[*English*]

At the same time, as I just mentioned, there are 68 members of the NDP who owe Canadian taxpayers \$2.7 million. The member who asked this question owes Canadian taxpayers over \$29,000 in illegal money that was funnelled to an illegal office in Montreal, against all of the rules of the House. The NDP might think that is funny. I can assure them that Canadians taxpayers do not. Canadian taxpayers would rather have the \$2.7 million in their pockets as a result of their hard work, and not in illegal offices in Montreal. I suggest that the NDP pay it back.

* * *

THE BUDGET

Ms. Kirsty Duncan (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister made it clear to Canadians that Conservatives only care about short-term political gain when he said that the TFSA

increase for the rich will be paid for Canada's next generation, and “why don't we leave that to [the Prime Minister's] granddaughter to solve”.

The cost will rise exponentially by tens of billions of dollars a year for both the federal government and the provinces. Why are the Conservatives mortgaging the future generation, instead of building a plan for jobs and growth?

Mr. Andrew Saxton (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are proud to leave more money in the pockets of Canadians, which is good for future generations. The TFSA is the most popular savings vehicle since the RSP was introduced, with 11 million accounts and growing, the majority of which are for low-income and middle-income earners.

The Liberals want high taxes on middle-class families, high taxes on middle-class seniors, and high taxes on middle-class consumers. That is their plan: high taxes on the middle class.

Our Conservative government is lowering taxes on the middle class, and we will not apologize for helping Canadians save for their future.

• (1125)

Ms. Kirsty Duncan (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in addition to saddling our future generations with a multi-billion dollar mortgage, the Conservatives are funding this change by taking \$32,000 from the poorest and most vulnerable seniors by raising the OAS age from 65 to 67.

Why are the Conservatives taking money away from low-income seniors and giving even more to high wealth households? Why will they not help the middle class and those working hard to join it?

Mr. Andrew Saxton (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is our Conservative government that has fought for seniors. We have increased the guaranteed income supplement by the largest amount in more than a quarter of a century. They voted against it. We have introduced pension income splitting for seniors. They voted against it. Economic action plan 2015 introduces even more support for seniors, such as the new home accessibility tax credit, more compassionate care benefits, and lower required RRIF withdrawals.

They want to raise taxes on seniors. We are putting money back in the pockets of Canadian seniors.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Garneau (Westmount—Ville-Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, increasing the TFSA limit will mainly benefit the richest Canadians and will impose a heavy tax burden on future generations. That is not fair or prudent. Canada is facing many challenges: an ageing population, a stagnant economy, a shortage of quality jobs and crumbling infrastructure. We must not mortgage our future and create problems for the Prime Minister's granddaughter to solve.

Oral Questions

Why is the government favouring the richest Canadians by mortgaging our children's future?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, nearly two-thirds of Canadians who contributed the maximum amount to a tax-free savings account earn less than \$60,000. The Liberals think that everyone who earns \$60,000 or less is rich and that they need to raise those people's taxes. That is the Liberals' position. We support taxpayers and seniors, and we are going to let them save more money without having to pay taxes on their earnings.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about another Conservative mess. A government ad promoting the apprentice loan program shows workers committing a wide range of serious violations of workplace health and safety standards.

Now the Conservatives want to spend \$7.5 million to promote their election budget at taxpayers' expense and with faulty advertising.

Will the Conservatives stop wasting taxpayers' money on partisan advertising that is full of misleading information and depictions of health and safety standards being violated?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is funding apprentice grants. Why? Because we will need one million skilled workers over the next seven years. We are giving out grants and loans to apprentices to prepare them to fill those jobs. The New Democrats do not believe in the skilled trades and oppose these investments. We will create jobs by training our young people in those trades.

* * *

[English]

THE BUDGET

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we actually think health and safety is important for the workplace and Conservatives cannot even get that right. They are spending \$7.5 million in advertising for a snake oil sales job on a budget that leaves Canadians behind and the Minister of Finance has admitted the truth that our grandchildren will be saddled with the fiscal problems of billion dollar handouts to the wealthiest few. Meanwhile, the number of out-of-work Canadians applying for EI benefits has surged, but fewer and fewer are being accepted.

Why do the Conservatives think that helping the wealthy buy a second BMW is more important than helping Canadians and parents put food on the table?

• (1130)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, New Democrats think anybody who makes \$60,000 a year is too wealthy. Sixty per cent of those who have maximized their tax-free savings accounts earned less than \$60,000 a year. Two-thirds of

those who have maxed out are seniors. These are people who are taking money from their RRSP and putting it into their tax-free savings accounts so that they can have a tax-free nest egg to live on. These are middle- and lower-income seniors and the NDP wants to raise their taxes.

* * *

[Translation]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that the Conservatives are placing a major burden on the shoulders of future generations.

The Conservative budget is a disappointment to Quebec, the regions and families. The Conservatives are unilaterally reducing the growth of health transfers to Quebec, and infrastructure funding will be both delayed and insufficient.

In addition, the Conservatives are making further cuts to the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec.

Is regional economic development not a priority for the Conservatives?

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 is continuing to help all regions of Quebec with their economic development.

We are a privileged partner of choice, and we would like other partners, such as the NDP, to vote for our budget, which will support many economic development projects in Quebec in the future.

* * *

[English]

LABOUR

Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, with soaring rates of youth unemployment many young Canadians are being pressured into taking unpaid internships in hopes of one day landing a job. Under the Conservatives' watch, thousands of interns have been left without basic workplace protection. After finally committing in the budget to take action to protect interns, Conservatives then voted against my private member's bill, the intern protection act.

Why are handouts to the wealthy few put on the fast track while rights for vulnerable workers are put on the backburner?

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch (Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I ask the member opposite if she is supporting the budget, because we are supporting interns. Economic action plan 2015 specifically outlines for interns in federal jurisdiction, regardless of the pay they receive, occupational health and safety benefits. Please, just read the text. We are very focused on making sure that people are safe and productive in the workplace.

Oral Questions

In addition to that, we are also focused on making sure Canadians have jobs which New Democrats are also against. We are for lowering taxes. They are for heightening them on middle-class Canadians. The facts are that we are doing things to make sure workplaces are safe, productive, and individuals are making funds. The NDP totally opposed all those things.

[Translation]

Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government talks a good line, but its actions do not measure up.

The youth unemployment rate is double the national average. Too many young people are accepting unpaid internships because there are no jobs available. In their last budget, the Conservatives promised to do something about that, but they voted against my bill to protect interns.

Does the government really intend to act, or will it leave those problems to the Prime Minister's granddaughter to solve?

[English]

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch (Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned what is in economic action plan 2015. Our government knows that internships in particular can provide important learning experiences so people get that first job. We are focused on making sure internships are available. They have been available in our previous budgets and would be available in this one. In fact, we have created 1.2 million net new jobs since the downturn of the recession, through numerous mechanisms. The New Democrats are against those things.

In addition to that, we are about lowering taxes, ensuring middle-class Canadians and even those students getting an income have lower taxes. The New Democrats want to heighten taxes on every Canadian.

* * *

[Translation]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Ms. Mylène Freeman (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, NDP): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservative government is putting billions of dollars into the pockets of the wealthiest Canadians, we find nothing in its latest budget to support women, nothing to provide them with support in their careers, such as affordable child care, nothing to ensure that they get pay equity.

With income splitting, this spring the Conservatives told women to stay at home; now, with their budget, the Conservatives are not giving them any other option.

Why is the government doing nothing to help women?

[English]

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch (Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the budget there is a new action plan for women entrepreneurs, again creating new jobs. That is what we need to do, create new jobs. We know that when women lead a company they actually hire more women, again creating more jobs. Let alone, the universal child care benefit which would actually benefit every mother and every father by ensuring they have a benefit. That is unlike the plan that the NDP put forward.

We are about supporting families, particularly women, ensuring they have great jobs. The New Democrats vote against it every time.

• (1135)

Ms. Mylène Freeman (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this budget would take no action on violence against women, pay equity or child care. There would be nothing to empower women to make those choices. Women are more than half of the university graduates, but when they graduate they will earn 10% to 30% less than men.

Women need access to child care, to proactive pay equity, freedom from violence and strong federal leadership on gender equality.

Why did the budget help the wealthiest few while ignoring half of Canada's population?

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch (Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the economic action plan specifically focuses on issues with sexual harassment in the workplace, ensuring women are protected there, as well as a number of initiatives that we have moved forward on to make sure we are supporting victims of crime.

About job creation, there there would be a new action plan for women entrepreneurs, creating jobs. They in turn create more jobs, particularly for women.

I encourage the member opposite to read the budget. We are about making sure jobs are created, taxes are lowered and Canadian women are supported through the universal child care benefit. They vote against these things every single time.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in this budget the Conservatives showed once again they have no respect for public servants. How can they claim to be bargaining in good faith with the public service on sick days when they are already declaring what the outcome will be? That is not good faith, that is not respecting the process and it is not negotiation.

Why does the minister show such disrespect for the public servants who work hard every day for all Canadians? They work hard for him and they work hard for the current government every day. Why is there such disrespect for public servants here in Ottawa and across the country?

Mr. Dan Albas (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government is committed to having good faith and meaningful negotiations with bargaining agents on sick leave and the short-term disability plan. The proposed disability plan would give public servants the comprehensive safety net that they need while protecting taxpayers who pay the bill. This is a win-win situation.

[Translation]

Mr. Mathieu Ravignat (Pontiac, NDP): Mr. Speaker, with their budget, the Conservatives are already banking on saving \$900 million on public service sick leave and disability benefits this year even though no agreement has been reached with the unions.

Oral Questions

The President of the Treasury Board maintains that he wants to negotiate in good faith, but does he realize that he is doing exactly the opposite through his actions? Is he purposely derailing the negotiations with public servants who are working hard to provide us with top-quality services?

[English]

Mr. Dan Albas (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, again, the government is committed to good faith and meaningful negotiations with bargaining agents on sick leave and the short-term disability plan. The 40-year-old sick-leave accumulation system is antiquated and not responsive to the needs of the majority of our employees.

Over 60% of employees in the core public administration do not have enough banked sick leave to cover a full period of short-term disability. That is why the government is proposing a short-term disability plan that would help public servants get healthy and back to work.

Again, we are looking out for the taxpayer and we are looking out for our employees. This can be a win-win for everyone.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, intimidating charities was not enough for the Canada Revenue Agency. Now it is campaigning for the Conservatives. Under the guise of requesting to confirm information it already has, the CRA is sending out mail to promote Conservative policies that have not even been approved here in Parliament yet.

Canadians are no fools. Rosemary Ronald is not happy that this money is being spent on partisan letters. Why are the Conservatives using tax dollars to campaign?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the notice the government sent to parents indicates that Parliament voted twice in favour of increasing the universal child care benefit to almost \$2,000 for every child under 6 and \$720 for every child between 6 and 17.

The Liberals do not want parents to know that this money is available because they want to take that money away and hand it over to big bureaucracies. We are putting that money directly into mom and dad's pockets.

* * *

[English]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Frank Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, veterans' benefits must also be an issue the government wants to leave to the Prime Minister's grandchildren.

First, the Conservatives claw back \$1.1 billion from veterans affairs so they can dole it out in inadequate portions later. Then they deny that firing 900 front-line workers was badly impacting veterans, despite their own department's warning, until they were forced to rehire a small fraction of them.

Now the Conservatives announce new financial benefits, but will not cover PTSD. Why are Canada's veterans always an afterthought for these Conservatives?

● (1140)

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, how untrue. Economic action plan 2015 not only benefits all Canadians, including low- and middle-income Canadians but also veterans.

Let me give some examples. Within this economic action plan is the new retirement income security benefit, which provides moderately to severely disabled veterans with a monthly income support payment beginning at age 65. There is also the family caregiver relief benefit, a new benefit for caregivers, and the critical injury benefit, which provides a \$70,000 tax-free award to support those Canadian Armed Forces personnel who experience a sudden injury.

Will this member support our veterans by supporting our economic action plan? That is the question.

Mr. Frank Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, those benefits cut them from a \$60,000 pension to a \$27,000 pension, and back to \$42,000. Why do they not get their full \$60,000 pension?

Veterans suffering from latent long-term symptoms of PTSD are also excluded from VAC's new injury award under Bill C-58. Even the Veterans Ombudsman acknowledges it does not go nearly far enough in supporting injured veterans as it will affect only a handful of former service members each year, and none with PTSD.

Why are the Conservatives so stubbornly refusing to present a plan that will honour our sacred obligation to veterans and all their families?

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this member really needs to start following the exciting new initiatives that we are delivering for our veterans.

He should be aware that we are expanding and opening nine new mental health injury clinics to support our veterans and their families all across Canada.

I mentioned, in this economic action plan, the family caregiver relief benefit, which provides eligible veterans with a tax-free annual grant of over \$7,200 to ensure that the veterans' needs are met. That is going to support the family.

Will this member support our veterans by supporting this economic action plan that has so many excellent measures for our veterans and their families?

*Oral Questions***AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD**

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Ontario farmers are worried because avian flu has been confirmed on a second farm in Oxford County, and the quarantine now stretches into the Waterloo Region.

This is the second major outbreak of bird flu in Canada in the last six months at a time when Conservative cuts have decimated the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. It has lost 300 employees while 54 positions in animal health remain unfilled.

What is the government's plan to contain the outbreak and protect the poultry industry? Will the Conservatives reverse their destructive cuts to CFIA?

Mr. Gerald Keddy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, CPC): Mr. Speaker, testing has confirmed that H5 avian influenza is on a number of farms in Ontario.

We are working closely with the province, industry and producers. CFIA has placed the farms under quarantine, and has established appropriate control zones in accordance with international protocols.

CFIA will continue to keep the public informed of developments through its technical briefings.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Mario Martinez Diaz came to Canada as a temporary foreign worker. His employer repeatedly broke the contract Diaz had signed before coming, including changing the job description and the wage, but has his employer had his labour market opinion revoked? No. Has his employer been put on the blacklist? No. So much for getting tough on abuse of the program.

Why do the Conservatives always promise reforms and then fall into the same old patterns of neglect when the media spotlight fades?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our position on the temporary foreign worker program is that Canadians should always come first for Canadian jobs. That is why we brought in massively increased inspections. We have brought in severe penalties and fines for those who break the terms and conditions of the program. We have capped the number of temporary foreign workers in low-wage sectors that a business of more than 10 employees can have at 10% of the workforce. This ensures that employers will go out and hire Canadians and pay fair wages so that our working people always get ahead.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the North is another file that is suffering because of the Conservatives' incompetence.

Canada is preparing to hand over the chairmanship of the Arctic Council among controversy and accusations that the Minister of the

Environment has politicized the council. Let us hope that the United States will be able to repair the damage done by this government.

What does the minister have to say about such accusations that undermine co-operation at the council?

• (1145)

[English]

Mr. Bernard Trottier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for La Francophonie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is proud of the initiatives we put forward during our chairmanship of the Arctic Council, and we look forward to the meetings in Iqaluit.

The Arctic Council is an intergovernmental forum for co-operation on sustainable development and environmental protection issues. It does not deal with matters related to defence and security, as members know. However, the fact remains that no other government in Canadian history has done more to stand up for our Arctic sovereignty than this Conservative government.

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the question is: If the government is so proud, why has it cancelled the planned showcase of Canada's accomplishments when it comes to the Arctic?

In fact, we heard from the minister from Nunavut that it was cancelled because of "...the challenges of everything happening all at once". The documents show that the meeting was cancelled because of direction from senior levels of the Canadian government.

Can the minister confirm that the meeting was cancelled because the Conservatives expected to be embarrassed by their own failures in the north?

Mr. Bernard Trottier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for La Francophonie, CPC): Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Arctic Council is very important for Canada. Obviously we have a very important role to play. The chairmanship over the last two years was led very ably by our Minister of the Environment.

I would also say that the Arctic Council is an important forum for us to discuss a variety of issues, including Arctic sovereignty and Canada's claims on sovereignty in the Arctic. We are backing that up with strong investments in the Arctic. We are making sure that our voice is heard at the Arctic Council.

*Oral Questions***THE BUDGET**

Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Minister of Finance tabled our government's balanced budget and low-tax plan for jobs and growth. On this side of the House, we believe in helping families and giving them back more of their hard-earned money.

Can the Minister of Employment and Social Development please tell this House what budget 2015 does for Canadian families?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have good news and bad news.

The good news is that economic action plan 2015 expands and extends the universal child care benefit. For every child under six there is \$2,000 and for every child six through 17 there is \$720, regardless of the family's income or the child care they choose.

Now the bad news. There are 200,000 Canadian families who have not yet signed up to receive this benefit from our Conservative government. They have exactly one week until the deadline to sign up and receive the first installment of this increased and expanded benefit. I strongly encourage people to go to Canada.ca/taxsavings to get the money that they deserve.

* * *

CANADA POST

Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan (Scarborough—Rouge River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have made it very clear that they are opposed to the Conservative cuts to our postal service. Yesterday, protesters even followed the Prime Minister to Winnipeg to condemn the cuts to home delivery that so many Canadians rely on.

Canada Post made millions in profits last year, which just underlines how wrong the Conservatives were to cut home delivery. Will they now do the right thing for our communities and halt their reckless cuts to our postal services?

Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will remind the member that Canada Post is an arm's-length Crown corporation, responsible for its own business decisions, especially its five-point plan.

As the member will know, Canada Post delivered 1.4 billion fewer letters last year than in 2006. That trend continues to decline. Two-thirds of Canadians currently do not receive door to door.

Canada Post has made a decision that in order to save daily mail, it will do so according to its five-point plan, and the member should support that.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Charmaine Borg (Terrebonne—Blainville, NDP): Mr. Speaker, two years ago a report commissioned by Canada Post forecast losses of \$250 million in 2014.

However, this year, Canada Post posted a profit of \$300 million. That is a half-billion-dollar mistake. Canada Post used the report to justify ending door-to-door delivery against the advice of 500 municipalities, including Terrebonne.

Will the minister admit her mistake and put a stop to Canada Post's plans?

Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2014, Canada Post delivered 1.4 billion fewer letters than in 2006. Two-thirds of Canadians do not have door-to-door delivery. Canada Post must balance its budget without imposing a burden on Canadian taxpayers, and we would expect nothing less.

• (1150)

Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse (Louis-Saint-Laurent, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government keeps repeating that Canada Post is an organization that makes its own decisions and that the government has nothing to do with it, but that is false. The government has a responsibility to listen to Canadians.

Canada Post based its decision on an erroneous report. More than 500 municipalities are asking it to start over. Seniors, people with reduced mobility and SMEs are losing access to essential services.

When will the minister assume her responsibilities and stop this plan that makes no sense?

[*English*]

Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada Post is an independent Crown corporation. It operates at arm's-length from the government. It has a CEO and a board of directors. They make the decisions on its operations.

Canada Post has a five-point plan precisely because it is delivering 1.4 billion fewer letter mail pieces in 2014 than in 2006. It has a responsibility to operate well into the future fiscally without being a burden to taxpayers. We expect it to do that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the lobster-fishing season in the Magdalen Islands is scheduled to begin on May 9.

However, yesterday, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans published contradictory administrative notices that are mandatory for some fishers but not for others. The department is requiring fishers to complete a logbook every time they go out to sea, a logbook that is filled with questions that have nothing to do with species management.

Why will the minister not grant a reprieve to allow for real consultation?

[*English*]

Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the department is in discussion with the association and the province, and will consult lobster fishers on this matter. We will continue to work with our partners to get agreement on a way forward.

Oral Questions

However, increasingly consumers demand traceability of their food products and industry certification demands additional information from the industry.

* * *

ETHICS

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the Mike Duffy trial, it was revealed that an expense claim for makeup services in 2009 was rejected by Senate finance officials as not parliamentary business.

That being the case, could the government explain how makeup services were then paid by the Senate in 2010 through Duffy's slush fund, including those services used by the Prime Minister?

Will the government conduct a broad inquiry to determine what other government or Conservative Party expenses were also forced on to the back of the Senate?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, these types of expenses are not passed on to taxpayers.

That is an unfortunate question coming from a member who was accused of living expenses that were inappropriate. I do not understand why the Liberals would have him ask this question. They should have the member for York West ask it. No, the member for York West could not have done it. The Kings—Hants promised to pay back \$40 million so it could not have been him. Maybe it could be the member for Vancouver Centre. No, the member for Vancouver Centre has illegal campaign debt, so I guess it does fall on him to ask this question.

Hearing the Liberals talk about ethics is like listening to people talk about Sasquatch. We hear a lot about it, but we just never see it.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the transfer of snow crab fishing licences. The New Brunswick Court of Appeal has already ruled in favour of Cyrenus Dugas, a crab fisher from New Brunswick. That decision was upheld by the Supreme Court in 2013. However, the case is back before the courts once again.

Can the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans follow the example of her predecessor and wait for the outcome of this case before she gets involved in the transfer of that licence to P.E.I. fishers Peter and Adam Gaudet, or will she respect the court of appeal's decision, which was upheld by the Supreme Court?

[*English*]

Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this issue has spent considerable time before the courts, and I can assure members that DFO's decision will be guided by court decisions and by DFO policies.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): My apologies. We skipped a slot there, so we will go back to the hon. member for Malpeque.

●(1155)

ETHICS

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary's answer to the previous question I would suggest should have been stated outside, but it does show what kind of a makeup artist the parliamentary secretary really is.

Surely, when the Prime Minister uses a makeup artist, any makeup artist who is given the kind of close access to the Prime Minister would have to go through an RCMP background check. Everything would be documented.

It was found that there were expenses made illegally through the Duffy slush fund in 2010. Will the government come clean and tell us how much it has cost taxpayers for the Prime Minister's blush, makeup and hairspray?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, taxpayers do not cover these expenses. When it comes to blush and hairspray, I suggest he ask the Liberal member of Parliament for Mississauga—Brampton South. I think she would have much more knowledge of that.

Again, when it comes to the ethics of the Liberals, I understand why they are having such trouble. Again, the leader of the opposition could ask that question but, of course, he accepted money when he was giving speeches to unions, churches and school groups, when he should have been in here, doing his job as a member of Parliament. I guess there is a limited number of MPs on that side who can actually talk about ethics.

