



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 141 • NUMBER 056 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, September 29, 2006**

—

**Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken**

## **CONTENTS**

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

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

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, September 29, 2006

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

•(1000)

[*English*]

### **SOFTWOOD LUMBER PRODUCTS EXPORT CHARGE ACT, 2006**

The House resumed from September 27 consideration of the motion that Bill C-24, An Act to impose a charge on the export of certain softwood lumber products to the United States and a charge on refunds of certain duty deposits paid to the United States, to authorize certain payments, to amend the Export and Import Permits Act and to amend other Acts as a consequence, be read the second time and referred to a committee, of the amendment and of the amendment to the amendment.

**Mr. Wayne Marston (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today on Bill C-24, the bill put forward by the Minister of International Trade, the softwood lumber products export charge act, 2006

As I was considering the fact that I would be speaking today, a thought crossed my mind that this softwood sellout kind of matches a definition I have used for years relative to some folks who have passed through the House, ministers, members, even governments, that we ordinary folk call rogues and scoundrels.

Mostly, the common people on the street will say it is their view that far too many people who have sat in the House or held official positions in the House have been quick to bow to an American policy on one file or another. One of the first that comes to mind, maybe even the most notorious up until this point in time especially in the minds of working Canadians, was the act of former Prime Minister John Diefenbaker when he caved into Dwight D. Eisenhower in the late 1950s. It was that prime minister, a Conservative prime minister by the way, who bowed to President Dwight D. Eisenhower and cancelled the Avro Arrow project.

In fact, we were reminded just this week that there is a prototype of the Avro Arrow that has been restored and taken to one of our national museums to be put on display I guess to say what might have been. At the time of the cancellation of that project there were

five leading prototypes of an aircraft that was 20 years ahead of its time.

What happened on Black Friday? Prime Minister Diefenbaker cancelled this project and cancelled the futures of over 15,000 workers when he did that. One has to sit back and wonder why. Why would a government turn on its own people in that fashion?

Then again in the 1980s many of us, including myself in the Hamilton labour movement, saw then Prime Minister Brian Mulroney sign the free trade agreement which basically sacrificed over 500,000 manufacturing jobs in Ontario, not to mention across this country. My riding of Hamilton East—Stoney Creek was affected in major ways.

I can recall when the draft text of the free trade agreement was signed. That very day Firestone Tire announced the closure of the plant in Hamilton because it no longer needed a plant. It could simply bring goods across the border. Thus, 1,500 people lost their jobs.

Not to pick on just the Conservatives, but maybe to throw a little fire across the way to the former Liberals, it was in the 1990s, as we will recall, that the Liberal Party ran on a platform in the 1993 election saying that it would not support the GST and would cancel it. It would not sign NAFTA. I recall a full page newspaper ad that had five priorities of things it would and would not do and those were the top two on that list. Lo and behold, what did it do? It kept the GST and signed the free trade agreement and again workers in my city were sold down the river.

We will recall not too long after that event the member from Hamilton at the time resigned on the basis that she had given her word that if the GST was kept, she would resign. A byelection took place. In fact, I was the candidate for my party in that byelection. We went from fifth place to second place just simply on the anger that the people had at the time for what was going on.

Steelworkers and manufacturers in my area wonder what is next. They see this softwood sellout. It is little wonder they do not trust the government after the previous Liberal and Conservative governments have sold them down the river. Now there is a spectacle by the present government. In the campaign it ran on being a fresh face, accountability and all of those grand words. What happened? Lo and behold, just before the House convened it had an unelected person appointed as a senator.

*Government Orders*

•(1005)

Then, further embarrassing to the House I would suggest, we had the minister who had the file on softwood lumber cross the floor two short weeks after the election. People in that member's riding, who worked hard to elect a Liberal, suddenly found themselves waking up one morning with a Conservative member.

Maybe I should have said switching allegiances because he did not physically get up and cross the floor. I think that would have taken a bit of courage and I do not see too much of that.

The government expects steelworkers, autoworkers and other workers in manufacturing in my riding to have faith in the Minister of International Trade. I can say there is not a chance of that. They are cringing. They are wondering what industry is next, that perhaps it will be one of theirs.

Our critic on this file from Burnaby—New Westminster has been warning the people of the country and the members in the House of what is happening. The critic has been in the House day in and day out drawing the attention of Canadians to this file. He has exposed the hidden costs of the softwood agreement to Canadians. He has also exposed the bullying tactics of the Prime Minister as the government goes after the industry to force it to support the agreement.

I have a quote from our critic. He said:

The [Conservative] government, who used bullying tactics to force support from the industry, is now using the tax system to punish his opponents.

The word is today, at least in some of the circles I was travelling in this morning, this deal may well be in trouble. If that is the case, it is certainly good news to this member's ears.

He also said:

Under the softwood lumber agreement, [the Prime Minister] and the [Minister of International Trade] are coercing Canadian softwood companies to hand over to the United States \$1 billion of the \$5.3 billion in duty deposits illegally collected by the United States Customs as a result of the softwood lumber dispute.

On top of that, we have had case after case where we have won rulings on this dispute. It is beyond me why our government would cave in and position us in front of the Americans as people who are on our knees when we do not have to be. We can win the next round of legal battles, the future litigation that is going to carry on, but more importantly, we have to prepare the way for the next sector that comes under attack from the Americans.

The Conservative government is again slapping on the Canadian softwood companies that refuse to join in this fiasco, for the lack of a better word, a 19% charge applied as a percentage of the refunded deposits. The charge would not be collected from companies who abide by the agreement. This is an abuse of power, especially when we have won, as I have said before, in the court of law. Canadian companies owe nothing to the United States. It baffles me why we are giving a billion dollars to the Americans.

Steelworkers and members from Hamilton are very concerned. American litigation will likely resume on future files. The Bush government recently moved to overturn the U.S. court decisions of April 7 and July 14 on the NAFTA and the Byrd amendment. This is

clearly a very plain and simple, even simple enough for the government to get it, indication of what is coming.

We have a dispute settlement mechanism within NAFTA that we are flouting with this agreement. It is beyond belief that our government would do this to the workers in the softwood industry.

•(1010)

Our leader was in Thunder Bay recently. He was there to show the workers that at least some members in this House were standing with them on this. It was very clear that the members of the government were not.

In the words of our leader, "The Prime Minister has sold out northern Ontario". That is a fact. "This is a total failure," he said. "One billion dollars left on the table in Washington", he said, but worse, "the Bush administration now has a direct say in how we manage our forestry industry".

Clearly, the actions of the Minister of International Trade fly in the face of democracy. I say the minister has sold out our country. He deserves to be ranked among the rogues and scoundrels that I spoke of in my opening remarks. I think the government will go down in history for this, maybe not ahead of the Diefenbaker government for cancelling the Avro, but it will be very close on the sellout of softwood lumber.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his input on this important debate.

We have had several days of debate on this whole issue of softwood lumber, but what I have not heard from members is what I think is the real issue. The real issue is about trade. It is about trade under NAFTA. It is about the years that this country has spent to build up trade relationships under the various treaties we have.

I am very concerned about the whole issue of dispute settlement mechanisms. It appears that notwithstanding all this work that was done to establish the rules of the game, those rules have been set aside, through bullying tactics, to impose a deal on those who have no choice. I wonder if the member would care to comment on that.

**Mr. Wayne Marston:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for raising this. As I referred to in my remarks, under our trade agreements we have a dispute settlement mechanism that we may as well not have. It is astounding.

The member talked people being forced off an issue, but when it is our own government that is forcing us off the issue, that is amazing. Our own Minister of International Trade is pushing at Canadian companies. It astounds me. Members might note that I am lost for words at times on this, because it flies in the face of everything that this House represents or that a minister should represent in this House.

As for our role, I will remind the Conservative members that they had as their campaign slogan "Stand up for Canada". If this is the way the Minister of International Trade will stand up for Canada, God help us all.

•(1015)

**Mr. Gary Goodyear (Cambridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I was not going to ask any questions this morning, but I think the member from the no democracy party has drifted off the ranks.

*Government Orders*

I would just like to bring to our minds the fact that Canadians know very well why the Liberals failed to reach this agreement. It was partly because there was no leadership on that side of the House and partly because they saw the phenomenal financial benefits of dragging out the litigation for another seven to 10 years.

In January, Canadians chose change. They chose a leader who actually brought together a deal that, frankly, represents the wishes and the needs of 90% of the lumber community in Canada. It helps save families' incomes. It allows us to move forward. One would arguably agree, in fact, that the better relationships this Prime Minister has been able to establish around the world have allowed us to bring this agreement together.

There is one thing I would like to ask the member to comment on, because of course he is telling us all these woeful things. I do remember back when NAFTA was brought in by another government with leadership, and our economy is extremely strong today as a direct result of that NAFTA agreement.

I just wondered if the member could comment. I am from Ontario. I remember the Rae days. It took a decade for Ontario to pull itself out of the economic bliss that Bob Rae as premier got us into, yet on the federal level we entered an economic boom as a result of a Conservative government with leadership.

I do not know whether the member wants to comment on that embarrassing period in the history of Canada, particularly Ontario, but maybe he wants to tell us why 90% of the lumber industry wants this agreement. The member has his head in the sand in thinking we should just go on forever with litigation. Maybe he wants to comment on that in some logical way.

**Mr. Wayne Marston:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear that the member heard my previous logic.

On the situation in Ontario in 1990, the hon. member asked about the government of the day. As I recall, that was two years into the free trade agreement. The 500,000 lost Ontario jobs that I just spoke of took away funding from the tax base. We were in the worst recession in the history of our country at that time. That government ran three successive deficits of \$10 billion, \$9 billion and \$8 billion to keep people employed and to keep the economy moving.

Would I have made the same choices? I do not know. I was not sitting around the cabinet table. Did I agree with the social contract? No, I did not agree with the social contract, end of story.

Getting back to the hon. member's point, he talked about how the previous government showed no leadership and all kinds of things around that particular file. I will remind you that you brought the Minister of International Trade—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. I caution the hon. member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek that he should be speaking to the hon. member through the Chair, not using the second person. He did that a couple of times and I let it slide, but if he keeps doing it, I have to bring it to his attention.

**Mr. Wayne Marston:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the help. I am a new member in the House and your advice is always well received.

Again, all I can say is that in my view, in the view of my party and in the view of the critic in this area, this softwood deal is a major sellout. I stand by that.

**Ms. Tina Keeper (Churchill, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Bill C-24, otherwise known as the softwood lumber products export charge act.

The dispute has been of particular interest to me, as the lumber industry is an important contributor to the economy of my riding of Churchill. It is certainly a critical issue and is of critical concern to the men and women who work in this industry in my riding.

Not only has the softwood lumber sellout been an issue of considerable local concern, but it is of course of concern throughout the country given the immense trade that takes place between Canada and the United States. This trade has a long history. It has developed over time and represents a history that is fundamental to the trade between our countries.

Today, over 37,000 trucks cross over the Canadian-American border daily. In 2003, two way trade in goods and services exceeds \$441.5 billion, which firmly establishes Canada and the U.S. as the world's largest trade relationship. The economies of our two countries are intertwined. Cooperation and respect are therefore essential components in order for this relationship to flourish.

No one in the House can deny the importance of trade with our closest friend and nearest neighbour. Trade is a two way street and it must be mutually respected in order to maximize efficiency. To this end, various trade courts and tribunals have been established to assist if and when trade disputes emerge. In fact, while exhausting such avenues in respect to the longstanding softwood lumber dispute, it was ruled in a variety of courts that Canada's practices in the softwood industry complied with international law.

Whether we took our case to the North American Free Trade Agreement tribunals, the World Trade Organization or U.S. courts, Canada always seemed to come out successfully. As recently as July 14, 2006, the U.S. Court of International Trade ruled in favour of Canada, concluding that the American tariffs and duties were in fact illegal. As well, NAFTA and WTO judgments were clear that our industry was not subsidized.

If this was indeed the conclusion, why did Canada settle for anything less? Canadians deserve better. We had won all the challenges and it is believed that the U.S. would have exhausted appeals within a short period.

The Conservatives did not fully appreciate, it seems, all that was at stake. There was much more at stake than simply the capital that was owed. First, Canadian sovereignty was at stake. Canada must have the courage to stand up to even the strongest of powers. Second, ensuring that the United States respected our trade agreement was also at stake. This settlement sets the stage and ensures that Americans do not take our agreement seriously.

*Government Orders*

This in effect highlights another point: the credibility of our dispute mechanism. By compromising the rulings found by the dispute resolution provisions of NAFTA, we are destroying the credibility of the dispute mechanism as a whole. Moreover, and most important, I have spoken with the industry in my riding and I would like to take this time to talk about its position and its displeasure.

The United Steelworkers in my riding have expressed great concern and frustration with this agreement. The union represents forestry workers in many communities throughout my riding and across Manitoba. Those communities include Thompson, Wabowden, Cranberry, Moose Lake, The Pas, Birch River, Swan River, Roblin, Neepawa, and even Winnipeg, which is not in my riding.

●(1020)

The president of the local has denounced the agreement, and on August 24 he stated, "This is a devastating deal with possibilities of having even higher penalties imposed on our lumber exports when prices fall, and a quota system legislated by the U.S. that will downsize operations". He went on to say, "[The Prime Minister] has done nothing in this effort to meet with Canadian workers and hear us...This isn't a respectful agreement. This is a sellout".

This represents the concerns and the position of the forestry workers in my riding. They believe this deal is a sellout. The minority government has simply abandoned them.

While the softwood lumber dispute was certainly on the forefront, its existence was by no means unique. In fact, a number of other trade disputes have emerged between Canada and the United States in the past. There have been disagreements with Canada Post and the Canadian Wheat Board among other things.

When the minority government finalized its agreement with the U.S., it in effect sent a strong message to both Canadians and Americans.

Canadians, particularly those in trade disputes, despite how many international court challenges they win, now understand that, under Conservative leadership, there is a possibility, and a very good possibility, that they will be compromised. Simultaneously, Americans, particularly those in trade disputes, despite how many international court challenges they lose, now understand that, under Canadian Conservative leadership, anything is possible.

Are Canadian industries wrong to believe that if they find themselves in a trade dispute, the government may settle for much less than they deserve?

The agreement has left \$500 million for the American lumber industry. This \$500 million should have been returned to Canadians. This so-called deal created an export tax, which at current price levels, is higher than current U.S. duties.

Canadians deserve better. The men and women working in the forest sector in my riding have worked too hard to have the government simply sign their industry over to the Americans.

In addition to this disconcerting precedent, the agreement has already begun to have consequences on production. For example, as a direct result, one of the operations in my riding in northern Manitoba had to eliminate the night shift, immediately. It has also

stated that further employment opportunities will be reduced as a result of the agreement.

This is an outrage. How could the industry in my riding possibly approve an agreement that would have such negative implications? How could I, as their respected member of Parliament, support an agreement that would cut jobs and lower wages?

The Prime Minister and his government bullied the Canadian industry with an ultimatum. The Conservatives have illustrated that they are willing to punish sectors of the industry and companies that refuse to support them by leaving them behind, and this is exactly what has happened.

Canada is a strong country. There is no good reason why a Canadian government must compromise and sacrifice our industry. We owe it to our lumber industry to support them with a solid deal.

Despite what they argue, there were alternatives. The Liberal Party proposed a supplementary aid package that included: \$200 million over two years to enhance the forest industry's competitive position, improve its environmental performance and take advantage of the growing bio-economy; \$40 million over two years to improve the overall performance of the national forest innovation system; \$30 million over two years to improve the competitiveness of the workforce, promote upgrading of workplace skills and provide assistance to older workers impacted by forestry industry layoffs; \$100 million over two years to support economic diversification and capacity building in communities affected by job losses in the forest industry; \$30 million over two years to develop new markets for Canadian wood products; and \$200 million over two years to fight the spread of the pine beetle in B.C. forests.

In addition, the previous Liberal government offered the industry to either accept a negotiated settlement or continue the justified legal actions, which we would have supported by providing loan guarantees, reinvestment support, community and worker adjustment and assistance with legal costs. The Liberal Party also offered solutions and alternatives to the forest industry.

●(1025)

I have risen today to speak on behalf of the forestry workers in my Churchill riding and, indeed, all workers across the country that have been left with the consequences of this careless agreement. I have joined them in their fight to ensure they have a future and proud livelihood.

Canadians deserve better. With this in mind I can never support such an agreement.

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate hearing the comments of the member for Churchill. She spoke about the impact in her riding, particularly on smaller communities, individual families and workers. We do not hear very much about this. We have heard a lot from the government that the deal is supported by the industry. In actual fact, I believe we are looking at very large corporations with their backs to the wall.

*Government Orders*

As we learn more and more about the agreement, and as the member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek pointed out earlier, it seems to be unravelling. I think there is more and more unease and concern of what the impact of this deal will really be.

I am from British Columbia. There is no doubt a huge impact on local communities as a result of this agreement. One of the things that really puzzles me is the agreement does not seem to be based on any industrial strategy, a strategy that looks at Canadian resources in a way that sustains our environment, protects jobs and produces value added products. There is still massive shipment of the export of raw logs in B.C. This deal will accelerate that problem.

Would the member comment on the job loss in her community and what kind of industrial strategy she thinks is required, instead of the softwood lumber agreement, that would actually provide stability to communities in Churchill, communities on the west coast of B.C. and other communities in Canada?

• (1030)

**Ms. Tina Keeper:** Mr. Speaker, the member's question is reflective of what is happening with smaller operations in my riding of Churchill. Certainly the concern is the immediate impacts that will be felt because of this deal.

One of the first things that happened was a night shift was lost. Because of the quota system, there is great fear that the agreement will have a serious impact. It has been made clear to the workers in the smaller mills that this is likely to happen.

What seems to be important is the government seemed anxious to strike a deal. Perhaps it was politically motivated and done in haste. I know it has been mentioned several times that there has been a long history surrounding the agreement, and there is. It represents years of hard work, efforts and challenges, which were won on behalf of Canadians. Many believed this would continue into the near future. It was the role of the previous Liberal government to support the industry so it could continue with those challenges.

Workers in my riding do not often talk about jobs lost, but it is a primary concern. They are talking about sovereignty issues and the future of our country. The workers feel the agreement is a clear sign that Canada is selling out and that our rights are sailing down the rivers and the lakes.

We need to support the industry. We need to look to incentives to help the industry develop in other areas.

**Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on to the bill in front of us.

I have heard the debate over the previous number of days and have followed it in the press and throughout the time I have been in Parliament. I have tried to put it in the perspective of the north. We are mentioned in the bill because the Northwest Territories, Yukon and Nunavut get an exemption under the clauses.

In some ways that is a result of certain trade links we have with the state of Alaska. Certainly the United States does not mind taking care of its own. In terms of Alaska and the relationship of how it receives lumber from some of the north, the United States is very good about taking care of its own. That speaks volumes about the

United States and suggests to me volumes about what Canada is about right now.

This agreement is about short term gain for long term pain. Let us look at it from a perspective of what the government is trying to accomplish. The government is very interested in moving toward a majority in Parliament the next time an election is called. It is very interested in appearing to be decisive and able to deal with issues. I think this has triggered the effort that has gone into selling out our industry. It is short term gain.

There will be short term gain in the industry as well, because the industry is starved for dollars and opportunities. We will get some investment dollars back in the short term. Companies will be able to hang on for a little longer and continue to work in the industry. However, we are in a North American market where housing has boomed for many years and now it is starting to die. When housing dies, the requirement for forest products die and the prices drop.

As the prices drop, the duties come in, so our industry will get the double whammy. Not only will we not have prices that are strong, but we will also have a duty imposed on us. That duty will drive us further into the ground. As time goes on, the industry will either shrink or the corporations will recognize that unprocessed raw logs will continue to cross the border duty-free. Their incentive, as the prices drop and as the duties come on, will be to relocate manufacturing and processing of wood into the United States. That is exactly what will happen with this deal.

Where will we be at the end of the day with our lumber industry? We will be in long term pain. That is what we will get from this deal. We will get a short term gain and long term pain.

Where is Canada going with this softwood lumber deal? It is larger than that, of course. Canada fundamentally is structurally altered with the free trade deal. Exports to the United States increased by 250%, and the U.S. now receives 87% of all Canadian exports.

As Canada becomes more dependent upon U.S. markets, trade within Canada and the rest of the world has decreased. The result of the free trade deal has led to dependency. We are in a dependent position to a country that has 10 times the economic clout that we do. We put ourselves in a position of a mouse and we have shortened the chain to the elephant. What kind of life is that when we are so close to that big foot?

I have noticed one thing in the softwood lumber deal. It is the interference of the deal in federal-provincial and provincial to provincial relationships. All of a sudden we have the United States demanding that we treat our internal politics differently.

We have deals for the Maritimes. The Americans have given it an exemption. We have different deals for Quebec. We have different deals across the country. Therefore, we have a foreign power now telling us how to run our internal affairs. That to me is once again an abrogation of Canada's sovereignty, the sovereignty for which all our forefathers fought hard and that this government seems to treat with a great deal of disdain.

*Government Orders*

●(1035)

The rights of Canadian citizens are being taken away in this deal. All of a sudden we have a deal that has numerous punitive clauses that go beyond most people's expectations when they go into business. Corporate directors are to be held liable for corporate debts due to the duties that are imposed under this deal, even for companies in bankruptcy.

Spouses and children are liable for the debts in the case of transferred properties. We are going to track them down to make sure they deliver this blood money over to the government.

Searches without warrants are authorized under clause 77 for records pertaining to payments and taxes. The authoritarian arm of the government will come down on these people who try to go away from this very special deal with the United States. Canada is basically giving up control of our country's resources to a foreign power.

When we think of it, this is a foreign power that is 10 times our size. When we focus on its finances and its manufacturing, the U.S. is a global power of immense and important distinction. What does Canada have in contrast? Canada is a country of 32 million people with a vast landscape of land and resources. Canada's strength is in what we do with those resources and how we position those resources for our children and our grandchildren.

When we sell out these resources, as we are doing here, we are doing irreparable harm to all those young children who want to grow up and live in their communities in regions of the country such as the northern and rural areas of Canada.

What are we doing? We are saying that this lumber is not for Canadians. We are saying that we will ship these logs down to the United States and these young Canadians can go and work in the cities. What we are doing here is giving up control.

I could talk about the energy deal that Canada signed under NAFTA but I will save that for another debate because there certainly should be a debate on our energy sector soon. If the government thinks that it can get away without talking about energy in this Parliament, without putting these things on the table, then it has another think coming when it comes to the NDP caucus.

Conservatives used to say that good fences make good neighbours. When they said that I liked Conservatives. I thought they were good guys. I thought they were there to protect us and take care of us. They have certainly fallen far away from that goal.

I have not had a chance to talk about the environment yet. To me the boreal forest of Canada is one of the last refuges of natural wilderness that we have in this country and it is being destroyed. What will this deal do to help that boreal forest? Zero. This agreement does not take the boreal forest into account at all. We are again abrogating our responsibilities to the environment. We are creating a situation, unlike northern Europe where they get 12 jobs for every one job that we get in the forest industry, Canada is going in the other direction with this deal. This is very sad.

I do not think I need to talk about jobs. We have heard it and we know what will happen. This is the deal that these people want for Canada.

●(1040)

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Newton—North Delta, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member for Western Arctic said that this was short term gain and long term pain, and I fully agree with him. This is the trend that the government is setting right now. It has a bullying nature as well. It wants to rule by exclusion, not by including people, when we hear that only 10% of the people will be affected by this deal.

He also mentioned the children and the environment. We had child care agreements with the provinces but when the present government came in, with its bullying nature, it cancelled those. That is the trend it is setting. It is the same thing with the Kelowna agreement, which also affects a minority group. The Conservatives say that this not a group that will vote for us, so they take it away.

The hon. member talked about the environment and the Kyoto protocol. The government is setting a trend of ruling by bullying and by exclusion.

I would like to hear from the hon. member how this trend will affect Canadians in general.

●(1045)

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** Mr. Speaker, yes, I outlined my feelings on this particular deal. In a number of ways, we are seeing the problems we have with Kyoto. We have a problem in that we want the advancement of our oil and gas industry but it has gone without any environment regulation and without any planning gone into it to ensure it is working for Canadians and the goals of Canadians.

Right now my party is pushing very hard to see that tax subsidies are taken off some of these developments that, by and large, are serving our neighbours to the south. We need to stand up on this issue.

I feel confident that Canadians are listening to us when we talk about the issues. I am confident that at the next election, the bullies will get their due. If they do not stand up for Canadians soon, they will get their due.

With all the bullying they can do in the House of Commons, when it comes to bullying people into voting, it will not work.

**Ms. Denise Savoie (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Victoria is known to be the city of gardens, not the city of forests, but we will be impacted by this very bad deal. By giving up control over our resources, by signing an agreement that encourages the export of raw logs and by preventing and not encouraging value added industry, all the communities, even those that do not have forests, will be impacted.

In my riding there is a fine woodworking company that sells incredibly beautiful furniture around the world, and this is the kind of small business that will be impacted.

I wonder if my colleague, whose comments I appreciated, would speak to the issue of value added industry and the impact that this deal might have on those small businesses?

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** Mr. Speaker, I will just speak to value added in terms of energy.



*Government Orders*

Right now, Sweden, Finland and many other countries are buying wood pellets from Canada and using them to produce clean energy in their own countries and yet we do not do this. We have a huge opportunity in Canada to develop the biomass energy industry and this could really help. The United States cannot stop us unless somewhere in this insidious deal the development of the biomass energy industry would be considered a subsidy to our people. I do not understand the deal well enough, but we are dealing with a powerful trade nation and it may have included some of those qualifications in the deal.

I certainly would like to understand the deal better because it is something that needs to be explored. However, the opportunities in the biomass energy field in this country are huge and we need to take advantage of them. They will work for Kyoto.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened to hours of debate on this ways and means motion relating to the so-called softwood lumber dispute. I have heard some very eloquent speeches from members all across the House, particularly those who have softwood industries in their ridings. They talked about the implications for their constituents and those businesses. We have heard stories about people who have gone bankrupt and people who have enormous loans and do not know whether they will have a future in the industry.

Those are devastating circumstances, which is why we are here debating the issue. However, we need to consider that this is not simply a debate about softwood lumber. This is, more important, a debate about the state of free trade between Canada and other countries.

When I first came to Parliament back in 1980, we were talking about trade deals. I remember going through the Mulroney years where free trade was the mantra. That was the future. Significant debate was held about whether or not we should enter into bilateral trade deals. As members know, we now have a variety of deals and they have been good for Canada.

At that time, diplomatic and consul-type people were going back and forth to meeting after meeting, month after month, almost year after year. One of the items they talked about more than anything else was the dispute settlement mechanism. In other words, if there were a problem with a deal, would they be able to anticipate the substantive importance of it and the criteria under which they could deal with its resolution under a trade deal. We have not had a lot of discussion in the House on that but I think it is vital because this is not just about softwood. This is about softwood and every other trading relationship that we have. This is, in fact, an admission that the dispute settlement mechanism does not work.

