



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 144 • NUMBER 030 • 2nd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, March 13, 2009

—

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, March 13, 2009

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

•(1005)

[*Translation*]

CANADA-EFTA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway, CPC) moved that Bill C-2, An Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the States of the European Free Trade Association (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Switzerland), the Agreement on Agriculture between Canada and the Republic of Iceland, the Agreement on Agriculture between Canada and the Kingdom of Norway and the Agreement on Agriculture between Canada and the Swiss Confederation, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues for taking an interest in the bill before us today.

I realize that free trade agreements can cause some conflict. Our world has been hit hard by the global economic crisis, and the crisis will have an impact here at home. We can take comfort in the fact that Canada has the most stable banking system in the world.

However, we must also recognize that our industries, our workers and our exporters are all under pressure.

That is why it is important for the government to do everything in its power to make things better by developing policies and programs that will lighten the burden on our industries and companies.

[*English*]

We know we are in a time of fiscal crisis and we know there are pressures all around. It is in times like these, more than any other, from the government's point of view and, I think, most Canadians that we should be looking at opportunities to open up the doors for, not just Canadian companies, but Canadian workers also. We should not be looking at ways in which to build walls but in fact to tear down walls and to open up possibilities.

History is very clear, as we have indicated before, that when we build a trade wall up we bring our economy down. We do not want

to see that happen, which is why we are taking a number of initiatives to pursue possibilities for Canadian workers and businesses to make their products and services more available world-wide.

As our economic history shows, we are as prosperous as we are in Canada because of the fact that we believe in trading freely. Because of our great capabilities, not just on the technology side but because we are innovative and productive, we can actually produce more products than we can all, as individual Canadians, consume.

Therefore, if we are going to truly move in the area of increased prosperity, we need to look for ways to sell our goods and services abroad into other countries. That is why pursuing free trade agreements, or more comprehensive economic agreements, as some countries prefer to refer to them, is part of our plan.

Free trade agreements are very significant. They will help Canadian producers and our workers. However, we also need to look at, as we do, areas like funding research and innovation, research and development and science and technology agreements. We pursue air agreements and open sky agreements with other countries to advance the air industry and make travel and the shipment of cargo even more productive and more competitive. We do a number of things, on several fronts, to ensure Canadians are positioned among the best in the world so their products and services can be manufactured and sold abroad.

This particular agreement, which is represented by Bill C-2, involves what will be the first ever free trade agreement with European countries. Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and Liechtenstein agree with us that there will be mutual benefits if we can tear down tariff walls, tear down the barriers that make trade more difficult back and forth and open the doors of opportunities on both sides.

If we look at last year's figures, we have about a \$4.2 billion relationship when it comes to merchandise exporting and trade and, even more important, we have over \$18 billion of direct investment. That means jobs for Canadians and the expansion of Canadian activity. We have a fairly stable and productive trading relationship with these countries, which are pulled together in this bill known as the EFTA, and we want to see this continue and enhanced.

Government Orders

As important as this bill is and as important as trade is with the individual countries that are named in this bill, it also serves, and we are not hiding this fact, as a lever into the larger EU community. Colleagues will know that we have made great progress on the EU front with 27 other countries eventually encompassed in the EU agreement. We have now gone through what is called the scoping exercise or the first phase of discussions and are very close to getting into official and formal negotiations with the broader EU community. That is something we are hoping to see develop over the next few months.

However, right now we want to focus on the countries named in this particular bill. These are friendly countries and long-standing friends and allies, and we want to see our capabilities back and forth to continue.

A number of issues have been raised, some in committee and others over a long period of time, in terms of consultation. I thank all the members of the committee for recognizing that a lot of work has gone on and a lot of consultation has taken place and we believe all of the substantive issues have been addressed.

● (1010)

These are not always easy discussions at the committee level, especially if there are ideological differences, but my sense is that most of us in the chamber and most of the people on the committee recognize that the opening of doors and the expansion of opportunities is something that is key to us at any time, regardless of the economic environment but especially now in a tough time of economic pressure.

It is important to note that political and democratic pressures come to bear in the negotiations of free trade agreements. Inevitably, certain industries will feel that if they do not have the protection of a tariff wall and they do not have the ability to tax goods coming into the country even before they get here, thereby forcing up the prices so that the goods coming into the country are less attractive to Canadian consumers, the Canadian product is more attractive because an incoming good has a tariff slapped on to it. Some industries, invariably, will be affected by any trade agreement. These are called sensitivities, which is why we work with those industries to try, as far as possible, to soften the impact of a free trade agreement.

I will use one example in this particular agreement that is represented in Bill C-2 and that has to do with the shipbuilding industry. We have had consultations with the shipbuilding industry that go back as far as the 1990s because there have been very high tariffs in that particular industry, some as high as 25% or more. That would mean that a product coming into Canada that is under the shipbuilding umbrella could be facing a tariff as high as 25% or more, which means that the price of the product coming in is artificially raised because a tariff has been slapped on it and that gives a competitive advantage.