We will continue to do the right thing. We will continue to provide the assistance to the Crown. If Mr. Duffy is found guilty, he should suffer the consequences of that.

* * *

CANADA BORDER SERVICES AGENCY

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on April 1, in the form of some cruel joke, the Conservatives shut down the border crossing between Stewart,

B.C. and Hyder, Alaska for eight hours every day. The two remote communities share emergency services that will now be closed a full third of the time. Local tourism, mining and other business community leaders say that this is a disaster for the local economy.

It has become so absurd that the Alaska State legislature recently voted unanimously to offer to pay Canada to keep its border open. This has become a ridiculous yet dangerous problem.

When will the minister stand and reverse this idiotic and irresponsible decision?

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is focused on ensuring that our shared border is secure, while easing the flow of legitimate travel and trade. We are investing in border infrastructure to support this objective, including new lanes at the busiest crossings.

Oral Questions

The port of entry that the member is speaking about has fewer than 10 travellers who pass during non-peak hours. It is simply not feasible to pay a highly trained border services officer to stand at an unused border crossing. Additionally, in cases of emergency, contingency plans are in place to allow smooth passage through the border in non-peak hours.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Ryan Leef (Yukon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Omar Ahmed Khadr is a convicted murderer. Under the direction of jihadist terrorists, he killed army medic Sergeant Christopher Speer. He left Tabitha Speer without a husband. He left Taryn and Tanner Speer without a father.

The media is reporting that this terrorist will now receive bail and will be out on our streets. Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness please update the House on our government's position on this outcome?

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for the Yukon for his work in public safety.

We are very disappointed with this decision, and I am here to say that we will appeal. Omar Ahmed Khadr pleaded guilty to heinous crimes, including the murder of American army medic Sergeant Christopher Speer. We have vigorously defended against any attempt to lessen his punishment for these crimes.

While the Liberals refuse to rule out special compensation for this convicted terrorist, and the NDP actively tries to force Canadian taxpayers to compensate him, we believe that victims of crime, not the perpetrators, are the ones who deserve full compensation.

* * *

PENSIONS

Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Cape Breton seniors, like many across the country, have been left out in the cold by the Conservative budget. Eighty-two-year-old Minnie Piercey, who lives in a seniors apartment complex and is president of the North Sydney seniors and pensioners club stated, "I can't see anything in it for seniors unless they have \$50,000 or \$60,000 stashed away in a bank".

Like many other seniors she finds it hard to go month to month, let alone save. Why are the Conservatives taking from the poor seniors and giving to the rich?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I do not understand how the Liberal Party can conclude that a senior who earns under \$60,000 is rich. It is pretty rich coming from the Liberal Party, which wants to raise taxes on those seniors.

This is how it works. When seniors take money out of their RRSP, they put it into tax-free savings accounts. They have a nest egg they can use to draw income to pay the monthly bills. We want to take taxes off that nest egg. That is what the tax free savings accounts do. They give most of the benefits to people earning less than \$60,000 a year, people on whom the Liberals would raise taxes.

● (1200)

TAXATION

Mr. Brad Butt (Mississauga—Streetsville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while our government has balanced the budget while lowering taxes, both opposition parties would reach into the pockets of hard-working, middle-class Canadians and reduce their take home pay with a forced CPP hike.

My constituents in Mississauga—Streetsville are concerned with the new Liberal pension payroll tax that could force a family of two workers to pay as much as \$3,200 more per year.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance please inform the House of our government's view on a mandatory expansion of CPP?

Mr. Andrew Saxton (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there are many other options, voluntary options, tax saving options, that we have enhanced to help people save. What we will not suggest is raising taxes on workers, claiming it is for their own good. Under our government, there will be no mandatory job-killing, economy-destabilizing pension tax hike, not for employees, not for employers.

Our government is focused on reducing taxes on the middle class, not increasing taxes like the Liberals and the NDP would do.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Brent Rathgeber (Edmonton—St. Albert, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, the government has spent almost \$5 million fighting 15 losing court cases, including over \$1 million trying to defend minimum mandatory sentences and abolishing early parole eligibility.

Why does the Minister of Justice insist on wasting taxpayer dollars on expensive litigation after routinely ignoring internal Department of Justice advice that his proposed legislation is almost certainly not compliant with the charter?

Mr. Bob Dechert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is worth noting that while the government at any given moment is involved in some 50,000 litigation files, about 85% of them are not initiated by the government. I would also note for the hon. member that in the majority of these cases the government has been successful.

We remain committed to defending the rights of Canadians and to ensuring their hard-earned tax dollars are spent efficiently and effectively.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Brent Rathgeber (Edmonton—St. Albert, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2015 predicts a \$3.6 billion employment insurance surplus, which the government is using as a revenue source in order to balance its budget. However, the number of Albertans applying for employment insurance benefits rose by a startling almost 30% in February. Now that the EI surplus has been depleted, how will the government fund the anticipated spike in employment insurance claims?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our policy is that the employment insurance account should balance over the median term. For example, during the recession, it was in a deficit. In the subsequent years the account pays back that deficit. As a result, we are able to reduce EI payroll taxes by about 20% in the year 2017.

Now, the Liberals and the NDP want to raise those payroll taxes to fund a 45-day work year; that is to have people work only 45 days and then collect EI for the rest of the year. That would be expensive. It would drive up taxes and kill jobs. We will not let that happen.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Bernard Trottier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for La Francophonie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaties entitled “Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the State of Israel on Air Transport”, done at Jerusalem on January 21, 2015, the “Agreement on Social Security between the Government of Canada and the Government of the People’s Republic of China”, done at Ottawa on April 2, 2015, and the “Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Burkina Faso for the Promotion and Protection of Investments”, done at Ottawa on April 20, 2015.

An explanatory memorandum is included with each treaty.

* * *

SENATE SPEAKER PIERRE CLAUDE NOLIN

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): It is with great sadness that we mark the passing of Senator Pierre Claude Nolin, the Speaker of the Senate.

[Translation]

Our thoughts and prayers are with Senator Nolin’s family and friends and the entire Senate community at this time of great loss.

The hon. Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.

• (1205)

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that we learned today of the passing of Senate Speaker Pierre Claude Nolin.

Tribute

He was a real gentleman with true character. He was a strong Quebecker who was proud to be Canadian.

[English]

Speaker Nolin was a strong and clear voice, dedicated to serving Quebeckers and all Canadians, and he did so as a member of the upper chamber for over 21 distinguished years.

[Translation]

During his time in the Senate, he contributed to numerous committees covering a broad range of issues, including legal and constitutional affairs; foreign affairs and international trade; national security and defence; and banking, trade and commerce.

After having been unanimously elected Speaker *pro tempore* of the Senate in 2013, he was appointed Speaker of the Senate in 2014. A strong supporter of the military, Senator Nolin was a member of the Cercle des Honoraires of the Régiment de Maisonneuve since 1995, becoming an honorary lieutenant-colonel of the regiment in 2012. In 2014, he was also named a Commander of the Order of Saint Lazarus.

[English]

Speaking in a personal vein, I first came to know P.C. Nolin, as we commonly called him, as a political organizer. He was very much an organizer’s organizer, the best kind, and by that I mean one who was determined above all to deliver victory. In 1984, he was a key player on the team that did just that for the Conservative Party in Quebec, restoring and reviving the party in a province where it had languished since the First World War. The result was a positive one, which made our country stronger.

As a senator, P.C. Nolin was serious and diligent in what he saw as the important duty of the Senate: to test and scrutinize the legislation we send over there. A Conservative minister heading to the Senate to testify on a bill might have thought that Senator Nolin, as a proud partisan and a good team player, would give that minister an easy ride. Such a minister was in for a surprise.

As I experienced first-hand, friendship and partisan ties were set aside and replaced with a higher duty. Senator Nolin would probe to ensure that a minister was truly master of the legislation presented. Then he would unerringly test the vulnerabilities of a bill and obtain the reasoned assurances that any proposal truly and genuinely reflected the public interest.

He was ensuring through his work that the Senate of Canada performed the diligent task envisioned for it when Sir John A. Macdonald, George-Étienne Cartier, and the other Fathers of Confederation built the structures of our new country and a century and a half old parliamentary democracy that endures successfully today.

[Translation]

We wish to express our sincere condolences to his wife, Camille, to his three children, Simon, Louis and Virginie, and to his grandchildren, as well as to his entire family, friends and colleagues in the Senate.

Tribute

As the Prime Minister said, Pierre Claude Nolin is now part of that small group of persons whose life and example have enhanced the institution they served while contributing to the common good. His distinguished service to the upper chamber and to our country will be remembered and honoured.

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this morning we were deeply saddened to learn of the passing of Senator Pierre Claude Nolin, a great gentleman who devoted his career to public life and who served Parliament and the public competently and with dedication.

The Leader of the Opposition, who sent a statement earlier, my caucus and I are thinking of his family and friends during these painful moments.

• (1210)

[*English*]

Ironically, I first met Senator Pierre Claude Nolin outside the Senate, on a panel for the 1997 election campaign on election night. His charm and his friendly manner impressed me right from the beginning.

Earlier today I was upstairs in the parliamentary cafeteria and the sadness of the staff there when they learned of his death is a real testament to how he was appreciated on Parliament Hill.

He was appointed to the Senate in 1993, and then to the role of Speaker only last November. Senator Nolin spent his entire life involved in politics and the betterment of his community and Canada as a whole. Over the years, Senator Nolin became well known and respected for his fierce independence and disregard for partisanship on matters of importance to him. So esteemed was he by his colleagues that they unanimously chose him to be the Speaker of the Senate.

Although he was a loyal Conservative, as my colleague has just mentioned, he voted often across party lines on a number of occasions. Just to mention one, in 2002, he was chair of the Senate committee that called for the legalization of marijuana. He continued to oppose harsh penalties for marijuana possession throughout his career.

[*Translation*]

As my colleague from Acadie—Bathurst just reminded me, he was always a strong supporter of bilingualism in this country.

As Speaker of the Senate, he was dedicated to being non-partisan in carrying out his duties and to doing everything he could to defend and restore the institution's reputation. Transparency and accountability were the principles that guided his actions as an individual and as a parliamentarian.

Last week, even as he was battling the cancer ravaging his body, Senator Nolin retained his lifelong good humour and determination.

[*English*]

Senator Nolin fought a brave fight against a rare form of cancer which took him far too soon. His courage in his fight is an inspiration to all of us.

[*Translation*]

To Senator Nolin, his family and his loved ones, our thoughts and prayers are with you.

Rest in peace, Senator Pierre Claude Nolin. You will be missed.

Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct honour to speak on this occasion.

We were all aware of Senator's Nolin's health problems but it still came a shock this morning to learn of his passing. It is a reminder that our lives are finite and our time on this Earth limited. The challenge is make the best possible use of the time we have.

Senator Nolin used the time that he had to make a lasting contribution. He married and raised three children. I extend my most sincere condolences to his wife Camille and his children, Simon, Louis, and Virginie.

Senator Nolin was an influential advocate for the Acadian community in New Brunswick. He was a political organizer and played an important role in building both the Progressive Conservative party and the party that emerged from the merger of the PC Party and the Reform Party, the current Conservative Party of Canada.

He was also an independent thinker. Notably he chaired the Special Senate Committee on Illegal Drugs, which recommended legalizing the use of marijuana in Canada. He also advocated for the rights of married same-sex couples to equal status in the courts of law. These were positions that were controversial among some Canadians, including many within his own party. Nonetheless, as Senator Nolin himself remarked:

I think it is much easier for senators to carry out their duties if they manage to reduce the influence of partisanship on their decisions. Each individual's free will is often a much better guide.

Those are words we would all be wise to remember.

Near the end of his life he took on the tough and thankless task of reforming the Senate so that it was more accountable and transparent. Unfortunately that work remains to be completed, but it is a testament to senator Nolin's character that he was entrusted by his peers with this responsibility.

On behalf of the Liberal Party of Canada, I express my condolences to the family and friends of Senator Nolin and I thank him for his contribution to our country.

May Senator Nolin rest in peace.

• (1215)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Is the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands rising on a point of order?

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): On the same point, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add a few words to say that Speaker Nolin was a friend to all in this place, that his—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Order. Before the hon. member proceeds, is there unanimous consent of the House for the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands to participate in the statement by minister?

Routine Proceedings

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At the point that Pierre Claude Nolin took over as the Speaker of the Senate, I had the great privilege of being in this place for some time. He was extraordinarily gracious. He was always a non-partisan face of welcome for those of us in the House of Commons who had occasion to be over in the Senate.

The news of his illness, of course, had reached all of us some time ago, but his passing is still a tremendous shock. I just wanted to express on behalf of the Green Party and myself our deepest condolences to his family and those who are close to him.

He was a great Canadian. He will be missed.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I now invite hon. members to rise to observe a moment of silence in honour of the late Honourable Pierre Claude Nolin, Speaker of the Senate.

[*A moment of silence observed*]

* * *

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. Kelly Block (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 10th report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources, in relation to Bill C-46, an act to amend the National Energy Board Act and the Canada Oil and Gas Operations Act.

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with amendments.

* * *

INDEPENDENCE OF THE JUDICIARY ACT

Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-669, an act to amend the Criminal Code (independence of the judiciary).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the independence of the judiciary act, which would ensure that judges have the necessary discretion to impose principled and proportionate sentences tailored to the particularities of individual circumstances, individual offenders, and individual victims.

Everyone in this House seeks to prevent crime and keep Canadians safe. Sometimes, however, measures intended to achieve these laudable objectives, which we all share, turn out to be ineffective, counterproductive, and unjust. Such is unfortunately the case with the government's ever-increasing reliance on mandatory minimum sentencing provisions.

As the Supreme Court said last week, "Empirical evidence suggests that mandatory minimum sentences do not, in fact, deter

crimes." Instead, they lead to prison overcrowding. They disproportionately impact aboriginals and other minority groups. They increase costs for taxpayers. They may violate the charter, and they are, as one American study put it, a recipe for recidivism.

While the bill would maintain the mandatory minimum sentencing requirement where warranted, it would allow judges to vary mandated sentences where it is deemed just and reasonable to do so, provided they give written reasons for doing so.

It is in the interests of both justice and public safety that the sentence fit the particularities of the crime.

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

* * *

● (1220)

[*Translation*]

NAVIGATION PROTECTION ACT

Ms. Mylène Freeman (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-670, An Act to amend the Navigation Protection Act (Viceroy Lake and other lakes and rivers).

She said: Mr. Speaker, in honour of Earth Day earlier this week, I rise today to introduce a bill in response to the changes this government made to the Navigable Waters Protection Act, changes that have left over 1,000 waterways in my riding without protection.

The riding I represent has a wealth of waterways that are truly at the heart of the identity and the economy of my region. Our lakes and rivers are more than just waterways, even though we benefit a great deal from them from a socio-economic standpoint; they are also symbolic of our life, history and culture.

However, the Conservatives removed thousands of waterways from the Navigable Waters Protection Act, limiting the protection to only about 100 lakes and about 60 rivers all across the country. Lakes and rivers are a public resource that must be protected for future generations.

That is why I am proposing that 46 major lakes and rivers in my riding of Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel be reintroduced to the Navigable Waters Protection Act. They include Lake Simon, Lac des Plages, Big McDonald Lake, Echo Lake, Barron Lake and Rivière du Nord.

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

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

CANADA POST

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present a petition signed by hundreds of residents of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, who are sending a clear message calling on the government to reverse its cuts to home delivery. I acknowledge the work of Lon Borgerson and the members of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers in sharing these voices.

Routine Proceedings

Home delivery is a fundamental service for people in Prince Albert and in communities across our country. The Government of Canada ought to listen to the people of Saskatchewan and all Canadians who call on their government to show some leadership and save our Canada Post.

AGRICULTURE

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I stand to present a petition to respect the right of small-scale family farmers to preserve, exchange, and use seeds. I want to note that in Bill C-18, that ability for farmers to preserve and use their seeds is protected.

NORTHERN GATEWAY PIPELINE

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present three petitions. Two are related to very similar topics. The first relates to the effort by Enbridge to create something called the northern gateway pipeline. Petitioners, primarily from Sooke and Surrey area, are calling on the government to resist those efforts.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, another petition calls for the House to pass a clear legislated and permanent ban on crude oil tankers on the west coast to protect

B.C.'s fisheries, tourism, cultural communities, and natural ecosystems. The petitioners are from the Vancouver area.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the third petition has over 1,700 signatures from British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario. The petitioners are calling for the House to reject Bill C-51, which the petitioners point out will create a framework that is inconsistent with international law and Canadian civil liberties.

AUTISM

Ms. Kirsty Duncan (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present several petitions regarding autism spectrum disorders, which are characterized by social and communication challenges and a pattern of repetitive behaviours and interests. They are lifelong, affect development and life experiences, and exert emotional and financial pressures on families. The petitioners call on the government to work with the provinces, territories, and stakeholders to develop a pan-Canadian strategy for autism spectrum disorders.

● (1225)

JUSTICE

Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to present a petition from my beautiful riding of Yellowhead. My constituents are calling on the Government of Canada to pass legislation recognizing pre-born children as separate victims when they are injured or killed during the commission of an offence against their mothers, allowing two charges to be laid against the offender instead of just one.

MARIJUANA

Mr. Paul Calandra (Oak Ridges—Markham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition today from the community of Markham, which is suffering from the consequences of a marijuana

home grow-op across the street from a school. The petitioners call on the government to do everything in its power to make sure that all facilities like these in communities are closed down. The petitioners also support this government's actions to do just that, and I support the petitioners in this.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present two petitions.

The first is a petition signed by more than 500 Canadians.

[*Translation*]

The petitioners are asking the Government of Canada to immediately employ all diplomatic means necessary to ensure that Raïf Badawi is released and reunited with his family, which has sought refuge in Sherbrooke, Quebec. Raïf was sentenced to 10 years in prison and 1,000 lashes for creating an online forum in Saudi Arabia.

The petitioners are joining parliamentarians from all political parties who adopted a motion to that end during a meeting of the Subcommittee on International Human Rights on February 26.

[*English*]

FALUN GONG

Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is on behalf of Canadians who are concerned about the practice of forced organ harvesting by the Chinese government regime on prisoners, including Falun Gong practitioners.

The petitioners call on the government to take measures to end the Chinese regime's practice of killing Falun Gong practitioners for their organs, to amend Canadian legislation to combat forced organ harvesting, and to publicly call for China to end its persecution of Falun Gong.

Having introduced Bill C-561 to further restrict organ trafficking and having heard testimony on this practice at our foreign affairs subcommittee on international human rights, I am pleased to stand in solidarity with these petitioners.

PROSTITUTION

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this petition is from 355 signatories, from B.C. all the way across to Newfoundland in our fair country.

The petitioners draw Parliament's attention to the fact that a high percentage of prostitutes are forced into the sex trade and are trafficked. The petitioners are calling on the Parliament of Canada to legislate such that it be a criminal offence to purchase sex from a woman, man, or child and that it be a criminal offence for pimps, madams, and others to profit from the proceeds of this pernicious sex trade.

*Routine Proceedings***QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

Mr. Dan Albas (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1103 and 1109.

[Text]

Question No. 1103—**Mr. Peter Stoffer:**

With regard to Veterans Affairs Canada and its contracts with Medavie Blue Cross Inc. (Medavie): (a) what services did Medavie provide from 2006 to 2015 inclusive; (b) what is the total value of all such contracts for all services provided, from 2006 to 2015 inclusive; (c) what is value of all such contracts for each fiscal year from 2006 to 2015 inclusive; (d) what are the values of such contracts from 2006 to 2015 inclusive, broken down by service provided; and (e) what are the details of each such contract signed in 2014, including (i) total contract value, (ii) description of work and services, (iii) contract period, including the end date?

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), Veterans Affairs Canada uses a contract with Medavie Inc., to manage health claims processing services. The major services provided to Veterans Affairs Canada under the current operational contract with Medavie Inc., include: provider claims processing, where claims are submitted by Medavie registered service providers; authorization process for specific pharmacy products; authorization of treatment benefits; client reimbursement for treatment benefits, veterans independence program and health-related travel claims; veterans independence program annual follow-up to ensure client needs are being met; and responding to general inquiries.

With regard to (b), the current operational contract was awarded January 7, 2002 and ends July 31, 2015. The value for each of the major services provided in the contract are not all broken down by year. The current value of this contract including taxes is \$386,053,494.00.

With regard to (c), the current operational contract covers multiple fiscal years. The current operational contract was awarded January 7, 2002 and ends July 31, 2015. The value for each of the major services provided in the contract are not all broken down by fiscal year. The current value of this contract including taxes is \$386,053,494.00.

With regard to (d), the following outlines the work and values included in the current operational contract, excluding taxes: development and administrative costs: \$112.2 million; claims processing: \$183.6 million; authorization of pharmacy products: \$14.1 million; treatment authorization services: \$23 million; veterans independence program follow-up: \$3 million; and client calls: \$1.4 million.

With regard to (e) (i), the current value for the Public Works and Government Services Canada contract awarded in 2014 including taxes is \$163,828,974.98.

With regard to (e) (ii), the services covered under this contract are primarily the same as those contained in the previous contract, see response (a) above.

With regard to (e) (iii), the contract awarded on January 6, 2014 will have an eight-month development period then be operational from August 1, 2015 until July 31, 2022. The contract has two additional two-year option periods.

Question No. 1109—**Mr. Scott Andrews:**

With regard to the Department of Employment and Social Development, and the processing of Employment Insurance claims for 2014-2015: (a) what percentage of such claims are computer-generated and what is the average timeframe to process those claims; (b) what percentage of claims are dealt with by agents and what is the average timeframe to process those claims; and (c) what is the average lapse of time between the date when an appeal is requested of the Social Security Tribunal, and the date when the appeal is heard?

Mr. Scott Armstrong (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Social Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), Service Canada does not distinguish between fully and partially automated employment insurance claims.

Service Canada tracks the average number of days from date of application for EI to date of first payment. As of February 2015, the average was 24 days. It does not distinguish the time to first payment based on the level of automation.

With regard to (b), Service Canada does not distinguish between fully and partially automated EI claims.