Panel after panel of both NAFTA and the WTO have ruled that we are not subsidizing our softwood industry. During all the time the discussions were going on, we know that duties were being slapped on. I have heard a lot of numbers thrown around in the House but, just for ballpark purposes, we are talking about \$5.4 billion of duties that have been withheld and charged to the industry.

We are also faced with the unusual situation of the trade minister in the current government, who is responsible for this file, having been the minister responsible for this file in the previous government. We have some continuity here but we need to look at

what the trade minister said to Parliament, to Canadians and to the industry. What he was saying was that we would fight this thing. He said that we were right under the NAFTA panels and under the WTO panels. He said that we would fight for the rights that we negotiated as part of the NAFTA. That is the essence of what he said but he sold our softwood industry to the Americans.

The softwood industry believed the minister and said that it would fight with the minister even if it meant going into debt to fight it in court. The federal government then said that it would give the industry loan guarantees and that it would stand with the softwood industry shoulder to shoulder to fight the Americans.

What happened? The government brought the industry to the brink and then the minister said that he had changed his mind because it was taking a long time. He claimed that fighting this was costing a lot of money. He also said that he was getting a lot of pressure from softwood lumber companies asking how they were supposed to manage their lives and operate their business on loan guarantees. They wanted to bring this issue to a head.

● (1050)

What happened? Parliament was virtually hijacked one day with, eureka, we have a deal. But the deal was not to get our \$5.4 billion back. It was something else. It was "We are not going to worry about what the WTO and NAFTA said about the dispute and about their decisions on whether or not we were subsidizing. We are going to abandon everything we have done, all the strategy that was carried through and pushed into, we are just going to abandon all of that".

The government sat down with the U.S. and basically said, "Let's cut a deal. This is not a win-win. We don't want to spend any more money in the courts. We want to bring this to a head. There is \$5.4 billion on the table. How about if we give you \$4 billion and we will call it square?" That is what happened.

**An hon. member:** It is \$4.5 billion, Paul.

**Mr. Paul Szabo:** Mr. Speaker, the member will understand that if we are talking about the American document, it is in U.S. dollars, but if the member is telling me it is \$4.5 billion in Canadian dollars converted, that is fine.

Basically, for argument's sake, there is \$1 billion left on the table. That \$1 billion is not going where one would think it would go. In fact half of it, half a billion dollars is actually going to the U.S. lumber industry lobbyists who are going to use that half a billion dollars to fight us any other time something comes up in the future. Does that not give them an advantage? The U.S. softwood lumber industry all of a sudden is going to have \$500 million to fight future disagreements that may come up.

The balance of the money that they are not going to give us back is basically going to George Bush and he will be able to do with it whatever he wants. He probably is going to invest the money in Iraq.

Why is it that the minister who has been the continuity on this entire file would take the industry down a road that he was not prepared to fight to the finish? He was not prepared to stand up for the softwood industry from the beginning to the end. He bailed out. That is why we call it a softwood sellout.

*Statements by Members*

I understand the industry has been shafted by the Conservative government, totally shafted. People in the industry are not getting all their money back and any money they get from this settlement is going to be turned over to the banks to repay the loans they had to take to go through this process that the minister sucked them into. That is what it turns out to be.

I have great sympathy for people in the softwood lumber industry. They cannot even count on the leadership of the government and particularly the minister to be with them. What did he do afterward? He came into the House and said, "Take the deal. If you don't take the deal, we are not with you any more". It is like Allstate when someone has an accident, "Sorry, not with you any more".

It led some in the industry into basic bankruptcy in many cases and now for the government to say, "We are not with you. If you decide to further pursue your legal options, do not even count on the Government of Canada to be by your side. Do not even count on the Government of Canada to be there to provide loan guarantees. As a matter of fact, we will look for other ways to make sure that your life is uncomfortable".

When the Conservative Government of Canada threatens the softwood industry, all I can say is shame on the government, shame on the government.

This is an issue of trade. Trade issues will arise. Maybe we have to reaffirm our commitment to free trade agreements and to the support of dispute resolution mechanisms that we will not abandon so that we do not give false hope to any industry which is caught in the same regard.

This is a short term deal. It is not going to provide security or stability for the industry for the long term. It is less than 24 months. On top of that, what does it mean in the future? Who is going to respect NAFTA in the future if they know all they have to do is spend more money?

• (1055)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hon. member's time has expired and just at the right moment. There will be time left for questions and comments, but we are now at the time for statements by members.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1100)

[English]

### NIGHT TO LIGHT WALK

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Gabrielle Starr, a grade 8 student from Langley Secondary School, has launched a career as an advocate for children in Africa. Gabrielle is organizing a 10 kilometre walk on October 21 to help the children of northern Uganda.

While there is a new and tenuous peace accord in Uganda, children who have been kidnapped and forced to become child soldiers for the Lord's Resistance Army are still living in terror in the wilderness. In order to avoid capture, children walk up to 17 kilometres every night to sleep in safety. During the raids, young girls have been abducted and given to the rebel soldiers as wives.

Gabrielle and others are working to help the crisis in Uganda. Please join Gabrielle at the Night to Light Walk on Saturday, October 21 in Langley to help raise money for the New Life Center in Kitgum, Uganda to provide support for the children, their families and their community.

In the words of Gabrielle's mother, "It is empowering to see what a 13 year old can do". We thank Gabrielle Starr.

\* \* \*

### LITERACY

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, those refugees from Queen's Park who weakened the public education system in Ontario are at it again. The Minister of Finance and the President of the Treasury Board think a surplus and a booming economy are signals for cutting social programs.

The national literacy program worked to promote literacy as an essential component of our society and to make Canada's social, economic and political life more accessible to the one in seven adult Canadians who are illiterate.

Surely the cuts to the program are a slap in the face to those adults who already feel marginalized. The ability to read and write is both a priceless gift and a necessity for full participation in society. I urge Canadians to demand that the Minister of Finance restore funding to literacy programs.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Robert Vincent (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, since October 2001, the government has been engaged in an arm-wrestling match with the Quebec school boards that launched an appeal to recover the full amount of GST paid on school transportation.

On January 29, 2003, the Tax Court of Canada ruled in favour of the school boards. However, the government has reimbursed only 68% of the amount paid.

On October 4, 2005, the Conservative Party tabled a motion, which was then adopted by the Standing Committee on Finance, to issue the total amount of reimbursements for GST on school transportation to the school boards, in accordance with the January 29, 2003, decision.

I am therefore asking the government to reimburse the remaining 32%, as it demanded in the fall of 2005. That remaining 32% represents over \$72,335 for the Val-des-Cerfs school board in my riding. When will they get this money?

*Statements by Members*

[English]

**CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD**

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, there is no business case for tearing apart the Canadian Wheat Board. It is pure ideological madness, yet the agriculture minister seems hell-bent on scheming behind closed doors with unregistered lobbyists and appointing a sham of a task force to undermine the democratic choice of Canadian farmers.

Just like the softwood lumber sellout, what the Americans could not achieve in 11 separate trade challenges, they hope Tory stooges and their separatist sidekicks will deliver.

I call it economic treason to sell out Canadian farmers on behalf of modern day robber barons like the American agrifood industry. I serve notice today that we will not give up this great prairie institution without the fight of our lives. To paraphrase Robert W. Service:

We'll fight and you bet it's no sham fight,  
It's hell but we've been there before;  
Curse Tories and their separatist sidekicks,  
We'll fight for the Wheat Board once more.

\* \* \*

**CHILDREN**

**Mr. Chris Warkentin (Peace River, CPC):** Returning this fall to Parliament, I come with the renewed motivation and inspiration to build a safer, more healthy and prosperous Canada, a Canada that I will be proud to leave future generations.

This renewed inspiration is a little girl named Abigail. On August 29, I held for the first time my nine pound, four ounce, baby daughter. My wife Michelle and I could not be more blessed by this gift of joy and life. We are thankful for the exceptional care that we received at Queen Elizabeth II Hospital in Grande Prairie. Dr. Brad Martin, Dr. Manju Murthi, and each dedicated nurse provided such exceptional care and we are thankful for it.

In the days that followed her birth, I was struck by the awesome responsibility to protect my child and do whatever is necessary to ensure that she will never face the horrific realities that some children face as a result of crime and violence.

Every child needs an advocate to ensure that he or she is protected. I am proud to be a member of this Conservative government that will ensure that we put forward initiatives that will ensure safety for her into the future. I believe my child Abby, my constituents' children and every Canadian child should have a safer future.

\* \* \*

● (1105)

**DARFUR**

**Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the genocide by attrition in Darfur is being accelerated. It is painful, almost incredulous, that such words even need to be said. But we are beyond words.

The following urgent action must be taken:

First, a UN mandated peacekeeping force must be deployed as quickly as possible.

Second, the international community must reinforce and fund an expanded African Union mission until the UN boots are on the ground.

Third, the no fly zone already established by the UN Security Council must be enforced once and for all, so that the indiscriminate bombing and burning of villages comes to an end.

Fourth, UN sanctions against Sudanese violators must be enforced.

Fifth, Sudanese officials responsible for international atrocities must be brought to justice.

Sixth, secured humanitarian access and aid is desperately required.

Finally, an urgent summit of world leaders from the UN, the African Union, the European Union and NATO needs to be convened to implement a save Darfur action plan.

Some 400,000 have already died and 3.5 million are on humanitarian life support. When will we act?

\* \* \*

**TOBIQUE—MACTAQUAC**

**Mr. Mike Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, over the past three months while away from this place I had the opportunity to reconnect with the important things in an MP's life, those being the people and communities we represent.

There were many significant community events over the past few months in my riding of Tobique—Mactaquac: the 100th anniversary of Fraser Sawmills in Plaster Rock, the 150th anniversary of the Town of Woodstock, and the 200th anniversary of the Coburn Family Farm on Keswick Ridge.

[Translation]

All of these events are excellent examples of just how vibrant and prosperous our communities are.

I am proud of the people, businesses and communities in my riding. It is a privilege for me to have the opportunity to represent them every day and to speak on their behalf.

\* \* \*

**SOUTHWEST MONTREAL**

**Mr. Thierry St-Cyr (Jeanne-Le Ber, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, alarm bells are sounding in southwest Montreal because an initiative based in the area I represent will never see the light of day thanks to this government's ideological and economic stubbornness.

Canada Post's old mail sorting facility in Little Burgundy was to be the site of an urban development project that would have promoted the preservation of the area's heritage, a variety of housing types and the creation of a major economic centre.

For nearly 150 years, this land along the Lachine Canal has been public property. Now this government plans to let the Canada Post Corporation sell the land to the highest bidder.

*Statements by Members*

On behalf of the residents of southwest Montreal, I would like to add my voice to those of the Regroupement économique et social du Sud-Ouest, Bâir son quartier and the Little Burgundy Coalition in asking the Minister of Transport to enable the Canada Lands Company to acquire the property.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL FOREST WEEK**

**Mr. Christian Paradis (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the start of National Forest Week celebrations. This week is an opportunity for Canadians to think about the vital role forests play in our lives. This year's theme is "Canada's natural resources: connected to our people and our land".

I would also like to draw hon. members' attention to the tabling in Parliament of the annual report entitled "The State of Canada's Forests", which contains exhaustive, current information on the state of our forests and the forestry sector and their contribution to Canada's economy and environment and Canadians' quality of life.

Canada's forests, which form part of our natural resources, make a major contribution to our quality of life, both in their natural state and through forest products and the jobs forests generate.

Together, we will certainly continue to improve our use of this valuable resource, in order to boost our economy, create jobs and protect the environment. In the meantime, we invite everyone to take advantage of National Forest Week to get out and appreciate the beauty of our Canadian forests.

\* \* \*

[English]

**FREEDOM'S FURY**

**Hon. Andrew Telegdi (Kitchener—Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, tonight at the National Gallery of Canada is the Canadian premiere of *Freedom's Fury*, a historical documentary in tribute to the 50th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution. It is the work of the brother and sister writing and directing team of Colin Keith Gray and Megan Raney Aarons.

In late November 1956, the water polo teams from Hungary and the Soviet Union met in an Olympic semi-final match. Just weeks before, the Hungarian people had engaged in the first popular revolution ever staged against Soviet power. The match, called "the bloodiest game in Olympic history", signalled the end of Hungary's brush with freedom.

"It was far more than just a sporting event", Ervin Zador of the 1956 Hungarian Olympic Team notes. "It was a battle for the spirit, for our freedom, for democracy. We won at the Olympics, we lost in the streets".

Congratulations to Colin and Megan for a film well done.

\* \* \*

●(1110)

**AFGHANISTAN**

**Mr. Russ Hiebert (South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today two great university rivals will be united for one cause, the support of our troops.

Students from the University of Ottawa and Carleton University have taken the initiative to demonstrate their appreciation for the work of our soldiers in Afghanistan.

In the first game of their season, the softball teams from both schools have agreed to wear uniforms incorporating the colour red to show support for our troops.

The softball game is taking place here tonight at Brewer Park at 7 p.m. The public is also encouraged to wear red.

This event is particularly special for one team, as a Carleton University coach will be deployed to Afghanistan in the coming weeks. He will be working there as a civilian employee in support of our troops.

I would like to commend the students of both universities for their patriotism and leadership. I encourage everyone to attend this event.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS**

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, over the past decade, the people of Winnipeg North have had to pull together in the face of abandonment by the Liberals who cut housing renewal programs, job search kiosks, front line tax offices, employment insurance for part time working mothers, and core funding for women's programs.

Now, along come the Conservatives taking away what little we have left that actually helps build a vibrant, local economy, and helps people find security and dignity in the face of all odds.

Shame on the Conservatives for taking away the very essence of community self-help: summer career placement jobs, literacy training, crime prevention initiatives, aboriginal supports and women's programs.

Governments can be guilty of many sins, but the most unconscionable, the absolutely unforgiveable, is a government that takes away the very tools that lead to renewed communities and productive lives.

As the *Winnipeg Free Press* says today, "But what kind of ideology opposes literacy and regards money spent in the battle against illiteracy as 'fat'?"

Shame on the Conservatives.

\* \* \*

**LITERACY**

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, an informed and caring government understands that it holds a responsibility to unlock the full potential of the citizens it represents, but in the case of Canadians who struggle with literacy skills, this government has in fact closed the door and thrown away the key.

Years of progress have been made in this area, progress that has been obtained through the efforts of committed staff and community volunteers supported by past federal governments. Now they find themselves in jeopardy because of the recent round of harsh and unnecessary cuts.

My wife Lynn is an adult educator, and what inspires and motivates her each day are the stories of students who have seized the opportunity to improve their literacy skills and further advance their education and in turn enhance their quality of life.

These devastating cuts made by an uninformed government that believes literacy initiatives are a waste of money clearly shows that Canadians with literacy challenges just do not matter.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### VOLUNTEERISM

**Ms. Nicole Demers (Laval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board announced on Monday that the Canada volunteerism initiative was being cut. This program recognized volunteer activity.

We should remind the minister that three million seniors do five billion hours of volunteer work each year, the equivalent of more than 2.5 million full time jobs. The contribution made by these people is worth \$60 billion to the economy.

Yet the government is cutting this program, which allowed seniors to feel valued, to remain active in society and, most importantly, to support the social economy. Instead of paying the \$3.2 billion to seniors entitled to retroactive guaranteed income supplement payments, this government is doing nothing to give justice to the people who built Quebec and Canada.

Seniors are being trampled on by this government, which is constantly lashing out at the most vulnerable. Yet they are an important part of society.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

**Ms. Tina Keeper (Churchill, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this Conservative government has set out to shut down the port of Churchill by means of more bad Conservative decision making. I am referring to its plan to destroy the Canadian Wheat Board by allowing a dual marketing system to come into effect.

The Wheat Board is the single largest user of the port of Churchill and the town's economy will be absolutely ruined if the board is compromised. The Canadian Wheat Board uses the port of Churchill because it provides the maximum return to producers located in north and central Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

With the loss of the rail traffic, towns, aboriginal communities and jobs along the Bayline railway will be hit hard as well. Weakening the Wheat Board will weaken the economy of this region.

The government rather than dictating policy should allow farmers to decide their future.

\* \* \*

• (1115)

#### MICHAL GUTOWSKI

**Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today I join with the Polish Canadian community in

#### Oral Questions

mourning the passing of General Michal Gutowski, a remarkable individual who has contributed greatly to both his birth country of Poland and his adopted country of Canada.

During the second world war General Gutowski served with distinction in the Normandy campaign. He was decorated for this valour by the Polish, French and American governments.

When he arrived in Canada in 1948, he began a long relationship with the Canadian Olympic Equestrian Team. Most notably, he was the team's trainer when it won the gold medal at the Olympic Games in Mexico City in 1968.

After the death of his wife, General Gutowski returned to Poland, where he recently passed away at the age of 95. He was put to final rest in Warsaw with full military honours in a state funeral. He will be greatly missed by all.

I ask that all members of Parliament join with me in recognizing this remarkable Canadian and his significant contributions to our country.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### VÉRONIQUE RIVEST

**Mr. Richard Nadeau (Gatineau, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I am delighted to congratulate Véronique Rivest, of Gatineau, who was awarded the distinction of best sommelier in Canada by the Canadian Association of Professional Sommeliers.

Ms. Rivest won the award on September 16, 2006, at the Institut du Tourisme et d'Hôtellerie du Québec, in Montreal, which hosted the first edition of Canada's best sommelier competition. She will represent Canada at the world's best sommelier competition in Barcelona, Spain, in March 2007. Ms. Rivest also won the title of best sommelier in Quebec in May of this year.

We wish Gatineau's Véronique Rivest the best of luck at the international competition; we would love to see her win this prestigious award.

---

## ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

#### AFGHANISTAN

**Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, President Karzai says that no "success" is possible in Afghanistan if the NATO mission is exclusively military. Diplomacy, development and reconstruction are essential "to winning the hearts and minds" of the Afghan people.

Yesterday, a senior Canadian officer in Kandahar, Lieutenant Colonel Hetherington, confirmed that nothing much has been accomplished and Canadian forces have been shifted away from reconstruction into military operations.

When was the decision made to change the original nature of this mission?

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I reject the premise of the House leader's question. The nature of the mission has not changed. The mission in which Canadian troops, diplomats and aid workers are currently engaged is precisely the mission to which my hon. friend's cabinet committed Canada in Afghanistan.

It is a mission under the aegis of a United Nations mandate, operationally being performed by NATO in the 36 country coalition. It is this government that has enhanced the development and diplomatic elements of the mission by nearly doubling our aid commitment and doubling our diplomat—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Wascana.

**Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Afghan officials in Kandahar have a different view of the situation. They say that the pace of reconstruction work in the Kandahar region has been “very slow” since Canadians took over from Americans about a year ago.

Our military officers are now saying that the pace will accelerate because they acknowledge that nothing much has happened over the course of the last year. In fact, personnel have been shifted away from the reconstruction work.

Specifically, what is the plan for developmental work in the Kandahar region and what specific goals—

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

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is hardly a news flash that development work in Kandahar province is being hindered by violence committed by the Taliban and its allied forces seeking to destabilize the democratically elected government of Afghanistan and the UN-NATO mission to provide security and development in that country.

The hon. member has asked what exactly are we doing. The previous Liberal government's plan had our aid commitment to Afghanistan going from \$100 million down to \$40 million a year by 2008-09. This government has increased—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry, the member's time has expired. The hon. member for Wascana.

**Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government has clearly failed to maintain the original principles of the Afghan mission. Personnel have been secretly shifted away from development and reconstruction. Progress on these fronts has all but disappeared in the Kandahar region.

Parliament and Canadians have not been kept informed. The required rotational support, except for two or three NATO countries, has not been forthcoming.

The President of Pakistan trivializes the loss of Canadian lives and the government remains silent.

When will we get a concrete remedial plan to get this mission back on track?

• (1120)

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our officials, in terms of international development, have done tremendous work under very trying circumstances in the region.

Among other things, we have conducted, in terms of the PRT in that province, over 500 patrols with local authorities. Our engineers have removed more than 400 pieces of explosive ordinance. We have donated diverse resources, including medical supplies and police equipment, to help with reconstruction. We have nearly doubled the aid commitment in Afghanistan over the next several years from what was committed by the previous government.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### SUMMIT OF LA FRANCOPHONIE

**Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Gilles Bernier, the father of the Minister of Industry, has been rewarded by the minority Conservative government for lending them his son. Indeed, we learned this morning that the elder Mr. Bernier is roaming the streets of Bucharest with the Prime Minister, on taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

Will the Prime Minister close the government travel agency, which seems to serve only ministers' fathers?

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member knows very well that Gilles Bernier, a former MP, is in Bucharest as an organizer for the Forum francophone des affaires, a non-governmental organization. He is there as a sherpa or guide for that organization.

Perhaps the hon. member does not like to see NGOs involved in la Francophonie, but we, the government, encourage NGOs to take part in international affairs.

[*English*]

**Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, after campaigning by promising to be as pure as the driven snow, the stains are adding up on the government's shirt. We know the government paid for Gilles Bernier's trip, and the organization he supposedly represents is penniless.

When Gilles Bernier returns from Romania, will the Minister of Industry be waiting at the airport to ask his father to pay back Canadian taxpayers?

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the member opposite believes that NGOs should not be involved in aiding the Canadian government in aiding international multilateral organizations in their important work.

On this side of the House, we believe that la Francophonie is an important international institution. Those Canadian NGOs that support its work should also be supported by this government, and Mr. Bernier is doing important work in that respect in Romania.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE**

**Ms. Monique Guay (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, when he appeared before the committee, Commissioner Zaccardelli acknowledged that he had known since early 2003 that the information leading to the deportation of Maher Arar to a Syrian prison was false. He even went so far as to say that he was convinced of his innocence. Instead of taking remedial action, he let Maher Arar rot in jail.

Does the government not feel that, on the basis of these revelations alone, the resignation of Commissioner Zaccardelli is imperative?

[English]

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Safety has been very clear that the government has confidence in the commissioner. The Prime Minister has been clear that the government does not act precipitously in these matters. We want to be absolutely clear. The commissioner came before a parliamentary committee yesterday to express the sincere regrets of both himself personally and the RCMP corporately.

The government recognizes that Mr. Arar suffered a terrible injustice, which is why we have accepted all the recommendations of the O'Connor report. We either have implemented them or we will implement them quickly.

[Translation]

**Ms. Monique Guay (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the government must act more quickly and act now. It is evident that because of his irresponsible behaviour Commissioner Zaccardelli failed to do his job. In these circumstances, it is quite questionable whether he has the necessary leadership to implement the O'Connor report recommendations.

I am asking again, what is the government waiting for to demand the immediate resignation of Giuliano Zaccardelli?

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I must point out that the government did take action as a result of Justice O'Connor's recommendations. The Minister of Public Safety advised the American authorities to remove the names of Mr. Arar and his family members from their watch list, among other things. We accepted all recommendations of the O'Connor report. The government and the RCMP are implementing all these recommendations.

\* \* \*

● (1125)

**MAHER ARAR**

**Mr. Serge Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday in committee the Minister of Public Safety made hollow assurances that he would file a formal complaint with the United States for the way Maher Arar was treated. However, in the House, the minister said he had sent a letter suggesting to the Americans that they remove Maher Arar's name from their list. This does not constitute a formal complaint.

What is the Minister of Public Safety waiting for to file a formal complaint with U.S. authorities, which the O'Connor report clearly recommends?

**Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as my colleague pointed out, I immediately sent a personal letter to Mr. Chertoff and I indicated that we hope the Americans will follow our example and clear the security information on Mr. Arar and his family.

**Mr. Serge Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, "We hope the Americans will follow our example"; is that what the minister calls a formal complaint?

It is utter confusion in this matter. While the Minister of Public Safety makes hollow assurances about filing a formal complaint, his colleague, the Minister of Foreign Affairs is making vague suggestions about the possibility of filing a complaint in the more or less distant future.

What is the government waiting for to put an end to this ambiguity, to do what needs to be done and file a complaint right away next week?

[English]

**Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, in agreement with my colleague, under the previous administration, under which this whole situation took place, there was abominable confusion.

Justice O'Connor indicated in his report that once the RCMP had given the information to the government that Mr. Arar was not a concern in terms of coming back from Syria to Canada, the former federal government could not speak with one voice to get that man out of prison.

In contrast, within hours of receiving the O'Connor report, the new Government of Canada took action. We removed the information about Mr. Arar and agreed—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Vancouver East.

\* \* \*

**AFGHANISTAN**

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, we can see the Conservative government getting more desperate in its position on Afghanistan.

Today we have further evidence that Canada's mission is on the wrong track. Reports from Kandahar city prove that the provincial reconstruction team is not doing much reconstruction at all. Lieutenant Colonel Hetherington admits that he has "few concrete results".

If reconstruction is working, could the government tell the House and Canadians how many schools, roads and hospitals has the PRT built in Kandahar?

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, if the NDP had its way and Canadian Forces were to be removed from Kandahar province, not only would there be no schools, no hospitals and no development work happening in that region, but schools, hospitals and development work that has been done would be completely destroyed by the Taliban, which is the enemy of civil reconstruction, democracy and stability in that country.

Yes, we want development, as does President Karzai, as do the people of Afghanistan and Kandahar province. None of us can deliver that kind of development until we have security in the region. That is what our brave men and women in uniform are doing for us today.

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear. The government's plan, even around reconstruction, is not working. This is the evidence coming from the field. Why is the government still telling Canadians that this is the game plan? Even today General Hillier offered his very deflated outlook on the current plan.

First, the government says that it is two years maximum. Then it says that it is five years minimum. Then we have the Prime Minister who says that it could be a lot longer. All the while we have officials who are saying that reconstruction is not taking place and victory through counter-insurgency is certainly not possible.

When will the government admit that this unbalanced mission has no clear—

• (1130)

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

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the NDP does not understand about the situation in Afghanistan.

A hostile militia is seeking to overthrow the democratically elected government and to cause violence and mayhem, an organization that is clearly closely associated with the al-Qaeda network. The Taliban is not interested in developing Kandahar province, which is precisely why it is seeking to destabilize the situation.

We cannot send aid workers in, as the NDP would have us do, to submit themselves to the tender mercies of the Taliban without first establishing security in the region.

\* \* \*

**ACCESS TO INFORMATION**

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister was forced to admit that he misled this House when it came to a Privy Council memo on access to information. However, the fundamental issue is that the Prime Minister's director of communications, Sandra Buckler, had the name of a journalist who made a private information request.

When did the Prime Minister find out about this breach of law and why has no one been disciplined yet?