We are very careful to protect our industry. When we negotiate a free trade agreement with any country we need to ensure its shipbuilding industry is not being subsidized. We must have a level playing field. I believe, time and again, that Canadians have shown that they can compete with the best anywhere in the world as long as we are on a level playing field. As a government, that is where we

need to be vigilant and vigorous when it comes to dealing with other countries. If we are looking at a free trade agreement abroad or an economic comprehensive agreement, we need to be aggressively pushing those other countries to ensure those tariffs are gone and that subsidies to those particular industries are removed so they do not have an unfair advantage competing against Canadians.

On the shipbuilding industry, we have put in place a 15-year phase-out of our tariff. That is the longest phase-out ever in Canadian history in a free trade agreement. We want to make this incremental and we want to give that industry as much time as possible to adapt.

We also have estimated, going over the next three decades, some \$43 billion in procurement in the shipbuilding industry. We are showing our shipbuilders that the opportunities are huge moving into the future. We have also put in place a finance structuring facility of up to \$50 million that assists our industry in terms of dealing with interest costs when it comes to purchases related to shipbuilding. We have carefully done this in a way that is compliant with our free trade agreements. It will not put us offside or at the risk or threat of any World Trade Organization dispute or any contest.

We have also indicated to our shipbuilding industry that just on the acquisition of Coast Guard vessels alone over the next few years, there are \$175 million of acquisition geared specifically to the Canadian industry. Since shipbuilding has been mentioned, I am using it as an example of how we can deal with a particular sector within a free trade agreement.

As elected people, we need to keep in mind that we must be constantly looking at what will be good overall for our producers, manufacturers and the economy of Canada. When we are approached individually by a sector that would be opposed to a particular agreement, we need to consider a couple of things. We first must consider what can we do within the agreement to soften the impact of a free trade agreement and to help that particular industry adjust and stay competitive over time when eventually those tariffs are completely removed.

● (1015)

The other thing we have to consider is this. There will always be in any free trade agreement one or more industries that come forward and say that it will make them less competitive and that they do not want the deal to go ahead. At that time, we not only have to look at it seriously, but we also have to consider that if the deal does not go ahead, other industries will be affected and will stay uncompetitive because we do not have a free trade agreement.

When we look at the agreement in Bill C-2, and we look at, for instance, the fishing industry, which has a huge impact in Atlantic Canada, if we do not move ahead because we have another industry that feels it could not be competitive, an advantage will be lost for our entire marine and fishing industries.

There could be an entire sector of agriculture products that if we did not move ahead with a free trade agreement, we would be still stuck with high tariff walls. If we try to be sensitive to one area, like shipbuilding, our entire agriculture sector will be affected.

Government Orders

Look at the shipment and the export of our paper products. Can we legitimately look at this entire industry, the Canadian companies that manufacture paper products, and say we cannot help with free trade because another sector will be upset, especially in a time when the forestry and paper industry is probably getting hit harder than at any other time in its history?

This is where the democratic process puts us in a bit of a dilemma. We will always have one group of constituents who will be, quite rightly, concerned about a free trade agreement. If we are only being sensitive to that group, we could in fact be denying many other groups the opportunity to more freely and ably market their goods abroad.

We can use the agreement and this arrangement, under Bill C-2, as an example. We can show how we identify an industry, in this case it would be the shipbuilding sector. We have worked with it. We have made the provisions to assist it through this 15 year phase-out period. We have clearly shown the economic advantages and the purchasing opportunities in the years ahead. We have taken great steps to not only sensitize it to a free trade agreement, but also to signal to many other industries that they will benefit from this agreement as well. Provisions are being made and overall, as an economy, we will see things improve.

As we consider Bill C-2 at third reading, I ask our colleagues to give fair thought to this. I ask them to show the world, which is watching us in a time of economic downturn, that Canada does believe that opening the doors of opportunity is the way to go.

This is the worst time for countries to give in to what would be an impulse that is understandable. It is natural that industries, companies and business would step forward and say, in a time of global contraction, that they need protection. The last thing we want to do is start building walls and making it more difficult to market our goods abroad.

We can be a leader and we can be an example. I believe we are doing that. Soon in this assembly we will see free trade agreements related to Peru and Colombia. In the not too distant future we hope to see the materialization of agreements that we are pursuing in Asia and the Americas.

When I was in India last month, I met with the prime minister and the minister of trade. I have an agreement to begin discussion on a more comprehensive trade agreement with India. I will be in China next month where we will open six new trade offices there. We are sending the indicators very clearly, not just in the pursuit of things like science and technology agreement but on a broader array of sectors, that we want an even more vigorous and more robust relationship with China.

At every opportunity we can, we want to allow the world to see and to be aware that Canadian producers, innovators, exporters and merchandisers are the best in the world. We can compete with anybody in the world at any time as long as the playing field is level. This is our intention with our free trade agreements.

I thank members for their involvement in this and hopefully for their support as we continue the third reading discussion on Bill C-2.

● (1020)

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, with great respect to my hon. colleague, he missed out on a few things.