Service Canada tracks the average number of days from date of application for EI to date of first payment. As of February 2015, the average was 24 days. It does not distinguish the time to first payment based on the level of automation.

With regard to (c), the average processing time for the Social Security Tribunal, general division, employment insurance cases received between January 1, 2014 and February 28, 2015 is at 120 days.

As a result of the highly successful reconsideration phase under the new system, fewer EI claims are ending up before the tribunal and the average processing time for an appeal has been significantly reduced.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Dan Albas (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if Questions No. 1101, 1102 and 1104 to 1108 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

[Text]

Question No. 1101—Mr. Peter Stoffer:

With regard to Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC): (a) how many individuals filed applications for disability benefits under the Pensions Act, from 2006 to 2014 inclusive, related to exposure to Agent Orange and chemical spraying at CFB Gagetown; (b) out of the individuals in (a), how many (i) were awarded disability benefits, (ii) were denied disability benefits, (iii) appealed the decision, (iv) were denied these benefits upon appeal, (v) received these benefits upon appeal; (c) how many individuals filed applications for disability benefits payments under the New Veterans Charter, from 2006 to 2014 inclusive, related to exposure to Agent Orange and chemical spraying; (d) of the individuals in (c), how many (i) were awarded disability benefits, (ii) were denied disability benefits, (iii) appealed the decision, (iv) were denied these benefits upon appeal, (v) received these benefits upon appeal; (e) how many enquiries were received at VAC call centres with regard to exposure to Agent Orange and chemical spraying at CFB Gagetown, each year from 2012 to 2014 inclusive (i) in total, (ii) broken down by month; and (f) of the enquiries received at VAC call centres, each year from 2012 to 2014 inclusive, related to exposure to Agent Orange and chemical spraying, how many enquiries were from (i) civilians, (ii) veterans?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1102—Mr. Peter Stoffer:

With regard to the Last Post Fund and agreements in place with Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC) related to funeral expenses: (a) for each year from 2006 to 2015 inclusive, how many requests to cover funerals and burial costs have been received by the Last Post Fund; (b) of the requests in (a), how many were (i) accepted, (ii) rejected; (c) of the requests rejected in (b)(ii), how many were denied because they did not meet (i) service-related disability qualifications, (ii) income threshold levels; (d) of the requests accepted in (b)(i), how many were from (i) traditional veterans (First World War, Second World War, Korean War), (ii) modern day veterans (post-Korea); and (e) of the requests rejected in (b)(ii), how many were from (i) traditional veterans (First World War, Second World War, Korean War), (ii) modern day veterans (post-Korea)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1104—Mr. Peter Stoffer:

With regard to the Veterans Independence Program (VIP) and the VIP expansion for survivors administered by Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC): (a) how many veterans have received VIP benefits each year from 2006 to 2014 inclusive; (b) how many clients were reassessed for eligibility for VIP benefits each year from 2006 to 2014 inclusive; (c) how many clients reassessed for VIP eligibility each year from 2006 to 2014 inclusive were denied the benefit; (d) from 2006 to 2014 inclusive, out of those veterans who were denied the VIP benefit after reassessment, how many (i) appealed the decision, (ii) did not appeal the decision, (iii) had their benefits reinstated upon appeal, (iv) were denied further benefits upon appeal; (e) how many weeks did it take for VAC to reassess eligibility for VIP benefits each year from 2006 to 2014 inclusive; (f) how many individuals applied for the VIP expansion for survivors each year from 2006 to 2014 inclusive; (g) how many individuals received the VIP expansion for survivors each year from 2006 to 2014 inclusive; (h) of those mentioned in (g), how many qualified as (i) Guaranteed Income Supplement recipients, (ii) Disability Tax Credit recipients; (i) broken down by year, how many individuals who applied to the VIP expansion as listed in (f) were denied the VIP expansion; and (j) out of these veterans listed in (i) how many individuals (i) appealed the decision, (ii) did not appeal the decision, (iii) received this benefit upon appeal, (iv) were denied these benefits upon appeal?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1105—Hon. Stéphane Dion:

With regard to materials prepared for past or current Assistant Deputy Ministers or their staff from April 1, 2011, to March 31, 2013: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is (i) the date, (ii) the title or the subject matter, (iii) the department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1106—Hon. Stéphane Dion:

With regard to materials prepared for past or current Parliamentary Secretaries or their staff from April 1, 2011, to March 31, 2013: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is (i) the date, (ii) the title or the subject matter, (iii) the department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1107—Hon. John McKay:

With respect to offences related to money and other assets held offshore in the period March 31, 2012, to December 31, 2014: (a) how many convictions were there during this period; (b) what are the details of each conviction in (a), including (i) the name of the individuals convicted, (ii) the name and type (i.e. civil or criminal) of offense, (iii) the amount of money or the type of asset and the value of the asset involved, (iv) the location of the money or asset involved, (v) the possible range of penalties/sentences upon conviction, (vi) the actual penalty or sentence received, (vii) whether the conviction was achieved through sentencing, plea bargain, settlement, etc., (viii) the amount of time that passed between the commencement of an audit, investigation, or some other form of compliance action in respect of the offence and the date of conviction; (c) how many offences related to money and other assets held offshore were considered/referred for civil prosecution during this period but never pursued; (d) how many offences related to money and other assets held offshore were considered/referred for criminal prosecution during this period but never pursued; (e) how many offences related to money and other assets held offshore were prosecuted civilly during this period but were thrown out of court or lost in court; and (f) how many offences related to money and other assets held offshore were prosecuted criminally during this period, but were thrown out of court or lost in court?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1108—Hon. John McKay:

With regard to contracts under \$10 000 granted by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited since March 27, 2014: what are the (a) vendors' names; (b) contracts' reference numbers; (c) dates of the contracts; (d) descriptions of the services provided; (e) delivery dates; (f) original contracts' values; and (g) final contracts' values, if different from the original contracts' values?

(Return tabled)

[English]

Mr. Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statements, government orders will be extended today by 10 minutes.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ANTI-TERRORISM ACT, 2015

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-51, An Act to enact the Security of Canada Information Sharing Act and the Secure Air Travel Act, to amend the Criminal Code, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act and the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): When the House last took up debate on the question, the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain had five minutes remaining for questions and comments.

Government Orders

• (1230)

Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be able to add two cents on Bill C-51, which the Conservatives appear to be ramming through this Parliament without regard for some of Canada's well-fought-for human rights and rights and privileges. Among them is information sharing among agencies. Multiple government departments will now be allowed to share information without being subject to the Privacy Act. The Privacy Act is one of the acts Canadians depend on to keep their personal and private information from prying eyes.

There is no better example of that than Ms. Ellen Richardson, in my riding, who tried to cross the border into the United States, only to discover that her medical information had been shared with the U.S. government in such a way that the U.S. government refused to allow her access. She is a disabled individual. She was going on a March of Dimes cruise, and that cruise was lost to her, and all the money she had spent on it was lost to her because of the information that had been shared by the government with the Government of the United States.

This bill makes that so much worse. I wonder if the member would comment.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on the specific case. I am not familiar with the facts of the situation or the underpinnings of it.

However, to not have, as the member says, those departments that have to do with the security of Canadians able to share information with other departments that have to do with the security of Canadians is not warranted in light of what we are facing in terms of imminent threats by terrorists, or anyone who would be a threat to Canadians. We would expect our agencies to share that information among themselves when it has to do with security.

There are checks and balances. Of course, if the information obtained by those agencies were used inappropriately, there would be steps that could be taken to remedy that.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member implied in his remarks that terrorism has to be taken head-on. It looks to me as if the implication was that those who may not support this bill are not willing to take terrorism head-on. There is a problem with that.

There is nobody in this House, I would submit, who does not want to take terrorism head-on. The difficulty is that we have a government that believes that the only opinion that matters is its own. Even though everyone else in this place represents some 61% of the population, from the Conservatives' point of view, their opinion does not matter. Does the member not see that as a problem?

The way this bill has developed, it is all of one or none of the other. Does the member not think that this place should be able to find compromises so that we deal with both the security side and the protection of civil liberties side? This bill is out of balance.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the member that this bill is out of balance.

Steven Bucci, the Heritage Foundation representative, said:

My review of Bill C-51 leads me to conclude that this is a...balance between greater physical protection without loss of civil liberties. In the various sections,

there's a judicious expansion of info-sharing and law enforcement authorities but in each there are also provisions for recourse and appeals. There is transparency and openness.... In short, this bill seems to balance security and liberty.

Indeed, we have to balance the various interests and come up with the best situation we can in the legislation. This legislation does that. We must combat terrorism head-on. We cannot stand on the sidelines. Even when we join our allies in the fight against ISIL, we expect to engage the terrorists where they are to disrupt them and to ensure that they cannot do us or Canadians any harm. We cannot be found, as some have been found in this House, standing on the sidelines watching while this situation unfolds before us.

• (1235)

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot help in this debate but start by asking what could have been. What could have been done properly with respect to this institution and the people who operate in it, regardless of political stripe, and with respect to finding the balance between national security and civil liberties?

Based on the knowledge we now have of other countries in terms of their national security legislation, and the review agencies that provide oversight on their security agencies, this Parliament could have produced a model for the world in terms of anti-terrorism legislation. However, the bottom line is that we have done anything but that.

We have a piece of legislation that deals somewhat with security concerns, and we support that part of the legislation. However, we are the odd person out in terms of providing protection under the law, through a national oversight sunset clause and other means, to ensure that the citizens of Canada have their civil liberties and freedom of expression protected.

We also want assurance that the national security agencies in total, not just CSIS, but any agency or department that is involved in national security, are properly monitored by people who should have the responsibility, the parliamentarians, on a day-to-day basis. This would ensure that on the one hand these agencies are abiding by the law and doing everything they can within the law to keep Canadians safe, and on the other hand that they are not going beyond the law to impose or infringe on Canadian's civil liberties, or for that matter a foreigner's civil liberties.

Legislation similar to Bill C-51 is required, as is evidenced in virtually every country that Canada is allied with or has shared values with. There is no question that countering the growing threat of foreign and domestic terrorism is a reality which must be confronted by the modern state. However, in combatting that threat, it is important for any government to ensure that the steps taken to combat it do not impose a different threat to its own citizens.

Government Orders

The Liberal Party supports the needed security provisions of Bill C-51 and has made that position clear from the outset. We are not shy about taking a leadership position in that regard. It is easy to oppose, but if we oppose the bill, then we are not dealing with those immediate needs. The policing agencies, CSIS, and even witnesses who have opposed the bill, have come before the committee and said there is a need for security provisions at this time. However, I submit that there is a real problem on the other side.

Sadly, there is a real dilemma here with the bill before us, as with many others. We get caught in what I could call a partisan vortex. We are accused by some, NDP members in particular, of supporting the government. We are not supporting the government. We are supporting certain aspects of Bill C-51. The government, on the other hand, is accusing the NDP and others of supporting terrorism. We all have national security concerns in this place. The problem is that the current Government of Canada does not allow this Parliament to work the way that it should.

We have also maintained that there are provisions in Bill C-51 that are excessive, and will in our opinion represent an intrusion by the state security agencies into the lives of Canadians. They are far too severe.

• (1240)

These provisions, as I have said, could have been narrowed; they could have been amended. There were decent amendments put forward by all parties, and most of them were rejected. Three of our amendments, and the NDP also had some, were indirectly accepted through the four amendments that came forward from the government.

Early in the debate on Bill C-51, my colleague, the member for Mount Royal, and I joined four former prime ministers, including three Liberal prime ministers and others, in issuing an open letter underscoring two fundamental responsibilities of government: ensuring the safety of Canadians, including protecting Canadians from terrorist attacks; and ensuring that initiatives in this regard are consistent with the rule of law and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and are particularly subject to comprehensive oversight, review, and accountability measures.

In the course of the committee hearings, we proposed many amendments, as did others. As I have said, three amendments were indirectly accepted within government amendments. One of the key ones was certainly taking the word “lawful” out before “protest”, et cetera, about which civil activists groups were rightly concerned.

Three critical amendments from our slate of amendments, though, were rejected: the need for oversight of our intelligence and security agencies; building in provisions in the bill for the review and sunset of certain provisions of Bill C-51; and the need to ensure that any new authorities given to CSIS and others under Bill C-51 are charter compliant. There is a very strong risk, and I believe a reality, that some of those provisions in the bill are not charter compliant.

The issue of oversight of our security and intelligence agencies has long had the support of the Liberal Party. In the wake of 9/11 and the first anti-terrorist legislation, it was a Liberal government, with the support of members of the government at the time and the NDP,

that brought forward Bill C-81. It created a committee of parliamentarians that would provide that oversight. As I said, that came out of a committee report that the previous minister, Anne McLellan, appointed. I happened to be a member of that committee as well as one of the co-chairs, as were the current Minister of Justice and the current Minister of State for Finance.

It was a unanimous report of the committee. That legislation was proposed, but it died on the order paper. In June 2009, in a report on the review of the findings and recommendations arising from the Iacobucci and O'Connor inquiries, the public safety committee recommended that Bill C-51 be adopted. It provided for national oversight.

It is interesting that six members of the Conservative government were on that committee. The hon. member for Yorkton—Melville, the member for Oxford, the member for Brant, the member for Northumberland—Quinte West, the member for Wild Rose, and the previous member of the Conservative Party, the member for Edmonton—St. Albert were on that committee. What has happened to them that they are not now in favour of national oversight?

I recognize that my time is short, but at the very least I would encourage the government to bring forward a parallel bill, in terms of oversight, for national security agencies. There are private members' bills on the books that would do the trick and could be brought forward.

We need three things. We are saying that while we support the bill, we will put these three things in the election platform of the Liberal Party because the government has failed to do so.

First, we need a national oversight committee of parliamentarians similar to that of our Five Eyes partners. Second, we need to put in place sunset clauses to ensure that sections of the bill cease to exist in three years. Third is a statutory mandatory review so that the bill itself, the good, the bad, and the ugly, is looked at by future Parliament, in three years' time, to make the bill the best that it can be.

• (1245)

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his speech. He also sits with me on the public safety committee.

Throughout his speech, he continued to refer to issues surrounding his failed private member's bill. He asked many of these questions of the witnesses during committee, even though his failed private member's bill and his ideas for oversight were not part of the actual bill itself. In fact, during clause-by-clause, he had to withdraw some of the amendments he had put forward because what he felt was the truth was actually not correct and officials had to correct him.

We have been very clear on this side of the House. We firmly believe that third party, independent, non-political oversight is the best method to ensure that our security agencies can operate without any political interference from very partisan members who are in the House. Let us be clear about that.

Government Orders

It is strange enough that the member likes to compare this particular issue with countries we are similar to, wanting to know why we are not doing it. I should ask him the same question. When comparing us to other countries, why did the Liberal Party vote against standing shoulder to shoulder with our allies in the global fight against jihadist terrorism and joining the air strikes and coalition against ISIL?

That is the question I would like to ask the member. Why does he not use that same philosophy on issues that actually matter to Canadians?

Hon. Wayne Easter: Mr. Speaker, the security of Canadians is very important, but oversight is important too. I will quote what Ron Atkey had to say. He is a former Conservative MP and was the first chair of SIRC. He said:

...I have been both a parliamentarian and a watchdog, a professional watchdog. The answer to whether Parliament or a specialized agency should have the power to review our security agencies is easy for me. Canadians should have both. Under our system of government, Parliament is the ultimate watchdog and is directly accountable to the people. The party having the most number of seats at each general election usually is called on to form the government, but Parliament itself remains the watchdog.

That came from a former Progressive Conservative member.

The other point I would make to what the parliamentary secretary said is that in terms of being non-partisan, are Deborah Grey, as chair of the SIRC committee, and Chuck Strahl, non-partisan? Come on. We all know better than that.

Let us be in line with our Five Eyes partners and do it right.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let us start with a known element here, which is that the House collectively is concerned with the safety and security of Canadians. When allegations are made otherwise by someone, it is not becoming of them or of others.

Let us also establish the fact that it is well understood that oversight is incredibly important, particularly when handing over increased powers. The powers being imagined to be given to CSIS in this bill are extraordinary. It would be able to tap phones, hack into people's email accounts, and have almost no judicial oversight of any of those measures.

We have asked for and demanded parliamentary oversight. My question specifically for my Liberal friend is that he mentioned that there were some amendments taken. They were small and around the edges of the essential questions. We do not believe that this bill is constitutional, and many experts who study constitutional matters agree with us. There is in fact nobody who says it is, other than the Conservatives across the way.

The member said that there were three elements that the Liberals proposed that were critical to the bill's function. We have a choice in front of us. None of those changes were offered up. The government has refused. It is not moving a private member's bill, as he suggested, to make something better happen; this is the Conservative plan on Bill C-51.

I have seen many bills passed through this place. I have never seen a public reaction against a piece of legislation like I have with this legislation. If those measures were critical, why for heaven's sake are

the Liberals continuing to vote for it? It is either critical or it is not. If it is that important to the Liberals, they have a choice, which is to vote against Bill C-51.

• (1250)

Hon. Wayne Easter: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my remarks, one of the difficulties with a dysfunctional Parliament and a government that does not allow compromises to be made through expert opinion and public input by members of the House is that it is nearly impossible to come to a united position. There is no question that we have felt some heat on Bill C-51, and I understand that. I respect those people who are out there demonstrating in the streets against the bill. I understand where they are coming from.

However, because I have been a former solicitor general and have seen the security side, when CSIS and police authorities now come to me and say that the threat level is higher at the moment and that they need those extra provisions, we should not take the approach of the Prime Minister that there is a terrorist under every rock. However, there is an increased security threat and we have a responsibility as a party to err on the side of security.

I agree with my colleague who asked the question. There is no question the court will eventually turn back this legislation because it does violate certain sections of the charter. However, we will err on the side of security for the moment and hopefully fix the bill, one way or another, after the coming election in October.

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today in this debate.

As members know, the anti-terrorism act, 2015, contains a number of important changes that would strengthen Canada's national security. Among many proposed amendments is a well-considered approach to expanding the mandate of the passenger protection program through the creation of the secure air travel act. This will be the focus of my remarks today.

As everyone should be aware, the international jihadi movement has declared war on Canada and our allies. Canadians have been targeted because these jihadi terrorists hate our freedom and open, tolerant way of life. This is why we introduced this important legislation, which would enhance the government's capacity to identify and mitigate threats to Canada, Canadian interests abroad and our foreign partners.

In so doing, it would be an effective complement to the Combating Terrorism Act, which came into force in July 2013. Unfortunately, the NDP opposed this important measure, effectively voting to allow terrorists to travel without consequence.

The 2014 public report on the terrorist threat to Canada made it clear that our country remained a target for jihadi terrorists. That report included a focus on the government's response to violent extremism and travel abroad for terrorist-related purposes.

Government Orders

The threat of Canadians travelling abroad to participate in jihadi terrorist activities is a significant security challenge and a priority for our Conservative government. Since the threats Canadians face at home are typically connected to developments abroad, it stands to reason that securing Canada's air transportation links to the world must be a priority of our Conservative government. This is why we have proposed these legislative measures to expand the mandate of the passenger protect program to address both threats to transportation security and terrorist travel by air.

Currently Canada uses several mutually reinforcing screening tools to protect the safety and security of Canadian and international air travellers. Passports are a key identifier used by border officers in combination with physical screening of air travellers to reduce the chances of allowing a person with malicious intent or dangerous items to board an aircraft. In an average year, the Canadian Air Transportation Security Authority screens more than 50 million travellers at Canadian airports.

As members may recall, our Conservative government launched the passenger protect program under the Aeronautics Act in 2007. This program screens passengers to identify threats to transportation security and uses measures such as denial of boarding to mitigate those threats. Since the program's mandate is to manage risks through preventive measures, individuals who are denied boarding are not arrested simply for being on the specified persons list. However, when a denial of boarding occurs, program officials always notify the RCMP for public safety reasons.

The anti-terrorism act, 2015, would provide new authorities to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness and the Minister of Transport and would define, in legislation, the recourse measures available to individuals affected by the program. Specifically, the legislation would authorize the government to create, maintain and share, where appropriate, a list of individuals who would pose either a threat to transportation security or a risk of travelling by air to engage in terrorism offences abroad. It would enable the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness to direct an air carrier to send a listed individual for additional physical screening or refuse boarding outright, if necessary, and it would establish in law a process for affected individuals to appeal their inclusion on the list.

In essence, the provisions would allow us to make needed enhancements to improve the security of air travel and, indeed, the security of Canada, all the while respecting privacy laws and providing a fair process to those who might be affected. Effectively, we are delivering a proportional response to different types of threats.

That is why the proposed legislation defines two distinct decision-making authorities, one to place individuals on or remove them from the list and the other to issue operational response directions. This model would allow the government to confirm an individual's identity documents and travel information at check-in before making a decision that would affect that person's ability to travel. At the same time, it would enable the government to tailor the response to specific circumstances.

●(1255)

Would these new measures place an undue burden upon our security partners? No. Given that the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority already conducts additional physical screening on randomly selected individuals, these new measure would not impose a significant burden upon their workload. At the same time, the enhanced ability to identify and mitigate threats would add an important layer of protection for Canadians and Canadian interests abroad, as well as our foreign partners.

As I have spoken about how the program would work and its minimal impact upon the operations of security partners, let me now say just a few words about safeguards to protect the rights of individual travellers, which take two main forms in the secure travel act.

First, there are the safeguards related to the sharing of the list with foreign governments. Let me be clear. International co-operation on security helps the government to better protect Canada and Canadians. The Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness would carefully assess the impact of any arrangement to share the list and that sharing would happen only in strict accordance with Canadian laws. Furthermore, even with an arrangement in place, our government would continue to assess the risk of disclosure. In some cases, for example, it could decide to share only part of the list with a foreign partner.

The second safeguard with respect to rights revolves around the appeal process for those listed.

Here, again, the secure air travel act would put effective measures in place. Any individual denied boarding could apply to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness to be removed from the list. The minister would provide the applicant with a reasonable opportunity to provide new information to the minister to challenge the listing decision. After reviewing the case in its entirety and taking into account any information provided by the applicant, the minister would, within 90 days, decide whether the applicant should remain on the list or be removed.