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister found out about this matter when it appeared in a news article early last week, as did the President of the Treasury Board, who immediately called the Privacy Commissioner, as did the Minister of Public Safety, who immediately called the Privacy Commissioner.

We want to get to the bottom of this. That is one of the reasons I put forward a motion, on behalf of the government, at the privacy and access to information committee for a full committee inquiry into the practices, as it relates to these names, of the current and previous governments. The Privacy Commissioner rapped former minister Art Eggleton on the knuckles precisely for having received this kind of information.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would never want to use an unparliamentary word in the House, but if the parliamentary secretary would check, perhaps his pants are on fire.

Two days ago, the deputy information commissioner warned that the accountability act would make corruption harder, not easier, to discover. The Prime Minister broke his promise to implement the Information Commissioner's report.

Accountability starts at the top. Where is it?

**Hon. John Baird (President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is passing strange to get a lecture on accountability from a member of the Liberal Party opposite. Every member of the Liberal Party voted against opening up access to information last November. Every Liberal wanted to keep the cloak of secrecy there.

When this government tried to open up and provide a little bit of light at the Canadian Wheat Board by making it subject to access to information, every Liberal in the House stood and voted for darkness and secrecy.

We will proceed with accountability and we will proceed—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Mississauga—Erindale.

\* \* \*

**MAHER ARAR**

**Mr. Omar Alghabra (Mississauga—Erindale, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as if Mr. Arar and his family needed any more pain and misinformation from the Conservatives, yesterday the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister falsely claimed that the Liberals took actions “which ended up putting Maher Arar in a Syrian jail”.

It is no wonder the Conservatives have not apologized to Mr. Arar. They have not read Justice O'Connor's report.

Will the parliamentary secretary stand up and apologize for misleading this House again?



*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused here. It seems to me that when the unfortunate incident surrounding Mr. Arar occurred, the government at the time was a Liberal government. Perhaps the hon. member would like us to forget that.

All I know is that the Liberals are asking the government to issue apologies because they think the government should take responsibility. This government is taking responsibility. I simply pointed out that it would be nice to hear a little bit of responsibility from the Liberals who were then in power.

**Mr. Omar Alghabra (Mississauga—Erindale, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will say what Canadians have not forgotten. When Mr. Arar was in detention, the Minister of Public Safety called for an inquiry to determine why the Liberals were defending him. The member for Calgary—Nose Hill convicted Mr. Arar as having links to al-Qaeda. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister was the first to leap to his feet to applaud those members every time.

The Conservatives did not hesitate to condemn Mr. Arar, but now that they know they were wrong why are they dragging their feet and not apologizing?

• (1135)

**Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, rather than collapsing into hysteria and misinformation, perhaps we should go directly to the report. In terms of talking about misperceptions, on page 240 of the report, referring to the foreign affairs minister of the time, the report says:

The perception that Mr. Arar had not been tortured was wrong and, no doubt, the Minister's statements planted the seeds of that misperception in the minds of some.

Here we have the former minister of the Liberal government, under whom this took place, who did not even believe he was tortured.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Marcel Lussier (Brossard—La Prairie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in her report presented yesterday, the environment commissioner said that to achieve the objectives for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, the government will have to focus its efforts on the oil, gas and transportation sectors, three sectors that are responsible for 78% of greenhouse gas emissions. However, the government is ignoring these sectors and is choosing to maintain tax benefits for the oil companies.

How does the government think it will achieve the Kyoto objectives if it ignores 78% of the causes of the problem?

[English]

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this government is taking a comprehensive approach to greenhouse gas emission reductions and climate change. All sectors need to be a part of the solution to clean up our environment. We want to involve all Canadians to be a part of the solution of our made in Canada plan.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marcel Lussier (Brossard—La Prairie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, while the environment commissioner was presenting her report, what were the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Natural Resources doing? Well, both ministers were visiting their friends, the oil companies.

Does this not show a blatant lack of interest in dealing with greenhouse gases and confirm the government's complacency toward the oil companies?

[English]

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we agree with the commissioner's recommendations. For 13 years the Liberals did absolutely nothing.

The commissioner said that she wanted a plan with action, which is exactly what our minister is doing. Imagine if Canada had had this environment minister for the last 13 years, the emission rates would have gone down. Instead, the Liberals caused the emission rates to go up. Shame.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

**Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, thousands of Quebec producers are mass mailing postcards to convince the government to listen to the concrete proposals they have developed to end the ongoing agricultural income crisis.

Producers are demanding concrete measures adapted to the realities of their different products.

Will the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food finally implement temporary measures until the 2008 review of the Agricultural Policy Framework by introducing a new agricultural income stabilization program to mitigate the damage caused primarily by foreign subsidies?

**Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there will be money.

The difference between the Bloc Québécois and us is that we mean what we say. We will come through for producers.

The first thing our cabinet did was give them \$750 million. That is money in the pockets of producers in Canada and Quebec.

As part of the budget, the Conservative party tripled its \$500 million commitment to \$1.5 billion. That is money in producers' pockets.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

[English]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I would remind members that there is no need to clap and yell after every answer. The answers are good enough.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

**Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like someone serious to answer me.

“There will be money”. What does that mean? This government has been in power for eight months and the agricultural income crisis still has not been resolved.

I want someone serious to answer me.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food wants to talk about money. The Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food promised that Quebec would get its fair share of the \$950 million budget for agriculture. However, Quebec's producers got only \$50 million because of the method for calculating inventories, which the minister has described as “the best system around”. What a nice way to compensate Quebec's producers.

How did the minister come to the conclusion that Quebec should receive only 5% of the money, when Quebec represents 18% of Canada's agricultural activity?

• (1140)

**Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, my dear colleague asked an excellent question, which I will answer.

We have invested in changing the CAIS program in order to put more money in the pockets of the producers. We promised and we have developed a new, innovative program: the Canadian Farm Families Options Program. This program will go a long way to helping the 4,000 families in Quebec who urgently need money.

\* \* \*

*[English]***GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS**

**Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Treasury Board president denied in the House that he ever said that helping adults learn to read was a waste of money.

Let me quote yesterday's Canadian Press article:

—[the] Treasury Board President...suggested that his government would rather spend more money teaching children how to read and write than try to help illiterate adults

On tape he said that we should “not be trying to do repair work after the fact”.

Did the Treasury Board president mislead the House or was someone impersonating him and doing media interviews yesterday?

**Hon. John Baird (President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we believe that when we spend upwards of \$40 billion to \$45 billion a year providing education and training to young Canadians and adults through school boards across the country, that it is not too much to ask that when people graduate from high school that they be literate.

**Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Treasury Board president was on the streets of Ottawa helping to raise \$12,000 for the literacy program. Now he only has to raise

another \$17.7 million to make up for the money he slashed from literacy groups this week.

Adults who need help with literacy are worth the government's time and respect. Why is the government giving up on them? How does the government expect to improve Canada's productivity when it abandons people who are learning to read and write?

**Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that is one more example of Liberal hypocrisy. This Canadian government is taking action to help with literacy, which is why we are investing over \$80 billion and why we have put forward 307 million new dollars to help with immigrant settling, something the Liberal members voted against.

I must point out that in the last session of Parliament the previous minister for literacy did not mention the subject in the House, not even once. It was all talk and no action.

*[Translation]*

**Hon. Raymond Simard (Saint Boniface, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in reference to the budget cuts he has made, the President of the Treasury Board described adult literacy as a waste of money.

Studies clearly demonstrate that minority communities are more disadvantaged in terms of literacy.

Plurielle, a group that provides literacy services for these communities, announced today that it was closing nine literacy centres in French-speaking Manitoba.

Will this Conservative government reverse these unacceptable budget cuts?

*[English]*

**Hon. John Baird (President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I said no such thing.

**Hon. Raymond Simard (Saint Boniface, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the same week the government cut literacy programs, the Prime Minister's wife was out contradicting her husband. It turns out that she was right.

Literacy leaders tell us that the whole coalition is now on life support. Saskatchewan is closing within two months. Yukon is closing within two weeks to a month. Alberta is hanging on by a thread. Newfoundland is in the worst shape of all. In my riding, Literacy Partners of Manitoba will close its doors in March.

When will the government reverse this unconscionable decision?

**Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we are refocusing the dollars spent on literacy on programs that will help Canadians right across the country, those within federal jurisdiction. We believe that provincial and regional issues can best be addressed at the provincial and regional levels, which is why we will not step on their toes. We will be focusing on Canada's vulnerable right across the country.

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, after so many years of inaction on the part of the former Liberal government, could the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development tell us what he will do to address the on reserve matrimonial real property issue?

**Mr. Rod Bruinooog (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, matrimonial real property has been a long-standing human rights issue that our Conservative government is committed to solving.

This morning, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has joined with the Assembly of First Nations and the Native Women's Association of Canada to launch a series of consultations with the aim of resolving this important issue. These consultations will be completed by January and the minister is confident that he will introduce legislation regarding this issue in the spring of 2007.

We are contributing \$9 million toward achieving a solution to this problem. Our party is getting things done for women, children and families.

\* \* \*

• (1145)

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Canada is not ready for climate change and, after five plans and \$6 billion, the Liberals did nothing that matters.

Just like the Liberals, the Conservative government gives \$1.5 billion to big oil and gas companies when they are reaping huge profits. To many of the people in my riding across the north, the caribou are their grocery store and climate change is killing a way of life.

When will the government stop the subsidies and get on with fighting climate change? Our northern children need a future too.

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member is asking for specifics on our plan. The plan will be tabled next month. It is a good plan. It deals with greenhouse gas emissions. It is achievable, it is realistic and it is what the commissioner is recommending. It is good for Canada.

\* \* \*

**FOREST INDUSTRY**

**Ms. Catherine Bell (Vancouver Island North, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the mountain pine beetle is now creeping into Saskatchewan's Jack pine, spreading the red tide of dead trees into the boreal forest. At the same time, the government is cutting almost \$12 million from fighting the scourge of the pine beetle.

The Minister of Natural Resources said that he has B.C. buy in, but I guess he forgot about Prince George that requested funds from the program and were denied.

*Oral Questions*

Does the Prime Minister believe that forestry workers in western Canada, who will lose their jobs because of these cuts, are merely fat to be trimmed?

[Translation]

**Mr. Christian Paradis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for her question.

First, this statement has to be set straight, because the commitments made by the Department of Natural Resources will be honoured, and this, on top of the \$200 million announced in Budget 2006.

\* \* \*

[English]

**CHINA**

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, diplomatic relations with China are in shambles and disarray. The foreign affairs minister even accused China of espionage in Canada.

Strong relations with China are vital to bilateral trade, to human rights and to terrorism, and is essential to the resolution of issues such as the imprisonment of Canadian citizen, Huseyin Celil. Relations with China must be returned to strengthened mutual respect.

What is the government doing to repair the enormous damage it has caused?

**Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to see the member across absent from the reception that was held yesterday at the residence of the ambassador of China.

When I met last week with the foreign minister from China, we had a very open and fulsome discussion on a number of issues, including some consular cases of which the hon. member is familiar.

Our relations with China are strong and are on a very good foundation. We are continuing to work on a number of economic issues. I know that the Minister of Agriculture, as well as the Minister of Natural Resources, have trips planned there in the future, as do I. We will continue to elevate and work very hard on this important relationship with China.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have provided the government with an email concerning the cancellation of a meeting with China to discuss the Celil case. In it the Prime Minister's parliamentary secretary writes:

I am going to be more discreet about what I say on this in the future as I am seriously concerned that this [cancellation] may have been the result of PRC [Chinese] eavesdropping.

The loose lips of that member have put a Canadian citizen in jeopardy and further damaged relations with China.

Will the Prime Minister finally take charge of the situation and start by firing his chronically indiscreet parliamentary secretary?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, quite to the contrary, the parliamentary secretary has been working diligently on the file of Mr. Celil, as have I. We have raised it a number of times, both in New York last week and previously at the ASEAN meeting. I know that the Prime Minister hopes to have the opportunity to meet with President Hu at the APEC summit.

These kinds of spontaneous outbursts that play to the gallery are not going to help Mr. Celil or elevate the important, respectful relationship that we have with the Republic people's of China.

\* \* \*

• (1150)

**TOURISM INDUSTRY**

**Mr. Roger Valley (Kenora, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the ideological cuts we have seen from the minority Conservative government this week will have devastating effects on border tourism.

In my riding thousands of visitors have taken advantage of the GST rebate offered to tourists, stimulating cross-border traffic and tourism opportunities. Jerry Fisher of the Northwestern Ontario Tourism Association maintains this will be a devastating blow to the industry. How can the government possibly justify the elimination of this business-friendly program on the very same day it announced record surpluses?

Is help for the cross-border tourism, in the government's words, mere "fat to be trimmed"?

**Hon. John Baird (President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, only 3% of visitors to Canada took advantage of this program; 97% of visitors to Canada did not take advantage of this program.

We brought in a huge tax cut to help spur investment, to help spur consumer spending in Canada. That was called a 15% reduction in the goods and services tax.

**Mr. Roger Valley (Kenora, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, most of that 3% must be in my riding then.

It makes absolutely no sense to cut such an effective program in the midst of surpluses. The government will also lose revenue associated with indirect sales coming from cross-border traffic. More important, this is a kick to tourism when it is already down. The high value of the Canadian dollar, more stringent entry requirements and difficulties crossing the border have all been squeezing this industry for some time now.

How can the government justify the elimination of a program that helps Canadian communities when they are already facing bleak times?

**Hon. John Baird (President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Again, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we are doing enough to assist in this regard. The very best thing we can do is reduce the GST one more percent, something this government plans to do.

[Translation]

**GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS**

**Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, there is an irony in the Prime Minister's wife and the President of the Treasury Board taking part in a walk for literacy, when the government announced this week \$17.7 million in cuts to this learning program.

Does the government plan to restore funding to this program and, at the same time, transfer its share to Quebec, given that it falls within its jurisdiction?

[English]

**Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we are respecting provincial jurisdiction. That is why we are going to focus our literacy spending on issues that cross provincial and territorial boundaries. We believe that local and regional issues are best addressed at the local and regional levels, including the provincial level. That is exactly what we are allowing the province of Quebec to do.

[Translation]

**Mr. Richard Nadeau (Gatineau, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this government's ideological choices are nothing new. The decision to cut the court challenges program dates back further. Indeed, in academic texts of his, the Prime Minister's chief of staff stated that the court challenges program only helped the "haves", namely women, francophones and gays.

Will the Prime Minister admit that it is totally unjustified to cut the court challenges program based on the outlandish idea—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. President of the Treasury Board.

[English]

**Hon. John Baird (President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite seems to be much more familiar with the writings of Ian Brodie than I am.

We take the issue of human rights to be incredibly important. We in the House have a responsibility to uphold human rights.

I, like all members of the House, am deeply disturbed by the serious allegations of former members of the Liberal cabinet and even one member of the Liberal frontbench who says that he feels he experiences bigotry and discrimination within the Liberal Party.

\* \* \*

**FISHERIES AND OCEANS**

**Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the lobster fishery in New Brunswick is in terrible shape and fishermen need help. The government needs to urgently support this industry, not simply slash \$20 million from DFO's budget.

This week the minister told listeners in Newfoundland not to worry, the entire cut would be absorbed in New Brunswick.

*Oral Questions*

Will the parliamentary secretary tell the House if this latest cut is just the beginning of the punishment the government intends to inflict on New Brunswickers for having thrown out the Prime Minister's buddy, Bernard Lord?

• (1155)

**Mr. Randy Kamp (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised by the question because it was the previous government that announced financial assistance to New Brunswick in the amount of \$20 million but never actually delivered that money. If it had, I think we would not be having this conversation.

When we formed government we recognized that although the aquaculture industry, which is where that money was intended to go, had undergone a certain amount of restructuring, it still faced some significant challenges, so our government almost immediately provided \$10 million through ACOA that has already gone out.

We have demonstrated a real commitment and real money to the aquaculture industry, in fact all sectors of the fishing industry in New Brunswick. I would expect the member to be applauding that.

\* \* \*

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian agriculture industry is being faced with long term human resource challenges that require the joint efforts of industry leaders, educators and other stakeholders.

Could the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development please tell the House what the Government of Canada is doing to ensure all parties in the agriculture sector are sharing ideas, concerns and perspectives about human resources and skills issues relating to the agriculture sector?

**Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Selkirk—Interlake for the fine and steadfast work he has done for agriculture over the last two years.

Recently I was very pleased to announce the investment of \$1 million to create a new sectoral council for the agriculture industry. This council will play a vital role in finding innovative solutions to help the human resources situation affecting agriculture today.

This is good news for Canadian farmers and it is good news for Canada.

\* \* \*

**CANADA-U.S. BORDER**

**Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, this past summer this government did nothing when the United States tore up a treaty that had been in existence from the War of 1812 that prohibited gunboats on the Great Lakes system.

Since that time, the American coast guard has indicated it wants a firing range flotilla to be set up that will conduct live fire exercises on a regular basis on the Great Lakes. This is dangerous for the environment, as well as for boaters and the tourism industry.

I want to know from this government, will it stand up and demand a cessation of this? The militarization of the border, including more helicopters, drone planes and watchtowers are what the Americans are moving toward. When will the government stand up and make sure that this is not going to put Canadian citizens at risk?

**Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the treaty that was referenced goes back to 1817 and actually allowed for armaments on vessels. However, the amendment to that treaty allowing what is happening today with machine guns on the coast guard vessels was done by the former government in April 2003.

I can tell members that from the point of view of border security, there is a 60-day comment period on this new process by the U.S. coast guard. On the point of border security, we are going to raise the concerns that Canadians have raised, the possible dangers in those particular waters. The ministry of the environment has also raised issues of environmental concerns. We are raising those concerns.

\* \* \*

**LITERACY**

**Ms. Denise Savoie (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, over nine million Canadian adults need enhanced literacy skills to succeed in our society. First the government called these adults “fat to be cut” and now it is calling them “repair work” that can be ignored.

Despite misleading answers in this House, the government does not even believe that fighting adult illiteracy is worth one dollar per Canadian per year.

Canada's literacy movement has told us that these cuts have devastated local on the ground literacy projects.

When will the government reverse its shortsighted cuts?

**Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Social Development, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this Canadian government believes it is important to have a competent, literate, well-skilled workforce if we are to be competitive in the world. That is why we are spending over \$2 billion a year in developing workplace skills. We have invested \$307 million of new money for settlement funding that will help new Canadians take literacy programming.

We put all these programs forward, along with a whole host of other workplace development skills and education programs which the previous government, the Liberal Party, voted against.

*Oral Questions***MAHER ARAR**

**Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the House has unanimously expressed its apologies to Maher Arar. Commissioner Zaccardelli has apologized to Maher Arar for the terrible injustice done to him. The government has acknowledged that a grave injustice was done to Maher Arar.

Maher Arar has wanted the government to apologize. Yesterday the hon. Minister of Public Safety said that the government wants to do what Maher Arar wants.

My question is, will the Minister of Public Safety, a decent and honourable man, do the decent and honourable thing and finally apologize on behalf of the government to Maher Arar?

• (1200)

**Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as with previous injustices perpetrated by the former Liberal government, just on the legal point of view, using the example of the Chinese head tax which was perpetrated by the former Liberal government, this particular government had no problem in terms of stating an apology and also working through the compensation process.

We will not go ahead with the apology until the compensation agreements have been worked out and until everything is accepted by those who have been hurt. We want to make sure that the Arar family, and Mr. Arar, who has been hurt in this process, has compensation negotiated in a fair way—

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

\* \* \*

**SPORT AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY**

**Mr. Chris Warkentin (Peace River, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, since Canada's new government came to power, we have taken a leadership role in encouraging Canadians to be more physically active through initiatives such as the children's fitness tax credit, a sports policy for persons with a disability, and a record \$140 million investment in sport in this year's budget.

On top of all this, can the Minister for Sport tell us if he is prepared to do even more to encourage Canadians to be more physically active by bringing back participation?

**Hon. Michael Chong (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister for Sport, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for all his work in promoting sport and physical activity. He has been very active on this file.

We are the single largest investor in the Canadian sport system. We have invested a record \$143 million a year into sport. We have invested a record \$160 million into a children's fitness tax credit. We have put \$16.5 billion into federal infrastructure programs over the next four years—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Burnaby—Douglas.

**YOUTH**

**Mr. Bill Siksay (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources dismissed the summer career placement program as a subsidy to corporations and cronies.

I do not know where the minister was looking, but it was not in Burnaby—Douglas where 86% of projects were in the not for profit sector and most others in small businesses.

These cuts mean fewer good student jobs, cuts to summer day camps for children, cuts to community economic development work and cuts to advocacy programs.

Why did the minister not bother to check how the money is being spent and how important it is to communities like Burnaby?

**Hon. John Baird (President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the government has made a decision to reduce funding in this regard and to focus those resources on young people at risk with significant challenges.

The program will not be reduced right across the country. On this side of the House we thought that in areas of the country where \$20 an hour summer jobs were going unfilled, it just did not make sense to offer wage subsidies in those same communities.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS**

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the report submitted yesterday by the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development confirmed what public servants had already told the government: the EnerGuide program is effective and makes a difference in the fight against climate change.

How can the Minister of Natural Resources justify the elimination of that program, which would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions, while the commissioner warns that urgent action is needed in this file?

**Mr. Christian Paradis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the government's plan will be tabled shortly. The commissioner's conclusions will be taken into consideration.

The minister was clear this week when he said that the costs involved in assessment are too high. We want results, and we will have results.

[*English*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** That brings question period to an end.

I might say with respect to the answer given by the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister for Sport, that it did say zero on the clock, but it seemed a bit short to me so we will review the tape. Apologies may be in order for having the minister's answer cut short.

*Routine Proceedings*

## PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**The Deputy Speaker:** I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Osvaldo Andrade, Minister of Labour and Social Welfare of Chile.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1205)

[English]

## FAMILY FARM COST-OF-PRODUCTION PROTECTION ACT

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-356, An Act to provide cost-of-production protection for the family farm.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce this bill on behalf of farmers throughout Canada. The idea of this bill is to provide cost of production protection to family farms in cases where the weighted average input cost of products typically produced or suited to production in a farming zone exceeds the weighted average netback to the farm gate of such products, averaged over three years.

The costs, then, in this pricing formula would be calculated on the basis of marketable product. That way, they would take into account bad weather, pests and other crop loss factors. It is a lot more fair. It would be a huge help to prairie farmers. I am very proud that my colleague, the hon. member for Windsor West, is here to second this bill today.

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

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (in the name of the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform)** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 111.1(2), I move:

That, in accordance with subsections 49(1) and 49(2) of the Act respecting the status and use of the official languages of Canada, Chapter O-3.01 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1985, this House approve the appointment of Graham Fraser as Commissioner of Official Languages for Canada for a term of seven years.

[English]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

## ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

**Hon. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among all parties and I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development be granted a budget of \$11,047 to attend the Canadian Aboriginal Law Conference 2006, in Ottawa, on October 4 and 5.

• (1210)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Does the hon. government whip have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

**Mr. Gary Merasty (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I move that the first report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, presented on Friday, May 12, 2006, be concurred in.

I rise to speak on this motion with the hope that this government will acknowledge and understand the ramifications of its choice to kill the Kelowna accord. I believe it does not understand how gravely it has hurt first nations, Inuit and Métis communities, directly and indirectly.

Over the spring and summer, we have seen the Conservatives' attitude toward Kelowna regress, from saying that they supported the accord, to "putting the wheels on" the accord, to finally denying that it ever existed.

Not only did the government mislead Canadians, it also misled the aboriginal people of Canada. Premiers across Canada were shocked by the government's betrayal. For example, the Premier of Saskatchewan and the leader of the official opposition voted unanimously in support of a motion urging the federal government to implement the agreement.

First nation, Inuit and Métis leaders were stunned by the complete lack of consultation before the government chose not to honour the agreement. No one could believe the Conservative government would simply cut and run from its commitments.

Perhaps the Conservatives like to tell themselves that the new consensus struck at Kelowna was nothing significant. To do so, however, ignores this landmark agreement and reinforces over 100 years of distrust and shame.

Kelowna is a high-water mark, one achieved through collaboration and good faith, aimed at reconciling the wrongs of the past.

My elders tell me that in order to move forward, we must truly understand the past and the present to properly envision the future. We must understand the three phases of modern aboriginal-state relations. Every member in this House must be able to grasp these words before we are to truly understand what will be lost if the members of this House continue to vote against the Kelowna accord.

*Routine Proceedings*

The first phase was an ad hoc/crisis phase. During this period of time from the 1950s until 1969, the federal government's approach to working with aboriginal people was with ad hoc responses to crises occurring in the communities. It was not until a crisis occurred that the government would respond. No medium, short or long term goals were ever taken. No constructive plans were ever enacted. This was simply and purely crisis management.

The second phase was an adversarial phase. The introduction of the 1969 white paper sparked aboriginal Canadians to respond strongly to its recommendations. Aboriginal people were tired of being swept under the rug and ignored until the last possible minute as they suffered misguided, imposed directives often disguised to assimilate the people and their lands.

From the 1970s until the mid-1990s, aboriginal Canadians found their voice and explored many avenues to speak out and affirm their rights. We demanded that our rights be recognized, respected and protected. We succeeded.

In the courts, we attained victories in Calder, Guerin, Baker Lake, Sparrow, Delgamuukw, Marshall, Powley, Haida, Mikisew and many others. First nations, Inuit and Métis rights were recognized and affirmed in section 35 of the Constitution. The United Nations also gave support to aboriginal Canadians, particularly in the case of Ms. Sandra Lovelace, who asserted her rights on the international stage and prevailed.

However, this was also a time of conflict, marked with protests, such as those at Oka, Ipperwash and others. Relationships were strained with increasing distrust and hostility. That had to end. We needed to move on and we did.

The relationship began to change in the mid-1990s. Canadian courts demanded that governments use political fora to address and deal with first nations, Inuit and Métis issues.

Self-government negotiations sprang up across the country, with an acceleration of programs being devolved to aboriginal control. Round tables were set up to deal with socio-economic issues. Real improvements in the lives of aboriginal people began to be made.

These were the three phases of aboriginal-state relations leading up to the Kelowna accord.

I also want to briefly make mention of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.

In 1996, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, RCAP, was concluded. RCAP emerged from the Oka crisis in 1990, with the then Progressive Conservative government realizing it could no longer ignore aboriginal people, something this government should take note of.

•(1215)

RCAP was incredibly ambitious in its vision and all-encompassing in its scope. Based on 177 days of hearings and 3,500 witnesses, a six volume, 5,000 page report could be boiled down to one key statement: that Canada can no longer allow aboriginal people to remain dependent upon the nation.

It laid out the history of how aboriginal people became dependent, of how their world became one of poverty and social upheaval.

RCAP identified three characteristics of government action that led to this upheaval: first, the systematic denial of aboriginal peoples' nation status; second, the violation of most agreements made with aboriginal peoples; and third, the suppression of culture and institutions.