First, he should be aware that the Canadian industry for military Coast Guard Laker and ferry fleets requires an investment of \$22 billion over 20 years, not \$175 million. None of the major yards will be building hovercrafts or the small Coast Guard vessels. We asked and pleaded for a \$22 billion investment over 20 years, and we received \$175 million.

The minister talked about structured facility financing. We have asked repeatedly, since 2001 in a report done by business, labour and the communities, to have SFF, structured facility financing, and accelerated cost capital allowance together over five years.

The previous Liberals and the current Conservatives repeatedly said that we could not have a double benefit. All we ask for is that the shipbuilding industry be treated in the same fashion as the aerospace industry.

I could not help but notice the other day when a Conservative MP stood and bragged about the investment in aerospace, yet shipbuilding received a pittance. We know that our five remaining yards cannot live by government procurement alone. They have to be stable. We have five major yards left in the country and a bunch of smaller ones. We are very concerned about them.

It is not that the NDP is against trade deals. We are for them, but we have asked for the exact same thing for which the United States has asked. Since 1924, and the minister should know this, every FTA the United States has signed has excluded shipbuilding marine services from the table. The Americans do not even bring it to these deals. Since they are our largest trading partner, we should have followed suit and done the same thing, but we did not. We know shipbuilding is a deal breaker in EFTA.

The minister is right about subsidies. We have not subsidized our industries for years, but Norway did for over 30 years when it was building up the North Sea oil. It subsidized it heavily to the point where it has it right.

It is not just Norway we are concerned about, because the next talks will be with Korea. Korea has said very clearly that the auto and shipbuilding sectors are major factors in the trade deal. Therefore, we are also concerned about Korea when it comes to shipbuilding and other countries down the road.

My hon. colleague, whom I have great respect for, should understand that we have asked very clearly for the shipbuilding aspect to be taken out of EFTA, and worry about everything else. If he says that we can compete with the rest of the world, that is fine. Does that mean supply management for our farmers—

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Minister of International Trade.

Hon. Stockwell Day: Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate my colleague's input. I am fascinated by his last remark. Is the NDP coming forward with a position different than ours on supply management? That was fascinating territory for him to be straying into.

Any government program, whether it is a local program to fix potholes or whether it is a federal program to look at exploration in space, by its very nature is always over subscribed.

The member says that we are not doing enough on the facility financing. I think \$50 million to assist with the paying down of interest is a lot of money. Could it be more? I guess it could be.

Just announced were \$175 million for Coast Guard vessel procurement construction acquisitions. Could it be more? Of course, it could be, but \$175 million is really nothing to sneeze at.

We have identified some \$45 billion of acquisitions over the next three decades. Could it be more? I guess it could. Could we have put more than \$12 billion into our infrastructure and roads program? I guess we could have.

There will always be an argument for more resources in any government program, but those requests should not deter the forward movement of seeing Canadian industries becoming more competitive and doors being opened for them.

That is why we have spent a lot of time with the shipbuilding industry. Let us talk about major shipyards. For the Davie shipyard in Quebec, we went to EDC and pursued the Canada account. We looked for provisions even above and beyond what normally would be available through EDC's deliberation to the point of over \$300 million for expanding its facilities, but keeping that from violating other trade agreements. It is not perfect.

We have not produced unlimited funds for every program, but we have gone a long way to ensure that our shipbuilding industry is protected in the appropriate ways that are allowable.

We have not only verbal but written assurance from Norway, and the proof to follow, that it no longer subsidizes its shipbuilding industry. That should be acknowledge as an accomplishment of the EFTA, that we have virtually another country standing back and getting out of the subsidy business.

To say that we should not pursue the agreement because in the past a certain country subsidized a certain industry, then we may as well pack up our bags and go home. Every country is guilty somewhere along the line of having subsidized some industry or another. We should not use that as a reason to stop this agreement.

I appreciate the member's questions, but we need to move ahead. Hopefully we can see program increases in some of the areas that he has mentioned.

• (1025)

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question for the minister is a simple one. From his speech, I got the feeling that he is not being as bold as

international regulations allow with respect to this kind of financial help. For example, with respect to the forestry crisis, the minister insists that loan guarantees are subsidies, and I sense that the same thing will happen with the shipbuilding industry. That worries me.

Despite the fact that his own lawyers handling the forestry file at the WTO have argued that loan guarantees are not subsidies, every day the minister stands up here in the House of Commons and says that loan guarantees violate WTO rules. That worries me, and I would ask him to clarify his position.

Hon. Stockwell Day: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from the Bloc party continues to follow the same path, but his approach is limited. He continues to focus on loan guarantees, an issue that is currently before the courts. I can assure the hon. member that Export Development Canada has programs to help industries across Canada and throughout the province of Quebec.

These include a financing program and a risk insurance program. He can keep on talking about loan guarantees. It is up to him to decide if he wants to continue focusing on an issue that is currently before the courts. We intend to await their decision. Then it will be up to Export Development Canada to decide if we can continue with certain kinds of programs—

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am afraid I will have to cut the hon. member off.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Calgary Centre.