If the applicant disagreed with the minister's decision, the secure air travel act would set out procedures for appeal to the federal court. The presiding judge would review all relevant evidence, while still protecting sensitive information that could endanger national security or the safety of any person, if disclosed. Applicants would receive a summary of the sensitive information and could, again, submit new evidence to respond to the government's case.

The secure air travel act, as contained in the anti-terrorism act 2015, would then enable the government to identify and mitigate threats to transportation security and to prevent travel by air for terrorism purposes, while providing listed persons with an administrative and judicial recourse, all of this without burdening our security partners.

It is for those reasons that I therefore urge all members to join us in supporting this vital bill.

Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise again on this bill to ask the member the same question before to which I did not get an answer.

Government Orders

The bill would allow information sharing between agencies, government departments, et cetera, and we have no objections to the sharing of some information. However, there is something called the Privacy Act, which is there to protect the privacy of Canadians. This information sharing under the bill would not be subject to the Privacy Act.

Miss Ellen Richardson, a constituent of mine, discovered not too long ago that her personal medical information was shared with the U.S. government through security agencies. Security agencies share everything, with everybody. She was denied a trip and ended up losing \$6,000 or \$7,000 as a result of this shared information with the U.S. government that prevented her from arriving in the U.S. on her way on a trip.

Would the member like to please advise why the Privacy Act is not being used to protect the privacy of Canadians in the sharing of information?

•(1300)

Mr. Paul Calandra: Mr. Speaker, the safety and security of Canadians is of paramount importance to us. So, too, is the privacy of Canadians.

I pointed out in the bill a number of mechanisms that not only could be utilized by the minister to ensure the safety and security of Canadians, but also the protection of Canadians with respect to their ability to fly.

It should also be noted that, as the member said, it is very important to share information that could become a threat to Canadians and our partners. That is why the legislation would update that and make that information sharing more effective across departments.

I encourage the member to support those measures because, ultimately, it is a measure of public safety and it is a measure of keeping Canadians both safe at home and abroad. It is about working with our international partners to attack the scourge of this global jihadi terrorism and whatever threats may come after that.

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is truly unfortunate, as I sit here today and listen to some of the questions coming from the NDP, that such misinformation about the bill is being pushed out, whether intentional or because of a complete, sheer lack of understanding. I certainly hope it is not intentional. However, during clause-by-clause in committee the very first amendment that was put forward by the NDP critic clearly showed he did not have an idea what the information sharing act was about. The fact that the NDP member stood up today and asked a question somehow connecting it to medical information about an individual case is completely outrageous.

The information sharing act has to do with information pertinent to national security and would allow one agency to relay that information on to the appropriate security agency to take action. It is absolutely crucial. We heard from many credible witnesses, unlike the NDP that brought in witnesses who said the sky was falling. Clearly that did not happen.

I would like to ask my hon. colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, what he thinks is the result of this

misinformation that is being pushed out there, either intentionally or because of a lack of understanding, and the implications that could have on national security.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety. She is doing a fabulous job for her constituents in Scarborough Centre.

This is very important legislation. We have put forward a legislative process that would help protect Canadians. It would help protect Canadians at home and abroad and it would work effectively with our international partners to do that.

The member is quite correct when she talks about some of the misleading statements that have been coming from the members opposite. Perhaps they have not read the bill. I truly believe most of them have read the bill and understand it. However, when we look at what the Liberals in particular have said about this, the leader of the Liberal Party actually got on a stage in British Columbia. Also, the member for Malpeque said earlier today that the only reason the Liberals are supporting this is not because they actually believe in the legislation and how important it is to protect Canadians, but they do not want Canadians to hold it against them if they vote against the bill. That is the Liberal position on this. They do not want Canadians to hold it against them if they vote in favour of the bill.

That speaks to how important the bill is, not only to Conservative members of Parliament but how important it is to Canadians that we pass the bill and do all that we can to ensure the safety and security of Canadians at home and abroad, and that we are part of the global coalition to stop these terrorists wherever they are.

I congratulate the member again for all of her hard work.

•(1305)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Blanchette (Louis-Hébert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have risen to speak to Bill C-51. After everything that has been said, my first instinct is to wonder what has happened to reason.

In this debate, it seems that we are motivated only by negative emotions. That may not be the best way to do things. This bill is obviously based on a well-meaning intention to better protect all Canadians. However, it is important to take a balanced approach in order to ensure, on the one hand, the safety of Canadians and, on the other, respect for their rights. It is vital that we not let ourselves be carried away by our emotions. We have to take a rational approach to this problem.

Government Orders

Since we are at report stage, now is the time to talk about what happened in committee. It is unfortunate that there was a limit on the number of witnesses who could speak during the study of a bill that is probably the most important bill of its kind since the bills that were passed in the aftermath of the tragic events of September 11, 2001. It is also unfortunate that some witnesses who could have made very important contributions to the debate were not able to participate. I am talking about the Privacy Commissioner and the Communications Security Establishment Commissioner, who are not nobodies. If the government had wanted to do a serious study, it would have invited these two people to testify in committee.

I have to wonder why a government that does not listen to all of the stakeholders and all of the experts can claim to be listening to Canadians and meeting their needs. Although the government invited a lot of witnesses, it is important to note that the vast majority of them—45 out of 48 witnesses—expressed concerns about this bill. That means that the bill is not perfect and still needs a lot of work.

Unfortunately, I get the impression that the government does not want to hear what anyone else has to say. It made its decision and does whatever it wants. However, more and more people are adopting the position that the NDP has defended since the very beginning. I could give a list of people and groups who have taken positions similar to ours. I am thinking of the Privacy Commissioner, the advisor to the UN's Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, the former assistant director of intelligence with CSIS, and the former chief of the Ottawa Police Service, as well as others, such as journalists, columnists and editorialists. Many of them have expressed concern about the bill as it now stands.

What is more, many of my constituents have shared their concerns with me about this dangerous bill. That is also important to mention. I would also like to point out that the Stop C-51 campaign alone has collected nearly 200,000 signatures from Canadians. Are 200,000 concerned Canadians not enough to make the government think again about this bill? That is something that the government really needs to consider.

Bills, particularly bills about security, require a balanced approach. When more power is given to protect our society, more monitoring of that power is also needed. It is not complicated.

● (1310)

We must not allow any opportunities for serious mistakes to be made. It is as simple as that.

Everyone knows that we need concrete measures that protect Canadians. However, we must not bring in such measures at the expense of our liberties and our way of life. With these kinds of bills, we must always find a way to strike a balance.

I find it unfortunate that the Conservatives wanted to play partisan politics with this bill instead of acting in the best interests of Canada, because fundamentally, this is one of those bills that leaves a mark on society forever.

When this kind of bill is introduced, it needs to be properly drafted and flawless. As some experts said, this bill may be struck down by the Supreme Court. Just think of all the time we will have wasted. It is unacceptable.

We need to keep Canadians safe, while at the same time protecting their civil liberties. It is not so complicated. Right now, according to most of the witnesses we heard in committee, that is not what this bill does.

Many people said that Daesh wanted to attack our way of life. One of the pillars of our way of life is the protection of civil liberties. This bill is an indirect attack on that important pillar, and that is just not good.

In our opinion, an anti-terrorism approach means tighter control over security agencies and the allocation of appropriate resources so that we can be sure that we can carefully monitor how these new powers are exercised both for the agencies and for Canadians. It is just a safeguard to ensure that everything is done right and that the power is exercised in accordance with the will of Canadians and the House. It does not go any further than that.

We understand that there is a need to exchange information between the various departments, but there again, there are shortcomings with regard to how to control and define the parameters of those information exchanges in order to ensure that not too much information is being shared. It is not complicated.

Furthermore, there is nothing about prevention. What is prevention? We have heard a lot about it in the context of preventing radicalization, the spiral of violence that the world seems to be caught up in these days. We have not talked very much about integration. The government is not trying to understand how it is that new converts are quickly picking up and leaving, for example. This bill does not address those problems.

When I say that, I am obviously thinking about France, for example, which introduced a bill on March 19. I invite the government to look at what France did because it has a balanced approach. France is not only considering security but also respect for rights and freedoms. That is very important.

However, if we look at the budget on this issue, all we see are so-called repression measures. If I were to read all of the headings in Chapter 4.3 of the budget, members would see that protection, prevention and combatting radicalization are not mentioned anywhere.

In closing, the more Canadians learn about this bill, the more they are opposed to it. That is clear.

● (1315)

The government tried to rush this bill through but was unable to put one over on people. We need balanced legislation that will not increase violence in our society or anywhere else.

Once again, I have to wonder what happened to reason in this bill.

Mr. Alain Giguère (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have some very sad news. Police forces in Quebec intercepted and imprisoned members of the Hells Angels. Unfortunately, this government managed to let them go because it was unable to try their cases within two years. They were let go by the justice system.

Government Orders

Now, with this wonderful bill, we have to wonder what is the use of a law that takes away our rights and freedoms if criminals and terrorists can slip through because police officers, judges and prosecutors are in short supply?

Can my distinguished colleague explain the Conservative logic that takes away our rights but offers no guarantee whatsoever that terrorists will be sentenced by the justice system?

Mr. Denis Blanchette: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

I talked about the balance between rights and the protection of privacy and civil liberties. Of course, there also has to be a balance between what a law sets out to do and the means to do it.

How many times during this Parliament have we seen stricter laws against certain crimes that were not accompanied by the necessary resources? Consider prisons, where there was not enough room for more prisoners. The provinces were forced to pay for that.

As for the bill before us, unfortunately the government did not think the whole problem through. It acted on impulse without taking the time to reflect on everything that such a law entails.

Mr. Tarik Brahmī (Saint-Jean, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague's speech.

He talked about the lack of resources, but even having enough resources does not necessarily translate into the ability to keep everything under control.

The Conservative government uses the example of the attack in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, where a young man with mental health problems indoctrinated himself. He was not indoctrinated from the outside, by Syria or Iraq. Since he did not speak Arabic, he was unable to establish contact with the Islamic State in Iraq or Syria. He indoctrinated himself and slipped through the hands of the RCMP. He was assessed by the RCMP, which came to the conclusion that he was no longer a danger to society. The RCMP released him and gave him back his passport. In a moment of madness, he killed an innocent soldier.

I would like my colleague to explain how even when we have all the information and even when the information is in the hands of the RCMP, we cannot foresee everything because there is the matter of mental health, which we cannot control.

Mr. Denis Blanchette: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for that very important question, which raises a specific problem that we have rarely talked about during this debate, and that is looking at the problem as a whole.

People may have bad intentions, and we must prevent them from acting on those intentions. We must provide resources to prevent them from taking action, but that is not all. We have talked at length about preventing radicalization. Other types of resources are needed in order to be able to assess and correct certain problems.

I come back to what is happening in France. Under its new legislation, France is investing an additional 60 million euros in preventing radicalization. It is aware that we cannot focus on law enforcement alone and provide resources to law enforcement. We

must also address the root of the problem, and that is what my colleague brilliantly raised.

• (1320)

[English]

Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan (Scarborough—Rouge River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today I rise again to voice my opposition to Bill C-51 in its current form.

Each one of us knows terrorism is a real threat and we are all committed to keeping Canadians safe. However, Bill C-51 remains a reckless, dangerously vague and likely ineffective piece of proposed legislation. It would not do things that are proven to work and it puts politics ahead of protecting Canadians.

The members of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security heard testimony from a range of experts. Many of these experts raised serious concerns about provisions in Bill C-51. The government also received amendments from the official opposition New Democrats and other parties. The government rejected the substance of these amendments. The government did make four amendments to the bill. Unfortunately, these amendments would do little to address the major concerns Canadians and experts have consistently raised about this bill.

Therefore, I stand proudly with my New Democrat colleagues as we continue to stand for privacy, national security, oversight and our civil liberties, while working to make our country safe from terrorism by advocating an evidence-based approach to anti-terrorism legislation.

In regard to privacy, 12 Canadian privacy commissioners have publicly criticized Bill C-51, but not one privacy commissioner was invited to appear before the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. These are the public authorities on privacy and should have been heard. In a written submission to the committee, Daniel Therrien, the Privacy Commissioner of Canada, wrote:

However, the scale of information sharing being proposed [by Bill C-51] is unprecedented, the scope of the new powers conferred by the Act is excessive, particularly as these powers affect ordinary Canadians, and the safeguards protecting against unreasonable loss of privacy are seriously deficient. While the potential to know virtually everything about everyone may well identify some new threats, the loss of privacy is clearly excessive.

All Canadians would be caught in this web.

Under the proposed legislation, law-abiding citizens could find their information shared by federal departments and agencies with intelligence and law enforcement agencies. Furthermore, the Privacy Commissioner stated that Bill C-51 does not prescribe clear and reasonable standards for the sharing, collection, use and retention of personal information. Canadians have a legitimate right to privacy.

Government Orders

How can the government be so reckless with the personal information of Canadians? How can it allow the sharing of information without proper oversight and clear standards regarding the necessity for the sharing of this information? Furthermore, experts such as Craig Forcese have pointed out that Bill C-51 also would erode the individual's right to legal recourse. Under Bill C-51, as long as Canadian government officials share information in good faith, if people are tortured or their livelihoods lost, these individuals could not sue the Canadian government.

We were shocked and saddened by the case of Maher Arar, a Canadian citizen who was tortured in Syria because of the information that was shared about him. Maher Arar was able to use legal recourse to get an apology and compensation from the government. If Bill C-51 becomes law, if anything like what happened to Maher Arar happened in the future, there would be no legal recourse for Canadians. As a nation, we should be ensuring that what happened to Maher Arar never happens again to another Canadian. We need to do that by ensuring there is oversight, and that the rights of our citizens are protected. We should not be allowing information to be shared with a little oversight and then stripping away the ways in which Canadians can hold their government accountable.

As I have stated in prior remarks, I am also concerned about the potential impacts of Bill C-51 on Canadians' freedom of speech and the right to protest. One of the four amendments that the government members accepted at committee stage changed the language to say that activity that undermines the security of Canada does not include advocacy, protest, dissent or artistic expression. However, any act that blocks infrastructure could be subject to disruption and covered as part of this anti-terrorism legislation.

• (1325)

In 2009, before I became a member of Parliament, many members of the Tamil community and other human rights activists were out on the streets trying to raise awareness about innocent people being killed in Sri Lanka. Each day in Ottawa, Toronto, and other cities across the country, people were engaging in lawful protest asking for the Canadian government to listen and take action.

On May 10, 2009, some of the protestors blockaded the Gardiner Expressway in Toronto. According to our experts, under Bill C-51, the blockade of the Gardiner Expressway could have been considered an activity that undermines the security of Canada, classified as blocking infrastructure and covered under this anti-terrorism legislation. On May 10, 2009, people blockaded the Gardiner Expressway to bring attention to people being displaced and killed senselessly in Sri Lanka. Should these people, seniors, children and families, who blockaded the Gardiner Expressway be called terrorists and subjected to additional surveillance? Is that fair?

In January 2013, six youths and a guide left on snowshoes on a walk to Ottawa in support of the Idle No More movement. They called their trek the Journey of the Nishiyuu, which means the "journey of the people" in Cree. In the final hours of the trek, the group numbered nearly 400 people, as other children and youth from Cree and Algonquin communities joined them along the way. I remember being one of the thousands more who joined them here on Parliament Hill as their journey came to an end. As people joined the

trek, perhaps streets were blocked and traffic snarled. Should these youth be called terrorists and subject to additional surveillance?

We must make sure that the voices of people can be heard. We must make sure that dissent and protest are protected in our country. We must allow for the freedom of speech to remain a charter-protected right in our country. We cannot allow non-violent acts to be called terrorism, because they are not terrorism. They are non-violent acts that can help build our civic infrastructure and can result in positive changes in policies.

This omnibus bill is 62 pages long and its scope is unprecedented. I could continue to talk for a lot longer about the many ways in which the bill threatens the civil liberties we hold dear, but I think the point has been made, and I am sure I am running out of time. This bill remains reckless, vague, and likely ineffective.

What are some proven approaches to combat terrorism that are more likely to be effective? I will name a few from what the experts have cited.

The first is to provide appropriate resources for security and intelligence agencies to track and identify threats to public security. Former Ottawa police chief and current Senator Vern White said:

My biggest concern right now is, do we have the resources to focus energy on [radicalized] people out there that are concerning us? I'm not convinced we have those resources.

RCMP Commissioner Bob Paulson testified before the Senate that he has reallocated resources including hundreds of personnel from areas such as organized crime to counter terrorism. Why would the police not have adequate resources to fight terror? Organized crime also presents a public safety threat to Canada, so why is the RCMP being forced to make these reallocations? We know that between 2009 and 2014, annual RCMP spending decreased by \$420 million, and between 2012 and 2014, 2,271 full-time equivalent positions were cut from the RCMP. In 2012-13, CSIS spending was cut by \$44 million.

A second proven approach to combat terrorism that is more likely to be effective is oversight. Over the past five years, oversight mechanisms that are meant to hold the security and intelligence agencies accountable have faced cuts, and positions have been left vacant. Now Bill C-51 would further expand surveillance and the capacity to detain people, but does not expand oversight. Oversight could mean more diligence on the part of the security agents themselves, knowing that oversight bodies are in place.

A third measure is counter-radicalization programs. Working with at-risk communities and connecting with community and faith leaders to provide resources to defuse radicalization in integral parts of our communities is an integral part of proven anti-terror programs.

Government Orders

I know I am running out of time, so I just want to say that today I am proud to be standing with my New Democrat colleagues as we take our responsibility to stand up for Canada seriously. We are disappointed, though, that the third party Liberals seem to believe that supporting this bill and giving the Conservatives a blank cheque is the best way to protect Canadian freedoms. I am proud that the New Democrats are taking a principled stance and not supporting Bill C-51. We will continue to defend both our rights and our freedoms in this country.

• (1330)

Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for Scarborough—Rouge River for her excellent speech.

The member pointed out that actions taken by Canadians of Tamil origin have in fact been successful in changing Canadian attitudes towards a certain government that was perhaps not as kind to its citizens as it ought to have been. Those Canadian attitudes having been changed has changed world attitudes, and it started, in part, with a protest that blocked part of a major artery through the city of Toronto. However, the current government would make that kind of protest illegal and thereby prevent such an amazing display by an amazing bunch of young and determined individuals in the city of Toronto.

I wonder if the member would like to comment further.

Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for York South—Weston for his passion and sincerity in knowing what happened to the Tamil people.

I remember that this was a youth-led, legal protest that happened across the country, specifically in Toronto, where young people, seniors, children, human rights activists from all parts of the world and Tamils living in Toronto were on the streets for two weeks every day. It seemed like their cries for help and support, and for the current government to do something, fell on deaf ears. Out of pure frustration, the people decided to walk up the Gardiner Expressway and blockade it. They got attention. They finally got the people and the government to listen.

However, under Bill C-51, that activity would be classified as an act of terror. We would see hundreds of thousands of children, seniors and families classified as terrorists in this country, and that just does not make any sense.

Mr. Rick Dykstra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I just want to note that the accusation level in the speech is actually completely false and untrue. Not only would the bill in and of itself not put someone who is participating in a legal and lawful protest in a position to continue to do that, but we actually clarified through amendment to the bill to give greater clarity to that exact expression in terms of the ability to protest in a lawful and peaceful way.

For the member to use an example of a protest and somehow try to twist it into something it is not is unfair and it is actually wrong. This should not be brought up in the House in a way that speaks to something that is false as if it were true. Just because one says it again and again does not actually make it true.

I would like to get the acknowledgement from the member on the protest she has indicated, whether or not she has actually checked the legal definition and whether she has actually sought to ensure it by subbing in at committee and asking that very question or making the very comment that she has. It is very clear in the legislation. There is even more clarity by the fact that an amendment was brought forward to deal with this specific issue.

I know that the leader of the Green Party accepts the clarification. I would hope the member would as well.

• (1335)

Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan: Mr. Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary for giving me this opportunity to remind him, through his own words, that just repeating falsehoods does not make them true. Every member of the Conservative Party and the current government should learn from the words of the parliamentary secretary, that repeating falsehoods never makes them true.

However, I will give the member an expert opinion, because, of course, we like to consider the opinions of lawyers and those who know the law better than probably most of us in this place.

Yes, the parliamentary secretary is correct in the sense that government members only accepted four amendments, and these are amendments that came from themselves. The only change that happened on the piece that he spoke of is a change from the words “legal protest” to “protest”.

However, the piece that remained, that I mentioned in my speech, and maybe he missed it, is that any acts that block infrastructure could be subject to disruption and covered as part of this anti-terror legislation. That is the truth. It is not a falsehood, it has been clarified by many experts, and that is what I speak of.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Before we resume debate, I will let the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage know there are about three minutes remaining in the time allocated for government orders today. We will of course have his remaining time when the House next resumes debate on the question.

Mr. Rick Dykstra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a privilege to invite all members of the House to support Bill C-51, the anti-terrorism act, 2015.

The safety and security of Canada, and Canadians, is being threatened. The international jihadi movement has declared war on Canada. ISIL has named Canada as a target. We have seen its supporters urge their comrades to kill Canadians by any means and at every opportunity. Al Shabaab is urging its followers to attack targets right here in our country. We know these are not idle threats. We have seen the horrific and deadly attacks on innocent people in Paris and Sydney, and elsewhere in the world, including the cold-blooded murders in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu and at our National War Memorial.

Private Members' Business

It is unfortunate and difficult to accept, but we see a concerning number of Canadians travelling to other countries to join and fight alongside terrorists from Syria to Somalia. Even more worrisome, we know that some of these radicalized Canadians have returned to this country, burning with hatred, and often with military training and combat experience.

Their values may seem medieval, and talk about an earlier time in history, but they show no reluctance to embrace technology to communicate, to terrorize, to recruit and raise funds. The threat is more complex, more insidious and more dangerous than could have been anticipated even a few years ago.

We must ensure that our security and intelligence organizations have the tools to meet this threat. To do otherwise would be to abandon our most fundamental responsibility to Canadians. That is why we must move swiftly to pass this bill. It is essential to assuring the safety and security of Canadians.

As we have heard, the anti-terrorism act, 2015 has a number of elements. I hope to get through the first one, and then re-engage on this when we return.