RCAP also made recommendations to overcome the incredibly challenging realities of dependency and poverty. In particular, it argued that substantial key investments be made with multi-year commitments. In time, those investments would pay for themselves, realizing net savings over the long term for the government. For example, RCAP recommended an immediate \$3 billion investment in housing that would result in Canada recovering more than twice that amount over the next number of years.

Poverty has become the reason for expense, but empowerment of the people and communities will be the way out. If the Kelowna accord is not honoured, this situation of empowerment and moving beyond dependency will not be reversed. Moreover, it is incredibly unsettling that the three key factors of oppression identified in RCAP, which I went through, namely, the denial of nation status, abandonment of agreements, and suppression of culture and institutions, are once again the government's agenda.

This minority government has a negative trend of undoing much of the progress made over the last 10 years. This relationship building stage is giving way to an adversarial stage once again. Yes, we are moving backwards with the Conservative government.

First, it has denied the nation status of aboriginal people. The UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples has been strongly opposed by the Conservatives, mostly on the basis that it would "revive 'extinguished' rights", as if section 35 of the Constitution and many Supreme Court decisions did not exist.

Second, it has violated agreements. Most important, of course, it trashed the Kelowna accord over the objections of the first nations, Métis and Inuit peoples of this country.

Third, it has suppressed culture and institutions. This is what it is doing with the cuts to literacy and skills training, scrapping the first nations SchoolNet program and the court challenges program, and cutting off funding for band elections.

I am not sure who the Conservative government purported to represent when it chose to kill the Kelowna accord. Everybody, and I mean everybody, wants the accord honoured.

The background or context of our choice is this. Let us look at some of the facts.

First, Canada is going through its most significant demographic shift in more than 50 years. Baby boomers are retiring while the aboriginal population is poised to enter the workforce in unprecedented numbers. The time to invest in education and post-secondary is now. At no other time has it been more important to support first nations, Inuit and Métis education.



*Routine Proceedings*

Second, because of the baby boom occurring in the aboriginal community, we are experiencing overcrowded housing. It is not uncommon to see three families and up to 16 or so people living in one house. The Saskatoon *StarPhoenix* described in detail the results of this overcrowding on health, on education and on self-worth.

Black mould is killing the people of Black Lake in my riding and many other communities across Canada. An elder passed away literally having black mould growing in her lungs.

Tuberculosis is rampant in my riding. I urge members to read the article in the *StarPhoenix* of September 26 and see a woman, a wife, a mother, lying in a coma from the complications of tuberculosis. Her husband and family are devastated. My daughter, Taylor, had to live with TB medication for a year. The government has ignored the TB outbreak in Black Lake like it has ignored the TB outbreak in Garden Hill. How can kids study or do homework in these conditions?

•(1220)

The *StarPhoenix* editorial board called this a “public health horror”. The Regina *Leader-Post* editorial board called it “a national disgrace”. And the government is going to tell me that it is not going to vote in favour of solving these issues. I hope government members can sleep at night.

A key reason why the Kelowna accord is so crucially important is that it provides the means to empower aboriginal communities to respond to the facts I have just laid out for members. If the Conservatives do nothing, not only will opportunity be lost but another generation will be lost to dependency and poverty. This must not and cannot happen.

The Kelowna accord represents, in the context of this speech, two things: first, the progress of the aboriginal people, the progress that they have made to improve the lives of their people, to have government recognize their rights, and to ultimately take their rightful place in Canadian society. Of course, these struggles are best described in the three phases I spoke of earlier.

Second, we need to begin to see the recommendations made in RCAP in 1996 implemented. This report was widely supported by aboriginal leaders across the country as a report which began to finally recognize our struggles, but also provided solutions for consideration.

Therefore, the Kelowna accord represents hope for first nations, Métis and Inuit people, and prosperity for Canada. It is a high watermark in aboriginal state relations, clearly leading toward implementing the nation to nation relationship necessary to resolve longstanding conflicts related to the numerous issues that could only be addressed through an improved legislated relationship recognizing the jurisdictions of each party.

It represents a new consensus in which all parties at the table agreed to jointly work toward resolving, issues such as housing, health, economic development and more. For the first time, Métis, Inuit and first nations people would be allowed at the table to set the agenda, the objectives, and the action plans to address social justice issues which have for too long been rampant in our communities. Finally, the cost of doing nothing was clearly understood, or so we thought.

Enter the Conservative minority government. How things have changed for the worse. Aboriginal people were betrayed as the Kelowna accord was killed without a second thought. Let us look at this novice Conservative government performance over the last eight months.

Of course, the Kelowna accord was not honoured. The government barely respected the residential school agreement, as I am sure there were some detailed discussions against this in cabinet. It refused to sign onto the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. The government was able to convince one country to side with it after unsuccessfully trying to convince others with horrendous human rights violations against indigenous peoples in their countries.

The government dragged its feet on responding to the Caledonia land dispute. It undermined the Dehcho nations negotiations on the Mackenzie pipeline and I know there is more to come.

Why do I say this? Let us look at some of the trends emerging on the government side. Let us list them.

Trend no. 1, there is no consultation with aboriginal people. There was no consultation on a decision to kill the Kelowna accord, no consultation on Bill C-2, no consultation on the UN declaration, and no consultation on the water or limited consultation on the water quality panel it set up.

There was no consultation on land claim issues, no consultation and no role for aboriginal people on the ministerial advisory committee on child care spaces initiative, and no consultation on the post-secondary review process which, coincidentally, the AUCC does not feel is fair consultation anyway.

There was no consultation on cutting the aboriginal procurement strategy, no consultation on cuts to education capital, and no consultation on cutting funding to Ontario first nations elections. And of course, there was no consultation on the federal budget of 2006-07.

Overall, this Conservative government just does not care enough to consult with aboriginal people. Aboriginal people are getting the message that the government does not want to talk to them.

Trend no. 2, there is a diminishing of aboriginal rights. One of the principles of the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples is the recognition of collective rights. In fact, the Minister of Indian Affairs stated in the *Globe and Mail* that “the text (in the declaration) could be used to revive rights that were lawfully extinguished or ceded by treaty.”

*Routine Proceedings*

What rights were extinguished lawfully? This is the basis upon which aboriginal people have battled the government for decades. Aboriginal people were swindled and prevented from defending themselves. In fact, many first nations people could not even hire a lawyer to act on their behalf.

● (1225)

This tells the aboriginal people that the minister is not open to discussing aboriginal rights in a fair and reasonable manner, especially it seems, collective rights. I think there is a reason to why collective rights are being targeted.

The Minister of Indian Affairs was quoted as saying in a Saskatchewan newspaper that fee simple land ownership is the only solution to dealing with aboriginal poverty. This is an entirely American policy. In the United States the Dawes act of 1887 stole Indian land from the Indian people on the premise of eliminating poverty.

In the book, *Reconciliation: First Nations Treaty Making in British Columbia*, Mr. Penikett, who is a well-respected authority on aboriginal rights, writes a passage that states:

Theodore Roosevelt praised the Dawes Act as “a mighty pulverizing engine to break up the tribal mass”. Through foreclosures and state tax collections, settlers soon grabbed all the best land. In less than a lifetime, Indians had lost half of their remaining lands in the United States.

Will this future Conservative government on reserve private land ownership legislation be known as the member for Calgary Centre-North act?

The minister's comments tell the first nations of Canada that the goal of the government is clearly not to respect their collective rights but to open up reserve lands for speculators. But, it does not end there.

The next issue the government is dressed in sheep's clothing on is matrimonial real property. Clearly, first nations women are not fairly or legally protected when it comes to the Indian Act. It is a very discriminatory piece of legislation that must be eliminated. In June 1992, Ms. Nellie Carlson of the group Indian Rights for Indian Women said:

Historically the Indian Act has thoroughly brainwashed us. Since 1869 Indian women already were legislated as to who she should be. Six times the Indian Act changed on Indian women. But each time she lost a little bit of her rights as an Indian.

To resolve this issue requires a very complex set of negotiations to take place. The respect and recognition of the first nations dispute resolution processes is necessary. The membership rules of the Indian Act, and specifically the Bill C-31 amendments must be changed to further protect the rights of first nations women.

Socio-economic conditions must be addressed. Recognition of women's rights within the communal land ownership context must be addressed effectively. If it is the plan of the Conservative government to establish fee simple land ownership in order to divide up matrimonial property upon dissolution of marriage, it will not work. If this is the plan, first nations women may end up losing more of their rights as Ms. Nellie Carlson described.

The move of the Conservative government is clearly to establish fee simple land ownership through any means possible, recognizing

of course what the Prime Minister did recently when he stood proud to denounce the rights of the aboriginal people of this country as race-based.

Aboriginal people have fought hard to have their rights recognized through the avenues available to them in this democratic country. It is an embarrassment for us as Canadians to see the path upon which the Conservative government wants to take us.

I want to cite Mr. Penikett's book one more time. He talks extensively about the fears of aboriginal people when it comes to the Conservative government. He writes:

Judging from previous statements by Conservative MPs, the possibilities include Aboriginal leaders' worst nightmares:

- Deeply cutting financial transfers for education, health and housing programs;
- Using the constitution's notwithstanding clause to limit Canada's obligations to Aboriginal peoples;
- Ending the separate Aboriginal fishery;
- Adopting Harper mentor Tom Flanagan's proposal to legislate “extinguishment”;
- Initiating Dawes Act-style privatizing tribal lands; and
- Offering individual cash buyouts for Aboriginal rights and title—

Well, Mr. Penikett called it.

The Kelowna accord best represents the hopes and dreams of the aboriginal people of this country to be recognized as equals in their own country and as significant contributors to the building of this great country that today we are all so proud of. They want to be proud of Canada, too, but this government is making it very difficult.

● (1230)

The Conservative government knew that it was never a matter of enough money. The rich treasury that we have seen in the last few days clearly points to the fact that the Conservative government chose not to honour the Kelowna accord and to make cuts right where it hurts.

**Mr. Rod Bruinooge (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, clearly, our government has moved forward with some of the largest increases in spending by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development that we have seen in years. We have only heard empty promises in the past from the old, tired Liberal Party.

I would like to ask my colleague a question in relation to some of the points he made with respect to matrimonial real property. He claimed that it was an important issue and I was glad to hear him say that. However, he was quoted yesterday as saying he did not know why the Minister of Indian Affairs would choose to tackle it now. When should we tackle it? That is always the problem with the Liberal Party. Those members always want to put off problems into the future. When should we tackle it if not now?

**Mr. Gary Merasty:** Mr. Speaker, the real question is: how are we going to tackle it? The when should be now. The more important question is, how?

If the government is proposing to ensure that the division of matrimonial real property occurs, yet at the same time breaking, demeaning and diminishing the rights of first nations people, including the rights of the women, then this is going to cause more problems in the future.

*Routine Proceedings*

How are we going to tackle it? I would ask that the Minister of Indian Affairs seriously consider the recommendations that the Assembly of First Nations and the Native Women's Association of Canada will make. I also ask him to consider the recommendations of Wendy Grant-John, who the government itself has hired and who I know will do a tremendous job in her report.

I ask the hon. member if there is any truth to some of the rumours out there that the government has already started to draft legislation on matrimonial real property before any of this consultation is done?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague a very simple question.

Why does he think the government so stubbornly refuses to implement the Kelowna accord?

[*English*]

**Mr. Gary Merasty:** Mr. Speaker, that is a question that baffles not only the first nations, Métis and Inuit people in this country but it baffles all Canadians I am sure. I am not sure who the Conservative government purports to represent, when I have heard every segment of Canadian society asking it to implement the accord.

This accord represented years of hard work by the aboriginal people of this country in an effort to try and battle their way out of the poverty and desperation they experience every day. To simply play politics because it was not theirs is a huge insult.

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Newton—North Delta, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentioned that the Saskatchewan premier is on side. I met with business leaders from British Columbia and they are also in favour of this historical agreement that we reached for the aboriginal people of Canada. The premier of British Columbia, who was perceived to be right wing, has taken a leadership role in defending the Kelowna agreement. I wonder how far right the Conservative minority government has to go to call itself the right government.

If we take the Kelowna agreement away from Canadians, how will this affect the lives of aboriginal people? How will it affect our standing on the international stage when it comes to being proud Canadians?

• (1235)

**Mr. Gary Merasty:** Mr. Speaker, let me tackle the UN declaration in the hon. member's reference to international fora.

First, It has been a huge embarrassment for our country to have the Conservative government side with Russia, which has one of the most atrocious human rights violation records in the world, especially as it relates to the indigenous people of its country. It has also tried to lobby other countries, with even worse records of human rights violations against indigenous peoples, to try to get them on side to vote against the declaration, which is simply to protect the rights of indigenous people, and it is non-binding. The excuses the minister has laid out are just ridiculous. They do not make sense.

Second, Canada is experiencing, within its borders, its greatest demographic shift in 50 years. Baby boomers are retiring. One of the

source populations upon which we can depend to replace these aging baby boomers is the aboriginal population. That is why investment in post-secondary education is absolutely necessary today as well as investment in other areas that affect education and health indicators, such as investment in housing, is absolutely critical.

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the speech of the member opposite. I want to assure him, and I think he would admit this if he were honest, that no one in the House wants to address the needs of aboriginal people more than I and my colleagues on this side of the House want.

When it comes to playing politics, I had the fortunate experience of sitting on the aboriginal affairs committee. The unfortunate experience, through the first number of meetings, was to be constantly brought back to the questions about Kelowna. We want to address the issues that Kelowna addressed, but it is clear that there is no Kelowna document, no accord. We keep talking about the Kelowna accord. I have not yet seen that so-called historic document.

How can the member say that there has been no progress made on the aboriginal file when just today, our parliamentary secretary made an announcement about the fact that our Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development would make an announcement on a move toward improving the issue of matrimonial real property for our aboriginal people?

Also, we know there have been many cases recently of improved water conditions on our reserves. As well, the committee at this point is studying the post-secondary educational needs of our aboriginal people and addressing the gaps that exist in allowing our aboriginal people to access post-secondary education. We know that one of the primary reasons they have difficulty accessing post-secondary education is because of the poor graduation rates in K to 12 and many the obstacles they face there, so we need to address the entire picture.

How can the member say that we on this side have no concern for the aboriginal people and the issue of matrimonial rights, as mentioned as one specific in his speech, when just today the parliamentary secretary announced we are making movement on this file?

**Mr. Gary Merasty:** There are a few questions in there, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to address.

First, on the existence of the Kelowna accord, millions of people watched the discussions as they unfolded before their eyes in Kelowna. A document laid out the objectives of the Kelowna accord.

Second, in May a senior bureaucrat from the Department of Finance appeared as a witness. The witness was asked directly if the money was made available through the ways and means. The senior bureaucrat said "Yes it was". Then the witness was asked what happened after? "Well, only the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance can choose to move that money and not honour the money that was set aside for Kelowna". Mr. Bureaucrat was asked if this is what occurred. The answer was "Yes, the Conservative government chose to go a different route".

*Routine Proceedings*

That is what happened with the Kelowna accord, very clearly. The hon. member should check the May blues of the finance committee himself and he will that.

The third point I want to make is that most investments were done, but not one penny has left the Treasury Board yet.

• (1240)

**Mr. Rod Bruinooge (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I always take it as an honour to speak on behalf of aboriginal issues and our new Canadian government.

This is a great day for the new government, as the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has announced a process for which we will be consulting with Canadians throughout the country, aboriginal Canadians, first nation Canadians, on the important issue of matrimonial real property. This has been a long outstanding issue, an issue that has unfortunately been in place for well over a century. There is no question that the government is taking action. The minister, within a very short period of becoming the minister, has engaged this very important file.

Today I am very proud to say that we will be moving forward, we will be finding developing legislation after the consultative process, and very soon we will have this issue resolved.

Today my hon. colleague, with whom I have the pleasure of sitting on the aboriginal affairs committee, is raising the issue, which he seems to often do, about what our government is doing in relation to the so-called Kelowna accord. As was already mentioned by my colleague from the government's side, who also sits on the committee, "accord" is really the wrong word to use. The word "accord" has an element to it which one would think requires signatures. When I asked the former prime minister this very question, he was unable to state that there were signatures associated with this so-called accord. Unfortunately, it was a promissory press release, and the former government did not follow through on many of its promises.

We can look back to the early parts of its administration in relation to cutting the GST, one of the most infamous promises of the former government. In fact, one of its ministers had to resign over that. It also wanted to kill the free trade agreement. Obviously that government enjoyed having the free trade agreement and all the benefits it brought to our great nation. There is no question that we had record surpluses throughout the nineties. The Liberals would say that it was due to them, but as an entrepreneur, it was due to the hard-working business people and all the employees who paid those taxes.

Today I will talk a bit though about what our government is doing for aboriginal people. I spoke already about the great announcement we made today on matrimonial real property. However, I would like to look back to the spring when we spoke of major increases in our budget for aboriginal affairs. We are spending considerable dollars in the areas of housing. We have the long outstanding residential schools settlement of \$2.2 billion. Our government is moving forward.

Structural reform, unfortunately, is something that was completely left out of the first ministers meeting of last year. In my travels

throughout the country, I met with many aboriginal people, first nations, Inuit and Métis, but first nations specifically, because they are under the thumb of the terrible Indian Act, this pre-Confederation document.

First nation citizens have called for structural reform. They want to see a new system through which benefits actually flow to the people who need it most. Unfortunately, this was not addressed by the first ministers meeting. It was not addressed by the former government. The new minister has said that structural change and reform is one of his key pillars, and I am very much looking forward to being a part of those discussions.

• (1245)

As we look at the first ministers meeting last fall, we do have a deeper and shared understanding of the challenges and needs faced by aboriginal people in areas such as health, water, housing, education and economic opportunities.

The first ministers meeting brought the parties together, federal-provincial-territorial and aboriginals, for discussions to clarify priorities and shared responsibilities. The process and discussions actually began much earlier, but, as several aboriginal groups have pointed out, they were not perfect. In fact, some groups found out about the meeting literally the week before. Nevertheless, they were a significant step forward in terms of consultation and consensus building, one of the three elements that the Auditor General identified as essential to improving the lives of aboriginal people.

Last fall's meeting, however, did not go so far as to culminate in an actual accord, outlining focused and immediate initiatives. Nor did it adequately address two other elements that the Auditor General had highlighted as key to further progress: structural change and capacity building, which I have already mentioned. After 13 years of Liberal governments, little or nothing has been done on this front, and I am not surprised.

As was noted earlier, structural changes are difficult. What has not been emphasized is that they are nonetheless very necessary. In many cases they are needed simultaneous, if not prior, to further investment. This will ensure that current and future investments have measurable results, which someone is accountable for and producing.

Our new Conservative government is committed not only to conserving and building on the good consultation and consensus work done at the first ministers meeting. We are not only committed to investing additional funds when they will be most effectively expended. We are not only committed to increasing capacity. We are also committed to making the difficult structural changes that the Liberals so long neglected at significant cost to all Canadians, especially aboriginal Canadians. We are committed to accountability, another area in relation to which the Liberals have had to scramble to prepare statements of defence.

*Routine Proceedings*

Given that we fully support the objectives and targets identified last fall, there is little the Liberals can do except try to pass off a press release, with a Liberal pre-election spending promise attached to it, as a legally binding Government of Canada commitment. The Liberals may publicly attack five months of Conservative action, now eight, because it does not fulfill one day of pre-election Liberal promises. Will they ever publicly admit, however, that today's debate is all about deflecting attention from the fact that five months, now eight months, of Conservative action has brought more new funding and initiatives on key aboriginal issues than 13 years of Liberal inaction? These 13 years have given the Liberals a record that even their potential future leader, Gerard Kennedy, has recently called "devastating".

As another hon. colleague from Winnipeg Centre pointed out earlier this year, the Liberals, after 13 years of power, had become skilled in announcing program funding spread over so many years, which it had little significant impact, and re-announcing the programs year after year. This did nothing to aid in the plight of aboriginal people. This will not be the new Conservative government's approach.

What is required now is a plan of action, a means to move forward, a plan that will evolve, as needed, specific consultations, as we have done today. We announced a major consultation with aboriginal women's groups across Canada. I am speaking about our plans for matrimonial property. However, we need structural change, capacity building and additional funding, a plan that will prove and produce tangible, measurable results and one that will have details of the concrete steps we need to take in order to implement the plan. Furthermore, the plan must be prioritized, focused and resourced, with clear responsibilities and accountabilities. We are taking that swift action.

● (1250)

In March of this year, one of this government's first acts was to launch a plan to address drinking water concerns in first nations communities. This was a terrible blight that was left upon the Government of Canada, a situation that was left at our feet by the previous administration, but we set this as a priority. The minister wanted to personally deal with the situation so he immediately put together a plan to remediate the situation.

This government understands the critical importance water is to improving the quality of life for aboriginal women, children and families. We recognize that providing opportunities for these women and their families builds economic strength and capacity from inside their communities, which means that aboriginal people will become more prosperous in their own right with their own source revenues, which they are so desperately striving for. We as a country want to assist them on that front. We feel that providing matrimonial real property to on reserve women who hold families together will be an excellent foundation from which economic development and economic prosperity will grow.

Looking back at our budget earlier this year, we allocated \$3.7 billion for aboriginal and northern programs. This amount of money dwarfs the previous budgets of the entire 13 years in this area. This also includes the \$2.2 billion that was put in place to address the legacy of Indian residential schools, a dark chapter in our history but

we have moved forward. We put that money in the budget and we are very proud of the fact that cheques are now being sent out to some of the claimants in advance of the process being fully in place. We took that action because we knew that some of these claimants were rather older in their term of being involved in this process and, thankfully, our government has streamlined this process.

The budget targeted investments for aboriginal Canadians in other key areas. These investments included \$300 million for affordable housing programs in the territories, benefiting both aboriginal and non-aboriginal peoples. Being a northerner myself, originally from the north, I can tell members that these housing dollars will be greatly appreciated as the cost of living in the north is considerably higher than here in the south, as is the cost of building a house.

Nunavut is where the problem is most pressing. I had the pleasure of travelling to Nunavut on my first trip in my capacity as parliamentary secretary. I enjoyed visiting the people of Nunavut and I saw firsthand that the need there is most pressing. That government will be receiving \$200 million in order to deal with this major issue. The other territories, as well, are receiving a considerable amount for the important issue of housing.

However, many aboriginals in Canada live off reserve so we put \$300 million into housing in those areas, as we see more aboriginal people moving from the reserve to urban centres. Sometimes they feel that is the right approach to find the economic means to look after their families. We have seen that and we are taking action.

● (1255)

We have also set aside \$450 million for key initiatives, such as education, something that the minister is very serious about. In fact, he feels that education is the key to children's future and the futures of aboriginal youth. Part of the money has been set aside for children and families to make a better community on reserve, as well as for on reserve water, which we dealt with immediately upon taking office. In fact, the minister had barely dusted off the desk in his new office when he had already begun working on that issue.

Of the \$3.7 billion earmarked for aboriginal and northern Canadians, we have a \$500 million socio-economic fund that will be essential to community development in the north in areas that will be potentially impacted by the Mackenzie Valley pipeline project. This will be an incredible fund to bring about own source revenues for so many communities that are interested in finding business opportunities in the north and to operate on funds that they generate themselves.

*Routine Proceedings*

Many aboriginal communities are not interested in seeing the government be the sole funder of life within their communities. They are looking for economic opportunities. This is a message that all too often was not heard by the previous government. However, as someone who comes from the private sector and who is an aboriginal Canadian, I know many aboriginal entrepreneurs who are proud of the fact that they are very successful within the business sector. I know this same type of entrepreneurialism will be found in the north, especially in the Mackenzie Valley delta.

This government has pledged to make progress toward its goal of working with first nations, Inuit and Métis partners and with the provinces and territories to establish priorities and develop effective sustainable approaches to the social and economic challenges they face in their communities.

We are delivering real results, not just empty rhetoric. Canadians voted for change and we are delivering to them positive change. We are committed to bettering the lives of aboriginal people in Canada through a practical and decisive approach and the steps we have taken so far clearly show this.

**Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary's speech was well read and well delivered.

I would like to ask the hon. member a question that speaks to a fundamental element of the Kelowna agreement. It concerns the 10 year old, highly successful aboriginal business procurement strategy that our government delivered, that has been audited three separate times and which engages somewhere in the neighbourhood of 28,000 to 30,000 Canadian aboriginal businesses.

I asked this question of the member's colleague, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, some time ago when a document was leaked to me as an opposition member showing that the department was in fact dismantling the aboriginal procurement strategy for Canadians without even consulting aboriginal peoples.

We then found out that First Canadian Health Management Corporation in Winnipeg, which administered \$1 billion of health benefits to aboriginal peoples over the last several years, woke up one morning to find out that on the MERX's procurement system there was an open RFP bid for some other company. We have seen all sorts of changes on procurement.

At some point in the parliamentary secretary's speech I think I heard him describe himself as an entrepreneur. I am trying to find out from the parliamentary secretary if it is the ideology of the University of Calgary or the chief of staff, Ian Brodie, or is it the Prime Minister's view that the marketplace should not be fettered and that the minimum set asides that are under the Treasury Board guidelines, which are still on the website of Treasury Board, should not be respected in some way because they are fettering the marketplace? Could he explain how the kind of procurement strategy we have for aboriginal peoples, now 10 years old, audited three times, highly successful and continues to be dismantled, is a positive aspect of Canada's new government?

• (1300)

**Mr. Rod Bruinooge:** Mr. Speaker, being an entrepreneur from Manitoba, I am very proud of First Canadian Health. It has done

remarkable work in its technology, especially in the area of health. I am quite certain that its success will continue into the future.

In relation to the member's question on procurement for aboriginal businesses, the Government of Canada has clearly stated on many occasions that this is a key plank of our department. We are always looking for ways to strengthen and improve our policies. We will continue to consult with aboriginal firms to find out ways that we can improve this strategy.

As an entrepreneur, I can say that there are countless Canadian businesses being managed by aboriginal entrepreneurs like myself which have done very well in all areas of the private sector and in areas of government as well. Aboriginals seem to have an excellent approach within business. I think it is, in part, because they have the ability to see through all the bureaucracy. Unfortunately, my colleague across the way likes to grow bureaucracy, which is something we on this side of the House choose not to do.

[Translation]

**Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. He is himself an aboriginal and a successful businessman. I congratulate him on that. In my riding, there are also aboriginal people who are successful.

I am tempted to ask him if he has not had enough of all the consultations, trips and tours. Does he not feel like finally getting some things settled?

We have heard about \$300 million to deal with the housing issue in remote aboriginal areas and another \$300 million for aboriginal people living in urban centres. In Quebec alone, aboriginal people are calling for \$700 million to meet their housing needs.

It is easy, the figures have already been provided.