• (1030)

Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted Bill C-2 has come to third reading because it is part of a broader plan. I wish the minister had more time in his address to speak to the bigger picture, the broader plan of global trading patterns and where we are in Canada's initiatives, being at the forefront of the new trend of freer trade around the world, particularly in this difficult economic time.

When President Obama visited Canada, there was some concern about protectionism. I think the dangers of protectionism became clear to most Canadians, particularly in a tough economic time.

Would the minister comment on the bigger picture? We have debated, at length, Bill C-2, and most of the House has agreed that this is a favourable and positive approach. However, I would like the minister to comment on the bigger picture of free trade and Canada's plans for the future.

Hon. Stockwell Day: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments from my colleague from Calgary and also his chairmanship of the committee that has looked at these issues.

There is a much bigger picture involved. I do not want to undermine the individual importance for each of the countries with which we will be engaged under this agreement. However, that broader picture is sending a signal around the world that protectionism is not the way to go, that as elected people, we need to understand the impulse to protect. If we really want to protect an industry, if we really want to protect our workers, then we open up the doors to these free trade agreements.

Government Orders

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Mississauga—Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have this opportunity today to speak on EFTA, as I have done in my previous capacity as the critic for international trade. During my tenure as critic, I had the opportunity to debate this issue, to work on it in committee, and to work with my caucus colleagues in the Liberal Party on this very important bill.

I want to say from the outset that we need to recognize what this debate is really about. This debate is about free and fair trade. I think we as parliamentarians must recognize now more than ever during these hard economic times that we need to promote free and fair trade.

Very close to my constituency of Mississauga—Brampton South, there is an airport that acts as a hub for many businesses that export, and I am reminded that we are seeing the challenges now in this global recession.

I think it is so important that we recognize that we have to avoid the protectionist tendencies that exist in various countries, including here in Canada. We need to recognize that we need to open up our borders and have access of goods and services back and forth to other countries.

We are a nation of 33 million people. For us to succeed and have the quality of life that we enjoy, for us to be able to export the goods and services that we need to make sure we generate the revenue so that we can have government play a role in people's lives and improving people's lives, we need to make sure that we create opportunities for trade and growth, both domestically and abroad.

This morning I was reminded again how difficult this economic situation is and the challenges we face. In the month of February, we lost 83,000 jobs. That is a big number, in my opinion. It speaks volumes about the concerns that people have about job losses.

The unemployment rate now, I think, is close to 7.5% or 7.7%. The projection is that it will go into double digits by the end of the year. These are alarming numbers, and in my opinion, a major cause of concern.

One thing I did hear from the minister and that I do want to echo on behalf of the Liberal Party before I speak on EFTA specifically is the importance of making sure that we promote not only bilateral trade, but multilateral trade.

We are a nation of only 33 million people, and when we engage ourselves in bilateral negotiations with other countries we have a difficult time of negotiating a favourable position because of the relative size of our country. Even though we have great human resources, great potential and great geography, because of the sheer numbers it makes it very difficult for us to get a favourable deal. I think that poses a challenge.

I would encourage this government to work very aggressively through the multilateral system, through the WTO, for example, to be able to negotiate better terms for Canada. That should be the number one priority when it comes to promoting trade with Canada.

The Liberal Party supports Bill C-2, but we have extreme caution and concern with respect to the shipbuilding industry. Yesterday our critic for industry made it very clear that we need to have a national

shipbuilding strategy. It is absolutely imperative that we have a strategy in place to help our shipbuilders.

As indicated before by my hon. colleagues, Norway, for example, for many years subsidized their shipbuilding industry and put it in a very unique position in light of this free trade agreement.

I think it is important that Canada has a domestic shipbuilding strategy that puts us in a position where we remain competitive. That would be consistent with provisions in the free trade agreement with respect to the buy Canada procurement policy. I think that is very important and would be consistent with those principles. So I would encourage and request this government to take action immediately in putting together a comprehensive strategy to help the shipbuilding industry.

Another cause of concern that many people had expressed to me, especially from the agricultural sector, was in regard to supply management. I am glad to see that in this bill supply management is protected. It is something that the Liberal Party fought for very hard in committee. It is something we really fought for when this was being negotiated and we made our position very clear to the government. So I would hope people recognize the role we played in shaping some of the elements in this particular free trade agreement.

•(1035)

I want to emphasize why this free trade agreement is important. EFTA countries are the world's fourteenth largest merchandise traders and Canada's fifth largest merchandising export destination. We export billions of dollars worth of goods to the EFTA countries, including nickel, copper, pharmaceuticals, machinery, precious stones, metals, medical devices, aluminum, and so forth. In addition, we import from them pharmaceuticals, organic chemicals, and many other goods and services. I think it is important to recognize that there is a healthy relationship there.

In my opinion, there is one thing that the agreement does lack that is a challenge, because it is a generation one agreement. It does not have a comprehensive strategy to deal with investment, promoting two-way investments and having that flow of investment between both countries. I hope that is something that will be considered in the near future as well to further enhance this very important relationship that we are developing.