First, it would create the security of Canada information sharing act. Departments and agencies of the Government of Canada collect information of various kinds on a daily basis. In some instances, this information may be of considerable value to the institutions charged with identifying and responding to threats to the security of this country or its allies. Yet we have no tangible, focused or reliable way to ensure that kind of information gets to the agencies in a timely way.

I am certain many Canadians would be surprised to learn, for example, that when citizenship and immigration receives a passport application that raises security flags, it is prohibited by law from sharing that information with the Canadian Security Intelligence Service.

I will leave it that and return to the discussion when the time is allocated to do so.

● (1340)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): The hon. parliamentary secretary will have seven minutes remaining in his time for comments on the question and of course the usual five minutes for questions and comments thereafter.

It being 1:40 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

VIA RAIL CANADA ACT

The House resumed from February 20 consideration of the motion that Bill C-640, An Act respecting VIA Rail Canada and making consequential amendments to the Canada Transportation Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mrs. Patricia Davidson (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to discuss Bill C-640, an act respecting VIA Rail Canada and making consequential amendments to the Canada Transportation Act. The government remains committed to ensuring economic growth and long-term prosperity for Canadians. Given this focus, the government cannot support Bill C-640, because it would have a negative impact on Canada's economic competitiveness and risk its reputation as a reliable trading partner.

To illustrate the potentially negative implications of this bill, I would like to first highlight the important role that freight rail plays in Canada. For more than 130 years, railways have linked communities, supported trade and expanded the Canadian economy. The historic role of railways in our country's growth since Confederation is well known.

The importance of freight railways has only increased today. Canada's freight railway sector, which comprises more than 60 short lines and two class 1 railways, Canadian National and Canadian Pacific, operates nearly 46,000 kilometres of track. Canadian businesses, producers and manufacturers rely on this expansive rail network every day to move a whole wide variety of goods to thousands of domestic and global destinations.

It is also worth noting that a substantial portion of rail movements contribute to our domestic and international trade. Clearly, the success of Canadian businesses is contingent on efficient, effective and reliable freight rail services. Grain farmers work hard to supply global markets with a world-class product. Lumber, pulp and paper, and other forest products from Canadian mills have a global reputation for being second to none in terms of quality. Demand for these products is increasing around the world. Global buyers in emerging economies are seeking high quality iron ore, coal and other commodities extracted from mines located across Canada.

Canada's manufacturing industries, including the automotive sector, continue to demonstrate strength and resilience in increasingly competitive global markets and integrated supply chains. However, success in all industrial sectors requires reliable and efficient freight rail service. Shippers would face broken sales contracts, declining market share and irreparable harm to their reputation as reliable global suppliers if they could not get their goods to market reliably and efficiently.

The government has taken important steps to ensure the efficiency, effectiveness and reliability of the rail-based supply chain. In 2010, the government initiated the rail freight service review. In 2013, the government passed the Fair Rail Freight Service Act, which aimed to support commercial solutions by providing shippers with the right to request a service level agreement, and a process to establish one if commercial negotiations fail.

Private Members' Business

Less than a year ago, the government passed the Fair Rail for Grain Farmers Act, which included additional measures designed to support the entire grain transportation system and achieve the goal of moving grain more efficiently and quickly. For example, the act required railways to move minimum amounts of grain; extended interswitching limits for shippers in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba; and clarified operational terms in service level agreements. In combination, these efforts have contributed to a strong, dynamic freight rail network in Canada that is recognized around the world for its ability to move diverse commodities over vast distances.

A cornerstone of the development of Canada's transportation system is a policy approach that supports competition in market forces. Specifically, the national transportation policy outlined in the Canada Transportation Act indicates that the objectives of a competitive, economic and efficient transportation system are most likely to be achieved when competition and market forces are the prime agents in providing transportation services. Furthermore, it states that regulation and strategic public intervention should not unduly favour any particular mode of transportation.

What would happen to this critical rail transportation system if Bill C-640 were to be passed? Provisions in the bill would undermine the government's recent efforts to strengthen Canada's rail-based supply chain and would also run counter to foundational policy principles by undermining commercial solutions and unduly favouring one type of rail transportation over another.

Specifically, Bill C-640 proposes amending the Canada Transportation Act to give VIA general scheduling and operational preference over freight rail in the event of conflict. Let me be clear on what this proposal intends to do. Essentially, this amendment would give unfettered primacy to passenger rail operations at the expense of freight rail efficiency.

• (1345)

Currently, VIA and freight railways negotiate commercial agreements for track access that allow parties to work together to find an operational arrangement that works for everyone involved. This approach recognizes that the best solutions are those negotiated by the parties themselves.

If commercial negotiations are unsuccessful, the Canada Transportation Act provides VIA and other public passenger service providers with recourse to the Canadian Transportation Agency to secure access to track, equipment, or other facilities. This dispute resolution mechanism balances the interests of communities, consumers, and public passenger service providers with those of freight rail carriers.

I want to emphasize today that passenger rail service in many parts of Canada needs to be enhanced to meet community needs. My constituency of Sarnia—Lambton is a good example of this. Due to lack of ridership, passenger rail service provided by VIA Rail has been cut back in my community over the past few years, causing issues for students, the elderly, and others who utilize this travel option. I have worked hard to advocate on the need for these services for my constituents to decision-makers at VIA Rail and in cabinet.

I also want to give credit and recognition to a local group of individuals who have worked tirelessly to improve passenger rail service for local residents. Rail Advocacy in Lambton, or RAIL, as it is more commonly known, has accomplished numerous achievements in its advocacy efforts through a broad, community-driven consultation process and through working in a co-operative fashion with VIA Rail Canada. This group has presented various solutions that may work well for my community, and as mentioned, it has had success with its efforts thus far, as a recent meeting with VIA Rail Canada ended with a promise by VIA officials to visit Sarnia-Lambton and to seek to enhance the passenger rail options for my riding.

I support RAIL in its efforts and will continue to do so, because it is seeking proactive solutions, but not at the expense of one mode of service over another. It understands that any viable solution to the transit issues facing the region will require a holistic, integrated approach, likely requiring the attention of the three levels of government involved: federal, provincial and municipal.

Its solutions do not place freight above passenger rail. Rather, they include both aspects of the rail industry in the discussion, as both sides' co-operation is indeed required for a positive solution to be reached with regard to passenger rail enhancement across the region. These are solutions that do not require the hardships Bill C-640 would create. By this I mean that Bill C-640 proposes amendments that would be in stark opposition to long-established commercial principles, such as ensuring modal neutrality and balancing the interests of the parties involved.

Ultimately, the changes proposed in Bill C-640 would greatly impact a railway's ability to operate its network, leading to inefficiencies and reduced reliability. This would have a corresponding negative impact on shippers' ability to get their goods to market, thereby risking their global reputations as reliable suppliers, reputations they work hard every day to achieve and sustain. It would also move away from a proactive solution that needs to involve both freight and passenger rail entities.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that Canada's economy cannot risk the reckless approach proposed in Bill C-640. Canadian shippers work hard to grow their businesses and realize global economic opportunities. Bill C-640 would ultimately undermine this hard work, risk shippers' global reputations as reliable suppliers, and harm the overall competitiveness of the Canadian economy. For that reason, the government cannot support Bill C-640.

• (1350)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-640, An Act respecting VIA Rail Canada and making consequential amendments to the Canada Transportation Act.

Private Members' Business

I would first like to commend my colleague from Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine for his excellent work. He has worked very hard on this file. He wanted to bring this issue to the forefront in Parliament. We have been trying to pass these vital measures in this Parliament for about 20 years. The member has done excellent work by proposing these very important changes.

I would first like to comment on why this bill is so important. Many Canadians across the country must use the services of VIA Rail, and the NDP believes that Canadians deserve rail services that are shared, adequate, safe and efficient. We know that most MPs have used VIA Rail services. We know just how essential this service is, but we also know that there is a great deal of room for improvement.

It is time for Canadian passengers to have priority over freight, as is the case in the United States. Later, I will talk about Amtrak, which Canada could really look to for best practices.

My colleague also introduced this bill because we believe that VIA Rail has a duty to provide a minimum level of service and that it should not cancel routes without consulting the public and Parliament. This bill has a number of measures and I will talk about a few of them. This bill essentially provides a legislative framework for VIA Rail's mandate. It requires VIA Rail to maintain service and to maintain the frequency of certain routes that must be served. Later, I will also talk about some essential routes that have been abandoned by VIA Rail in recent years.

The bill also provides for a transparent and democratic assessment mechanism if VIA Rail wishes to cancel service. It provides a framework for VIA Rail governance and funding. We know that these two priorities are important if we want VIA Rail services to work. This bill ensures that municipal representatives have a say in VIA Rail services.

The bill also gives priority to passenger trains over freight trains. It imposes fines on rail companies for failing to comply with regulations that favour VIA Rail. It demands transparency with respect to the fees paid by VIA Rail to rail companies. Lastly, if VIA Rail wishes to cancel service, it must first seek approval from Parliament.

I would like to digress for a moment to also talk about Canada Post. We know that this topic has been debated in the House and there is a lot of talk about it in my riding of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles. The people of Rosemère have already lost their home mail delivery and people in Boisbriand will lose it this year. Of course they oppose this reduction in service, but we know that the Conservatives' approach, which involves cutting services and increasing prices, is not the right way to run a business. That is not the right thing to do to ensure that Canada Post remains a profitable business.

The government keeps repeating that people are sending fewer letters, for one thing. That may be true, but they are sending more parcels, they are doing more online shopping and they still receive bills by mail. Furthermore, municipalities still need to send their correspondence related to municipal taxes to their residents by mail. The reduction in Canada Post services is affecting a large segment of the population, as well as municipal budgets, which are already very tight.

●(1355)

I mention Canada Post because, similarly, it is not by reducing VIA Rail's services or access to it that the crown corporation will become more profitable.

Since 2011, VIA Rail has dropped major routes. The Victoria-Kootenay line was dropped in 2011. In December 2012, VIA Rail also stopped its passenger service on the Matapédia-Gaspé line, despite the fact that a major part of that line is now safe.

In 2012, VIA Rail announced that it was reducing its Ocean train service between Montreal and Halifax. I would like to mention that a number of my colleagues here in the House defended that train service and travelled from one end of the country to the other to mobilize people in order to protect VIA Rail services. I am talking about the hon. member for Halifax and other NDP members from the Maritimes. Following the derailment of a freight train in June 2014, VIA Rail stopped operating the Winnipeg-Churchill line indefinitely.

It is important to talk about these lines because Canada is a very diverse country and remote municipalities do not have the same needs as major urban centres. VIA Rail's service is very important to these remote regions.

Passenger rail service in remote areas is in free fall. Furthermore, in more urban areas, freight trains cause significant delays in passenger service. This is very inconvenient for people who use these services.

Basically, the bill supports the concept that management of passenger rail service must comply with section 5 of the Canada Transportation Act and section 5 of the Federal Sustainable Development Act, especially when it comes to the principles of accessibility, economic growth of urban and rural communities and sustainable development.

When I was researching this bill, I looked at Amtrak, a U.S. passenger train company. Amtrak, which serves our neighbours to the south, decided to increase frequency rather than reduce it, as a result of a study that showed that decreasing the frequency of passenger trains does not result in significant savings.

Quite the opposite is happening in Canada. In the case of the Halifax-Moncton-Montreal train, there was a reduction of almost 40% in ridership in 2012, while there was only a \$1 million savings in fuel and operating costs.

Furthermore, the increased frequency of Amtrak trains in the United States has resulted in a significant increase in ridership and revenue.

I would like to comment further on the case of Canada Post. We know that if there is good management, more service and some guarantee of quality service, people will use the services available and the number of users will grow. Cutting services will not make an organization profitable. There are some interesting comparisons to be made with the case of VIA Rail.

Private Members' Business

We want VIA Rail to have a clear mandate to provide safe, adequate, efficient service. During question period in the House, NDP members have often called for VIA Rail to reinstate all of the routes that have been cancelled since 2011. We also want all changes to its network to be subject to public consultation and debated in Parliament. This is an important issue, particularly for my NDP colleagues who live in areas served by VIA Rail.

For example, the member for Churchill knows her community's needs. She is in an ideal position to understand the impact of service cuts at VIA Rail on her community and the ability of her constituents to travel and be mobile.

● (1400)

I see that my time is up, so I would like to conclude by inviting all of my colleagues to support a wonderful bill, Bill C-640.

[English]

Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am please to have the opportunity to speak to private member's bill C-640, an act respecting VIA Rail Canada and making consequential amendments to the Canada Transportation Act.

An intercity passenger rail service with VIA Rail as the predominant service provider is an important component of our transportation system. VIA benefits our economy and society by connecting Canadians from coast to coast. Recognizing this, our government has and continues to support VIA Rail.

Our government provides VIA Rail with substantial financial support to operate and maintain its network. VIA was given a subsidy amounting to \$305 million in 2013-14, a significant amount of funding. In addition, our government is making unprecedented capital investments in VIA Rail to allow it to make important improvements to modernize its operations.

Our government has made available more than \$1 billion in capital funding over the past seven years to upgrade and modernize portions of VIA Rail's network and many of its rail cars and locomotives.

However, despite our government's demonstrated support for VIA, we cannot support the bill. The bill would introduce legislation that would not only increase these costs, but would fundamentally alter, for the worst, how the corporation would be operated and managed.

VIA Rail is a federal crown corporation. Like all corporations, both private and public, VIA is governed by a board of directors that is responsible for all decisions the corporation takes. Our government has made efforts to strengthen governance practices in crown corporations and agencies by setting guidelines and best practices for board membership and operation. These best practices include seeking candidates with a range of experience drawn from both public and private sectors. To this end, VIA's board of directors is made up of qualified citizens who represent the diversity of Canada. There are currently members from many regions of the country, with each member bringing their unique skills, experience and perspective to the board.

The bill proposes to limit the pool of potential candidates for selection as VIA board members to only those candidates who are

already members of the Canadian Tourism Commission and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. This is curious logic, as by unduly limiting potential candidates for the VIA board, the bill works against these best governance practices.

Furthermore, as VIA board members have the responsibility to act in the best interests of the corporation and exercise due care and diligence, the proposal in the bill would put VIA directors in a real or perceived conflict of interest with their obligation as directors of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Canadian Tourism Commission.

The bill also promotes the addition of significant financial risk to the government by moving VIA Rail from its current non-agent structure to that of an agent of the Crown. Our government cannot support this proposal as being an agent of the Crown would increase the government's financial risk by exposing the government directly to all VIA's debts, losses and liabilities.

Bill C-640 would further add to the financial risk to the government by providing VIA with borrowing power. The proposed bill allows the corporation to borrow, issue or pledge debt on the credit of the corporation. It also allows the Ministers of Transport and Finance, in co-operation with the Governor-in-Council, to authorize VIA to borrow up to an aggregated total of \$500 million from the consolidated revenue fund. Ultimately, however, the government would have to backstop these financial commitments.

Furthermore, the bill proposes to change the share structure to provide employees with a 10% ownership in VIA. This makes no economic sense, given VIA's reliance on federal subsidies to operate. Typical of most scheduled, intercity passenger rail carriers around the world, VIA has no market value as its debts and liabilities far outweigh its assets. With little prospect for share value appreciation, the granting of non-market traded shares as performance incentives to employees would likely be an ineffective and inappropriate use of taxpayers money.

The bill also attempts to define a new mandate and objectives for VIA. In fact, it makes many of VIA's objectives inflexible and removes VIA's ability to seek an optimal balance between its objectives. On the one hand, the proposed legislation mandates the current root structure, while on the other hand, it requires VIA to maximize its financial performance. In other words, the bill ties VIA's hands and sets it up for failure.

Our government believes that VIA operates most efficiently as an independent crown corporation. This means the government does not operate the railway. This means the government does not get involved in VIA's day-to-day operations. This means the government does not try to tell VIA how many times per day it should operate its services.

● (1405)

It does not mean our government provides VIA with the necessary resources and funding needed to achieve its plans. This process has been clearly evident in recent years, with our government providing significant capital infusions and increased operating funding to allow VIA to build extra capacity, replace equipment and align the delivery of its services with planned resources.

Private Members' Business

Our government believes the current method of approving VIA's direction through annual corporate plans is the best approach. Currently, VIA's object is:

To offer a national passenger rail transportation service that is safe, secure, efficient, reliable, and environmentally sustainable, and that meets the needs of travellers in Canada.

Overall, this approach provides the necessary flexibility in service delivery to Canada's passenger rail service.

Although passenger rail remains an important service, particularly in remote areas and to support tourism across Canada and along the Quebec-Windsor corridor, it is no longer a predominant mode of transportation in Canada. Travel by private car remains the overwhelming choice for most intercity travellers.

VIA Rail is ultimately responsible for making business decision on its operations, including how best to lower its cost to reduce its reliance on federal taxpayer dollars, while meeting its objective to operate a national railway system that is safe and efficient. This is why VIA rail has to continuously assess its markets and operations to decide how best to provide the most economically efficient service to passengers.

The bill would make the process for determining the optimal mix of routes and fleet resources more difficult to achieve and delay VIA from proactively reacting to changes in its marketplace. It would take away this essential flexibility for VIA, resulting in poorer financial performance and governance processes that would not align with best practices for crown corporation governance. It bill would result in higher borrowing, insurance and risk management, costs for VIA. The bill would also result in higher costs and risk exposure for the Government of Canada.

Our government will not support Bill C-640.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Lise St-Denis (Saint-Maurice—Champlain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the slow erosion of the passenger rail system in Canada is relentless. In Haute-Mauricie, cuts are being made to services for aboriginal people, services for those who travel to receive medical care, services for the many tourists and vacationers, and interregional services. We are facing an organized dismantling of rail transportation in order to decrease service delivery in remote regions. If the government wants to shut down the towns and villages in the regions, there is no better way to go about it.

We no longer see trains passing by. Our train stations are becoming museums in memory of our investments of yesterday in areas abandoned by government. Nevertheless, it is rather ironic to hear the Prime Minister boast about the advantages of occupying the areas adjacent to the Northwest Passage in response to thirsty nations' claims on our Arctic regions, when meanwhile the current government is abandoning our regions by closing the railway lines that forged our national and territorial identity.

How far will the destruction of our symbols and our infrastructure go? You have to be familiar with the regions to see the problems caused by the elimination of train service, and it seems fairly obvious that the executives at the head office have never set foot out of the Toronto or Montreal stations. The cuts made to the passenger rail

system should not have an impact on local economies. Were they expecting the Holy Spirit to provide service to remote regions?

Despite the wishful thinking of VIA Rail executives and their obvious lack of sensitivity to rural populations, people are suffering from these haphazard cuts. They are selling stations for a dollar, abandoning one-hundred-year-old services, liquidating our heritage to the lowest bidder, replacing station agents with self-service kiosks—and you can forget it if you are not paying with plastic.

The bill introduced by the member for Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine partially meets the expectations of local populations. Is it realistic to put restrictions on VIA Rail to give passenger service priority over commercial or industrial service? We are aware of the limits of such a measure, in light of who owns the railways in Canada. It seems to us that, in this context, the lack of a national strategy for passenger transportation will be a crucial consideration in developing new criteria and controls for VIA Rail.

Little by little, the train has become the means of transportation for urban dwellers, to the detriment of people living in the regions. We are one of the industrialized societies that invests the least in public transit. The dismantling of VIA Rail and its regional services was done without consultation. Changes in rates, schedules and the number of destinations are determined by bureaucrats who happily sacrifice regional development without listening to users' complaints.

How can we get VIA Rail back on track? How can we make the current government realize what is happening in the regions? We understand the gist of the member's bill. We can see the complete indifference of VIA Rail executives towards people in the regions. However, how can we compel this crown corporation and private rail companies without having a national rail transportation policy?

The number and scope of rail disasters should have prompted the minister to develop a serious rail policy. We are still waiting for the improvisation to stop.

• (1410)

We must conduct a comprehensive study of the negative effects of the cuts to passenger rail service in order to align those findings with the modernization of freight transportation.

The government is proposing that penalties be imposed on recalcitrant carriers as the ultimate fix for these carriers' possible mismanagement. The many planned restrictions with regard to services and the prioritization of passenger transportation are not realistic because passenger transportation is not as profitable as freight transportation.

Any passenger rail policy that is developed must align with the development of freight transportation. The co-existence of the two systems requires an assessment of the risks inherent in their respective areas of expertise, which are disproportionate. The prosperity of one must benefit the other.

Private Members' Business

Regional development, which relies on many industrial bases, is related to the needs of local populations. We cannot hope to earn a profit from our resources without giving small communities sustainable infrastructure.

For many, the end of VIA Rail means the end of many communities. Every generation must reinvent its prosperity. The same is true of the role of this passenger rail stakeholder.

For the time being, we are not assessing the magnitude of the social disaster caused by the disappearance of passenger rail service. We have not assessed the social costs of this disappearance. We believe, as does the member for Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, that VIA Rail must be forced to provide services to remote regions. We believe that the current level of service is lacking. We are disappointed about the lack of regard for passenger safety on a number of lines of this so-called national carrier.

VIA Rail has a critical role to play as a passenger carrier in Canada, but resources are lacking as a result of the lack of interest shown by governments. In addition to imposing a new legal framework on the carrier, we must finally develop a real Canadian passenger and freight transportation policy.

The topic of land use must not be limited to the throne speech. We need to make our historical presence in the north and south a national priority. The almost total lack of rail service in the regions is a daily struggle. The local populations have been abandoned and must reluctantly leave their homes.

We believe that the thought process initiated by the member for Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine is the first step toward the creation of a national inclusive transportation policy. The introduction of Bill C-640 enables us to begin a debate on the role of public services in Canada. This bill sets out responsibilities that are consistent with the historic role of parliamentarians in this place. We need to be able to debate the people's needs and report on the progress and setbacks in this domain.

This bill decrees rules of precedence and shared use for the crown corporation and private companies, rules that we have to take a close look at while considering the costs arising from such a policy.

However, private companies do not operate in a vacuum and must be accountable to civil society, particularly with respect to safety and the common good.