Does he not feel like settling this matter once and for all, instead of continuing with the consultations, trips and tours?

That is my question to him.

[English]

**Mr. Rod Bruinooge:** Mr. Speaker, many communities throughout Canada, especially aboriginal northern communities, have numerous housing needs. Having visited many of these northern communities, I know it can become quite difficult to ship building supplies into some of them because they do not have access year round. It makes for a very difficult process. However, we are moving forward with important budget additions.

I agree with my colleague's point. We do need structural reform that will ensure that these communities are able to achieve economic success on their own and get out from under the awful Indian Act.

*Routine Proceedings*

• (1305)

**Mr. Gary Goodyear (Cambridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the parliamentary secretary for, what I think most members in the House would agree, the remarkable amount of work that has been done, even by the minister himself. My goodness, the new Conservative government has been here for a reasonably short period of time and we have solved the residential school issue, as well as the situation with the water. Over 100 areas in this country had polluted water. I remember that the previous government took six or eight weeks to even look at the problem while people were being diseased. This government had the problem solved before the dust was off our desks and the fax machines were taken out of their boxes. The previous government never used that kind of technology because it was so far behind. However, this government solved that problem and a number of other issues as well.

My colleague from Saskatchewan spoke earlier but I guess this issue was not important enough, unfortunately, for the member to stick around. He mentioned the issue of land claims but he should have known that land claims are a provincial issue and that it is a provincial Liberal government that is dodging around on that.

I think the truth comes down to the fact that everyone in this House would agree that housing, water, health, education and economic opportunities are things we all want for our aboriginal communities. However, I think what we are disagreeing on is the best approach to take. Would the parliamentary secretary not agree that the difference in the approaches is that this new government tends to act, not spend a decade talking about it?

**Mr. Rod Bruinooge:** Mr. Speaker, action really is the key to many of these issues. That is one of the biggest reasons I decided to run for government. We need to see action. I know that the members on this side are interested in action. In fact, there could not be a more right party than our party. I am very proud of that.

We are a government of action. We are a government that is going to take on the difficult challenges, the challenges that are a terrible Liberal legacy. The Indian Act was neglected completely. Everyone knows that major structural reform is needed. I am very proud that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development will be taking on this task. I look forward to assisting him in this important area.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** The hon. member for Churchill, mindful that there is less than two minutes for both the question and the answer.

**Ms. Tina Keeper (Churchill, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member's speech reiterates the position of the Conservatives. It was really clear from the speech that there is no commitment by the government to go forward on the Kelowna accord. There are many issues in the Kelowna accord that have to be dealt with. Even when we are talking about matrimonial real property, we are talking about socio-economic conditions that have to be met.

If the Conservatives move forward on these issues, how do they intend to address the socio-economic situation for first nations in relation to matrimonial real property?

**Mr. Rod Bruinooge:** Mr. Speaker, matrimonial real property is an important issue. It forms the basis of so many situations where individuals are left in a poor economic situation. Sometimes families

have to leave their homes because they do not have any rights to that piece of real estate. This cannot happen any longer in Canada.

That is why the minister has taken the initiative on this very important issue. I look forward to assisting him on this structural change which will impact on the lives of so many female aboriginal Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the Bloc Québécois to address the adoption of the first report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, regarding the implementation of the Kelowna accord.

At the outset, I want to inform the House that the Bloc Québécois is in favour of adopting this report and believes that the government has a duty to honour the accord signed with the aboriginal peoples on November 25, 2005, at the first ministers meeting.

I find a little odd what the parliamentary secretary said. In fact, I have been hearing Conservative members suggest today that there never was an accord. I would like to quote from a letter that their Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians wrote to the chair of the committee. Here is what he wrote on the second page of his letter:

The time has come to build on what was decided on November 2005—

The minister himself confirms in his letter that decisions were made in 2005. Today, we are told that there is no text, no accord, but that decisions were made.

It is typical of the Conservative Party to talk a great deal but do nothing. Earlier, the parliamentary secretary provided proof of this. The Conservatives consult, they travel, they visit, but they do not accomplish anything. They probably picked up this habit from the Liberal Party, which did that for a long time. Maybe one day, after listening to and understanding the Bloc Québécois members, they will manage to do some good things.

Speaking of good things, our Bloc Québécois Indian and northern affairs critic, the member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue, introduced the motion we are discussing today. This motion became a report that was tabled by our colleague on May 8, 2006. The motion recalls that, once again, Ottawa has not kept its promises and lived up to its responsibilities to Canada's aboriginal peoples.

The motion that led to the report today reads as follows:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the Committee recommends that the government implement the Kelowna agreement, entitled Strengthening Relationships and Closing the Gap, which was reached on November 25, 2005 between the First Ministers and the National Aboriginal Leaders.

When we talk about the Kelowna agreement, we have to understand something. The provincial premiers were there, as were aboriginal representatives and federal government representatives. Consequently, the Kelowna meeting was far more important than the Conservative government is trying to imply.

The third paragraph of the report reads as follows:

That the Committee adopt these recommendations as a report to the House and that the Chair present this report to the House.

*Routine Proceedings*

This is what we are discussing today.

We must not kid ourselves, though. The Kelowna agreement is just a temporary measure that will do nothing to improve aboriginal peoples' living conditions in the long run. It is a good start. That is what the Bloc Québécois means to say. It helps to close the growing gap between the quality of life of aboriginal peoples and that of Quebecers and Canadians.

The agreement represented \$5.1 billion over five years for aboriginal education, health, housing and economic opportunities.

Considering that the \$5.1 billion is shared by the federal government, Quebec, the provinces and territories and the aboriginal administration before it reaches the first nations, Inuit and Métis, where the need is, this is very little money to use to really close that gap.

The need is critical—as I was saying earlier—in housing alone for the first nations of Quebec. The immediate, known, calculated, negotiated and discussed need is over \$700 million to provide the roughly 7,000 housing units that are lacking. I am glad to hear the parliamentary secretary say that aboriginals are doing well. I told him as much. In my riding, aboriginals are doing very well, just as non-aboriginals are. There are many successes, but there are also many pockets of poverty. Obviously resolving the social housing problem helps eliminate the pockets of poverty.

In Quebec, we need \$700 million for 7,000 housing units. The shortfall gets bigger every year. If this problem is not resolved, the gap will widen further and the 7,000 units we need now will become 8,000 units in a few years' time.

As we know, this lack of housing has extremely dire human and social consequences. Health issues are closely linked to the lack of housing. It is high time to stop the increase in the number of cases of poisoning, infection, tuberculosis and so on. It is also worrying to see the incidence of diabetes, fetal alcoholism and suicide.

● (1310)

Suicide is a serious problem, although it should be noted that the rates vary considerably from one community to another. Nonetheless, the overall rate is much too high. Knowing that the suicide rate is five to seven times greater among first nations youth than among non-aboriginal youth, and that the suicide rate among Inuit youth is among the highest in the world, some 11 times higher than the Canadian average, it is urgent to invest time and money. There is no need for consultations since everyone knows these statistics. It is high time to devote resources to dealing with the increased rate of suicide.

As far as education is concerned, if the government ever decided to address the problem, it would take 27 to 28 years to narrow the gap between aboriginals and other Quebecers and Canadians, according to the Auditor General's 2004 report. That is saying something.

The Auditor General told us that the gap between Quebecers, Canadians and aboriginal peoples is 27 to 28 years if it is to be addressed based on federal government spending in 2004. That is why the Kelowna accord was important, but, once again, the Conservative Party has decided to continue to hold consultations.

The gap will widen as the Conservatives consult. Apparently this has become the Conservatives' magic recipe: travel and consult.

The multiple reports of the Auditor General, the observations of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples and, more recently, the last report of the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, namely on living conditions of aboriginal peoples in Canada, sound the alarm. The United Nations published a report on the living conditions of aboriginal peoples in Canada and the situation is considered alarming. This is not something we can deny. Reports have been written about it. The Conservatives tell us more consultations are needed. Yet the United Nations produced a report on the living conditions of aboriginal peoples in Canada. I do not understand why we are not taking action, unless it is because we want to save even more money at the expense of the poor. That is the reality, that is what is happening. For the past two weeks we have watched the Conservative party play politics at the expense of those most in need. It goes looking for money, makes cuts to programs and that is what is being done to aboriginal peoples. We carry on, no investments are made, the money promised at Kelowna is not forthcoming and, obviously, savings are had. But for what? We shall see some day. They will probably use it to help their friends. They are going to catch the Liberal sickness.

Aboriginal peoples have already presented to Ottawa this study by the United Nations as well as their own. But Ottawa has always turned a deaf ear.

On the eve of the first ministers' conference, the Bloc Québécois publicly supported the shared position of the Assembly of First Nations of Quebec and Labrador and Quebec Native Women, who rejected the government's actions. Aboriginal peoples have already conducted their own analysis of the situation under the auspices of the Assembly of First Nations.

Quebec Native Women has already carried out its own study. The Assembly of First Nations of Quebec and Quebec Native Women deplored the fact that the approach used to diminish the gap between living conditions of aboriginal peoples and those of Quebecers and Canadians would not tackle the root causes of the first nations' plight, that is the absence of equitable access to land and resources as well as respect for their rights.

Earlier today the parliamentary secretary announced some trifling measures, but the real problems are not being addressed.

Aboriginals, first nations and Quebec Native Women are telling us plainly that there is no equitable access to lands and resources, and no respect for their rights. The Assembly of First Nations of Quebec and Labrador and Quebec Native Women also deplore the fact that the Kelowna objective's pan-aboriginal approach and lack of community consultations to target the real issues would perpetuate the first nations' cycle of dependency.



*Routine Proceedings*

The Bloc Québécois believes we need concrete solutions that are in tune with all of the different aboriginal nations and that go to the root of the inequalities that affect their communities. Furthermore, these measures must be decided in concert with aboriginal nations because money alone cannot solve these problems.

The Bloc Québécois believes that an agreement was reached in Kelowna, and that there was \$5.1 billion on the table. Great—that is a start. Now we are ready. Let us sit down with the first nations, with the aboriginal peoples, and find solutions to their problems. Aboriginal communities are not all the same. We cannot approach this from a pan-aboriginal perspective. We have to sit down and talk about it. However, we should not go about it like the Conservative Party, which talks a lot but does not put up the cash. They will talk and talk, they will beat around the bush, then eventually they will come up with some money, but the problem will go on.

In the end, ten years will have passed and the problem will have gotten worse: more housing units will be needed; health problems will not have been resolved, but will have worsened; and furthermore, the education gap will not have been bridged. It is estimated it will take 30 to 35 years to bridge the education gap. All of this because the Conservative party decided to save money in the short term at great cost to our most vulnerable citizens, aboriginals.

• (1315)

We know in this House that commitments to aboriginal Canadians—particularly concerning housing, infrastructure, education and health care—are federal jurisdictions.

I do not believe this will be questioned. As the Bloc Québécois has always maintained, Ottawa must not default on its fiduciary obligations. It must be understood that this is a federal jurisdiction. All too often, this House hears criticism about federal attempts to take over provincial jurisdictions.

Here is a striking example: our Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec wanted to create a Marshall plan in an area of jurisdiction that, once again, is not federal. Regional economic development is a provincial jurisdiction.

The federal government has the fiduciary responsibility for any problems facing aboriginal peoples, yet it is not resolving those problems. They do not want to spend any money, yet they want to create programs.

The Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec wanted to create a vast Marshall plan to provide assistance to all areas of Quebec. He finally coughed up a mouse this week: \$85 million over three years. Moreover, this money is recycled from other programs, money that was not already spent. Once again, this is not a federal jurisdiction.

Some would argue that the Supreme Court said that the federal government has the spending power and can therefore spend its money however it likes. This is true. It has the power to do so. The Supreme Court granted that power. However, the Constitution says that regional development is a provincial jurisdiction. That is the reality.

Thus, they are not minding their own business. They are not resolving aboriginal peoples' problems, or a number of others. Rather, they are trying to invest or gain visibility in areas that are not federal jurisdictions.

The Conservative government's approach to managing aboriginal issues is not very reassuring. For example, a plan to guarantee safe drinking water in first nations communities is commendable in and of itself. The idea is a good one. However, there is cause for concern when the initiative excludes the communities in the greatest need, those with no drinking water system that still bring water in. The plan targeted communities that had drinking water systems, but there was no money for those that did not. That shows how the Conservatives are managing this issue.

Moreover, the plan to ensure safe drinking water explains that:

First Nations are responsible for the construction, design, operation and maintenance of their water systems. INAC provides funding to First Nations for these activities, subject to the appropriate technical review and funding approval process.

With this initiative, the Conservative government is telling communities that not only is no new money being committed to implement the plan, but communities in the greatest need could lose their funding if they fail the INAC approval process. This is totally unacceptable. It shows a lack of trust in our aboriginal peoples. The government is setting up an inspection system that they might spend money on, but that does not mean that the government is going to pay them. It is not paying anything up front; work is done, but then is inspected, and there is no guarantee that the money will be paid out in the end.

The first budget the Conservatives brought down is also indicative of the new approach of this so-called new government. Aboriginal communities have critical socioeconomic problems. The situation is untenable in some cases. The Bloc Québécois does not believe that the \$450 million over two years that has been announced will be enough to respond appropriately.

We must not forget that the Kelowna agreement provided for \$5.1 billion over five years. This is nowhere near that.

I said it earlier, and I will quote from the minister's letter again, because it is really something to hear what the Conservatives are saying today: the minister writes to the committee chair that "The time has come to build on what was decided in November 2005—". That was it. He figures that decisions were made. One of those decisions was to invest \$5.1 billion, but the money is not there. When the time comes to talk money and to help those in our society who are most in need, the Conservatives consult, travel, visit, listen and take so long to do anything that the issue will never be addressed.

In its search for a new and better approach to managing aboriginal issues, the Conservative government should start with the findings of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. The commission, which cost \$58 million, was set up when the Conservatives were in power and was paid for with Quebec and Canadian taxpayers' dollars, but since the report was released, its conclusions have been completely ignored.

*Routine Proceedings*

The government wants to hold a new round of consultations. Yet the Conservatives have already paid for consultations: the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. The commission's report is not being used. Like other reports, it is gathering dust.

• (1320)

This enables us to travel, visit first nations, find out just how bad their situation is and bemoan their plight. Unfortunately, nothing gets resolved and no money is forthcoming despite a Conservative-mandated royal commission that cost \$58 million and produced a report the Liberals chose to ignore.

One might have thought the Conservatives would have gone back to the royal commission's conclusions and would have tried to apply them, rather than consulting, visiting and travelling.

The Bloc Québécois supports the report—that is what I have been saying all along. Among other things, we support the implementation of the Kelowna accord. The commitments the federal government made in Kelowna are the first step toward bridging the gap between aboriginals and Quebecers and Canadians. However, the Bloc Québécois finds that the underlying causes of these inequalities have not yet been corrected.

Aboriginals must be given all of the tools they need to direct the development of their own identity: the right to self-government and recognition of their rights. The Bloc Québécois has always supported this. Furthermore, we demand that the funds promised during the Kelowna conference be delivered.

We were open to having a discussion at this conference. When we agreed on the \$7.1 billion, we realized that there would be discussions with aboriginal peoples to ensure that the funds would not be uniformly distributed in standardized programs. We were aware that we would have to take action based on needs. At least we had an agreement on the amount of money.

I would like to state once again that Kelowna is not the only issue that the Conservatives are not interested in addressing. As I mentioned earlier, when I read the minister's letter, he stated that conclusions were arrived at and decisions made at Kelowna. However, the Conservatives do not believe in making monetary investments. We witnessed it this week: when the time comes to help those most in need and the weakest in our society, the Conservative party stands aside; it prefers to give money to the rich, not the poor.

With regard to future relations between the government and aboriginal peoples, we recommend a more comprehensive approach, one that recognizes the aspirations of aboriginal peoples and one that favours negotiating agreements nation to nation.

The Bloc Québécois believes that Quebec is a nation, that the aboriginal peoples are nations and that Canada is a nation on an equal footing with the others, and that these nations must negotiate with one another in order to arrive at agreements and real solutions.

I also wish to point out in this House that we agree entirely with the idea of the right to self-government of aboriginal peoples. In more general terms, we identify with the aboriginal peoples' claims for autonomy; we recognize aboriginal peoples as distinct peoples with the right to their own culture, language, customs and traditions as well as the right to direct the development of their own identity.

In closing, I remind you that the Bloc Québécois endorsed the main recommendations of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples and the Erasmus-Dussault report. This commission set out an approach for self-government based on recognition of aboriginal governments as a level of government with authority over issues of good governance and the well-being of their people. The entire report is based on recognition of the aboriginal peoples as self-governing nations occupying a unique place in Canada.

• (1325)

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** Questions and comments. The hon. member for Fort McMurray—Athabasca should be mindful that there is less than two minutes for both the question and the answer.

**Mr. Brian Jean (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of questions for my hon. colleague. I have always found him to be a very reasonable gentleman, but I am curious in this particular case.

I worked in Alberta in the legal field for some time doing divorce and matrimonial law. I always found the position the government has taken in the past, the Liberal government primarily, on matrimonial property rights on reserves to be a total embarrassment actually, and totally shameful.

I have many family members who live in northern Alberta on reserves, on three particular reserves. I am always mindful of what takes place for them and how shocking it is that a mother with children, if she leaves her husband, can be tossed out on the street like a piece of baggage, yet the Liberal government in the past has done nothing to stand up for those women and children.

I am wondering if the member could comment briefly on the great initiative that this government and the minister has taken on this particular subject.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Laframboise:** Mr. Speaker, the division of matrimonial property rights can be part of a discussion. However, when families are too poor to get housing, and too poor to be healthy or to get a good education, I do not understand how the problem can be solved.

The Conservatives are trying to shift the debate. Yes, it is true that the division of matrimonial property rights is a problem. However, why not solve at the same time the housing, education and health problems?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** It is my duty to interrupt the debate on the motion. Consequently, the debate on the motion is deferred to a future sitting. There will be eight minutes and fifteen seconds left to ask questions of the member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel.

[*English*]

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

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1330)

[English]

### CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from May 31, consideration of the motion that Bill C-277, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (luring a child), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. John Maloney (Welland, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill C-277, a one paragraph bill that simply proposes to double the maximum sentence for communicating on the Internet for the purposes of luring a child from five years to ten years.

No one will doubt that the act of luring a child over the Internet is simply reprehensible. In June 2002 the former Liberal minister of justice, Martin Cauchon, announced that tough new legislation protecting children from sexual exploitation, Internet luring and child pornography received royal assent.

The new law fulfilled a commitment made in the 2001 Speech from the Throne. The legislation also met with commitments undertaken by the federal, provincial and territorial ministers of justice at their meeting in September 2000 to create a new offence of Internet luring. In these discussions, the penalty for this offence would have been discussed and a consensus would have been reached.

In the justice committee's deliberations on this new section of the Criminal Code, I was impressed with the presentation of a report on child exploitation and the Internet submitted by the Canadian Resource Centre for the Victims of Crime, and I wish to reference some of the information provided.

The Internet has made the world a smaller place. It has also made it more dangerous for our children. While we encourage our children to take advantage of the benefits of the net as a wonderful tool for education and obtaining information, we must also ensure that they are aware of the dangers and that we take the necessary steps to protect them. There is a dark side to the Internet.

Chat rooms have opened up our homes to virtual strangers who can pretend to be anyone, any age and either sex. They can talk to children in complete secrecy. They can prey on a child as the child's parents sit in the very next room. They can entice a child to meet in person, where the risk of sexual abuse becomes imminent, and they do. Pedophiles who used to be isolated can now find victims without leaving the security of their own homes, at little expense and reduced risk of being caught.

Millions of children are online in their own homes, in public libraries, schools, or at a friend's house. Children who come home from school to an empty house may turn to the Internet as much as they used to turn to television. They may not feel any threat by talking to someone online, especially when they believe it is a child like themselves. After a few weeks or months of communication, they are not strangers any more and that new-found friend is actually a sexual predator ready to claim another unsuspecting victim.

The Internet does not respect any global boundaries. This makes it difficult to police. Experienced users were operating with virtual

### *Private Members' Business*

anonymity, although law enforcement in some parts of the world are struggling to catch up. Countries like Canada have recognized this new form of child sexual exploitation and have begun to dedicate the necessary resources and attention to this growing problem.

The protection of children has always been a priority for Canadians as well. As more and more Canadians recognize the value of the Internet and get online in their homes, the risks to their children increase as online predators go searching for new victims. There is an acknowledgement, both inside and outside Canada, that we need a coordinated law enforcement to deal with this problem.

Pedophiles may use the Internet for a variety of reasons, including validation through communication with like-minded people, to find potential victims and to trade child pornography. Pedophiles who use the Internet to search new victims may be the predatory type who have above average intelligence and have the economic means to operate the Internet, as was referenced in the publication "Use of Computers in the Sexual Exploitation of Children".

Some online services and Internet service providers allow parents to limit access by their children to certain services and features, such as adult oriented websites, chat rooms and bulletin boards. In addition, there are filtering features built into the popular Internet browsers that empower parents to limit their children's access only to those sites that have been rated appropriate for children. Other useful tools are software programs that block websites, newsgroups and chat areas that are known to be inappropriate for children.

Most of these programs can be configured by the parent to filter out sites that contain nudity, sexual content, hateful or violent material, or that advocate the use of drugs, tobacco or alcohol. Some can also be configured to prevent children from revealing information about themselves, such as their name, address or telephone number. They help, but they are not foolproof.

Children benefit from being online, but can also be targets of crime and exploitation in this as in any other environment. Just like there are good and bad people in schools, parks and our homes, there are good and bad people on the net.

• (1335)

The fact that crimes are being committed online, however, is not a reason to avoid using these services. To tell children to stop using these services would be like telling parents not to send their kids to school because of some high profile cases of teachers preying on their students. Parents need to instruct children about both the benefits and dangers of cyberspace, and how to protect themselves.

We all have a stake in protecting our children. Governments, Internet service providers, educators and others should focus resources and efforts into educating children and parents about the dangers that the Internet presents.

*Private Members' Business*

There are over 100 million Internet users around the globe. The overwhelming majority are people who use the net for work, research or to communicate with family and friends. Even if cyberstalkers and predators represent only a small percentage of users, we are still talking about a significant number of offenders and even more potential victims.

The complexity of the Internet means that solutions are equally complex. The net is truly international and laws about crime committed against children, in particular child pornography, vary from country to country.

We owe it to our children to do what we can to protect them from predators, whether it is a family friend, camp counsellor or a pedophile on the net. It is only logical that Canada would enforce the same laws on the net that we do in the real world. While this may be a difficult challenge, society's efforts to protect children must not change simply because technology has changed.

The global nature of the Internet makes any police response difficult because offenders and/or victims may not be in the same country. This underscores the need for an international approach to this problem and Canada must be at the forefront of such an initiative.

Society is only now beginning to learn of the dark side of the Internet. The sexual exploitation of children is only one of the many other types of crimes committed online. Sabotage, fraud and hacking all present major problems for companies, individuals and governments, and all deserve a law enforcement response. However, there is no more precious commodity than our children and no more important priority than their well-being.

What is an appropriate sentence for the Internet luring of a child? That is really the crux of the debate today. I would suggest that there are a wide range of opinions. For a child who has been sexually abused or harmed in other ways, and most especially the parents and friends of such child, 10 years imprisonment as suggested by the bill may be inadequate. That is an understandable response. For the sponsor of the bill a maximum of 10 years is more in line of what he feels is appropriate.

For the government of the day four short years ago and its justice minister, as well as the justice ministers of our 10 provinces and three territories, five years imprisonment would have been an appropriate response. The approach of the Conservative government and its predecessors, the Canadian Alliance and the Reform Party, have the same theme: more incarceration and double, triple the prison times. That will certainly deter child sex predators and pedophiles, that will be the fix for them.

Four years ago the former Liberal government put in place this offence with a sentence that was thought to be appropriate under the circumstances. Before we change that sentence, I would like to see the empirical evidence and statistics to support the premise that an increase in penalties, a doubling of penalties, is warranted. Then we can respond to this legislation in an informed and educated way.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Nicole Demers (Laval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise this afternoon to speak to Bill C-277.

Indeed, as members probably know, I have a 13-year-old grandson of whom I have legal custody. This issue is very important to me because I am aware that for a 13-year-old child, chatting on the Internet is much more interesting than doing homework. Every day I have to bring myself to discipline him to make him understand that too much chatting is not good.

Unfortunately, I believe this bill does not achieve the goals that it sets out to achieve. The Bloc Québécois has always recognized the need to better protect children and it took an active part in the pursuit of this goal, including through the recent addition of provisions on the luring of children to the Criminal Code. However, the increased maximum sentence proposed in Bill C-277 for this offence is aimed specifically and deliberately at increasing the scope of Bill C-9 on conditional sentencing.

In fact, Bill C-277, combined with Bill C-9, will give judges less flexibility and will take away from them the possibility of handing down a conditional sentence in certain minor cases. Currently, conditional sentences allow judges to give a person who is not a threat to society a sentence of less than two years to be served in the community.

Bill C-9, introduced by the Conservatives in the spring, eliminates conditional sentences for offences punishable by a maximum of 10 years or more.

The Bloc Québécois opposes this bill because the list of offences for which conditional sentences would be eliminated is arbitrary and includes offences such as graffiti, counterfeit money, credit fraud, false prospectus and mail theft.

Furthermore, by removing judges' prerogatives to order sentences in the community, Quebec and the other provinces would assume the additional financial burden of having to imprison more people, while that money could be better spent on rehabilitation and prevention.

The Bloc wants to do whatever it takes to protect children from predators. Unfortunately, the Bloc believes that Bill C-277 is not the way to achieve this.

Once again, the ideology of this Conservative government is modeled after the Americans. The government's proposal is based on the slogan *Tough on crime*. The idea behind this is simple, that is, to put as many criminals as possible in prison where the living conditions are intolerable and to keep them there as long as possible.

According to the Conservatives, this should get the criminals off the streets and dissuade others from committing crimes.

Furthermore, they believe that punishment is the key to controlling crime. The philosophy behind their policy is this: if penalties are lax, crime rates go up; if they are tough, crime rates come down.

However, our American neighbours have proven that this model does not work. The homicide rate in the United States is three times higher than in Canada, and four times higher than in Quebec. California spent \$14 billion to build prisons between 1982 and 1993. The prison population increased by 500% and the overall crime rate went up by 75%.

In 1992, the situation was compared to that of Texas, which reacted very differently to the pressure on its prison system in the 1980s. In an economic recession, Texas decided to build fewer prisons and to impose more conditional releases. The only difference noted between the two crime rates was a certain increase in the repetitive nature of offences against property, although certain indications also attributed this to high unemployment rates in Texas during that time.