There is concern, and I think rightly so, with respect to this bill. I hope the government exercises good judgment and is careful in monitoring this free trade agreement, especially when it comes to the snap-back provisions, if there are violations of any of the provisions in the agreement. The 15-year phase-out should be monitored very carefully to make sure that there is no violation of that. I would encourage the government to really pay attention to those two provisions, which are very important to making sure that the shipbuilding industry, in conjunction with the national shipbuilding strategy, is in a position to be competitive once this free trade agreement comes into effect.

Government Orders

I would like to raise one other very important point. In my opinion, EFTA is just the first step to something bigger. As I alluded to earlier with respect to multilateralism, I think it is important that we use EFTA as a launching pad to negotiate with the European Union. It is a very important trading bloc. It is something that we need to recognize. This downturn reminds us that our dependency on the United States has compromised our position. I think it is very important we recognize that we need to diversify our trade and look at other markets.

One of the other key markets is the European Union. I think there is enormous potential there as well, and I hope the government understands and recognizes the importance of working with not only the EFTA countries but other European nations to be able to promote free and fair trade.

I have taken enormous pride in working very closely with my colleagues in the Liberal Party on this file. As I have indicated before, I think this is a very important step in the right direction to promote trade. Trade is very important now in light of the economic challenges we are facing. As a nation of 30 million plus, we need to recognize that we have to open doors. We need to be in an environment where we foster an openness and a sense of opportunity for our businesses here to succeed. I very much believe in our businesses. I very much believe in our workforce and the fact that we can be productive. We can be competitive. We can be innovative, and we can compete with the rest.

However, I also want to underscore the importance of promoting fair trade. One of the concerns that my colleagues and I have expressed in the past is the fact that Norway, for a very long period of time, subsidized the shipbuilding industry in their country. We need to recognize that. In order to combat that and be able to put ourselves in a favourable position once the 15-year phase-out is eliminated, we need to make sure we have a national shipbuilding strategy.

With that, I just want to say that I look forward to this debate. I look forward to working with my colleagues from all political parties to make sure that this bill is passed and that we continue to promote free and fair trade, consistent with Liberal principles and the legacy of a party that has very much engaged in free and fair trade and has negotiated free trade agreements in the past as well. Hopefully when we form government in the near future with the support of many Canadians, we will continue to do so.

• (1040)

Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate the member for Mississauga—Brampton South on his comments today, but more so on his efforts as a critic in the past Parliament who really brought this bill to where it is today. I think it was an example of cooperation. We heard diverse views throughout. We heard witnesses extensively on these matters and came to what I think is a very good bill.

More than that, I think it is the start of an ongoing process. The way we proceeded with this reflects on the future. I would like the member comment on that, if he would, about how this begins a process and how it carries on. As he just stated, we are at a time in the world when we do not want to proceed down the old path of protectionism. It is very important to increase relations with

countries around the world, to open up markets for Canadian products and open up opportunities for Canadian business around the world.

I know how knowledgeable the member is on these matters, so I would ask that he comment again on that point, and also on this particular bill and how it is an entry market to open a bigger market in Europe.

Hon. Navdeep Bains: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague again for allowing me the opportunity to share my comments on this. The first question he asks is a very important one, which is what kind of strategy do we deploy to make Canada competitive in this new global environment where there is major restructuring taking place? One of the key and fundamental ways of doing that is to promote free trade. The best way for Canada to do so is through a multilateral position, which I have indicated, through the WTO, and it is very important that we pursue that strategy very aggressively.

In light of that, there also needs to be a parallel strategy to work with some of the key emerging markets. I would sense from my experience that there is no doubt that the potential exists in countries like China, India, Brazil and Russia, and we need to have a strategy not only to push our trade agenda through the multilateral organizations, but also to work with these nations at the same time to make sure that we do not fall behind other countries.

One of the concerns I have is that as a trading nation we are falling behind. We need to be aggressive when it comes to promoting trade, but in a very fair manner and in a manner that recognizes not only the importance of trade but some of the other elements within our system as well.

Also, with respect to EFTA, I mentioned in my speech that EFTA should be a stepping stone toward building a more comprehensive and open strategy with the European Union. That is a very important market, a market that, essentially, we need to be present in, that we need to be more active in. In light of what we have seen in the United States, we now recognize more than ever the importance of diversifying our trade to be able to have a presence in other markets so that when one market takes a downturn we can then take advantage of expanding our trade and services in other markets.

EFTA, in my opinion, is definitely the right step in promoting trade within that geographic region. I would encourage that EFTA go beyond simply a first generation agreement and look at investment and services as well.

Government Orders

•(1045)

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is no clearer illustration of just how out of touch Conservatives and Liberals are than that exchange we just had between two members. I like very much the standing committee chair for international trade, but how could they be more out of touch with what is happening across this country? At a time when we are hemorrhaging jobs, when there are hundreds of thousands of lost jobs, the committee chair did not mention that every single witness before the Standing Committee on International Trade who actually came from the shipbuilding industry said that this is going to kill their industry, that they are going to lose thousands of jobs.