• (1415)

[*English*]

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in the House today to support Bill C-640, the work of my colleague, the member for Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine. He follows in a great tradition of rail advocacy by the NDP. I would be remiss if I neglected to mention Bill Blaikie, who along with his many principled contributions to the House as the member for Elmwood—Transcona and deputy speaker was and remains a fierce defender and advocate of preserving, diversifying, and expanding rail infrastructure in our great country.

Bill C-640 is an effort to turn the tide on the steady erosion of rail travel that began with the Liberals' deregulation of the industry and the privatization of the Canadian National Railway system in 1995.

Bill C-640 seeks to prevent VIA from cancelling routes and passenger service without consulting with Canadians and with Parliament. Canadians have the right to the highest levels of service, protection, and accessibility of travel that can be provided. Instead we have seen the erosion of infrastructure due to neglect and corporate offloading and the cancellation of services across the country.

Canada has a growing population comprising families with children, seniors, and citizens who need to travel and are very conscious of the environmental legacy we are creating for future generations.

With proper stewardship and a visionary plan, there is real potential to revive our once thriving rail travel industry. However, that kind of vision requires a federal government focused on national stewardship rather than what both Liberal and Conservative governments did when they sold off national interests and pandered to those who bankroll their campaigns. Even worse, this current Conservative government, as did previous Liberal governments, refuses to acknowledge that the economic and environmental benefits of a truly enhanced, integrated, accessible, and sustainable rail transit system far outweigh and outlive short-term political gain. It fails to understand that everyone, from the youngest Canadian to the seasoned commuter, benefits from the kind of forward thinking that ensures that rail travel is part of our future.

This reality is not lost on the citizens of London and southwestern Ontario. These are the Canadians who suffer from what is described in the Network Southwest action plan as a mobility gap. VIA Rail needs substantial modernization and service improvements to prevent a further decline in ridership. Investment and modernization would permit the enhancement and strengthening of rail service for future generations.

We have to be forward thinking. Rail travel is cost-effective in terms of the pocketbook and the environment. While high-speed rail is a longer-term vision, high-performance rail is able to operate on many existing main and secondary routes. High-performance rail is part of an interconnected alternative public transit system, and it provides infrastructure to feed future high-speed rail.

The Network Southwest report, written by Greg Gormick in March 2015, outlines the need for VIA Rail services to be upgraded to HPR standards as one of its three building blocks. The plan also includes feeder bus services to provide transit between trains and communities off the rail lines and mobility hubs to connect all transportation modes, including local traffic.

Private Members' Business

All of this can be done efficiently and seamlessly. There are already several successful models of rail-based regional public transport solutions in the U.S. One of the characteristics they all share is the joint support of federal and state governments. A joint approach by federal and provincial governments in Canada could bring about the mobility improvements needed in regions like southwestern Ontario, and such a transit solution could become a template for other parts of Canada.

A successful precedent for innovation happened after the federal Liberal government slashed half the rail passenger service in Canada in the 1990s. In response to that void, the Ontario NDP government partnered with VIA and restored a London-Toronto train that was threatened by the axe. This restored service was a crucial link that the provincial government knew must be saved. It was a matter of determination and foresight.

Bill C-640 would allow Canadians and this Parliament to evaluate cases where VIA Rail plans to eliminate a required route and would call on Parliament to study, debate, and then vote on the recommendations in the minister's report, thus giving Parliament the final decision. Interestingly, that is what our system is supposed to do: ensure that Parliament, and not the party in power, has a role in vital national decisions.

• (1420)

VIA serves three well-populated corridors in southwestern Ontario, and there are many factors in favour of improving these routes. First of all, they service one of the highest population densities in Canada. They can be utilized by significant numbers of students in numerous colleges and universities, students who do not have access to cars.

These routes bring visitors to tourist and cultural attractions, including the Stratford Shakespeare Festival. They have close proximity to Toronto, which is a destination and an economic hub. They decrease often difficult travel on Highway 401 and the QEW. Both those highways can be very hazardous at any time of year.

I have had occasion to meet with numerous community organizations in London and area that rely on VIA Rail for their transportation. Groups like the University of Western Ontario Student Council and Fanshawe Student Union have a keen interest. A significant segment of the London workforce relies on VIA Rail to commute to the GTA. The intercommunity travel between London, Sarnia, Windsor and Toronto is vital to all of our local economies.

The London Chamber of Commerce and business leaders in the community know that without dependable VIA Rail service, many community jobs would be lost. Bill C-640 provides effective measures to ensure that that does not happen.

As the *London Free Press* reported on April 11, new rail investment would create 30 to 36 new jobs and \$3 million to \$4 million in economic spinoffs. Bus network improvements would add to those regional economic benefits as well. The cost associated with Network Southwest's five-year plan is equivalent to the cost of building just one kilometre of subway in Toronto and the benefits are huge. American studies indicate that for each \$1 million invested in rail, 30 jobs are created and GDP increases threefold.

When we consider the drain on the Canadian economy associated with motor vehicle accidents and injuries which cost us \$22 billion per year, these benefits are impossible to ignore.

Rail Advocacy in Lambton says of Bill C-640 that the concept of a national rail policy is, in their view, a necessary step in supporting a sustainable passenger rail system for all Canadians. It says that without this legislation, Via Rail and Canada's passenger rail system is doomed to die a slow death, with no hope of resurrection, unless immediate restorative action is initiated. It says that it needs an affordable, frequent, marketable passenger rail service that ensures no passenger is ever left behind. It also says that this legislation is the first step in a long-overdue process that will make VIA Rail a viable, productive, successful national transportation agency.

Mike from London, Ontario, has written to remind me that next year will be the 160th anniversary of the London and Port Stanley Railway, the third oldest in Canada, founded in 1856. Included in all the other travellers who rode that line were big band musicians and fans headed to Port Stanley's famous Stork Club. Reconnecting London and St. Thomas to Port Stanley's beaches and shops again would be a boost to our local economy.

I also want to mention the work that is being undertaken by the City of London. I am encouraged by London's Shift initiative that presents a bold and important vision for transportation in our city. It focuses on rapid transit as part of the transportation system that will help our city grow and prosper.

The Shift proposal calls for London to conduct a public environmental assessment that allows citizen input in planning and designing the network. In addition, it will assess the need for rapid transit, and how rapid transit can alleviate such problems as congestion, overcrowded buses and the high cost of driving. The assessment will determine which streets are suitable for rapid transit and how they can be designed to improve mobility for everyone, and determine the form or forms of rapid transit that should be used. Shift is a City of London initiative that has great potential.

The integration and coordination of VIA Rail routes and services is vital to moving the population of London in, through and around the community. Bill C-640 lays the framework for that progress to happen.

I am very happy to stand in support of Bill C-640. It is good for the people of London and southwestern Ontario. It is good for all of Canada.

Private Members' Business

• (1425)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): The hon. member for Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine now has five minutes for his right of reply.

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to close this first debate on Bill C-640, VIA Rail Canada Act. This bill is very important to me personally. For one thing, it guarantees passenger rail service to my region, in the Gaspé. Regions like the Gaspé need reliable, affordable passenger rail service. In our regions, bus service is far from exemplary, and air travel is simply too expensive.

Our regions need a Canada-wide passenger rail system. It is more affordable than air travel, it is the best option for the environment, it would connect our remotest regions, and it would help develop the economies of the regions served. Let us be clear: this bill is in the best interest of our environment, our economy and our regions.

I cannot emphasize enough the benefits such a passenger rail service could have, not only in the communities that are served directly, but also for society in general. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, every dollar invested in passenger rail service produces between \$3 and \$4 in economic spinoffs.

However, our current system is not reaching its full potential. The status quo is simply not working. This becomes clear simply by comparing VIA Rail with the Amtrak passenger rail system in the U.S.

With Amtrak, a traveller can get from Seattle to New York in three days for the equivalent of 275 Canadian dollars, and departures are offered daily. With VIA Rail, a trip from Vancouver to Montreal takes a day longer than with Amtrak, four days in other words, and costs an extra \$200, or \$475. What is more, VIA Rail offers just three departures a week during the summer and only two departures in winter. In fact, it would be cheaper, better and faster to travel with Amtrak in the United States to get from Vancouver to Toronto.

In the United States, politicians of all stripes understand that a modern country cannot afford not to invest in passenger train services. In Canada, we recognize the importance of investing in public infrastructure such as schools, hospitals, and fire stations. We even allocate a lot of money to road and air transport. Why then refuse to recognize the importance of passenger rail service?

It is not a question of nationalizing a private company because VIA Rail is already a crown corporation and is already subsidized by the federal government. Bill C-640 simply proposes to clarify VIA Rail's role, rights and responsibilities. Canadians deserve to know what they are getting for their investment and to have the power to ensure that their expectations will be met.

The VIA Rail Canada Act would give passenger trains priority over freight trains. This is not all that outrageous. Such a system is already in place in the United States. What is more, VIA Rail was created to free CN and CP from their obligation to provide passenger service. In return, CN and CP now allow VIA Rail to use their rail lines for a fee. It is important to note that VIA Rail pays more than Amtrak for those same rights.

Bill C-640 would allow VIA Rail Canada to negotiate on equal footing with these host railway companies and would ensure that it had scheduling preference in order to promote increased passenger use. Let us not forget that the preference of passenger trains would not apply if it were to unduly impair the freight service of a railway company. This is not about penalizing railway companies. It is simply about ensuring effective passenger transportation.

Bill C-640 would also establish a list of mandated routes. We are paying for a Canada-wide network so we expect to see a Canada-wide network, especially since the service would generate economic spinoffs in the communities being served. This model was very successful in the United States.

I would like to close by quoting the former president of Amtrak, David Gunn. He said:

• (1430)

[*English*]

No national rail passenger system in the world is profitable. Without public subsidy, there will be no passenger rail transportation systems....

[*Translation*]

We cannot get along without a national passenger rail transportation service in the 21st century. Privatizing VIA Rail is out of the question. The reason why the crown corporation was created was that the private sector was unable to provide this essential service. We must have a Canada-wide service. This bill is the first step in that direction.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, April 29, immediately before the time provided for private members' business.

• (1435)

[*English*]

Pursuant to an order made Wednesday, April 22, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Motion No. 587 under private members' business.

*Private Members' Business***GENOCIDE RECOGNITION**

Mr. Brad Butt (Mississauga—Streetsville, CPC) moved:

That the House: (a) re-affirm its support for (i) the Holocaust Memorial Day Act, (ii) the Armenian genocide recognition resolution adopted on April 21, 2004, (iii) the Rwandan genocide resolution adopted on April 7, 2008, (iv) the Ukrainian Famine and Genocide (“Holodomor”) Memorial Day Act; (b) call upon the government to honour the victims of all genocides by recognizing the month of April as Genocide Remembrance, Condemnation and Prevention Month; and (c) acknowledge the associated commemorative days of (i) Yom ha-Shoah (Holocaust Memorial Day), as determined by the Jewish Lunar calendar, (ii) Armenian Genocide Memorial Day on April 24, (iii) Rwandan Genocide Memorial Day on April 7, (iv) Holodomor Memorial Day on the fourth Saturday in November.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present Motion No. 587 before the House today. I would like to thank the hon. member for Don Valley East for seconding the motion.

I would like to thank the House for the opportunity to start off this important debate on a motion that would reaffirm the support of the House for the recognition of historical genocides. It would also call upon the government to recognize April as genocide remembrance, condemnation and prevention month.

In August, 1941, shortly after British intelligence broke the Enigma code and began intercepting first-hand Nazi reports of mass slaughters and remorseless brutalities in occupied Ukraine and Russia, Winston Churchill spoke to an international audience in a live radio broadcast. He said, “We are in the presence of a crime without a name”. In the United States, the noted legal scholar, Raphael Lemkin, a Jewish refugee from Nazi-occupied Poland, heard Churchill's words. In the hope that naming the crime would help to prevent it, two years later, Lemkin coined the word “genocide”, defining it as “the systematic destruction of all or a significant part of a racial, ethnic, religious or national group”.

He tirelessly campaigned for its recognition in international law. Finally, in 1948, after the systemic nature and horrific scope of the Nazis' mass crimes had been more fully grasped, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Canada has been a party to this convention for more than 60 years, and its resolve to combat and prevent genocide around the world continues to be strong and steadfast.

Some seven decades after the liberation of the Nazi death camps, our country remains committed to helping to prevent future atrocities by combatting oppression, hatred, and xenophobia, and teaching future generations about the lessons of genocide around the world. Canada has been profoundly shaped by survivors of genocide who have had first-hand experience with the horrific crime and have resettled across our great country. That is why this Parliament has officially recognized the historical genocides that have affected many Canadian immigrants and the ancestors of many Canadians. Those genocides include the Holocaust, the Armenian genocide, the Holodomor, and the Rwandan genocide.

The Holocaust Memorial Day Act, which was passed in 2003, recognizes the unique atrocities of the Shoah, during which 6 million European Jews, including 1.5 million Jewish children, lost their lives. Millions of other European civilians were slaughtered because they belonged to groups deemed expendable, according to the Nazis' heinous ideology.

The Armenian genocide resolution, adopted 11 years ago this month, recognized the terrible suffering and loss of life endured by the Armenian people in 1915 as a genocide, condemning it as a crime against humanity.

The Ukrainian Famine and Genocide (“Holodomor”) Memorial Day Act was passed in 2008. It established the fourth Saturday in November as an annual day to remember one of the greatest tragedies of the last century, the deliberate starvation of millions of men, women, and children in Ukraine, between 1932 and 1933, by the Soviet regime under Joseph Stalin.

● (1440)

Finally, in 2008, Parliament unanimously adopted a resolution commemorating the 1994 slaughter of 800,000 Rwandans, targeting ethnic Tutsis and political moderates, including ethnic Hutus, and designating April 7 as a day of reflection on the prevention of genocide. Parliament had previously declared April 7 a day of remembrance for the victims of the Rwandan genocide in 2004.

With the designation of April each year as genocide remembrance, condemnation and prevention month, we would be specifically remembering those unfathomable, tragic, historic events. At the same time, we would be more broadly acknowledging that genocide betrays the fundamental value of human dignity.

Genocide does not begin with the mass murder of a people. Its seeds are planted with hatred, racism and a denial of human rights. We must be vigilant and never allow such horrific crimes to be forgotten or repeated. We have an obligation to remember and to learn from some of the darkest events in human history. By doing so we renew our commitment to do everything we can to prevent such events from happening ever again.

In the words of author, Nobel Laureate and Holocaust survivor, Elie Wiesel:

An immoral society betrays humanity because it betrays the basis for humanity, which is memory.... A moral society is committed to memory.

As time passes, it becomes even more imperative for moral societies such as ours to remain firm in our commitment to memory. Without active efforts such as those proposed by this motion, there is always the risk that the memory of historical genocides could be lost, minimized, or even denied.

Indeed, in recent years, we have seen an unfortunate rise around the world in the heinous practice of Holocaust denial and in the denial of other genocides. The only appropriate response is to strongly reaffirm our collective commitment as a society to remember and commemorate genocide, to educate future generations about the poisonous effects of hate and intolerance, and to uphold the importance of preventing such atrocities from ever reoccurring.

Indeed, while the nation at the centre of any genocide holds the primary responsibility to protect its people from such atrocities, the international community also has significant responsibilities.

Private Members' Business

Canada has been a world leader in genocide commemoration and education. We have opened the Canadian Museum of Human Rights in Winnipeg, supported resolutions on the prevention of genocide at the Human Rights Council, and served as the 2014 chair of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, among many other recent initiatives.

The motion we are debating today is in the spirit of ensuring that our country continues to set an important international example. I call on all members of this House to support Motion No. 587.

I have appreciated the opportunity to address the House on this very important matter.

• (1445)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will soon have the honour of also speaking to Motion No. 587.

I would like to congratulate the member for Mississauga—Streetsville for his initiative. I would like to ask him what our country should do to honour the international agreements and treaties on the prevention of future genocides. What role should Canada play on the international scene in order to be more proactive and prevent such atrocities and horrors from happening again? What are his thoughts on that?

[*English*]

Mr. Brad Butt: Mr. Speaker, Canada continues to be a world leader and continues to play a very effective role in the international community in speaking out and making sure that we are honouring our international commitments and treaties.

Right now, of course, we are playing a very significant role in making sure another genocide does not take place in Iraq and Syria by committing Canadian Armed Forces and providing humanitarian aid and assistance to Iraq and Syria to protect religious minorities in those countries, Yazidis, Christians, Chaldeans, and Syrians who are being slaughtered at the hands of ISIL.

Canada will continue to play its very strong role where we are recognized internationally as standing up for vulnerable people in the world and speaking the truth about these tragedies at all times.

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his speech and his initiative. I am pleased to co-operate to ensure that all communities will be on board. As he knows, we should perhaps consider adding another genocide that unfortunately happened to our friends in Bosnia. I would like to hear his views on that. As we have agreed, I understand that will not be today.

My colleague from Montreal has spoken with the minister. However, it might be good to explain where we are with respect to that, to ensure Canada is willing to commemorate in the month of April all of the genocides, including the one that happened in Bosnia.

Mr. Brad Butt: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friends in the NDP, the Liberal, and Green parties who have all indicated their support for this motion. It is great to see Parliament come together

over an issue like this. That is a credit to the fine men and women who serve in this chamber.

In the motion, I specifically referred to four genocides. However, it is obvious that should this motion pass, the month of April would be known as the genocide prevention remembrance month. It would include all genocides, including Bosnia and the others that have taken place. I would expect that this would cover all of those, and that we would find an appropriate way to commemorate these horrific events in human history and include all of those other organizations that would also like to be part of this in the month of April.

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for bringing this motion forward. On the weekend, a number of people were in downtown Toronto in remembrance of the Armenian genocide. Across this country, we often stop and remember what has happened.

I wonder if the member could speak more emotionally to how important it is to remember, not only for government and for us, but for the victims and the people who have suffered through this.

Mr. Brad Butt: Mr. Speaker, even today, just a short couple of hours ago on the lawn at Parliament Hill, we had a commemoration for the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. I had an opportunity to speak at that, which I am honoured to have done. When I looked into the crowd and saw the people's faces, I could see their pain and sadness for their relatives, friends, and ancestors who were affected by these acts.

There is an old saying that time heals all wounds. I am not always sure that is completely true. If we do not continue to recognize these events that have taken place in the history of our world, which have been our darkest moments in what human beings have done to one another, we are unfortunately doomed to repeat them. Therefore, we must continue to recognize these events each and every year.

• (1450)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, once again, I am extremely honoured to have the opportunity to participate in this debate and this discussion in the House of Commons. We are debating a fundamental and extremely important topic. Once again, I would like to thank my colleague from Mississauga—Streetsville for moving this motion and giving us an opportunity to put our thoughts together and have a rational discussion on some tragic events that took place over the course of the 20th century. There was the Armenian genocide, the first genocide of the 20th century, and then the Holocaust, the Holocaust and, more recently, the Rwandan genocide.

Private Members' Business

This is an important discussion for us to have, and this is an important week to have it. It is no coincidence that we are debating this motion today on April 24. The NDP worked very hard this week to ensure that the debate would be held on or before April 24. Why? April 24 is an important date. One hundred years ago, the interior minister of the Ottoman empire send a fateful telegram that would trigger a series of atrocities and massacres that went on for several years, during which time some 1.5 million Armenians were killed. That was the first time concentration and death camps were used. For the first time in the 20th century, there was a deliberate attempt to exterminate an entire population, to eradicate it from the planet. Fortunately, it failed.

Nevertheless, considerable force was unleashed for the purpose of destroying and killing people simply because of who they were. State resources were used to exterminate a people, a language and a culture from the face of the earth. The people who lost their lives over there are now considered saints and martyrs, as recently confirmed by the Pope. That is significant; it means something. Those people suffered through utterly horrible ordeals, and families were wiped out. People were killed and massacred. There were massive deportations of women and children, who were forced to walk in the desert for weeks. Obviously, they did not survive.

It is important for us to remember this because it must never be used to justify more such atrocities and attempts to exterminate a people. Though not unknown, these events are not well known enough. Remember what Adolf Hitler said when attempting to justify his plan to exterminate the Jewish people from Europe: "Who speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?" He was trying to prove that it was okay to kill millions of people because of their identity, their ethnicity, their religion or their language. That is extremely tragic, and people need to know what happened if only to prevent it from ever happening again. Sadly, it did happen again. We have a moral duty to make sure people are informed about and aware of what happened.

Earlier today I attended the rally on Parliament hill with my colleague from Mississauga—Streetsville and thousands of other people who came here today at the invitation of the Armenian National Committee of Canada to mark what happened 100 years ago. I shared a fact. It is not an anecdote, but indeed a fact. There are a few photos on our piano back home. One of the photos is of my wife's great-great-grandfather. He was a photographer. It is a lovely photo. He looks like a very dignified and upstanding man. The photo next to his is of this three oldest children, three sons. We look at those photos every day and we know full well that he and his three sons did not survive what happened in 1915. They were all killed. It is the story of millions of Armenian families. It is no coincidence that today in the Republic of Armenia there are three million people, but the Armenian diaspora represents eight million people.

• (1455)

Naturally, those who survived or were able to escape went to other countries, such as Uruguay, Canada, Australia, France and the United States.

Fortunately, in addition to the three sons who died, this man also had a daughter, who today lives in Paris, and another son. This fifth child went to Greece and also had two children, including a son,

Andranig, who came to Canada and had three children: Shant, Gary and Lisa, my wife. We have a young son whom we called Sevan, an Armenian name, to preserve this family tie, history and continuity. It is important for us to proclaim this message about the fight against intolerance, racism and xenophobia. We must work every day, here in Parliament, but especially beyond these walls, to find a way to live a life that is good and congenial and allows us to respect differences by accepting them.

Then, in the 20th century, other tragedies and genocides also occurred. The Holodomor, the Ukrainian genocide, is not very well known either. Stalin industrialized the U.S.S.R. on the backs of the people of Ukraine, by stealing and extorting Ukrainian wheat and other grains, and then selling them on international markets in order to buy factories that were crumbling, which is what made possible the industrialization of the U.S.S.R. However, he did this on the backs of millions of people who lost their lives. He caused an intentional, deliberate famine, an act of organized crime. This was later repeated with the Holocaust, as we all know. We cannot forget the death camps, the extermination camps and the trains that led Jews to their deaths in furnaces and gas chambers. Six million people died at that time.