According to the information available, there is simply no compelling evidence that imprisonment or various periods of imprisonment have a greater deterrent effect, even for property offences. There are even some reasons to believe the opposite: recidivism rates for imprisoned offenders are higher than those for individuals given non-custodial sentences.

• (1340)

This is why the Bloc Québécois disagrees with this way of thinking, and it is not alone. In the 1988 report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General entitled “Taking Responsibility”, the committee admits that imprisonment has had no effect on rehabilitation, has not been a great deterrent and has contributed to protecting society only temporarily.

It also says that sure solutions to crime prevention are further sharing of wealth, working on better social integration and relying on rehabilitation. We can also see the success of the Quebec model, based on rehabilitation. There are fewer violent crimes in Quebec than anywhere else in Canada.

In the past, the Bloc Québécois has taken concrete measures on several occasions to better protect citizens. As evidence of this, we have antigang legislation, the reversal of the burden of proof, the reopening of RCMP detachments—thus better border region security—and protection against sexual exploitation and forced labour. The Bloc Québécois pressed the government to give priority to adopting this bill that will provide more legal tools to police officers in the fight against the scourge of sexual exploitation and forced labour. We also have a DNA bank. These are real tools that we can work with. Imprisonment is never the best solution.

Victims of violence are always foremost in our concerns.

Better protection for citizens is also and primarily accomplished by attacking the root of the problem and the causes of crime and violence. Poverty, inequality, and feeling excluded are the breeding grounds of crime.

The report by the Association des services de réhabilitation sociale du Québec deems conditional sentencing to be a tough, safe, and coherent measure that serves as a deterrent. In addition to its punitive value, conditional sentencing promotes the social reintegration of offenders without compromising the safety of our communities.

This measure, which has the support of the public, makes it possible to have a longer period of supervision for offenders jailed for committing similar offences. Abolishing conditional sentencing for more than 160 offences will not lead to improved safety of our communities. On the contrary, in the medium and long term, safety could be compromised.

### *Private Members' Business*

Incarceration, particularly when unnecessary, can significantly impact offenders and their families in several ways: it can lead to loss of employment, poverty, isolation, worsening of social problems, loss of custody of children, inability to carry out certain responsibilities, loss of independence and so forth. These factors can place offenders and their families in a situation that is even more precarious and that could increase the chance of recidivism or firmly establish a lifestyle based on crime.

Before handing down a conditional sentence, the judge must make sure that the offender does not represent a threat to society. This helps ensure that conditional sentencing is a safe alternative.

It is also said that serving time in prison tends to increase the risk of reoffending, as compared to community-based sentences. That is also true. We are talking about crimes that can sometimes be abhorrent in some instances and pretty minor in other instances, but the judge could no longer use his or her discretion in sentencing. That is really dangerous.

Public opinion is in favour of conditional sentencing, while showing a legitimate concern about the individuals' dangerousness and about certain types of violent crimes. The Supreme Court of Canada has pointed out that conditional sentences are designed not only to punish and denounce, but also to rehabilitate. The highest court of the land further stated that such a sentence provides an alternative which promotes both monitoring and behavioural improvement.

Moreover, this is a sentence that allows people to show that they are able to function properly in society, to take responsibility for their behaviour and to abide by the mandatory and optional terms and conditions of the conditional sentence order.

I will conclude with these words of my brilliant colleague from Hochelaga:

Let me be clear, we are not saying that luring children is not important... It is not that the member's bill... is not important. In fact, it is so important that we supported it when it was introduced by the previous government. We cannot, however, agree with the idea of increasing the sentence from five years to ten so that people who are found guilty of luring children under the Criminal Code cannot serve their sentence in the community—

• (1345)

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to respond to the private member's bill of the member of Parliament for Abbotsford.

I want to begin my remarks by putting things into context from my perspective.

As a teacher, I was involved with training young people about media awareness. I had the pleasure to work with the Media Awareness Network, which is based in Ottawa. Its work has been picked up and used as a model throughout the country. In fact, it is internationally renowned. What it does is educate young people. As its name suggests, it brings to schools, to children and to young people the tools they need to navigate not only the Internet, but various other media as well.

*Private Members' Business*

This is really important. All we have to do is turn on the television, walk down the streets and see the billboards, or look at our magazine stands. I believe we have taken the wrong direction in our society in how we display children and women and how we have sexualized and turned women and children into objects. Part of luring is about objectification, how we have commodified human beings.

I have two young boys. Sadly, it is something that I have had to educate them about at a very early age, about why we have magazines displayed that objectify women in advertising to sell products, when it has nothing to do with the product. We have this kind of pollution put in front of us and seemingly as a society we okay it or we do not do much about it.

With Media Awareness Network, we were able to teach students from the elementary level to high school and show them what kinds of media were out there and how to interpret some of the images. Let us be honest, it is quite confusing for someone who is four, five or six years of age to see some of these images in magazines, on television screens and on the Internet, and to try to understand how that relates to what they see in their everyday lives.

Quite clearly, if one were to take all the images that are thrown at our young people and children, put them in a context and say that this is reality, I think we would find that most children would be very confused and very disturbed if they were not given the guidance that most parents and teachers give. They need to be told that this is not reality, that this is a version of someone's reality and it does not reflect our human family and our human dimensions.

I wanted to start off with that because in essence what we are talking about is the objectification, the exploitation, the sexualization of young people, of children and of women, and we have seen that in the past. That is the heart of this issue. It is how we can tackle what really has become the commodification of human beings.

With that in mind, what we did with the Media Awareness Network was put young people onto the Internet and have them show us the kinds of sites and images that they saw on a day to day basis. This had to do with advertising, the kinds of things that kids are confronted with all the time. We pointed out there were places that were dangerous and what they should do if someone talked to them on a chat line, how to prevent being lured and why these people do this. Again, it is very confusing for young people. Quite rightly, we hope, young people trust others. Sadly, there are people who exploit that.

• (1350)

What we really need to do is give them the tools to ensure they are not victimized. On that I guess I am a little surprised at the government's approach to this. On certain days we will hear the government say that this kind of behaviour is the fault of poor parenting. In essence, what it saying is that the government will be the parent because the parents are unable to do this. The government will make sure it does it. It will have the big hand of the law and take care of everything.

I am sad to say that this is not good enough and it is intellectually incongruent with what this political party asserts most of the time.

I also have to mention this weeks cutbacks to literacy to help grassroots organizations, schools, community organizations and libraries. They work with young people to give them the tools they need to ensure they are aware of what is out there, the kinds of predators, the pitfalls when one turns on a computer. They need to know there are people out there of whom they should be weary.

I find it strange that we have a government that on the one hand is saying we need to have a law like this, I would suppose, and without prejudice, because it would take care of the problem of luring children. On the other hand the government seems to be taking away all the tools that have been provided to prevent this. Ultimately, the way to deal with problems such as luring children is to prevent hee crime from happening.

I want to turn my attention to what has been done to date in other jurisdictions and what can be done. For the Ottawa police service and for many other police services, one of the problems they have right now is they do not have the tools to deal with the Internet being used as a tool, be it for luring children or for other crimes. Yet as Canadians, we are probably best suited to deal with this problem. We are at the top of the class in developing software and other IT tools to track this kind of phenomena. We have seen that when we have had to deal with and seriously take on concerns around terrorism.

On the other hand, when we are talking about police services and their ability and financial and human capacity to deal with Internet crimes, it seems as though it is an afterthought. That is not because they have not identified it. I happen to know the people on the police services board in Ottawa. I happen to know that this is a concern around the country, and I am sure other members know this. One of the problems police services are having right now is they do not have enough person power. They do not have enough of the IT tools that are necessary. Particularly, the police do not have people who are trained and who can remain in those positions.

This is the kind of approach we need. It is the kind of thing we need to do to prevent these kinds of crimes from happening. We need to be able to identify predators who are on line. Then we can arrest these people and make sure something can happen before the crime happens.

My major concern about the bill is not enough attention has been paid the prevention of crime. I extend that to an analysis on the approach the government seems to be taking on crime in general. Getting tough on crime is hard to argue with in some instances. However, it begs the question, what is the government doing to protect people and prevent these crimes?

If we are unable to have a debate and to put in the tools to prevent crime, then we are not fulfilling our responsibility and our jobs as legislators. Ultimately, we have failed our communities and we have failed children.

• (1355)

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Abbotsford for his hard work on Bill C-277 and for bringing it to this House.

I would also like to comment on some of the addresses that have been made in the House.

*Private Members' Business*

The Liberal member said that more information is needed to find out whether or not this bill is on the right track. Then let us send this bill to committee so we can have that debate and let us hear from the witnesses.

The Bloc has said that rehabilitation is needed. Let us send the bill to committee so that we can hear from the witnesses how to rehabilitate these pedophiles.

The NDP has just said that we need to prevent the crime and provide the tools. Let us send this bill to committee so that we can find out what tools are needed.

Bill C-277 addresses the seriousness of a criminal behaviour that targets our children: Internet luring.

Since 2002 it has been a crime in Canada to use the Internet to communicate with a child for the purpose of facilitating the commission of child sexual exploitation or abduction against a child. Because we criminalize this behaviour, we have to be able to track for the first time the prevalence of this type of activity.

Over 600 Internet luring cases have been referred to the police by Cybertip since 2002. The trend seems to show that it is becoming an increasingly more common problem.

Cybertip has been Canada's national tip line for child sexual exploitation on the Internet. It has been in operation collecting valuable data and referring child sexual exploitation cases to the police since 2002. The data provided by Cybertip.ca and the anecdotal evidence that has been collected over the last four years paints a disturbing picture of a typical Internet luring case.

Picture a man in his mid to late 30s who portrays himself as a 17-year-old boy, who spends his time online in teen chat rooms. Now picture a young girl, 13 years old, who likes to chat with her friends in the teen's chat room, where the conversations get a little racy. Imagine this man gaining the trust of this young girl, striking up a friendship, talking about life, love and sex. Imagine this man taking the relationship to another level, telephone calls, using webcams and perhaps even in-person meetings. This is a typical scenario and escalation of events in cases where a real victim is at risk.

This criminal behaviour is becoming increasingly prevalent, which means that Canadian children are increasingly at risk.

When the luring provision was originally enacted, it was introduced to address a problem. The problem was not related to luring per se because luring itself is not a new phenomenon but one that has been greatly facilitated by the Internet and its associated technologies.

The problem with the act of luring, the grooming and enticing of a young person, was at that time there was no specific offence of luring to commit a child sexual offence and it fell short of an attempt to commit a child sexual exploitation offence. Canadian jurisprudence that dealt with the issue of attempts required that the act, which would constitute the attempt, would be more than mere preparation. It would be difficult to characterize chat or email as more than mere preparation, hence, the creation of the offence of luring a child. The new offence criminalized communicating for the purpose of facilitating the commission of a child sexual exploitation or abduction offence.

Why is all of this very important? Because this is how the current penalty of the luring provision was determined.

Under the Criminal Code the penalty for attempts is half that of the substantive offence that was attempted. Therefore, since the new luring provision, in a way, criminalized activity that was somewhat less than what could normally be characterized as an attempt, it was seen as appropriate that the penalty should be half of what the other child sexual exploitation offences carried.

Today we look at Internet luring very differently. The prevalence of this criminal behaviour and the risk of physical contact have been two supporting factors for treating this crime more seriously.

• (1400)

However, it is the direct contact that is made between the predator and the victim via the Internet, where a relationship of trust is created for the sole purpose of exploiting the young person and betraying his or her trust, which escalates this behaviour above that of an attempt and puts it onto a level with that of the other child sexual exploitation offences.

The last time we debated the bill, a number of questions were posed in relation to it. After careful consideration of its aims and purposes, I think we may have the answers to those questions.

If members will allow me to refresh the collective memory of the House, the questions were the following. Does the existing penalty of Internet luring adequately reflect the serious nature of this offence, particularly in comparison to other contact child sexual offences? Would the proposed new maximum penalty be consistent with the penalty with contact child sexual offences? Would it be consistent with other measures that are currently before Parliament, including Bill C-9, which proposes Criminal Code reforms to prevent the use of conditional sentences for offences that carry a maximum penalty of 10 years' imprisonment or more?

These are good questions. I believe I have already answered the first question, in that the current penalty scheme does not adequately reflect the seriousness of this type of criminal behaviour. Internet luring should be treated in the same way as the other Criminal Code offences relating to child sexual exploitation.

*Private Members' Business*

Second, Bill C-277, as amended, which calls for increasing the maximum penalty on indictment and summary conviction for the luring offence to 10 years and 18 months respectively, is completely consistent with the maximum penalties for the other child sexual exploitation contact offences. Only two child sexual exploitation offences continue to have a five year maximum penalty on indictment. Both are related to child pornography, possession and accessing, where contact with the potential child victim is not an element of the offence.

Finally, the bill is also complementary to government bills currently before the House, namely Bill C-9, on conditional sentence of imprisonment, and Bill C-22, on the age of protection. Bill C-277 also fits into the government's priority on tackling crime and, more specifically, on treating child sex exploitation crimes more seriously.

If enacted, Bill C-277 would, by virtue of raising the maximum penalty on indictment for the luring offence to 10 years, bring the offence up to the threshold contemplated in Bill C-9, which would remove the possibility of a conditional sentence, or house arrest, if the accused was prosecuted by the way of indictment.

Bill C-9 in its current form proposes to remove the possibility of conditional sentencing orders, which we commonly refer to as house arrest, for all serious crimes. Bill C-9 currently defines serious crimes as those crimes that carry a penalty of 10 years or more on indictment. The use of conditional sentencing in child sexual exploitation cases has been seriously criticized and Bill C-277 and Bill C-9 together will answer that criticism in part.

Bill C-22, on the age of protection, although not directly linked to the penalty enhancements that are being proposed in Bill C-277, will expand the protective shield of section 172.1, the luring offence. Currently all children under 14 years are fully protected by section 172.1, but only some youth between 14 years and 18 years are protected by it. When Bill C-22 is enacted, the full protection of the luring offence will be extended to all children under 16 years.

New technologies, including the Internet, have created new opportunities for Canadians, and for the most part they have been extremely positive. However, they have also created new opportunities for would-be child molesters to anonymously and secretly enter into our homes through the Internet with a view to sexually exploiting our children.

Since its enactment in 2002, section 172.1 has served as a useful and effective tool for law enforcement and has resulted in convictions. In a recent Nova Scotia case, Kevin Randall was convicted of Internet luring as a result of engaging in explicit online communications with a person he believed was a 13-year-old girl but who was in reality an undercover police officer. The offender had arranged to meet the 13-year-old girl at a coffee shop, where the police apprehended him with a pocketful of condoms.

• (1405)

Clearly, section 172.1 is an important tool for law enforcement and it is being used to successfully secure the conviction of offenders. Our obligation as parliamentarians—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** Resuming debate. The hon. member for Mississauga South.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is a member in this place who does not have a great deal of concern about issues that impact children. The cliché is that children are our future, but they, together with seniors—and I suspect people would agree with me—are the most vulnerable in our society because they can be taken advantage of depending on their circumstances.

We really get into a situation where people are now saying that this is even more serious. In fact, I have had a private member's motion that called for more serious penalties for those who abuse a spouse as opposed to committing assault against another person, the reason being that when someone abuses their spouse, they are violating a trust relationship. Therefore, it is an exacerbating circumstance and the penalty should be greater than the penalty for simply getting into a fight with a stranger in a bar and punching him in the nose. There is something different and it is called an exacerbating factor.

I think members would agree that issues to do with harming children is an exacerbating factor. One member even said he did not think current penalties reflect the seriousness of the crime.

A Bloc member spoke about her grandchild and the need to take care of that grandchild to give it the guidance it needs. If something untoward happened to that grandchild and we asked what should be done in terms of the response of the juridical system, the person with the emotional attachment is going to say, "Throw away the key". The person will say that the individual who harmed that grandchild has absolutely no right to be in our society. That could be the solution to all serious crimes, to just throw away the key. The trouble is that it is not something we can do. I know that this point alone on just throwing away the key when people do bad things would be a very interesting debate in Parliament.

But in our system today, even those who commit the most serious crimes such as first degree murder, punishable by a sentence of 25 years' imprisonment, eventually will be released into society. They will be released with certain conditions, but they will be out of jail. That, in certain circumstances like the Clifford Olson crimes, is totally unacceptable. There are provisions for incarceration for longer periods of time, but in general first degree murderers eventually get back into society.

That is why our judicial system is based on the principle of rehabilitation. It means that if someone in jail for a serious crime admits their crime and takes programs to rehabilitate themselves to reintegrate into society, they may qualify for probation and get out a little earlier. That is only if they behave themselves and take the program. Those who do not want to probably do not even get probation. Many get turned down because they are not sorry for their crimes. They do not realize the seriousness of their crimes or the damage they have caused to society.



*Private Members' Business*

I am going to support Bill C-277 at second reading to go to committee. I am going to recommend it to my caucus colleagues because I think that although we have had a very large debate going on in Parliament, very piecemeal, this private member's bill may very well be the proxy for us to start talking about the whole sentencing and judicial model and whether or not we have confidence in our judges and in the courts, and whether we believe that some cases are different from others, even for the same crime. I can give members an example.

For instance, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba surveyed people in their prisons and found that about 50% of them suffered from alcohol related birth defects, fetal alcohol syndrome. It is a mental illness. Rehabilitation is not applicable to them, but they are in jail. Why are they in jail? They committed crimes, but they did not know the difference between right and wrong. Should they get the same penalty? Should they be in the same system where rehabilitation is what we do? Probably not. They should probably be in appropriate institutions to help them learn how to cope with their disability and their mental health.

• (1410)

The courts have taken a greater latitude in looking at each case individually to find out whether there are exacerbating or in fact mitigating circumstances. I do not believe the latitude can be taken away from the courts and judges to be able to determine whether there are exacerbating or mitigating factors.

This bill, although it is very simple in saying to just increase the penalties from 5 to 10 years, is quite straightforward, but the enormity of the implications and the breadth of the discussion are absolutely phenomenal.

This is a hybrid offence. It means that matters can be handled by a summary conviction or by indictment. It may also still permit, in certain circumstances, conditional sentencing. It may in fact impose a mandatory minimum, effectively, in an inappropriate circumstance. I am not sure whether there is a model that is going to fit all. I am not sure whether raising the penalty from 5 to 10 years is going to be the best solution.

I am one member of Parliament. I have some concerns. I know we do not have the tools to be able to deal with these complex issues in debate of private members' business. We do not have the same opportunity to have a fulsome debate on the vital issues and all the relevant issues, but we do know one thing. We know that at committee we will have the opportunity to have that clear debate with the officials from the justice department and from groups and organizations who are advocating on behalf of protecting children and from the public at large through their members of Parliament. That is where this should happen. That is why I think it is extremely important that we get this bill to committee.

I should specifically indicate with regard to the bill that although it simply doubles the sentence from 5 to 10 years for a conviction by indictment for luring a child into a sexual act through the Internet, the bill does not alter the existing availability of summary conviction procedure, where the maximum sentence would be six months in prison. People will never understand a sentence of six months' imprisonment for someone who is a sexual predator. There is something wrong with that, and I agree.

It appears there is a second purpose of the bill. That is to bring this offence within a class of offences for which government Bill C-9 would remove conditional sentencing as an option if and only if proceeded with by indictment. We have to note that all other sentencing options, including suspended sentence, probation, fines, et cetera, would in fact remain with this bill whether the indictment or summary procedure was used. It is not exactly as advertised, as just increasing the sentence from 5 to 10 years. There is a lot more included in the family of possible outcomes with regard to a case.

The offence of luring in section 172.1 prohibits only communication to facilitate possible sexual acts. It is not the actual acts themselves that are dealt with. So the bill may be short, but the implications and the related issues are very broad.

I would like to conclude. I tend to agree with the speaker from the New Democratic Party who wanted to reach out to the House and to Canadians and say that bad things happen in this world but human beings are not born bad. They are a function of their environment. Loving, caring parents who guide them and give them a good sense of values help them to grow up to be good contributing members of society, but those who do not get that loving, that caring and that teaching obviously are the ones who have a higher probability of getting into some difficulty.

We do not need just tougher sentences. We still have to use all of the tools available. They involve prevention and education. They involve rehabilitation. They involve, in some cases, mandatory minimum sentences. In other cases, quite frankly, they require putting a person away and throwing away the key because there are cases that turn out like that.

I want to thank the member for bringing the bill forward, but I think members have shown the House that this bill has many more sweeping implications and that it should go to committee for us to properly address those other aspects of the bill.

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Serge Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we can generally say that bills introduced by backbenchers are well intentioned. Members are rather radical in the solutions that they offer, probably because it is so difficult for them to take their bills all the way to the House, and it is even rarer that they get them passed. That is perhaps what is happening here.

All members of my party and of this House certainly feel that child exploitation in one form or another—whether sexual exploitation, which is one of the worst forms of violence, or child exploitation for economic or other purposes—is an absolutely reprehensible type of conduct that is naturally condemned. However, the clause at hand deals with only one means of luring children: through the Internet.

*Private Members' Business*

However, if the individual continues, if he or she commits other offences, even rape, after luring the child through the Internet, these offences will be liable to tougher maximum sentences, up to and including life imprisonment. This can lead, in many cases, to more than 10 years of imprisonment, so that the judge must apply the maximum five-year sentence for luring. Moreover, he or she can decide to impose a concurrent sentence.

Certainly, when the judge makes the decision, he will consider the added rape or sexual exploitation, taking into account the fact that this started with the luring of a child through the Internet. Luring is thus secondary to offences that people find really reprehensible and that already carry very tough penalties under the Criminal Code. I say very tough, but I see that there are now in this House a majority of members who believe that we are never tough enough in Canada.

This is all too apparent in this bill. It is not that a five-year sentence for luring a child—in addition to the sentence the offender will serve if, in the worst case, he goes as far as committing rape or sexual assault—is deemed insufficient. The worst cases will be treated according to the offence committed. No, that is not the issue. It is that some would like this offence to be in another category. They want to put it in a category where a judge cannot impose a sentence of deprivation of liberty. They want this offence to be punishable by a sentence to be served in the community.

I do not know why this fairly recent provision in the Criminal Code is being attacked. I believe it was approved in 1996 or 1998. I think it was 1998. I do not know of any serious studies that show that judges have abused this provision, especially since they still have recourse to probation, with what is called a suspended sentence.

The difference between a conditional sentence and a suspended sentence is very simple. Under a suspended sentence, the accused is released under certain terms and conditions. No sentence is passed by the judge. If the accused abides by these terms and conditions, the judge will no longer have the ability to pass sentence. But if the accused violates the terms and conditions, he or she will be brought back before the judge to receive the sentence the judge could have passed initially. At that time, the judge may adjust the sentence, imposing a tougher or lighter one.

Under a conditional sentence, the judge gives a sentence of two years or less, which the accused may serve in the community under certain terms and conditions. These generally include a curfew requiring the individuals to be home by a certain time in the evening, the obligation to work, the obligation to support their family, and so on. If the terms and conditions are violated, then the accused has to serve the rest of his or her sentence in prison.

In other words, a person sentenced to serve 18 months at home who abides by the terms and conditions for 17 straight months, and then violates them after 17,5 months, will have to spend two weeks in prison to finish serving his or her sentence.

• (1420)

Had the same person received a suspended sentence and violated the terms and conditions after 17 months, the judge would have said, "I gave you a break; now, I am sentencing you to imprisonment".

The Bloc Québécois is among those who have most actively promoted this change to the Criminal Code. We believed that the

legislation had to take into account new technologies and the new ways they provide of luring children. The Bloc Québécois therefore supported the establishment of a new offence. This needs, however, to be set in a broader context. We also have to look at the offence of using a computer to lure a child from the perspective of sexual assault. I think members will agree that sexual assault is a more serious offence than luring a child. Bear in mind that a child is under the age of 18 or 16—

• (1425)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** I am sorry, but I must interrupt the member for Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, since there are only five minutes left in the debate. These last five minutes are provided to the sponsor of the bill, the hon. member for Abbotsford.

[English]

**Mr. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to close the debate on what I believe is a significant step forward in protecting the rights of children across Canada in order to be safe from sexual predators.

As the sponsor of the bill, I am encouraged by the support the bill has received today. I had hoped that debate on this bill would transcend our partisan differences and for the most part it has. I especially want to thank those members of the opposition parties who have agreed to support the bill at least as far as the committee stage is concerned. For those who have expressed concerns, I respect those perspectives. I am hoping that all members of the House will at least agree to have the bill sent to committee for further review.

There may be some who will ask whether the bill is an overreaction to the problem of child luring. I would respond by looking at the experience in other countries such as Britain, Australia and yes, the United States. When we look at the maximum sentences for child luring in those jurisdictions, we see a range of 12 to 30 years in prison. In some cases the legislation provides for mandatory minimum sentences of five years.

By comparison, Bill C-277 represents a relatively modest increase in the maximum sentence from 5 to 10 years imprisonment. As my colleagues know, our government has also introduced legislation, Bill C-9, which will remove conditional sentences including house arrest where serious crimes are concerned. Increasing the maximum sentence for child luring for sexual purposes makes a clear statement that this is a serious crime and will ensure that sexual predators do not receive house arrest.

Members should also know that of the cases successfully prosecuted under the current child luring law, the large majority of the sentences are for terms ranging between 6 and 18 months, and most of those are conditional sentences to be served in the community.

My heart tells me that the protection of our children is worth much more than that. There is no doubt in my mind that offenders who are so deprived that they would take advantage of a vulnerable young child deserve tough sentences, not a sentence served in the comfort of their homes and communities.

*Private Members' Business*

I would invite members of the House to reflect on our fundamental role as members of Parliament. That role is to ensure the safety and security of all Canadians, and to use the utmost diligence in protecting and defending the interests of the most vulnerable in our society. Clearly, young, impressionable children are included in that group. They face growing threats from a rapidly changing world, a world which is becoming increasingly less friendly and safe. More importantly, those who prey on and exploit children are becoming increasingly bold in their attempts to gain access to our children.

In fact, as I stated earlier, many of these predators cannot be treated and will remain a constant threat to our communities for the rest of their lives. It is our job as members of the House to ensure that we do everything within our lawful power to provide our justice system with the legal tools to keep sex predators away from our children. It is very simple. We have a job to do. Let us do it well.

Parents also have a job to do. I encourage parents to listen to and understand their children, inform themselves about parental controls on their child's computer, keep their child's computer in a public place, stay involved and remain vigilant, educate themselves, and understand that the Internet is not as safe as they may have assumed.

Bill C-277 achieves three goals. First, it condemns in the strongest terms the sexual exploitation of our children. Second, it brings the maximum sentence for luring into line with other sexual offences. Third, it ensures that such offenders serve their sentences in jail, not in the comfort of their homes where they continue to have access to the Internet.

The message of the bill is very clear. If people choose to prey on our children, they will pay a significant price. I encourage the members of the House to put aside partisanship and do something significant for our children. At the very least, refer the bill to committee. Our children deserve nothing less.