Yet with complete complacency, just like they did with softwood lumber, killing that industry, Conservatives and Liberals are combining to say, “We do not care, we are all right, so we are going to just close shipyards right across the country”.

I would like to say to the public watching this morning, particularly shipyard workers in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in Marys-town, Newfoundland, in Lévis, Quebec, in the Washington yards in Vancouver, and in Victoria and Nanaimo, B.C., every single witness said this is going to kill our shipbuilding industry.

We have had a lot of lip service paid to fair trade. The reality is what countries are doing now around the world is protecting key industries. The Jones Act in the United States and that country's fair trade policies are one very good example. Americans have built on their shipbuilding industry. Conservatives and Liberals in this House are moving to kill ours.

I would like to ask the hon. member, who I like and respect as a person but quite frankly think he is completely out to lunch when it comes to economic policies, how he reacts to Alfred Komo from Halifax, who said:

It's a shame that the Liberal party of Canada feels that it has to remain a puppet of the Conservative government in supporting another bad free trade deal for Canada.

And he signs his name, “Another—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I am going to have to cut the hon. member off there to allow a response.

The hon. member for Mississauga—Brampton South.

Hon. Navdeep Bains: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the enthusiasm shown by my colleague from the NDP.

People want to see that parties are working together, in the House especially, and recognize that these issues exist. I would like to acknowledge that we have demonstrated in the past, in government and in opposition, that we have sound economic policy that breeds prosperity, creates wealth and helps our productivity. We have illustrated that we work with industry to improve its standing, especially vis-à-vis other countries.

The member makes a very good point that the shipbuilding industry is going to face some major challenges. Irrespective of the EFTA agreement, it is going to face major challenges in general. We in the Liberal Party feel it is very important that we have a national shipbuilding strategy and we have asked the government to create a strategy, not just on paper but by investing the money required to make sure our shipbuilding industry is in a competitive position.

We are also asking the government to make sure it stipulates in the EFTA agreement that any violation of the agreement is monitored, and to make sure of the snap-back provision and the 15-year phase-out to allow our shipbuilding industry to be on a competitive footing vis-à-vis the other countries.

The Liberal Party very much promotes free and fair trade. It understands the sensitivities around the shipbuilding industry, and that is why it has called for a very comprehensive, integrated strategy when it comes to the national shipbuilding community across the country, not only on the east coast but also on the west coast and in parts of Quebec as well. I hope the hon. member recognizes that.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, with great respect to the member, it was his party, under Mr. Tobin, that initiated the national shipbuilding strategy, and it has been sitting on the Minister of Industry's desk since 2001. He does not have to write a new policy. We already have one.

The problem is that for the five years following, the Liberals let it gather dust. Now the Conservatives are letting it gather dust. The hon. member should know that we in the NDP do not have anything against trading deals with other countries. That is what we should be pursuing.

I am going to ask him this one question, because I know he is a very intelligent individual. When the United States enters into free trade deals, since 1924 it has excluded shipbuilding and marine services from the trade deals because it knows how vital and strategic that industry is to its economy and its country. If the United States does that, and it is our largest trading partner, why does Canada not do it?

•(1050)

Hon. Navdeep Bains: Mr. Speaker, again I want to illustrate how important the shipbuilding industry is in Canada, in our opinion.

One of the provisions in this agreement that Liberals feel is very important in addressing some of the concerns that have been raised is the buy Canada procurement. There needs to be a recognition that we understand the importance of this provision, because it will allow our shipbuilding industry to create the ships they need for our domestic consumption and use.

Also, it is very important for people to recognize that there is a 15-year phase-out period that would enable this industry to transition, but not in isolation. It has to be done with a comprehensive national shipbuilding strategy. That is something Liberals have been pushing on a daily basis in committee, through press releases and critics, in public and in debates to make sure the government comes up with a national strategy with regard to shipbuilding.

Government Orders

In light of that, I think the three components, that is, a national shipbuilding strategy, the phase-out and the buy Canada procurement, would help the shipbuilding industry, but make no mistake, the industry is going through some very difficult and challenging times. We recognize that and will play a role. In my opinion, whenever the next election occurs, and I do not know that, with the support of Canadians I am confident that when Liberals form the next government, we will work very hard with the shipbuilding industry to have a national—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on behalf of the Bloc Québécois about Bill C-2, the Canada-EFTA Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act. This is a bilateral agreement between Switzerland, Norway, Liechtenstein, Iceland and Canada.

When we are faced with a free trade agreement, we must be able to take a step back and analyze its pros and cons, and that is what the Bloc Québécois does each and every time, in a responsible manner. We have to look at its strengths and weaknesses. The Bloc Québécois' top priority has always been the interests of Quebecers. We are the only party in this House that rises every day to defend the interests of Quebecers.

When we look at this agreement in terms of markets and economies that could generate as many imports and exports from Quebec to the EFTA as from them to us, we can see that there are some very significant markets in Quebec.

First of all, there is aluminum, which is our leading export to Iceland.

When it comes to Norway, nickel accounts for 80% of what we export. In Quebec, we have in Ungava one of the biggest nickel mines in the world, belonging to Xstrata. This too is one of our strengths.