In 1994, not all that long ago, we saw the massacre of the Tutsis in Rwanda, when 800,000 people were killed in three and a half months. It is our duty to remember. The Parliament of Canada is the ideal place to reaffirm that we know what happened, that we acknowledge it and that we remember those men, women and children who were killed simply for who they were. We need to do everything in our power to ensure that it never happens again.

That is why the NDP is calling on the Canadian government and Canada to do more with our international treaties on genocide prevention and to punish the government officials responsible for these atrocities. We have already done so. In 2004, Alexa McDonough was one of the sponsors of a motion that was adopted here in the House on the recognition of the Armenian genocide, and we are proud of that. My colleague from Ottawa Centre also tabled a resolution in 2010 to make April 23 the National Day of Remembrance and Action on Mass Atrocities. This is a day to commemorate the victims of all atrocities, including genocide, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing and major war crimes.

It is unfortunate to see that these types of crimes are still being committed today. I would also like to point out that even though they are not included in this motion, crimes were committed against the people of Cambodia, where between 1975 and 1979, one in five people in that country went missing or was murdered. That is completely unacceptable and atrocious. War crimes and crimes against humanity are still being committed even today. We need to talk about them, condemn them and take action to stop them and to keep them from happening again.

Today, on behalf of the NDP, I am extremely proud to be in the House with my colleagues to support this motion and to remind everyone of the Armenian genocide in 1915, the Ukrainian genocide, the Holocaust and the Rwandan genocide. We remember. We will never forget, and we will do everything in our power to ensure that this does not happen again.

Private Members' Business

• (1500)

[English]

Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, on the occasion of the 21st anniversary of the genocide of Tutsis in Rwanda, I spoke at a gathering on Parliament Hill to mark Canada's National Day of Reflection on the Prevention of Genocide. Last week, I attended a Yom Hashoah Holocaust remembrance service in my riding, 70 years since the liberation of the death camps. Earlier today, I had the privilege to address the thousands assembled outside this building, who are commemorating the Armenian genocide, which began a century ago and which Pope Francis recognized as the first genocide of the 20th century.

What these genocides and others have in common, as I said at the gathering to commemorate the genocide of the Tutsis in Rwanda, is not only that these genocides are unspeakable because of the horror of the genocide, but also because these genocides were preventable. Nobody could say that we did not know. There were, as there always are, warning signs, forerunners to genocide. Yet time and again, the world has stood by, minimizing the threats of demonization and dehumanization, ignoring the ominous march to mass atrocity until it is too late and we find ourselves yet again promising never again and insisting that we mean it this time.

I therefore welcome the motion put forward by the member for Mississauga—Streetsville, which acknowledges four genocides that have been recognized by the House, along with the associated memorial days, and which calls on the House to establish April as genocide remembrance, condemnation and prevention month. A month so designated would provide an impetus not only to remember these tragic events, le devoir de mémoire, but to speak out and to act against racism, hatred, exclusion, demonization and dehumanization, the precursors to genocide, and in favour of justice, human dignity and the protection of human rights, including minority rights. Moreover, such a month would be an opportunity to continue the teaching and learning of the genocides past, with a view to preventing genocide in the future.

I will now touch on several lessons of remembrance and the remembrance to act always.

The first lesson is the danger of forgetting the importance and responsibility of remembrance itself, both in the sense of bearing witness to past collective failures to prevent genocide and in the sense of acknowledging and bearing witness to each victim of genocide as individuals. The numbers of genocide can be overwhelming: six million Jews killed by the Nazis, 10,000 Tutsis murdered every day for three months, 1,000 Ukrainians starved to death every hour at the height of the Holodomor, and I could go on. Genocide is not a matter of abstract statistics. As we say at these moments of remembrance, unto each person there is a name; each person has an identity; each person is a universe.

The second enduring lesson is that genocides have occurred not only because of the machinery of death, but because of state-sanctioned incitement to hate. The Supreme Court of Canada has recognized that the Holocaust did not begin in the gas chambers; it began with words. The international community must therefore bear in mind, as the Supreme Court of Canada affirmed also in the Mugesera case, that incitement to genocide is a crime in and of itself.

Taking action to prevent it, as the genocide convention compels us, is not a policy option; it is an international legal obligation of the highest order.

The third lesson is the danger of indifference and the responsibility to act. In 1994, for example, while the UN Security Council dithered and delayed, Rwandans were dying. Ten years later, massacres in Darfur were met with a similarly dilatory global response. No one can say that we did not know. We knew, but we did not act.

In an effort to end this pattern of the international community as bystander, the United Nations adopted in 2005 the responsibility to protect doctrine, a Canadian initiative of which we should be very proud. According to R to P, whenever there are war crimes, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing or, God forbid, genocide, and the government of the region in question is unable or unwilling to take action, or worse, is the author of that criminality, as in the case of the Syrian regime, the international community has a responsibility to intervene to protect targeted or innocent civilians. It is now the 10th anniversary of R to P and Canada must reaffirm its commitment to the abiding moral imperative in which it is anchored, that we are each, wherever we are, the guarantors of each other's destiny.

• (1505)

The fourth lesson is a danger of a culture of impunity and therefore the importance of bringing to justice those who are engaged in mass human rights violations. If the past century was the age of atrocity, it was also the age of impunity. Far too few of the perpetrators of crimes against humanity have been brought to justice and far too many of them live comfortable lives in Canada and elsewhere. As such, I encourage the government to commit adequate resources to Canada's war crimes program in order that such war criminals will be brought to justice.

The fifth lesson is the cruelty of genocide denial in its most obscene form, where genocide denial actually even accuses the victim of falsifying the crime, of perpetrating a hoax, but by commemorating genocide, we repudiate such denial.

Today, with crowds gathered on Parliament Hill to observe the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, we must be clear. The current Turkish government and the Turkish people are not responsible for the killing of Armenians a century ago. Yet, reconciliation requires recognition, and I trust we all hope for reconciliation between the Turkish and Armenian people anchored in recognition and truth.

Sixth is the importance of remembering the heroic rescuers, those who confronted and resisted evil, who remind us of the range of humanity that prevailed in the face of evil, and thereby transformed history.

I am reminded, for instance, of our former colleague, Senator Romeo Dallaire, who was a beacon of humanity amidst the inhumanity of the genocide of the Tutsis in Rwanda; and of Raul Wallenberg, the Swedish diplomat who, in 1944, rescued more Hungarian Jews than any single government before himself disappearing into the Soviet gulag.

Private Members' Business

Finally, we must remember and pay tribute to the survivors who endured the worst of inhumanity, and somehow found in the resources of their own humanity the will to go on, to rebuild their lives, as they contribute to the building of the communities in which they live.

Thus, I thank the member for Mississauga—Streetsville for his motion, and my party and myself will happily support it. Indeed, I have introduced a similar motion. The only difference being that mine makes mention of the Srebrenica massacre.

In that vein, before I close, I inform the House of a letter I received earlier this week from the president of the Congress of North American Bosniaks and from the chairman of the Institute for Research of Genocide in Canada. They wrote to express their surprise that the Srebrenica Remembrance Day and the related motion unanimously adopted by the House, on October 19, 2010, were not mentioned in Motion No. 587. They request that it be included.

Indeed, Srebrenica Remembrance Day is the only genocide commemoration day recognized by the House of Commons, but not specifically referenced in the motion before us. As such, I intend to introduce a motion in the coming weeks that will reaffirm the House's recognition of the Srebrenica massacre as an act of genocide to be commemorated each year on July 11.

On Srebrenica Remembrance Day, on the other commemorated days mentioned in Motion No. 587 and soon, during the entire month of April, Canadians will unite in active remembrance of the victims and in furtherance of tolerance, human dignity, human rights and peace. Never again will be affirmed, and this time we will be able to not only remember but hopefully act always on that remembrance.

• (1510)

Mr. Brad Butt (Mississauga—Streetsville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to specifically thank my colleagues, the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie and the hon. member for Mount Royal, for also speaking on behalf of their parties to this motion. I would also like to

thank the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, who also indicated to me that her party supported this motion as well.

It is a great day for Parliament when we see all political parties working together for such an important motion, important commemoration that we can have in our country by establishing April as our genocide remembrance prevention and condemnation month in Canada.

I appreciate the comments of the hon. member for Mount Royal about Bosnia. I would be prepared to work with him, and there is certainly no reason why that situation could not also be included in the commemorations within the month of April.

I simply want to thank all members of the House for the support for this motion, and I look forward to it being approved.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): In my opinion the yeas have it. I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): It being 3:14 p.m., pursuant to an order made Wednesday, April 22, this House stands adjourned until next Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 3:11 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. 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

MRS. STELLA AMBLER

HON. JOHN DUNCAN

HON. DOMINIC LEBLANC

MR. PHILIP TOONE

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	Mississauga—Brampton South	Ontario	Lib.
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 and Consular	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Saskatchewan	CPC
Andrews, Scott	Avalon	Newfoundland and Labrador	Ind.
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	Ontario	NDP
Armstrong, Scott, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister of Labour	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
Barlow, John	Macleod	Alberta	CPC
Bateman, Joyce	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	CPC
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	Québec	Ind.
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	Northwest Territories	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
Chan, Arnold	Scarborough—Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
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
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
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
Dubourg, Emmanuel	Bourassa	Québec	Lib.
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.
Eglinski, Jim	Yellowhead	Alberta	CPC
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Falk, Ted	Provencher	Manitoba	CPC
Fantino, Hon. Julian, Associate Minister of National Defence	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
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	FD
Freeland, Chrystia	Toronto Centre	Ontario	Lib.
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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Gill, Parm, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	Brampton—Springdale	Ontario	CPC
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	Ind.
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, Hon. Ed, Minister of State (Science and Technology)	London West	Ontario	CPC
Hsu, Ted	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Hughes, Carol	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing	Ontario	NDP
Hyer, Bruce	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Ontario	GP
Jacob, Pierre	Brome—Missisquoi	Québec	NDP
James, Roxanne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	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
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, 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 National Defence 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	FD
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. K. Kellie, Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women	Simcoe—Grey	Ontario	CPC
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs.....	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	Ind.
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
Maguire, Larry	Brandon—Souris.....	Manitoba	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
Mathyssen, 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 Health 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
Michaud, Élane	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier.....	Québec	NDP
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound...	Ontario	CPC
Moore, Christine	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	Québec	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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 Foreign Affairs	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 Finance	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	CPC
O'Neill Gordon, Tilly	Miramichi	New Brunswick	CPC
Opitz, Ted	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	CPC
O'Toole, Hon. Erin, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Durham	Ontario	CPC
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Québec	Ind.
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
Perkins, Pat	Whitby—Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Perreault, Manon	Montcalm	Québec	Ind.
Pilon, François	Laval—Les Îles	Québec	NDP
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet— Bécancour	Québec	BQ
Poilievre, Hon. Pierre, Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for 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 Natural Resources and Minister for the 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
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 Foreign Affairs and for La Francophonie	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
Uppal, Hon. Tim, Minister of State (Multiculturalism)	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	Alberta	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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
Vaughan, Adam	Trinity—Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Vellacott, Maurice.....	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin.....	Saskatchewan	CPC
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	Ontario	CPC
Warawa, Mark	Langley	British Columbia	CPC
Warkentin, Chris, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services.....	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
Yurdiga, David	Fort McMurray—Athabasca ...	Alberta	CPC
Zimmer, Bob	Prince George—Peace River...	British Columbia	CPC
VACANCY	Ottawa West—Nepean.....	Ontario	
VACANCY	Peterborough	Ontario	
VACANCY	Sudbury.....	Ontario	

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
Barlow, John	Macleod	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
Eglinski, Jim	Yellowhead	CPC
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	CPC
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister	Calgary Southwest	CPC
Hawn, Hon. Laurie	Edmonton Centre	CPC
Hillyer, Jim	Lethbridge	CPC
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Minister of National Defence and Minister for Multiculturalism	Calgary Southeast	CPC
Lake, Hon. Mike, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont	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, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Peace River	CPC
Yurdiga, David	Fort McMurray—Athabasca	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	Ind.
May, Elizabeth	Saanich—Gulf Islands	GP
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	CPC
McLeod, Cathy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health 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 (14)		
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
Falk, Ted	Provencher	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.
Maguire, Larry	Brandon—Souris	CPC
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	CPC
Sopuck, Robert	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	CPC
Toet, Lawrence	Elmwood—Transcona	CPC
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	Ind.
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	Northwest Territories	NDP
-------------------	-----------------------	-----

NOVA SCOTIA (11)

Armstrong, Scott, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister of Labour	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 Agriculture, 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 (103)

Adams, Eve	Mississauga—Brampton South	Lib.
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
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
Chan, Arnold	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Charlton, Chris	Hamilton Mountain	NDP
Chisu, Comeliu	Pickering—Scarborough East	CPC
Chong, Hon. Michael	Wellington—Halton Hills	CPC
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
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, Associate Minister of National Defence	Vaughan	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Haldimand—Norfolk	CPC
Freeland, Chrystia	Toronto Centre	Lib.
Galipeau, Royal	Ottawa—Orléans	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CPC
Gill, Parm, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	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, Hon. Ed, Minister of State (Science and Technology)	London West	CPC
Hsu, Ted	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Hughes, Carol	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking	NDP
Hyer, Bruce	Thunder Bay—Superior North	GP
James, Roxanne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Scarborough Centre	CPC
Kellway, Matthew	Beaches—East York	NDP
Kent, Hon. Peter	Thornhill	CPC
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	CPC
Lauzon, Guy	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	CPC
Leitch, Hon. K. Kellie, Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women	Simcoe—Grey	CPC
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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
Mathysen, Irene	London—Fanshawe	NDP
McCallum, Hon. John	Markham—Unionville	Lib.
McColeman, Phil	Brant	CPC
McGuinty, David	Ottawa South	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John	Scarborough—Guildwood	Lib.
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 Foreign Affairs	Niagara Falls	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	CPC
Oliver, Hon. Joe, Minister of Finance	Eglinton—Lawrence	CPC
Opitz, Ted	Etobicoke Centre	CPC
O'Toole, Hon. Erin, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Durham	CPC
Perkins, Pat	Whitby—Oshawa	CPC
Poilievre, Hon. Pierre, Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for 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 Natural Resources and Minister for the 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
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	CPC
Trottier, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for La Francophonie	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
Vaughan, Adam	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Watson, Jeff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport.....	Essex.....	CPC
Woodworth, Stephen	Kitchener Centre	CPC
Young, Terence	Oakville.....	CPC
VACANCY	Ottawa West—Nepean.....	
VACANCY	Peterborough	
VACANCY	Sudbury.....	

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 (75)

Aubin, Robert.....	Trois-Rivières	NDP
Ayala, Paulina.....	Honoré-Mercier	NDP
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	Ind.
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
Dubourg, Emmanuel	Bourassa	Lib.
Dusseault, Pierre-Luc.....	Sherbrooke	NDP
Fortin, Jean-François	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia	FD
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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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
Groguhé, Sadia	Saint-Lambert	NDP
Hassainia, Sana	Verchères—Les Patriotes	Ind.
Jacob, Pierre	Brome—Missisquoi	NDP
Lapointe, François	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup	NDP
Larose, Jean-François	Repentigny	FD
Latendresse, Alexandrine	Louis-Saint-Laurent	NDP
Laverdière, Hélène	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	NDP
Lebel, 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	Ind.
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	Ind.
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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Consular	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 April 24, 2015 — 2nd Session, 41st Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Blake Richards

Vice-Chairs:

Niki Ashton
Carolyn Bennett

John Barlow
Rob Clarke

Earl Dreeshen
Jonathan Genest-Jourdain

Carol Hughes
Kyle Seeback

Mark Strahl

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
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
Dennis Bevington
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
Joan Crockatt
Nathan Cullen
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Roxanne James
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
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
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
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Mathieu Ravignat
Scott Reid

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 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
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

Chair:

Pierre-Luc Dusseault

Vice-Chairs:Patricia Davidson
Scott SimmsCharlie Angus
Charmaine BorgRay Boughen
Paul CalandraLarry Maguire
Tilly O'Neill Gordon

Bob Zimmer

(10)

Associate Members

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

David Christopherson
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Roxanne James
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
Dave MacKenzie
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
Anne Minh-Thu Quach
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
David Yurdiga

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:

Bev Shipley

Vice-Chairs:

 Malcolm Allen
 Mark Eyking

 Ruth Ellen Brosseau
 Earl Dreeshen

 Gerald Keddy
 Larry Maguire

 LaVar Payne
 Francine Raynault

Bob Zimmer

(10)

Associate Members

 Diane Ablonczy
 Mark Adler
 Dan Albas
 Harold Albrecht
 Mike Allen
 Dean Allison
 Stella Ambler
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Scott Armstrong
 Keith Ashfield
 Niki Ashton
 Jay Aspin
 Alex Atamanenko
 John Barlow
 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
 Patricia Davidson
 Bob Dechert
 Linda Duncan
 Rick Dykstra
 Jim Eglinski
 Ted Falk
 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
 Carol Hughes
 Roxanne James
 Peter Julian

 Randy Kamp
 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
 Pat Martin
 Colin Mayes
 Phil McColeman
 Cathy McLeod
 Costas Menegakis
 Larry Miller
 Rick Norlock
 Deepak Obhrai
 Gordon O'Connor
 Tilly O'Neill Gordon
 Ted Opitz
 Pat Perkins
 Joe Preston
 James Rajotte
 Scott Reid

 Blake Richards
 Andrew Saxton
 Gary Schellenberger
 Kyle Seeback
 Devinder Shory
 Joy Smith
 Robert Sopuck
 Brian Storseth
 Mark Strahl
 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
 David Yurdiga

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair:

Gordon Brown

Vice-Chairs:
Stéphane Dion
Pierre NantelRick Dykstra
Jim HillyerRathika Sitsabaiesan
Kennedy StewartJohn Weston
Terence Young

David Yurdiga

(10)

Associate Members

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

John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Andrew Cash
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Nathan Cullen
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Matthew Dubé
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Mylène Freeman
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James

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
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
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
Pat Perkins
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 Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair:

David Tilson

Vice-Chairs:
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe
John McCallumJay Aspin
Jim EglinskiChungsen Leung
Irene MathysenCostas Menegakis
Jasbir Sandhu

Devinder Shory

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
John Barlow
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
Andrew Cash

Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Don Davies
Libby Davies
Bob Dechert
Pierre Dionne Labelle
Earl Dreesen
Rick Dykstra
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Alain Giguère
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
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
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards

Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Jinny Jogindera Sims
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
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
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Harold Albrecht

Vice-Chairs:Megan Leslie
John McKayStella Ambler
Dennis BevingtonColin Carrie
François ChoquetteRobert Sopuck
Lawrence Toet

Stephen Woodworth

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Robert Aubin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Robert Chisholm
Corneliu Chisu

Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Nathan Cullen
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Linda Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Roxanne James
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
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
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
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
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
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

FINANCE**Chair:**

James Rajotte

Vice-Chairs:Scott Brison
Nathan CullenMark Adler
Joyce BatemanRon Cannan
Raymond CôtéPierre Dionne Labelle
Andrew Saxton

Dave Van Kesteren

(10)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
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 Chisu
Michael ChongRob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreesen
Emmanuel Dubourg
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter KentGreg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Hoang Mai
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
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
Scott Reid
Blake RichardsGary 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
Susan Truppe
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Rodney Weston

Vice-Chairs:

Robert Chisholm
Lawrence MacAulay

Ryan Cleary
Patricia Davidson

Randy Kamp
François Lapointe

Ryan Leef
Robert Sopuck

John Weston

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
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
Fin Donnelly
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent

Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
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
Pat Perkins
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
Philip Toone
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
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chairs:	Paul Dewar Marc Garneau	
Lois Brown Peter Goldring	Laurie Hawn Hélène Laverdière	Romeo Saganash Gary Schellenberger	Bernard Trottier	(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Rob Clarke	Ed Komarnicki	Scott Reid
Mark Adler	Irwin Cotler	Daryl Kramp	Blake Richards
Dan Albas	Joan Crockatt	Mike Lake	Andrew Saxton
Harold Albrecht	Joe Daniel	Guy Lauzon	Kyle Seeback
Mike Allen	Patricia Davidson	Ryan Leef	Bev Shipley
Stella Ambler	Don Davies	Pierre Lemieux	Devinder Shory
Rob Anders	Bob Dechert	Chungsen Leung	Joy Smith
David Anderson	Earl Dreeshen	Laurin Liu	Robert Sopuck
Scott Armstrong	Rick Dykstra	Wladyslaw Lizon	Brian Storseth
Keith Ashfield	Jim Eglinski	Ben Lobb	Mark Strahl
Jay Aspin	Ted Falk	Tom Lukiwski	David Sweet
John Barlow	Steven Fletcher	Dave MacKenzie	David Tilson
Joyce Bateman	Royal Galipeau	Larry Maguire	Lawrence Toet
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Wayne Marston	Brad Trost
Tyrone Benskin	Parm Gill	Colin Mayes	Susan Truppe
James Bezan	Robert Goguen	Phil McColeman	Dave Van Kesteren
Kelly Block	Jacques Gourde	Cathy McLeod	Maurice Vellacott
Ray Boughen	Nina Grewal	Costas Menegakis	Mike Wallace
Peter Braid	Richard Harris	Larry Miller	Mark Warawa
Garry Breitzkreuz	Bryan Hayes	Marc-André Morin	Chris Warkentin
Gordon Brown	Russ Hiebert	Rick Norlock	Jeff Watson
Patrick Brown	Jim Hillyer	Deepak Obhrai	John Weston
Rod Bruinooge	Randy Hoback	Gordon O'Connor	Rodney Weston
Brad Butt	Pierre Jacob	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	David Wilks
Paul Calandra	Roxanne James	Ted Opitz	John Williamson
Blaine Calkins	Peter Julian	LaVar Payne	Stephen Woodworth
Ron Cannan	Randy Kamp	Ève Pécelet	Terence Young
John Carmichael	Gerald Keddy	Pat Perkins	Wai Young
Colin Carrie	Peter Kent	Joe Preston	David Yurdiga
Corneliu Chisu	Greg Kerr	James Rajotte	Bob Zimmer
Michael Chong			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Scott Reid	Vice-Chairs:	Irwin Cotler Wayne Marston	
Tyrone Benskin	Nina Grewal	Jim Hillyer	David Sweet	(7)