● (1430)

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** It being 2:30 p.m., the period of debate has now expired.

[*English*]

Accordingly, the question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, October 4, immediately before the time provided for private members' business.

[*Translation*]

It being 2:32 p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2:32 p.m.)



**APPENDIX**

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

**CHAIR OCCUPANTS**

**The Speaker**

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

**The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole**

HON. BILL BLAIKIE

**The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. ROYAL GALIPEAU

**The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. ANDREW SCHEER

---

**BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY**

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

MS. LIBBY DAVIES

MR. MICHEL GUIMOND

HON. JAY HILL

HON. ROB NICHOLSON

MR. JOE PRESTON

HON. KAREN REDMAN

HON. LUCIENNE ROBILLARD

HON. CAROL SKELTON

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session—Thirty Nine Parliament

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

First Session—Thirty Nine Parliament

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dhaliwal, Sukh	Newton—North Delta	Lib.
Dosanjh, Hon. Ujjal	Vancouver South	Lib.
Emerson, Hon. David, Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics	Vancouver Kingsway	CPC
Fast, Ed.	Abbotsford	CPC
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Grewal, Nina	Fleetwood—Port Kells	CPC
Harris, Richard	Cariboo—Prince George	CPC
Hiebert, Russ, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale	CPC
Hill, Hon. Jay	Prince George—Peace River	CPC
Hinton, Betty, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo	CPC
Julian, Peter	Burnaby—New Westminster	NDP
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission	CPC
Lunn, Hon. Gary, Minister of Natural Resources	Saanich—Gulf Islands	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CPC
Martin, Hon. Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	Lib.
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	CPC
Moore, James, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	CPC
Owen, Hon. Stephen	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Priddy, Penny	Surrey North	NDP
Savoie, Denise	Victoria	NDP
Siksay, Bill	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Strahl, Hon. Chuck, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	CPC
Warawa, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Langley	CPC
Wilson, Blair	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	Lib.

#### MANITOBA (14)

Bezan, James	Selkirk—Interlake	CPC
Blaikie, Hon. Bill, The Deputy Speaker	Elmwood—Transcona	NDP
Bruinooge, Rod, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Winnipeg South	CPC
Fletcher, Steven, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	CPC
Keeper, Tina	Churchill	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	CPC
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Hon. Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	CPC
Simard, Hon. Raymond	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	CPC
Toews, Hon. Vic, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Provencher	CPC
Tweed, Merv	Brandon—Souris	CPC
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North	NDP

#### NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	CPC
D'Amours, Jean-Claude	Madawaska—Restigouche	Lib.



Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Godin, Yvon .....	Acadie—Bathurst .....	NDP
Hubbard, Hon. Charles .....	Miramichi .....	Lib.
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic .....	Beauséjour .....	Lib.
Moore, Rob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada .....	Fundy Royal .....	CPC
Murphy, Brian .....	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe .....	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy .....	Fredericton .....	Lib.
Thompson, Hon. Greg, Minister of Veterans Affairs .....	New Brunswick Southwest .....	CPC
Zed, Paul .....	Saint John .....	Lib.

#### NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (7)

Byrne, Hon. Gerry .....	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte .....	Lib.
Doyle, Norman .....	St. John's East .....	CPC
Hearn, Hon. Loyola, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans .....	St. John's South—Mount Pearl .....	CPC
Manning, Fabian .....	Avalon .....	CPC
Matthews, Bill .....	Random—Burin—St. George's .....	Lib.
Russell, Todd .....	Labrador .....	Lib.
Simms, Scott .....	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor .....	Lib.

#### NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)

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

#### NOVA SCOTIA (11)

Brison, Hon. Scott .....	Kings—Hants .....	Lib.
Casey, Bill .....	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley .....	CPC
Cuzner, Rodger .....	Cape Breton—Canso .....	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark .....	Sydney—Victoria .....	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald .....	South Shore—St. Margaret's .....	CPC
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency .....	Central Nova .....	CPC
McDonough, Alexa .....	Halifax .....	NDP
Regan, Hon. Geoff .....	Halifax West .....	Lib.
Savage, Michael .....	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour .....	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter .....	Sackville—Eastern Shore .....	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert .....	West Nova .....	Lib.

#### NUNAVUT (1)

Karetak-Lindell, Nancy .....	Nunavut .....	Lib.
------------------------------	---------------	------

#### ONTARIO (105)

Albrecht, Harold .....	Kitchener—Conestoga .....	CPC
Alghabra, Omar .....	Mississauga—Erindale .....	Lib.
Allison, Dean .....	Niagara West—Glanbrook .....	CPC
Angus, Charlie .....	Timmins—James Bay .....	NDP
Bains, Hon. Navdeep .....	Mississauga—Brampton South .....	Lib.
Baird, Hon. John, President of the Treasury Board .....	Ottawa West—Nepean .....	CPC
Barnes, Hon. Sue .....	London West .....	Lib.

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Watson, Jeff .....	Essex .....	CPC
Wilfert, Hon. Bryon .....	Richmond Hill .....	Lib.
Wrzesnewskyj, Borys .....	Etobicoke Centre .....	Lib.
VACANCY .....	London North Centre .....	
<b>PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)</b>		
Easter, Hon. Wayne .....	Malpeque .....	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence .....	Cardigan .....	Lib.
McGuire, Hon. Joe .....	Egmont .....	Lib.
Murphy, Hon. Shawn .....	Charlottetown .....	Lib.
<b>QUÉBEC (74)</b>		
André, Guy .....	Berthier—Maskinongé .....	BQ
Arthur, André .....	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier .....	Ind.
Asselin, Gérard .....	Manicouagan .....	BQ
Bachand, Claude .....	Saint-Jean .....	BQ
Barbot, Vivian .....	Papineau .....	BQ
Bellavance, André .....	Richmond—Arthabaska .....	BQ
Bernier, Hon. Maxime, Minister of Industry .....	Beauce .....	CPC
Bigras, Bernard .....	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie .....	BQ
Blackburn, Hon. Jean-Pierre, Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec .....	Jonquière—Alma .....	CPC
Blais, Raynald .....	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine .....	BQ
Blaney, Steven .....	Lévis—Bellechasse .....	CPC
Bonsant, France .....	Compton—Stanstead .....	BQ
Bouchard, Robert .....	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord .....	BQ
Boucher, Sylvie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and Minister for la Francophonie and Official Languages .....	Beauport—Limoilou .....	CPC
Bourgeois, Diane .....	Terrebonne—Blainville .....	BQ
Brunelle, Paule .....	Trois-Rivières .....	BQ
Cannon, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities .....	Pontiac .....	CPC
Cardin, Serge .....	Sherbrooke .....	BQ
Carrier, Robert .....	Alfred-Pellan .....	BQ
Coderre, Hon. Denis .....	Bourassa .....	Lib.
Cotler, Hon. Irwin .....	Mount Royal .....	Lib.
Crête, Paul .....	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska— Rivière-du-Loup .....	BQ
DeBellefeuille, Claude .....	Beauharnois—Salaberry .....	BQ
Demers, Nicole .....	Laval .....	BQ
Deschamps, Johanne .....	Laurentides—Labelle .....	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane .....	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville .....	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles .....	Laurier—Sainte-Marie .....	BQ
Faille, Meili .....	Vaudreuil-Soulanges .....	BQ
Folco, Raymonde .....	Laval—Les Îles .....	Lib.
Freeman, Carole .....	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant .....	BQ
Gagnon, Christiane .....	Québec .....	BQ
Gaudet, Roger .....	Montcalm .....	BQ
Gauthier, Michel .....	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean .....	BQ
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board .....	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière .....	CPC

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

#### SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary (for the Canadian Wheat Board) to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CPC
Batters, Dave	Palliser	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Breitkreuz, Garry .....	Yorkton—Melville .....	CPC
Fitzpatrick, Brian .....	Prince Albert .....	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph .....	Wascana .....	Lib.
Komarnicki, Ed, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration .....	Souris—Moose Mountain .....	CPC
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform .....	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre .....	CPC
Merasty, Gary .....	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River .....	Lib.
Ritz, Gerry .....	Battlefords—Lloydminster .....	CPC
Scheer, Andrew, The Acting Speaker .....	Regina—Qu'Appelle .....	CPC
Skelton, Hon. Carol, Minister of National Revenue and Minister of Western Economic Diversification .....	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar .....	CPC
Trost, Bradley .....	Saskatoon—Humboldt .....	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice .....	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin .....	CPC
Yelich, Lynne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development .....	Blackstrap .....	CPC
<b>YUKON (1)</b>		
Bagnell, Hon. Larry .....	Yukon .....	Lib.

## LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of September 29, 2006 — 1st Session, 39th Parliament)

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Colin Mayes	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Jean Crowder Nancy Karetak-Lindell	
Harold Albrecht	Marc Lemay	Inky Mark	Anita Neville	(12)
Steven Blaney	Yvon Lévesque	Gary Merasty	Todd Russell	
Rod Bruinooge				

#### Associate Members

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

---

## ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

**Chair:**

Tom Wappel

**Vice-Chairs:**
Pat Martin  
David TilsonSukh Dhaliwal  
Jason Kenney  
Jean-Yves LaforestCarole Lavallée  
Jim PetersonBruce Stanton  
Dave Van KesterenMike Wallace  
Paul Zed

(12)

### Associate Members

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

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

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

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

---



## AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

**Chair:**

Gerry Ritz

**Vice-Chairs:**
André Bellavance  
Paul SteckleDavid Anderson  
Alex Atamanenko  
James BezanKen Boshcoff  
Wayne EasterJacques Gourde  
Larry MillerJean-Yves Roy  
Robert Thibault

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
Guy André  
Charlie Angus  
Dave Batters  
Leon Benoit  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Paule Brunelle  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Serge Cardin  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
Joe Comartin  
Nathan Cullen  
John CumminsPatricia Davidson  
Dean Del Mastro  
Barry Devolin  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Mark Eyking  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Cheryl Gallant  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Randy KampGerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Tony Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Ted Menzies  
Gary Merasty  
Rob Merrifield  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre PoilievreJoe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Lee Richardson  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Peter Stoffer  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Bradley Trost  
Garth Turner  
Merv Tweed  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Peter Van Loan  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Williams  
Lynne Yelich

## CANADIAN HERITAGE

**Chair:** Gary Schellenberger

**Vice-Chairs:**

Mauril Bélanger  
Maka Kotto

Jim Abbott  
Charlie Angus  
Sylvie Boucher

Ed Fast  
Tina Keeper

Luc Malo  
Francis Scarpaleggia

Scott Simms  
Chris Warkentin

(12)

### Associate Members

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

Libby Davies  
Dean Del Mastro  
Barry Devolin  
Ruby Dhalla  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Hedy Fry  
Cheryl Gallant  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp  
Nancy Karetak-Lindell

Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Wayne Marston  
Colin Mayes  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
Maria Minna  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston

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

## CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**Chair:**

Norman Doyle

**Vice-Chairs:**

 Meili Faille  
 Andrew Telegdi

 Johanne Deschamps  
 Barry Devolin  
 Raymonde Folco

 Nina Grewal  
 Rahim Jaffer

 Jim Karygiannis  
 Ed Komarnicki

 Bill Siksay  
 Blair Wilson

(12)

### Associate Members

 Jim Abbott  
 Diane Ablonczy  
 Harold Albrecht  
 Omar Alghabra  
 Mike Allen  
 Dean Allison  
 Rob Anders  
 David Anderson  
 Dave Batters  
 Leon Benoit  
 James Bezan  
 Dawn Black  
 Steven Blaney  
 Sylvie Boucher  
 Diane Bourgeois  
 Garry Breitzkreuz  
 Gord Brown  
 Patrick Brown  
 Rod Bruinooge  
 Paule Brunelle  
 Blaine Calkins  
 Ron Cannan  
 Colin Carrie  
 Bill Casey  
 Rick Casson  
 Olivia Chow  
 David Christopherson  
 Joe Comartin

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

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

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

## ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**Chair:**

Bob Mills

**Vice-Chairs:**

 Bernard Bigras  
 Mario Silva

 Nathan Cullen  
 Mark Eyking  
 John Godfrey

 Luc Harvey  
 Marcel Lussier

 Pablo Rodriguez  
 Maurice Vellacott

 Mark Warawa  
 Jeff Watson

(12)

### Associate Members

 Jim Abbott  
 Diane Ablonczy  
 Harold Albrecht  
 Omar Alghabra  
 Mike Allen  
 Dean Allison  
 Rob Anders  
 David Anderson  
 Dave Batters  
 Don Bell  
 Leon Benoit  
 Dennis Bevington  
 James Bezan  
 Sylvie Boucher  
 Garry Breitzkreuz  
 Scott Brison  
 Gord Brown  
 Patrick Brown  
 Rod Bruinooge  
 Paule Brunelle  
 Blaine Calkins  
 Ron Cannan  
 Colin Carrie  
 Bill Casey  
 Rick Casson  
 Joe Comartin  
 Paul Crête  
 Jean Crowder  
 John Cummins  
 Patricia Davidson

 Claude DeBellefeuille  
 Barry Devolin  
 Stéphane Dion  
 Norman Doyle  
 Ken Dryden  
 Rick Dykstra  
 Ken Epp  
 Ed Fast  
 Brian Fitzpatrick  
 Steven Fletcher  
 Cheryl Gallant  
 Peter Goldring  
 Gary Goodyear  
 Jacques Gourde  
 Nina Grewal  
 Helena Guergis  
 Art Hanger  
 Richard Harris  
 Laurie Hawn  
 Russ Hiebert  
 Jay Hill  
 Betty Hinton  
 Mark Holland  
 Rahim Jaffer  
 Brian Jean  
 Peter Julian  
 Susan Kadis  
 Randy Kamp  
 Gerald Keddy  
 Tina Keeper

 Jason Kenney  
 Ed Komarnicki  
 Daryl Kramp  
 Mike Lake  
 Guy Lauzon  
 Jack Layton  
 Pierre Lemieux  
 Tom Lukiwski  
 James Lunney  
 Dave MacKenzie  
 Fabian Manning  
 Inky Mark  
 Pat Martin  
 Colin Mayes  
 Ted Menzies  
 Rob Merrifield  
 Larry Miller  
 James Moore  
 Rob Moore  
 Rick Norlock  
 Deepak Obhrai  
 Christian Ouellet  
 Stephen Owen  
 Brian Pallister  
 Christian Paradis  
 Daniel Petit  
 Pierre Poilievre  
 Joe Preston  
 James Rajotte

 Scott Reid  
 Lee Richardson  
 Gerry Ritz  
 Todd Russell  
 Denise Savoie  
 Francis Scarpaleggia  
 Gary Schellenberger  
 Bev Shipley  
 Joy Smith  
 Kevin Sorenson  
 Lloyd St. Amand  
 Bruce Stanton  
 Peter Stoffer  
 Brian Storseth  
 Belinda Stronach  
 David Sweet  
 Myron Thompson  
 David Tilson  
 Alan Tonks  
 Bradley Trost  
 Garth Turner  
 Merv Tweed  
 Dave Van Kesteren  
 Peter Van Loan  
 Robert Vincent  
 Mike Wallace  
 Chris Warkentin  
 John Williams  
 Lynne Yelich

**FINANCE**

<b>Chair:</b>	Brian Pallister	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Massimo Pacetti Pierre Paquette	
Diane Ablonczy Dean Del Mastro Rick Dykstra	John McCallum John McKay	Michael Savage Thierry St-Cyr	Garth Turner Judy Wasylcia-Leis	(12)

**Associate Members**

Jim Abbott Harold Albrecht Mike Allen Dean Allison Rob Anders David Anderson Dave Batters Leon Benoit Maurizio Bevilacqua James Bezan Steven Blaney Sylvie Boucher Garry Breitzkreuz Gord Brown Patrick Brown Rod Bruinooge Paule Brunelle Blaine Calkins Ron Cannan Colin Carrie Bill Casey Rick Casson Chris Charlton David Christopherson Jean Crowder Nathan Cullen John Cummins Patricia Davidson Libby Davies	Barry Devolin Ruby Dhalla Norman Doyle Ken Epp Ed Fast Brian Fitzpatrick Steven Fletcher Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Gary Goodyear Jacques Gourde Nina Grewal Helena Guergis Art Hanger Richard Harris Laurie Hawn Russ Hiebert Jay Hill Betty Hinton Rahim Jaffer Brian Jean Peter Julian Randy Kamp Gerald Keddy Jason Kenney Ed Komarnicki Daryl Kramp Mike Lake Guy Lauzon	Jack Layton Pierre Lemieux Tom Lukiwski James Lunney Dave MacKenzie Fabian Manning Inky Mark Pat Martin Irene Mathysen Colin Mayes Ted Menzies Rob Merrifield Larry Miller Bob Mills James Moore Rob Moore Rick Norlock Deepak Obhrai Christian Paradis Daniel Petit Pierre Poilievre Joe Preston James Rajotte Yasmin Ratansi Scott Reid Lee Richardson Gerry Ritz Anthony Rota	Gary Schellenberger Judy Sgro Bev Shipley Mario Silva Joy Smith Kevin Sorenson Brent St. Denis Bruce Stanton Brian Storseth Belinda Stronach David Sweet Paul Szabo Lui Temelkovski Robert Thibault Myron Thompson David Tilson Bradley Trost Merv Tweed Dave Van Kesteren Peter Van Loan Maurice Vellacott Joseph Volpe Mike Wallace Mark Warawa Chris Warkentin Jeff Watson John Williams Lynne Yelich
---	--	---	---

---

## FISHERIES AND OCEANS

**Chair:**

Gerald Keddy

**Vice-Chairs:**
Raynald Blais  
Bill MatthewsG rard Asselin  
Gerry Byrne  
John CumminsRodger Cuzner  
Randy KampJames Lunney  
Lawrence MacAulayFabian Manning  
Peter Stoffer

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Dave Batters  
Catherine Bell  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Raymond Bonin  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Robert Carrier  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
Paul Cr te  
Jean Crowder  
Nathan CullenPatricia Davidson  
Dean Del Mastro  
Barry Devolin  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Wayne Easter  
Ken Epp  
Mark Eyking  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Cheryl Gallant  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian JeanJason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mario Laframboise  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Dominic LeBlanc  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
Dave MacKenzie  
Inky Mark  
Colin Mayes  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott ReidLee Richardson  
Gerry Ritz  
Todd Russell  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Scott Simms  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Bradley Trost  
Garth Turner  
Merv Tweed  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Peter Van Loan  
Maurice Vellacott  
Robert Vincent  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Williams  
Lynne Yelich

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<b>Chair:</b>	Kevin Sorenson	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Francine Lalonde Bernard Patry	
Diane Bourgeois Bill Casey Peter Goldring	Albina Guarnieri Keith Martin	Alexa McDonough Deepak Obhrai	Peter Van Loan Bryon Wilfert	(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Sukh Dhaliwal	Daryl Kramp	Yasmin Ratansi
Diane Ablonczy	Ruby Dhalla	Mike Lake	Scott Reid
Harold Albrecht	Stéphane Dion	Guy Lauzon	Lee Richardson
Mike Allen	Norman Doyle	Jack Layton	Gerry Ritz
Dean Allison	Ken Dryden	Dominic LeBlanc	Pablo Rodriguez
Rob Anders	Rick Dykstra	Pierre Lemieux	Anthony Rota
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Tom Lukiwski	Michael Savage
Claude Bachand	Mark Eyking	James Lunney	Gary Schellenberger
Larry Bagnell	Ed Fast	Lawrence MacAulay	Bev Shipley
Navdeep Bains	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dave MacKenzie	Bill Siksay
Vivian Barbot	Steven Fletcher	John Maloney	Raymond Simard
Dave Batters	Raymonde Folco	Fabian Manning	Scott Simms
Don Bell	Hedy Fry	Inky Mark	Joy Smith
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Wayne Marston	Caroline St-Hilaire
James Bezan	John Godfrey	Pat Martin	Bruce Stanton
Dawn Black	Gary Goodyear	Brian Masse	Paul Steckle
Steven Blaney	Jacques Gourde	Colin Mayes	Brian Storseth
Raymond Bonin	Nina Grewal	John McKay	David Sweet
Sylvie Boucher	Helena Guergis	Dan McTeague	Lui Temelkovski
Garry Breitkreuz	Art Hanger	Ted Menzies	Myron Thompson
Gord Brown	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	David Tilson
Patrick Brown	Luc Harvey	Larry Miller	Alan Tonks
Rod Bruinooge	Laurie Hawn	Bob Mills	Bradley Trost
Paule Brunelle	Russ Hiebert	Maria Minna	Garth Turner
Blaine Calkins	Jay Hill	James Moore	Merv Tweed
Ron Cannan	Betty Hinton	Rob Moore	Dave Van Kesteren
Serge Cardin	Mark Holland	Brian Murphy	Maurice Vellacott
Colin Carrie	Michael Ignatieff	Anita Neville	Joseph Volpe
Rick Casson	Rahim Jaffer	Rick Norlock	Mike Wallace
Denis Coderre	Brian Jean	Stephen Owen	Mark Warawa
Joe Comartin	Peter Julian	Brian Pallister	Chris Warkentin
Irwin Cotler	Randy Kamp	Christian Paradis	Jeff Watson
John Cummins	Jim Karygiannis	Daniel Petit	John Williams
Patricia Davidson	Gerald Keddy	Pierre Poilievre	Blair Wilson
Dean Del Mastro	Jason Kenney	Joe Preston	Borys Wrzesnewskyj
Johanne Deschamps	Wajid Khan	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Barry Devolin	Ed Komarnicki		

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

<b>Chair:</b>		<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Irwin Cotler Jason Kenney	Wayne Marston Ted Menzies	Maria Minna Kevin Sorenson	Caroline St-Hilaire	(7)

## GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

**Chair:**

Diane Marleau

**Vice-Chairs:**Daryl Kramp  
Peggy NashHarold Albrecht  
Omar Alghabra  
Navdeep BainsRaymond Bonin  
James MooreRichard Nadeau  
Louise ThibaultMike Wallace  
Chris Warkentin

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Dave Batters  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
David Christopherson  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Dean Del Mastro  
Barry Devolin  
Paul Dewar  
Norman Doyle

Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Cheryl Gallant  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Charles Hubbard  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney

Ed Komarnicki  
Jean-Yves Laforest  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Pat Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Massimo Pacetti  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte

Scott Reid  
Lee Richardson  
Gerry Ritz  
Denise Savoie  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Paul Szabo  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Bradley Trost  
Garth Turner  
Merv Tweed  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Peter Van Loan  
Maurice Vellacott  
Joseph Volpe  
Mark Warawa  
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis  
Jeff Watson  
John Williams  
Lynne Yelich

---



**HEALTH****Chair:**

Rob Merrifield

**Vice-Chairs:**Carolyn Bennett  
Christiane GagnonDave Batters  
Brenda Chamberlain  
Patricia DavidsonNicole Demers  
Ruby DhallaRick Dykstra  
Steven FletcherTina Keeper  
Penny Priddy

(12)

**Associate Members**Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitreuz  
Bonnie Brown  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Paule Brunelle  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
Chris Charlton  
Nathan Cullen  
John Cummins  
Dean Del Mastro  
Barry Devolin  
Norman DoyleKen Dryden  
Ken Epp  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Hedy Fry  
Cheryl Gallant  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Susan Kadis  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike LakeGuy Lauzon  
Jack Layton  
Pierre Lemieux  
Yvan Loubier  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
John Maloney  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Keith Martin  
Brian Masse  
Irene Mathysen  
Colin Mayes  
Ted Menzies  
Gary Merasty  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
James RajotteScott Reid  
Lee Richardson  
Gerry Ritz  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Lloyd St. Amand  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Lui Temelkovski  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Bradley Trost  
Garth Turner  
Merv Tweed  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Peter Van Loan  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Judy Wasylycia-Leis  
Jeff Watson  
John Williams  
Lynne Yelich

## HUMAN RESOURCES, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

**Chair:** Dean Allison

**Vice-Chairs:** Jean-Claude D'Amours  
Yves Lessard

France Bonsant  
Bonnie Brown  
Patrick Brown

Denis Coderre  
Mike Lake

Tony Martin  
Geoff Regan

Brian Storseth  
Lynne Yelich

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Dave Batters  
Carolyn Bennett  
Leon Benoit  
Maurizio Bevilacqua  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Paule Brunelle  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
Raymond Chan  
Chris Charlton  
Olivia Chow  
David Christopherson  
Jean Crowder  
Nathan Cullen  
John Cummins  
Rodger Cuzner  
Patricia Davidson  
Libby Davies

Dean Del Mastro  
Nicole Demers  
Barry Devolin  
Sukh Dhaliwal  
Norman Doyle  
Ken Dryden  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Raymonde Folco  
Cheryl Gallant  
John Godfrey  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Mark Holland  
Michael Ignatieff  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian

Randy Kamp  
Nancy Karetak-Lindell  
Gerald Keddy  
Tina Keeper  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Guy Lauzon  
Carole Lavallée  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Pat Martin  
Irene Mathysen  
Colin Mayes  
Alexa McDonough  
Ted Menzies  
Gary Merasty  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
Maria Minna  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Christian Ouellet  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis

Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Lee Richardson  
Gerry Ritz  
Denise Savoie  
Gary Schellenberger  
Andy Scott  
Bev Shipley  
Bill Siksay  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Thierry St-Cyr  
Bruce Stanton  
David Sweet  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Bradley Trost  
Garth Turner  
Merv Tweed  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Peter Van Loan  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Judy Wasylcia-Leis  
Jeff Watson  
John Williams

## INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Chair:** James Rajotte

**Vice-Chairs:**

Paul Crête  
Dan McTeague

André Arthur  
Colin Carrie  
Susan Kadis

Jean Lapierre  
Brian Masse

Bev Shipley  
Belinda Stronach

Dave Van Kesteren  
Robert Vincent

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Gérard Asselin  
Larry Bagnell  
Dave Batters  
Catherine Bell  
Don Bell  
Leon Benoit  
Maurizio Bevilacqua  
Dennis Bevington  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Ken Boshcoff  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Paule Brunelle  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Serge Cardin  
Robert Carrier  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
Raymond Chan  
Chris Charlton  
David Christopherson  
Joe Comartin  
Jean Crowder  
Roy Cullen

John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Libby Davies  
Claude DeBellefeuille  
Dean Del Mastro  
Barry Devolin  
Stéphane Dion  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Cheryl Gallant  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Mark Holland  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Marlene Jennings  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Tina Keeper  
Jason Kenney

Wajid Khan  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Jean-Yves Laforest  
Mario Laframboise  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Jack Layton  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Wayne Marston  
Pat Martin  
Tony Martin  
Irene Mathysen  
Colin Mayes  
David McGuinty  
Joe McGuire  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Peggy Nash  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Massimo Pacetti  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre

Joe Preston  
Yasmin Ratansi  
Geoff Regan  
Scott Reid  
Lee Richardson  
Gerry Ritz  
Anthony Rota  
Michael Savage  
Gary Schellenberger  
Andy Scott  
Bill Siksay  
Raymond Simard  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Brent St. Denis  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Robert Thibault  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Bradley Trost  
Garth Turner  
Merv Tweed  
Roger Valley  
Peter Van Loan  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Williams  
Blair Wilson  
Lynne Yelich  
Paul Zed

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Chair:** Leon Benoit

**Vice-Chairs:**

Serge Cardin  
Lui Temelkovski

Guy André  
Ron Cannan  
Mark Eyking

Helena Guergis  
Peter Julian

Dominic LeBlanc  
Pierre Lemieux

John Maloney  
Ted Menzies

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Alex Atamanenko  
Dave Batters  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Blaine Calkins  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
Paul Crête  
Nathan Cullen  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Dean Del Mastro

Barry Devolin  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Cheryl Gallant  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Francine Lalonde  
Guy Lauzon  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Pat Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Alexa McDonough  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte

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

---

## JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

<b>Chair:</b>	Art Hanger	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Derek Lee Réal Ménard	
Larry Bagnell Sue Barnes Patrick Brown	Joe Comartin Carole Freeman	Rob Moore Brian Murphy	Daniel Petit Myron Thompson	(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Rick Dykstra	Guy Lauzon	James Rajotte
Diane Ablonczy	Wayne Easter	Carole Lavallée	Scott Reid
Harold Albrecht	Ken Epp	Jack Layton	Lee Richardson
Omar Alghabra	Ed Fast	Pierre Lemieux	Gerry Ritz
Mike Allen	Brian Fitzpatrick	Tom Lukiwski	Gary Schellenberger
Dean Allison	Steven Fletcher	James Lunney	Judy Sgro
Rob Anders	Cheryl Gallant	Dave MacKenzie	Bev Shipley
David Anderson	Yvon Godin	John Maloney	Bill Siksay
Dave Batters	Peter Goldring	Fabian Manning	Joy Smith
Leon Benoit	Gary Goodyear	Inky Mark	Kevin Sorenson
James Bezan	Jacques Gourde	Wayne Marston	Bruce Stanton
Steven Blaney	Nina Grewal	Pat Martin	Brian Storseth
Sylvie Boucher	Helena Guergis	Irene Mathysen	David Sweet
Garry Breitkreuz	Richard Harris	Colin Mayes	David Tilson
Gord Brown	Luc Harvey	John McKay	Bradley Trost
Rod Bruinooge	Laurie Hawn	Serge Ménard	Garth Turner
Paule Brunelle	Russ Hiebert	Ted Menzies	Merv Tweed
Blaine Calkins	Jay Hill	Rob Merrifield	Dave Van Kesteren
Ron Cannan	Betty Hinton	Larry Miller	Peter Van Loan
Colin Carrie	Michael Ignatieff	Bob Mills	Maurice Vellacott
Bill Casey	Rahim Jaffer	James Moore	Joseph Volpe
Rick Casson	Brian Jean	Anita Neville	Mike Wallace
Raymond Chan	Randy Kamp	Rick Norlock	Tom Wappel
Irwin Cotler	Gerald Keddy	Deepak Obhrai	Mark Warawa
John Cummins	Tina Keeper	Stephen Owen	Chris Warkentin
Patricia Davidson	Jason Kenney	Brian Pallister	Jeff Watson
Libby Davies	Ed Komarnicki	Christian Paradis	John Williams
Dean Del Mastro	Daryl Kramp	Pierre Poilievre	Borys Wrzesnewskyj
Barry Devolin	Mike Lake	Joe Preston	Lynne Yelich
Norman Doyle			

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOLICITATION LAWS

**Chair:**

**Vice-Chair:**

**LIAISON****Chair:**

Dean Allison

**Vice-Chair:**

Judy Sgro

Rob Anders  
 Leon Benoit  
 Garry Breitzkreuz  
 Rick Casson  
 Norman Doyle  
 Gary Goodyear

Art Hanger  
 Gerald Keddy  
 Guy Lauzon  
 Diane Marleau  
 Colin Mayes  
 Rob Merrifield

Bob Mills  
 Shawn Murphy  
 Brian Pallister  
 James Rajotte  
 Lee Richardson  
 Gerry Ritz

Gary Schellenberger  
 Kevin Sorenson  
 Paul Szabo  
 Merv Tweed  
 Tom Wappel

(25)

**Associate Members**

Claude Bachand  
 Mauril Bélanger  
 Catherine Bell  
 Don Bell  
 André Bellavance  
 Carolyn Bennett  
 Bernard Bigras  
 Raynald Blais  
 John Cannis  
 Serge Cardin  
 Joe Comartin  
 Paul Crête  
 Jean Crowder

Jean-Claude D'Amours  
 Paul Dewar  
 Ken Epp  
 Meili Faille  
 Brian Fitzpatrick  
 Christiane Gagnon  
 Yvon Godin  
 Michel Guimond  
 Mark Holland  
 Nancy Karetak-Lindell  
 Maka Kotto  
 Daryl Kramp  
 Jean-Yves Laforest

Mario Laframboise  
 Francine Lalonde  
 Derek Lee  
 Yves Lessard  
 Pat Martin  
 Irene Mathysen  
 Bill Matthews  
 Dan McTeague  
 Réal Ménard  
 Peggy Nash  
 Massimo Pacetti  
 Pierre Paquette

Bernard Patry  
 Marcel Proulx  
 Pablo Rodriguez  
 Mario Silva  
 Joy Smith  
 Brent St. Denis  
 Paul Steckle  
 Peter Stoffer  
 Andrew Telegdi  
 Lui Temelkovski  
 David Tilson  
 Alan Tonks

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS****Chair:****Vice-Chair:**

**NATIONAL DEFENCE****Chair:**

Rick Casson

**Vice-Chairs:**Claude Bachand  
John CannisCarolyn Bennett  
Dawn Black  
Robert BouchardBlaine Calkins  
Ujjal DosanjhCheryl Gallant  
Laurie HawnRuss Hiebert  
Joe McGuire

(12)

**Associate Members**Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Larry Bagnell  
Dave Batters  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Bernard Bigras  
Steven Blaney  
Raymond Bonin  
Sylvie Boucher  
Diane Bourgeois  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Robert Carrier  
Bill Casey  
Joe Comartin  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Dean Del Mastro  
Johanne DeschampsBarry Devolin  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Tina Keeper  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mario Laframboise  
Mike LakeFrancine Lalonde  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Keith Martin  
Colin Mayes  
John McCallum  
Dan McTeague  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Anita Neville  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Geoff Regan  
Scott ReidLee Richardson  
Gerry Ritz  
Anthony Rota  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Brent St. Denis  
Bruce Stanton  
Peter Stoffer  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Robert Thibault  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Alan Tonks  
Bradley Trost  
Garth Turner  
Merv Tweed  
Roger Valley  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Peter Van Loan  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Williams  
Lynne Yelich

## NATURAL RESOURCES

**Chair:** Lee Richardson

**Vice-Chairs:** Catherine Bell  
Alan Tonks

Mike Allen  
Roy Cullen  
Claude DeBellefeuille

Richard Harris  
Christian Ouellet

Christian Paradis  
Todd Russell

Lloyd St. Amand  
Bradley Trost

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Alex Atamanenko  
Dave Batters  
Leon Benoit  
Dennis Bevington  
James Bezan  
Bernard Bigras  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Paule Brunelle  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
Paul Crête  
Jean Crowder

Nathan Cullen  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Dean Del Mastro  
Barry Devolin  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Cheryl Gallant  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean

Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Marcel Lussier  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Colin Mayes  
David McGuinty  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Daniel Petit

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

---



**OFFICIAL LANGUAGES****Chair:**

Guy Lauzon

**Vice-Chairs:**

Yvon Godin

Pablo Rodriguez

Vivian Barbot  
Sylvie Boucher  
Paule Brunelle

Jean-Claude D'Amours  
Luc Harvey

Pierre Lemieux  
Brian Murphy

Daniel Petit  
Raymond Simard

(12)

**Associate Members**

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Alex Atamanenko  
Dave Batters  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
Joe Comartin  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Dean Del Mastro  
Barry Devolin

Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Cheryl Gallant  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Marlene Jennings  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki

Maka Kotto  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Jack Layton  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Colin Mayes  
Alexa McDonough  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid

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

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

<b>Chair:</b>	Gary Goodyear	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Michel Guimond Marcel Proulx	
Yvon Godin Jay Hill Marlene Jennings	Tom Lukiwski Stephen Owen	Pauline Picard Joe Preston	Karen Redman Scott Reid	(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Libby Davies	Jason Kenney	Lee Richardson
Diane Ablonczy	Dean Del Mastro	Ed Komarnicki	Gerry Ritz
Harold Albrecht	Barry Devolin	Daryl Kramp	Gary Schellenberger
Mike Allen	Norman Doyle	Mike Lake	Bev Shipley
Dean Allison	Rick Dykstra	Guy Lauzon	Mario Silva
Rob Anders	Ken Epp	Pierre Lemieux	Raymond Simard
David Anderson	Ed Fast	James Lunney	Joy Smith
Dave Batters	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dave MacKenzie	Kevin Sorenson
Leon Benoit	Steven Fletcher	Fabian Manning	Bruce Stanton
James Bezan	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Brian Storseth
Steven Blaney	Michel Gauthier	Colin Mayes	David Sweet
Ken Boshcoff	Peter Goldring	Réal Ménard	Myron Thompson
Sylvie Boucher	Jacques Gourde	Ted Menzies	David Tilson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Nina Grewal	Rob Merrifield	Bradley Trost
Gord Brown	Monique Guay	Larry Miller	Garth Turner
Patrick Brown	Helena Guergis	Bob Mills	Merv Tweed
Rod Bruinooge	Art Hanger	James Moore	Dave Van Kesteren
Blaine Calkins	Richard Harris	Rob Moore	Peter Van Loan
Ron Cannan	Luc Harvey	Rick Norlock	Maurice Vellacott
Colin Carrie	Laurie Hawn	Deepak Obhrai	Mike Wallace
Bill Casey	Russ Hiebert	Brian Pallister	Mark Warawa
Rick Casson	Betty Hinton	Christian Paradis	Chris Warkentin
Joe Comartin	Rahim Jaffer	Daniel Petit	Jeff Watson
Jean Crowder	Brian Jean	Pierre Poilievre	John Williams
John Cummins	Randy Kamp	James Rajotte	Lynne Yelich
Patricia Davidson	Gerald Keddy		

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Chair:</b>	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>
---------------	--------------------

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENT HILL SECURITY

<b>Chair:</b>	Gary Goodyear	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	Marcel Proulx	
Gérard Asselin	Yvon Godin	Joe Preston		(5)

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS****Chair:** Shawn Murphy**Vice-Chairs:**Brian Fitzpatrick  
Jean-Yves LaforestDavid Christopherson  
Mike Lake  
Richard NadeauPierre Poilievre  
Marcel ProulxYasmin Ratansi  
David SweetJohn Williams  
Borys Wrzesnewskyj

(12)

**Associate Members**Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Navdeep Bains  
Dave Batters  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
Denis Coderre  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Dean Del Mastro  
Barry DevolinSukh Dhaliwal  
Ujjal Dosanjh  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Ed Fast  
Steven Fletcher  
Cheryl Gallant  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Mark Holland  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Marlene Jennings  
Peter Julian  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald KeddyJason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Guy Lauzon  
Jack Layton  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Pat Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Joe Preston  
James RajotteScott Reid  
Lee Richardson  
Gerry Ritz  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
Paul Szabo  
Louise Thibault  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Bradley Trost  
Garth Turner  
Merv Tweed  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Peter Van Loan  
Maurice Vellacott  
Joseph Volpe  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis  
Jeff Watson  
Lynne Yelich

**PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY**

<b>Chair:</b>	Garry Breitkreuz	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Joe Comartin Mark Holland	
Maurizio Bevilacqua Gord Brown Raymond Chan	Irwin Cotler Carole Freeman	Laurie Hawn Dave MacKenzie	Serge Ménard Rick Norlock	(12)

**Associate Members**

Jim Abbott	Rick Dykstra	Mike Lake	Lee Richardson
Diane Ablonczy	Ken Epp	Guy Lauzon	Gerry Ritz
Harold Albrecht	Ed Fast	Derek Lee	Gary Schellenberger
Mike Allen	Brian Fitzpatrick	Pierre Lemieux	Bev Shipley
Dean Allison	Steven Fletcher	Tom Lukiwski	Bill Siksay
Rob Anders	Cheryl Gallant	James Lunney	Joy Smith
David Anderson	Roger Gaudet	Fabian Manning	Kevin Sorenson
Dave Batters	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Bruce Stanton
Leon Benoit	Gary Goodyear	Wayne Marston	Brian Storseth
James Bezan	Jacques Gourde	Pat Martin	David Sweet
Steven Blaney	Nina Grewal	Irene Mathysen	Myron Thompson
Sylvie Boucher	Helena Guergis	Colin Mayes	David Tilson
Patrick Brown	Art Hanger	Ted Menzies	Bradley Trost
Rod Bruinoooge	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	Garth Turner
Paule Brunelle	Luc Harvey	Larry Miller	Merv Tweed
Blaine Calkins	Russ Hiebert	Bob Mills	Dave Van Kesteren
Ron Cannan	Jay Hill	James Moore	Peter Van Loan
Colin Carrie	Betty Hinton	Rob Moore	Maurice Vellacott
Bill Casey	Rahim Jaffer	Deepak Obhrai	Robert Vincent
Rick Casson	Brian Jean	Brian Pallister	Mike Wallace
Paul Crête	Randy Kamp	Christian Paradis	Tom Wappel
Roy Cullen	Gerald Keddy	Daniel Petit	Mark Warawa
John Cummins	Tina Keeper	Pierre Poilievre	Chris Warkentin
Patricia Davidson	Jason Kenney	Joe Preston	Jeff Watson
Dean Del Mastro	Ed Komarnicki	James Rajotte	John Williams
Barry Devolin	Daryl Kramp	Scott Reid	Lynne Yelich
Norman Doyle			

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF THE ANTI-TERRORISM ACT**

<b>Chair:</b>		<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
Gord Brown Joe Comartin	Roy Cullen Dave MacKenzie	Serge Ménard Rick Norlock	Tom Wappel	(7)

**STATUS OF WOMEN****Chair:**

Judy Sgro

**Vice-Chairs:**Irene Mathysen  
Joy SmithPatricia Davidson  
Johanne Deschamps  
Nina GrewalHelena Guergis  
Maria MinnaMaria Mourani  
Anita NevilleBruce Stanton  
Belinda Stronach

(12)

**Associate Members**Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Dave Batters  
Catherine Bell  
Carolyn Bennett  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Dawn Black  
Steven Blaney  
France Bonsant  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
Chris Charlton  
Olivia Chow  
Irwin CotlerJean Crowder  
John Cummins  
Libby Davies  
Dean Del Mastro  
Barry Devolin  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Meili Faille  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Hedy Fry  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald KeddyTina Keeper  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Jack Layton  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Colin Mayes  
Alexa McDonough  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Peggy Nash  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel PetitPierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
Penny Priddy  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Lee Richardson  
Gerry Ritz  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Kevin Sorenson  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Bradley Trost  
Garth Turner  
Merv Tweed  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Peter Van Loan  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Judy Wasylycia-Leis  
Jeff Watson  
John Williams  
Lyne Yelich

## TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

**Chair:** Merv Tweed

**Vice-Chairs:**

Don Bell  
Mario Laframboise

Steven Blaney  
Robert Carrier  
Ed Fast

Charles Hubbard  
Brian Jean

Peter Julian  
David McGuinty

Andy Scott  
Brian Storseth

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Dave Batters  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Paule Brunelle  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
Olivia Chow  
David Christopherson  
Joe Comartin  
Paul Crête  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Libby Davies

Dean Del Mastro  
Barry Devolin  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Cheryl Gallant  
Roger Gaudet  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Randy Kamp  
Jim Karygiannis  
Gerald Keddy  
Tina Keeper  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Dominic LeBlanc  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Pat Martin  
Brian Masse  
Colin Mayes  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Peggy Nash  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
Marcel Proulx

James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Lee Richardson  
Gerry Ritz  
Denise Savoie  
Francis Scarpaleggia  
Gary Schellenberger  
Bev Shipley  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Peter Stoffer  
Belinda Stronach  
David Sweet  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Bradley Trost  
Garth Turner  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Peter Van Loan  
Maurice Vellacott  
Robert Vincent  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Williams  
Lynne Yelich

**VETERANS AFFAIRS****Chair:**

Rob Anders

**Vice-Chairs:**Brent St. Denis  
Peter StofferRodger Cuzner  
Roger Gaudet  
Betty HintonColin Mayes  
Gilles-A. PerronAnthony Rota  
Bev ShipleyDavid Sweet  
Roger Valley

(12)

**Associate Members**Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
David Anderson  
Claude Bachand  
Dave Batters  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Dawn Black  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Dean Del MastroNicole Demers  
Barry Devolin  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Christiane Gagnon  
Cheryl Gallant  
Yvon Godin  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Randy KampGerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Alexa McDonough  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre PoilievreJoe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid  
Lee Richardson  
Gerry Ritz  
Gary Schellenberger  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Brian Storseth  
Robert Thibault  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Bradley Trost  
Garth Turner  
Merv Tweed  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Peter Van Loan  
Maurice Vellacott  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
Jeff Watson  
John Williams  
Lynne Yelich

## STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

#### Joint Chair:

#### Joint Vice-Chair:

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Janis Johnson  
Jean Lapointe  
Donald Oliver

Vivienne Poy  
Marilyn Trenholme Counsell

Mike Allen  
Gérard Asselin  
Colleen Beaumier  
Blaine Calkins  
Joe Comuzzi  
Cheryl Gallant

Peter Goldring  
Gurbax Malhi  
Fabian Manning  
Jim Peterson  
Louis Plamondon  
Denise Savoie

(17)

#### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Vivian Barbot  
Dave Batters  
Carolyn Bennett  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Dean Del Mastro  
Barry Devolin

Paul Dewar  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra  
Ken Epp  
Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Charles Hubbard  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki

Maka Kotto  
Daryl Kramp  
Mike Lake  
Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Lawrence MacAulay  
Dave MacKenzie  
Inky Mark  
Colin Mayes  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Rick Norlock  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston

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



## SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

**Joint Chairs:** John Eyton  
Paul Szabo

**Joint Vice-Chairs:** Paul Dewar  
Ken Epp

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michel Biron  
John Bryden  
Pierre De Bané  
Mac Harb

Wilfred Moore  
Pierre Claude Nolin  
Gerry St. Germain

Robert Bouchard  
Ron Cannan  
Dean Del Mastro  
Monique Guay  
Derek Lee

John Maloney  
Rick Norlock  
Garth Turner  
Tom Wappel

(20)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Diane Ablonczy  
Harold Albrecht  
Mike Allen  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Dave Batters  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitzkreuz  
Gord Brown  
Patrick Brown  
Rod Bruinooge  
Blaine Calkins  
Colin Carrie  
Bill Casey  
Rick Casson  
John Cummins  
Patricia Davidson  
Barry Devolin  
Norman Doyle  
Rick Dykstra

Ed Fast  
Brian Fitzpatrick  
Steven Fletcher  
Cheryl Gallant  
Peter Goldring  
Gary Goodyear  
Jacques Gourde  
Nina Grewal  
Helena Guergis  
Art Hanger  
Richard Harris  
Luc Harvey  
Laurie Hawn  
Russ Hiebert  
Jay Hill  
Betty Hinton  
Rahim Jaffer  
Brian Jean  
Randy Kamp  
Gerald Keddy  
Jason Kenney  
Ed Komarnicki  
Daryl Kramp  
Mario Laframboise  
Mike Lake

Guy Lauzon  
Pierre Lemieux  
Tom Lukiwski  
James Lunney  
Dave MacKenzie  
Fabian Manning  
Inky Mark  
Pat Martin  
Colin Mayes  
Réal Ménard  
Serge Ménard  
Ted Menzies  
Rob Merrifield  
Larry Miller  
Bob Mills  
James Moore  
Rob Moore  
Deepak Obhrai  
Brian Pallister  
Christian Paradis  
Daniel Petit  
Pierre Poilievre  
Joe Preston  
James Rajotte  
Scott Reid

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

**Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees**

**The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole**

HON. BILL BLAIKIE

**The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. ROYAL GALIPEAU

**The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole**

MR. ANDREW SCHEER

MS. DAWN BLACK

MR. BILL CASEY

MR. JOHN CUMMINS

MR. KEN EPP

MR. RAHIM JAFFER

HON. DIANE MARLEAU

MR. DAVID MCGUINTY

MR. BERNARD PATRY

MR. MARCEL PROULX

MR. DAVID TILSON

## THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Stephen Harper	Prime Minister
Hon. Rob Nicholson	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform
Hon. David Emerson	Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics
Hon. Jean-Pierre Blackburn	Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Hon. Greg Thompson	Minister of Veterans Affairs
Hon. Marjory LeBreton	Leader of the Government in the Senate
Hon. Monte Solberg	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Chuck Strahl	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board
Hon. Gary Lunn	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Peter MacKay	Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
Hon. Loyola Hearn	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Stockwell Day	Minister of Public Safety
Hon. Carol Skelton	Minister of National Revenue and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
Hon. Vic Toews	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Rona Ambrose	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Michael Chong	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister for Sport
Hon. Diane Finley	Minister of Human Resources and Social Development
Hon. Gordon O'Connor	Minister of National Defence
Hon. Bev Oda	Minister of Canadian Heritage and Status of Women
Hon. Jim Prentice	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. John Baird	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Maxime Bernier	Minister of Industry
Hon. Lawrence Cannon	Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Hon. Tony Clement	Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario
Hon. Jim Flaherty	Minister of Finance
Hon. Josée Verner	Minister of International Cooperation and Minister for la Francophonie and Official Languages
Hon. Michael Fortier	Minister of Public Works and Government Services

**PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES**

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher	to the Prime Minister and Minister for la Francophonie and Official Languages
Mr. Jason Kenney	to the Prime Minister
Mr. Tom Lukiwski	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform
Ms. Helena Guergis	to the Minister of International Trade
Mr. Betty Hinton	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mr. Ed Komarnicki	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. David Anderson	(for the Canadian Wheat Board) to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board
Mr. Jacques Gourde	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board
Mr. Christian Paradis	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Deepak Obhrai	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Peter Van Loan	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Randy Kamp	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Dave MacKenzie	to the Minister of Public Safety
Mr. Rob Moore	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Mr. Mark Warawa	to the Minister of the Environment
Mrs. Lynne Yelich	to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development
Mr. Russ Hiebert	to the Minister of National Defence
Mr. Jim Abbott	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Rod Bruinooge	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Mr. Pierre Poilievre	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Colin Carrie	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Brian Jean	to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Mr. Steven Fletcher	to the Minister of Health
Ms. Diane Ablonczy	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Ted Menzies	to the Minister of International Cooperation
Mr. James Moore	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics

# CONTENTS

Friday, September 29, 2006

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Softwood Lumber Products Export Charge Act, 2006</b>	
Bill C-24. Second reading .....	3419
Mr. Marston .....	3419
Mr. Szabo .....	3420
Mr. Goodyear .....	3420
Ms. Keeper .....	3421
Ms. Davies .....	3422
Mr. Bevington .....	3423
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	3424
Ms. Savoie .....	3424
Mr. Szabo .....	3425

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Night to Light Walk</b>	
Mr. Warawa .....	3426
<b>Literacy</b>	
Ms. Brown (Oakville) .....	3426
<b>Goods and Services Tax</b>	
Mr. Vincent .....	3426
<b>Canadian Wheat Board</b>	
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	3427
<b>Children</b>	
Mr. Warkentin .....	3427
<b>Darfur</b>	
Mr. Cotler .....	3427
<b>Tobique—Mactaquac</b>	
Mr. Allen .....	3427
<b>Southwest Montreal</b>	
Mr. St-Cyr .....	3427
<b>National Forest Week</b>	
Mr. Paradis .....	3428
<b>Freedom's Fury</b>	
Mr. Telegdi .....	3428
<b>Afghanistan</b>	
Mr. Hiebert .....	3428
<b>Government Programs</b>	
Ms. Wasylcia-Leis .....	3428
<b>Literacy</b>	
Mr. Cuzner .....	3428
<b>Volunteerism</b>	
Ms. Demers .....	3429
<b>Canadian Wheat Board</b>	
Ms. Keeper .....	3429
<b>Michal Gutowski</b>	
Mr. Norlock .....	3429

## Véronique Rivest

Mr. Nadeau .....	3429
------------------	------

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Afghanistan

Mr. Goodale .....	3429
Mr. Kenney .....	3430
Mr. Goodale .....	3430
Mr. Kenney .....	3430
Mr. Goodale .....	3430
Mr. Kenney .....	3430

### Summit of la Francophonie

Mrs. Jennings .....	3430
Mr. Kenney .....	3430
Mrs. Jennings .....	3430
Mr. Kenney .....	3430

### Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Ms. Guay .....	3431
Mr. Kenney .....	3431
Ms. Guay .....	3431
Mr. Kenney .....	3431

### Maher Arar

Mr. Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin) .....	3431
Mr. Day .....	3431
Mr. Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin) .....	3431
Mr. Day .....	3431

### Afghanistan

Ms. Davies .....	3431
Mr. Kenney .....	3432
Ms. Davies .....	3432
Mr. Kenney .....	3432

### Access to Information

Mr. Cuzner .....	3432
Mr. Kenney .....	3432
Mr. Cuzner .....	3432
Mr. Baird .....	3432

### Maher Arar

Mr. Alghabra .....	3432
Mr. Kenney .....	3433
Mr. Alghabra .....	3433
Mr. Day .....	3433

### The Environment

Mr. Lussier .....	3433
Mr. Warawa .....	3433
Mr. Lussier .....	3433
Mr. Warawa .....	3433

### Agriculture and Agri-Food

Mr. Bellavance .....	3433
Mr. Gourde .....	3433
Mr. Bellavance .....	3434





**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**1782711  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*  
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante :**  
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Additional copies may be obtained from Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5  
Telephone: (613) 941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943  
Fax: (613) 954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757  
[publications@pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:publications@pwgsc.gc.ca)  
<http://publications.gc.ca>**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**

**On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires ou la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5  
Téléphone : (613) 941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943  
Télécopieur : (613) 954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757  
[publications@tpsgc.gc.ca](mailto:publications@tpsgc.gc.ca)  
<http://publications.gc.ca>**