Pharmaceuticals should also be included. We all know that Switzerland is a major producer of pharmaceuticals, and thanks to the skills Quebec has developed in this sector and the assistance provided over the years, Quebec provides very fertile ground for this entire industry and a free trade agreement like this could well give its industry a real boost.

Turning to agriculture, there is always a major problem with international agreements because of the supply management issue. Unlike other treaties, though, this one excludes supply management. It is very important for us to be able to defend the interests of Quebec farmers under supply management. In this agreement, the government has understood, for once, the message that the Bloc Québécois gave it: remove the entire supply management question from the treaty.

One very important thorny point remains and that is shipbuilding. There is a feeling in the treaty that this problem was taken into account. That is why the entry tariffs on equipment and ships and any agreements are subject to a 15 year phase-out with counter-vailing duties that are reduced with a certain moratorium for three years. This was obviously a major concern.

I will be repeating myself now because I had a chance at another stage of the bill to express my views on this matter. I am very surprised, though, that we could not arrive at a consensus in the House—not to put the free trade agreement on the back burner, because I think it is good for Quebec and also Canada—but to deal right away with the real problem in our shipyards. This is a sector that cries out for a real Canadian policy.

I am amazed that the government has not quickly implemented a Canadian shipbuilding policy and that we are not busy in the House discussing one now. If we look at this Canada-EFTA free trade agreement, it soon becomes apparent that the entire shipbuilding industry has been ignored by the Canadian government for far too long in comparison with what has been happening elsewhere, especially in Norway. I know this is a sensitive issue, but the people opposed to the free trade agreement will understand. I am thinking of the New Democratic Party. It is obvious, though, that if shipbuilding were removed from the treaty, the EFTA countries would no longer have much reason to sign it.

• (1055)

We have to be realistic about this situation. But once again, it is important that the Government of Canada use the moratorium and the 15-year period over which tariffs will be reduced to put in place the Canadian marine policy the industry is calling for.

It was very hard to listen earlier as the Minister of International Trade told us yet again that he had provided enough support for this industry sector with the programs that had been put in place. This is staggering, because I do not sense any openness and, in light of how he answered the question I asked him, I sense that the government is going to take the same approach to the forest industry: they have to be careful, there are international laws, there is the WTO.

While the minister is refusing to introduce loan guarantees for the forest industry, claiming that they are subsidies, his own lawyers are arguing at the WTO and in the London court that loan guarantees are not subsidies. He has given the same answer to every question the government has been asked about this, yet no one has been able to quote a section of any law or regulation that says that loan guarantees are subsidies.

There are loan guarantees in the auto sector and many other sectors. EDC provides loan guarantees for all parts of the aerospace industry. That is a fact, yet we have the feeling that the shipbuilding industry is falling victim to the Conservatives' tendency to help only certain industries and to use international laws as an excuse to refuse help for industries not in that select group.

That is a hard reality, because the forest industry impacts Quebec. And if the government does the same thing in the case of shipbuilding, it will affect the Davie yards in Lévis, near Quebec City. Once again, these are repeated attacks against Quebec that we cannot ignore. We agree with Bill C-2 in principle, but there is a problem in this agreement, and it has to do with shipbuilding, because the government has neglected this industry for too long.

Statements by Members

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel will have 12 minutes remaining after question period.

[*Translation*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

YOUNG CANADA WEEK

Mr. Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today marks the 60th year the Goderich Lions Club has hosted the annual Young Canada Week hockey tournament. This tournament first began in 1950 during spring break. Back then it was a one day tournament and 12 teams participated. Now more than 66 teams take part from the AAA division all the way down to the D division.

Over the years local hockey legends Gary Doak, Larry Jeffrey, Boyd Devereaux, Dave McIlwain, Paul Henderson, Dave Farrish and Dave Shaw have participated in the tournament, as well as NHL hockey legends Wayne Gretzky and Darryl Sittler.

I encourage you, Mr. Speaker, members of Parliament and all Canadians to come to Goderich, Ontario to support Young Canada Week and experience Ontario's west coast.

* * *

• (1100)

PARKS CANADA

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, sadly, Parks Canada has embarked on an initiative that will result in the laying off of employees across the country. In these desperate times when the government is spending billions to create jobs, why would it do the exact opposite and shut down jobs?

While the external relations and visitor experience, ERVE, initiative could be a valuable addition, it should not be at the expense of Parks Canada's basic services, which are already understaffed.

In my riding alone, it looks like local Parks Canada staff will need to cut a million dollars from normal programming and possibly the only way will be by cutting 14 jobs.

In our small northern communities, such as Dawson and Haines Junction, the loss of these families who are integral parts of the communities will be devastating. Even if nine new employees are hired, it does not help the families of the fourteen workers laid off from their positions in their community if they do not qualify for these new jobs.

It will also severely hurt regular operations that have been cut to the bone in recent years and have been sorely understaffed.