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:

Pat Martin

Vice-Chairs:Gerry Byrne
Greg KerrMark Adler
Tarik BrahmiBrad Butt
Guy LauzonMathieu Ravignat
Chris Warkentin

Wai Young

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Denis Blanchette
Kelly Block
Françoise Boivin
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie

Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Paul Dewar
Earl Dreeshen
Linda Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
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
Pat Perkins
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 Trotter
Susan Truppe
Nycole Turmel
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

HEALTH**Chair:**

Ben Lobb

Vice-Chairs:Hedy Fry
Murray RankinMatthew Kellway
Wladyslaw LizonCathy McLeod
Christine MooreLawrence Toet
David Wilks

Terence Young

(10)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
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 ChisuMichael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Carol Hughes
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald KeddyPeter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Megan Leslie
Chungsen Leung
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Wayne Marston
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Manon Perreault
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake RichardsAndrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Djaouida Sellah
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Jinny Jogindera Sims
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
Mike Sullivan
David Sweet
David Tilson
Brad Trost
Bernard Trottier
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

**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
Ray Boughen

Brad Butt
Jim Eglinski

Sadia Groguhé
Colin Mayes

Marie-Claude Morin

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe
Kelly Block
Alexandre Boulerice
Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
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
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Matthew Dubé
Rick Dykstra
Ted Falk
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
Roxanne James
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
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Irene Mathysen
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Manon Perreault
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger

Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Rathika Sitsabaiesan
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
Mike Sullivan
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
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair: David Sweet

Vice-Chairs: Peggy Nash
Judy Sgro

John Carmichael
Joe Daniel

Cheryl Gallant
Mike Lake

Brian Masse
Annick Papillon

Mark Warawa

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
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
John Barlow
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
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
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
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
Anne Minh-Thu Quach
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
Glenn Thibeault
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
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

INTERNATIONAL TRADE**Chair:** Randy Hoback**Vice-Chairs:**Don Davies
Chrystia FreelandMike Allen
Ron CannanParm Gill
Nina GrewalLaurin Liu
Marc-André Morin

Devinder Shory

(10)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
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 Chisu
Michael ChongRob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Paul Dewar
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike LakeGuy Lauzon
Hélène Laverdière
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Brian Masse
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
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Mathieu Ravignat
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew SaxtonGary 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 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
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair: Mike Wallace

Vice-Chairs:

Françoise Boivin
Sean Casey

Blaine Calkins
Bob Dechert

Robert Goguen
Pierre Jacob

Ève Pécelet
Kyle Seeback

David Wilks

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
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
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu

Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Matthew Kellway
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
Larry Maguire
Wayne Marston
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
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Murray Rankin

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
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
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

LIAISON

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:	David Christopherson	
Harold Albrecht	Royal Galipeau	Ben Lobb	Blake Richards	(26)
Leon Benoit	Richard Harris	Pat Martin	Bev Shipley	
Gordon Brown	Randy Hoback	Phil McColeman	David Sweet	
Chris Charlton	Peter Kent	Larry Miller	David Tilson	
Michael Chong	Daryl Kramp	Joe Preston	Mike Wallace	
Pierre-Luc Dusseault	Hélène LeBlanc	James Rajotte	Rodney Weston	

Associate Members

Niki Ashton	Rodger Cuzner	Carol Hughes	Pierre Nantel
Mauril Bélanger	Patricia Davidson	Yvonne Jones	Peggy Nash
Carolyn Bennett	Don Davies	Greg Kerr	Jamie Nicholls
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe	Paul Dewar	Kevin Lamoureux	Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Françoise Boivin	Stéphane Dion	Alexandrine Latendresse	Murray Rankin
Garry Breitkreuz	Kirsty Duncan	Megan Leslie	Geoff Regan
Scott Brison	Wayne Easter	Lawrence MacAulay	Judy Sgro
Gerry Byrne	Mark Eying	Hoang Mai	Scott Simms
John Carmichael	Chrystia Freeland	John McCallum	Jinny Jogindera Sims
Guy Caron	Hedy Fry	David McGuinty	Lise St-Denis
Sean Casey	Marc Garneau	John McKay	Peter Stoffer
Robert Chisholm	Randall Garrison	Joyce Murray	Frank Valeriote
Nathan Cullen	Jack Harris		

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:		
David Christopherson	Phil McColeman	Larry Miller	Joe Preston	(6)
Pat Martin				

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Chair: Peter Kent

Vice-Chairs:

Jack Harris
Joyce Murray

James Bezan
Tarik Brahmi

Corneliu Chisu
Cheryl Gallant

Élaine Michaud
Rick Norlock

John Williamson

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
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
Michael Chong

Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Megan Leslie
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Christine Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton

Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Peter Stoffer
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
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:

Leon Benoit

Vice-Chairs:
Guy Caron
Geoff ReganKelly Block
Chris CharltonJoan Crockatt
Linda DuncanRyan Leef
Pat Perkins

Brad Trost

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
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 Chong
Rob Clarke
Nathan Cullen
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Yvon Godin
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Claude Gravelle
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Carol Hughes
Roxanne James
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy

Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
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
John Rafferty
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Romeo Saganash

Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Kennedy Stewart
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
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
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair:	Michael Chong	Vice-Chairs:	Jamie Nicholls Lise St-Denis	
Corneliu Chisu Joe Daniel	Anne-Marie Day Jacques Gourde	Claude Gravelle Chungsen Leung	John Williamson	(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Colin Carrie	Greg Kerr	Andrew Saxton
Mark Adler	Rob Clarke	Ed Komarnicki	Gary Schellenberger
Dan Albas	Joan Crockatt	Daryl Kramp	Kyle Seeback
Harold Albrecht	Patricia Davidson	Mike Lake	Bev Shipley
Mike Allen	Bob Dechert	Alexandrine Latendresse	Devinder Shory
Dean Allison	Stéphane Dion	Guy Lauzon	Joy Smith
Stella Ambler	Pierre Dionne Labelle	Ryan Leef	Robert Sopuck
Rob Anders	Earl Dreeshen	Pierre Lemieux	Brian Storseth
David Anderson	Rick Dykstra	Wladyslaw Lizon	Mark Strahl
Scott Armstrong	Jim Eglinski	Ben Lobb	David Sweet
Keith Ashfield	Ted Falk	Tom Lukiwski	David Tilson
Jay Aspin	Steven Fletcher	Dave MacKenzie	Lawrence Toet
Robert Aubin	Royal Galipeau	Larry Maguire	Brad Trost
John Barlow	Cheryl Gallant	Colin Mayes	Bernard Trotter
Joyce Bateman	Parm Gill	Phil McColeman	Susan Truppe
Leon Benoit	Yvon Godin	Cathy McLeod	Nycole Turmel
Tyrone Benskin	Robert Goguen	Costas Menegakis	Dave Van Kesteren
James Bezan	Peter Goldring	Larry Miller	Maurice Vellacott
Kelly Block	Nina Grewal	Marie-Claude Morin	Mike Wallace
Ray Boughen	Dan Harris	Rick Norlock	Mark Warawa
Peter Braid	Richard Harris	Deepak Obhrai	Chris Warkentin
Garry Breitkreuz	Laurie Hawn	Gordon O'Connor	Jeff Watson
Gordon Brown	Bryan Hayes	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	John Weston
Lois Brown	Russ Hiebert	Ted Opitz	Rodney Weston
Patrick Brown	Jim Hillyer	LaVar Payne	David Wilks
Rod Bruinooge	Randy Hoback	Pat Perkins	Stephen Woodworth
Brad Butt	Roxanne James	Joe Preston	Terence Young
Paul Calandra	Peter Julian	James Rajotte	Wai Young
Blaine Calkins	Randy Kamp	Scott Reid	David Yurdiga
Ron Cannan	Gerald Keddy	Blake Richards	Bob Zimmer
John Carmichael	Peter Kent		

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Joe Preston	Vice-Chairs:	Kevin Lamoureux Alexandrine Latendresse	
David Christopherson Tom Lukiwski	Dave MacKenzie Ted Opitz	Scott Reid Blake Richards	Craig Scott	(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Corneliu Chisu	Randy Hoback	Kyle Seeback
Mark Adler	Michael Chong	Roxanne James	Bev Shipley
Dan Albas	Rob Clarke	Randy Kamp	Devinder Shory
Harold Albrecht	Joan Crockatt	Gerald Keddy	Joy Smith
Mike Allen	Jean Crowder	Peter Kent	Robert Sopuck
Dean Allison	Nathan Cullen	Greg Kerr	Brian Storseth
Stella Ambler	Joe Daniel	Ed Komarnicki	Mark Strahl
Rob Anders	Patricia Davidson	Daryl Kramp	David Sweet
David Anderson	Bob Dechert	Mike Lake	David Tilson
Scott Armstrong	Earl Dreshen	Guy Lauzon	Lawrence Toet
Keith Ashfield	Kirsty Duncan	Ryan Leef	Philip Toone
Niki Ashton	Pierre-Luc Dusseault	Pierre Lemieux	Brad Trost
Jay Aspin	Rick Dykstra	Chungsen Leung	Bernard Trotter
John Barlow	Jim Eglinski	Wladyslaw Lizon	Susan Truppe
Joyce Bateman	Ted Falk	Ben Lobb	Nycole Turmel
Carolyn Bennett	Steven Fletcher	Larry Maguire	Frank Valeriote
Leon Benoit	Mylène Freeman	Colin Mayes	Dave Van Kesteren
James Bezan	Royal Galipeau	Phil McColeman	Maurice Vellacott
Kelly Block	Cheryl Gallant	Cathy McLeod	Mike Wallace
Ray Boughen	Parm Gill	Costas Menegakis	Mark Warawa
Peter Braid	Yvon Godin	Larry Miller	Chris Warkentin
Garry Breitzkreuz	Robert Goguen	Rick Norlock	Jeff Watson
Gordon Brown	Peter Goldring	Deepak Obhrai	John Weston
Lois Brown	Jacques Gourde	Gordon O'Connor	Rodney Weston
Patrick Brown	Nina Grewal	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	David Wilks
Rod Bruinooge	Sadia Grogue	LaVar Payne	John Williamson
Paul Calandra	Richard Harris	Pat Perkins	Stephen Woodworth
Blaine Calkins	Laurie Hawn	James Rajotte	Terence Young
Ron Cannan	Bryan Hayes	Murray Rankin	Wai Young
John Carmichael	Russ Hiebert	Andrew Saxton	David Yurdiga
Colin Carrie	Jim Hillyer	Gary Schellenberger	Bob Zimmer
Chris Charlton			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Dave MacKenzie	Vice-Chair:		
Brad Butt	Philip Toone	Frank Valeriote		(4)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON A CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS

Chair:	Joe Preston	Vice-Chair:		
Carolyn Bennett Kelly Block	Joan Crockatt Jean Crowder	Mylène Freeman	Chris Warkentin	(7)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:**

David Christopherson

Vice-Chairs:John Carmichael
Yvonne JonesDan Albas
Malcolm AllenJay Aspin
Ted FalkAlain Giguère
Bryan Hayes

Stephen Woodworth

(10)

Associate Members

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

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:

Daryl Kramp

Vice-Chairs:Wayne Easter
Randall GarrisonDiane Ablonczy
Rosane Doré LefebvreTed Falk
Roxanne JamesRick Norlock
LaVar Payne

Jean Rousseau

(10)

Associate Members

Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
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 Carmichael
Colin Carrie

Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Don Davies
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
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
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent

Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
Pat Perkins
François Pilon
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Murray Rankin
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
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
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

STATUS OF WOMEN**Chair:** Hélène LeBlanc**Vice-Chairs:**Kirsty Duncan
Tilly O'Neill GordonJohn Barlow
Joyce BatemanJoan Crockatt
Mylène FreemanPat Perkins
Djaouida Sellah

Susan Truppe

(10)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Niki Ashton
Jay Aspin
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe
Kelly Block
Françoise 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 CarrieCorneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Jean Crowder
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Anne-Marie Day
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreesen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Sadia Groguhé
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy KampGerald 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
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Ted Opitz
Annick Papillon
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
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 Trottier
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
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

Chair:

Larry Miller

Vice-Chairs:Hoang Mai
David McGuintyPeter Braid
Ed KomarnickiIsabelle Morin
Mike SullivanJeff Watson
Wai Young

David Yurdiga

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Robert Aubin
John Barlow
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 Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Roxanne James

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
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Pierre Nantel
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
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 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:

 Peter Stoffer
 Frank Valeriotte

 Sylvain Chicoine
 Laurie Hawn

 Bryan Hayes
 Pierre Lemieux

 Wladyslaw Lizon
 Ted Opitz

John Rafferty

(10)

Associate Members

 Diane Ablonczy
 Mark Adler
 Dan Albas
 Harold Albrecht
 Mike Allen
 Dean Allison
 Stella Ambler
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Scott Armstrong
 Keith Ashfield
 Jay Aspin
 John Barlow
 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
 Patricia Davidson
 Bob Dechert
 Earl Dreeshen
 Rick Dykstra
 Jim Eglinski
 Ted Falk
 Steven Fletcher
 Mylène Freeman
 Cheryl Gallant
 Parm Gill
 Robert Goguen
 Peter Goldring
 Jacques Gourde
 Nina Grewal
 Jack Harris
 Richard Harris
 Russ Hiebert
 Jim Hillyer
 Randy Hoback
 Roxanne James
 Peter Julian
 Randy Kamp
 Gerald Keddy
 Peter Kent
 Greg Kerr

 Ed Komarnicki
 Daryl Kramp
 Mike Lake
 Guy Lauzon
 Ryan Leef
 Chungsen Leung
 Ben Lobb
 Tom Lukiwski
 Dave MacKenzie
 Larry Maguire
 Pat Martin
 Irene Mathysen
 Colin Mayes
 Phil McColeman
 Cathy McLeod
 Costas Menegakis
 Larry Miller
 Rick Norlock
 Deepak Obhrai
 Gordon O'Connor
 Tilly O'Neill Gordon
 LaVar Payne
 Pat Perkins
 Manon Perreault
 Joe Preston
 James Rajotte
 Scott Reid
 Blake Richards
 Andrew Saxton

 Gary Schellenberger
 Kyle Seeback
 Bev Shipley
 Devinder Shory
 Joy Smith
 Robert Sopusck
 Brian Storseth
 Mark Strahl
 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
 David Yurdiga
 Bob Zimmer

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chair: Richard Harris

Joint Vice-Chairs: Carol Hughes
Scott Simms

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Anne C. Cools
Nicole Eaton
Suzanne Fortin-Duplessis

Terry M. Mercer
Jim Munson

Stella Ambler
Tyrone Benskin
Rod Bruinooge
Rob Clarke
Réjean Genest

Guy Lauzon
José Nunez-Melo
Lawrence Toet
Dave Van Kesteren

(17)

Associate Members

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

Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Joan Crockett
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
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
Mike Lake
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
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
Pat Perkins
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
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Denise Batters
Chris Charlton

Joint Vice-Chairs: Mauril Bélanger
Garry Breitkreuz

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Céline Hervieux-Payette
Thomas Johnson McInnis
Don Meredith

Wilfred P. Moore
Bob Runciman
David P. Smith

Dan Albas
Rob Anders
Paulina Ayala
Patrick Brown
Jim Hillyer

François Pilon
Anne Minh-Thu Quach
Brian Storseth
Maurice Vellacott

(19)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Gordon Brown
Lois 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
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
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
Roxanne James
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
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Brian Masse
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
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards

Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
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
David Yurdiga
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

MR. MIKE ALLEN

MR. BLAINE CALKINS

MS. JEAN CROWDER

MR. DON DAVIES

MR. BRYAN HAYES

MS. HÉLÈNE LAVERDIÈRE

MS. IRENE MATHYSSEN

MS. JOYCE MURRAY

MR. BLAKE RICHARDS

MR. BRIAN STORSETH

MR. DAVE VAN KESTEREN

MR. BOB ZIMMER

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 Foreign Affairs
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. Tony Clement	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Peter Van Loan	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Jason Kenney	Minister of National Defence 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	Associate Minister of National Defence
Hon. Steven Blaney	Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Hon. Ed Fast	Minister of International Trade
Hon. Joe Oliver	Minister of Finance
Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Pierre Poilievre	Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform
Hon. Shelly Glover	Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages
Hon. Chris Alexander	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. K. Kellie Leitch	Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women
Hon. Greg Rickford	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario
Hon. Erin O'Toole	Minister of Veterans Affairs
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. Candice Bergen	Minister of State (Social Development)
Hon. Michelle Rempel	Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)
Hon. Ed Holder	Minister of State (Science and Technology)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Dan Albas	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. David Anderson	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Consular
Mr. Scott Armstrong	to the Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister of Labour
Mr. James Bezan	to the Minister of National Defence
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. Colin Carrie	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Bob Dechert	to the Minister of Justice
Mr. Rick Dykstra	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Parm Gill	to the Minister of International Trade
Mr. Robert Goguen	to the Minister of Justice
Mr. Jacques Gourde	to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Ms. Roxanne James	to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Mr. Randy Kamp	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Gerald Keddy	to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
Hon. Mike Lake	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Pierre Lemieux	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mr. Chungsen Leung	for Multiculturalism
Mr. Tom Lukiwski	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mrs. Cathy McLeod	to the Minister of Health and for Western Economic Diversification
Mr. Costas Menegakis	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Deepak Obhrai	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights
Mr. Andrew Saxton	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Mark Strahl	to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development
Mr. Bernard Trotter	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for La Francophonie
Mrs. Susan Truppe	for Status of Women
Mr. Chris Warkentin	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Mr. Jeff Watson	to the Minister of Transport

CONTENTS

Friday, April 24, 2015

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Anti-Terrorism Act, 2015

Bill C-51. Report stage..... 12977

Speaker's Ruling

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton)..... 12977

Motions in Amendment

Ms. Doré Lefebvre..... 12977

Motions Nos. 1 to 3..... 12977

Ms. May..... 12977

Motion No. 4..... 12977

Ms. Doré Lefebvre..... 12977

Motions Nos. 5 to 44..... 12977

Ms. May..... 12978

Motion No. 45..... 12978

Ms. Doré Lefebvre..... 12978

Motions Nos. 46 to 66..... 12978

Mr. Easter..... 12980

Mr. Cullen..... 12980

Ms. May..... 12980

Mr. Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)..... 12982

Mr. Côté..... 12982

Mr. Lamoureux..... 12983

Mr. Komarnicki..... 12983

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Goldman Environmental Prize

Ms. May..... 12984

The Budget

Mr. Butt..... 12984

Canadian Legion Branch 4

Mr. Benskin..... 12985

Children's Day Celebrations

Mr. Vellacott..... 12985

National Day of Remembrance and Action on Mass Atrocities

Mr. Cotler..... 12985

World Meningitis Day

Ms. Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)..... 12985

Scientific Heritage

Ms. Liu..... 12986

Armenia

Mr. Daniel..... 12986

Second Battle of Ypres

Mr. Lizon..... 12986

Armenia

Ms. Sitsabaiesan..... 12986

Taxation

Mr. Gill..... 12986

Canada-U.S. Border Security

Mr. Cullen..... 12987

Taxation

Mr. Keddy..... 12987

Alasdair Graham

Mr. Regan..... 12987

Rouge National Urban Park

Mr. Calandra..... 12987

Ethics

Mr. Dionne Labelle..... 12987

Taxation

Mrs. Block..... 12988

ORAL QUESTIONS

The Budget

Mr. Christopherson..... 12988

Mr. Saxton..... 12988

Mr. Christopherson..... 12988

Mr. Saxton..... 12988

Ethics

Mr. Christopherson..... 12988

Mr. Calandra..... 12988

Ms. Doré Lefebvre..... 12989

Mr. Calandra..... 12989

Ms. Doré Lefebvre..... 12989

Mr. Calandra..... 12989

The Budget

Ms. Duncan (Etobicoke North)..... 12989

Mr. Saxton..... 12989

Ms. Duncan (Etobicoke North)..... 12989

Mr. Saxton..... 12989

Mr. Garneau..... 12989

Mr. Poilievre..... 12990

Government Advertising

Mr. Julian..... 12990

Mr. Poilievre..... 12990

The Budget

Mr. Julian..... 12990

Mr. Poilievre..... 12990

Regional Economic Deveopment

Mr. Caron..... 12990

Mr. Gourde..... 12990

Labour

Ms. Liu..... 12990

Ms. Leitch..... 12990

Ms. Liu..... 12991

Ms. Leitch..... 12991

Justice	
Mr. Eglinski	13000
Marijuana	
Mr. Calandra	13000
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Cotler	13000
Falun Gong	
Mr. Cotler	13000
Prostitution	
Mr. Vellacott	13000
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Albas	13001
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
Mr. Albas	13001

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Anti-Terrorism Act, 2015	
Bill C-51. Report Stage	13002
Mr. Sullivan	13003
Mr. Komarnicki	13003
Mr. Easter	13003
Mr. Easter	13003
Ms. James	13004
Mr. Cullen	13005
Mr. Calandra	13005
Mr. Sullivan	13006
Ms. James	13007
Mr. Blanchette	13007

Mr. Giguère	13008
Mr. Brahmi	13009
Ms. Sitsabaiesan	13009
Mr. Sullivan	13011
Mr. Dykstra	13011
Mr. Dykstra	13011

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

VIA Rail Canada Act

Bill C-640. Second reading	13012
Mrs. Davidson	13012
Ms. Liu	13013
Mr. Payne	13015
Ms. St-Denis	13016
Ms. Mathysen	13017
Mr. Toone	13019
Division on motion deferred	13019

Genocide Recognition

Mr. Butt	13020
Mr. Boulerice	13021
Mr. Dion	13021
Mr. Calandra	13021
Mr. Boulerice	13021
Mr. Cotler	13023
Mr. Butt	13024
(Motion agreed to)	13024

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>