I implore the government to put a moratorium on all cuts of regular Parks Canada programming and layoffs, and provide totally new funding to Parks Canada for the ERVE programming.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on March 17, in keeping with tradition, we will celebrate St. Patrick's Day and pay tribute, among other things, to the Irish community's contribution to the development of Quebec. The traditional St. Patrick's Day parade through the streets of Montreal will take place on March 22, rain or shine. Year after year, this parade of green, the colour of Ireland, draws large crowds. The second largest parade in Quebec will be held this Sunday, March 15, for the 31st time, in my riding of Rawdon, which is home to a large Irish community.

During the 19th century, throngs of Irish fled Ireland, which was devastated by famine and disease, to be able to start their lives over. Many of them settled in Montreal and elsewhere in Quebec. They have greatly contributed to the development of our nation with their vitality, courage, joie de vivre and traditions.

This is why I encourage everyone to come out and take part in any of the various activities scheduled across Quebec to mark St. Patrick's Day.

* * *

[*English*]

JUNIOR CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I inform the House about the achievements of Eden Beaudin, a nine-year-old girl from the community of M'Chigeeng First Nation which is situated on beautiful Manitoulin Island in my riding.

Eden Beaudin is the author, illustrator and producer of *The Adventures of Pegasus and I and With All Our Friends*. The long hours of hard work resulted in Eden receiving the 2008 Pegasus Literacy Writing Award. On March 3 of this year, she was a recipient of the Ontario Junior Citizen of the Year Award.

Her book is being read by many children and will be enjoyed by many more in the years to come. Her achievement at such a young age has inspired not only the students at Lakeview School in M'Chigeeng, but many others to recognize that they, too, have the potential to make their mark in history. Her parents and schoolmates, her school and her community are extremely proud of Eden.

I would like members to join me in recognizing Eden's great achievement at such a young age.

* * *

MARGUERITE MACDONALD

Mrs. Shelly Glover (Saint Boniface, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and pride that I rise today to honour and remember a courageous Métis woman of Cree descent who passed away on Monday night in the veterans wing of Saskatoon's Sherbrooke Community Centre.

Statements by Members

Marguerite MacDonald was my grandmother. She was a female veteran of the second world war. She was no ordinary woman. Her mother died when she was only 12 years old. Her life's struggles were sometimes painful, but she always had a desire to serve her people and her country from a young age.

So strong was this need to protect others that she falsified her date of birth and joined the Canadian armed forces in January 1942 at the tender age of 17 years. She and many other Canadian women just like her chose to serve alongside our brave soldiers during a time of war.

She trained with the Women's Army Corps in Prince Albert before flying to England where she met my grandfather, Sergeant James MacDonald of the South Saskatchewan Regiment.

In the name of my grandmother's memory, I thank our Canadian heroes of the armed forces, our veterans and their families. Their sacrifices will never be forgotten.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Mrs. Michelle Simson (Scarborough Southwest, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the recent reports that the number of Filipino caregivers approved to work in Canada has been slashed almost in half since the Conservative government came to power. Statistics show that 66% of the Filipino caregivers who applied to the Canadian visa office in Manila last year were refused.

This past weekend, at an event in my constituency with members of the Filipino community, I heard time and again the concern they have regarding this regressive and arbitrary approach to immigration.

In Manila between 2006 and 2008, the rejection rate for caregivers rose from 35% to 66%.

Clearly, the Conservative government has decided to pick favourites when it comes to whom it lets in and whom it does not.

The government must stop undervaluing caregivers and allow them to enter Canada to fill the demand for their much needed services.

* * *

• (1105)

TOURISM

Mr. Greg Rickford (Kenora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is some great news for Canada's tourism industry. The World Economic Forum has just released a report that lists the most attractive countries for tourism developers. We should celebrate that Canada has moved from ninth to fifth place.

One of the determining factors for the World Economic Forum in moving Canada up is this government's policy on tourism. A spokesperson specifically stated that Canada's high ranking is aided by a perception in the business community that the Conservative government is making a significant effort to promote tourism overseas.

Let us not forget that Canada's brand, "Keep Exploring", ranks second in the world according to the Country Brand Index report.

Tourism is a major industry in my beautiful riding of Kenora. It is clear that our new investments are already being noticed and are bringing international results.

Canada's tourism is a vital part of our economic fabric. I am delighted that we are being recognized on the world stage.

Congratulations, Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LAURA ARCHER

Ms. Paule Brunelle (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to express my indignation, but also my incredulity at the kidnapping of Laura Archer. From Montreal, Ms. Archer is a nurse by training and a volunteer with Doctors Without Borders in the Darfur region of Sudan, where humanitarian aid is crucial, given the situation.

Originally from Prince Edward Island, where she completed her training in 2001, Ms. Archer was on her third overseas mission. In Darfur, she worked with a mobile clinic that took medical care directly to those in need of it. The clinic has served over 55,000 people.

Although the kidnapping victims do not appear to have suffered any violence, we hope Ms. Archer will soon be able to return home to her loved ones, safe and sound. It makes no sense at all that people who devote themselves to bringing comfort to the lives of those most vulnerable should be kidnapped in the name of someone else's cause. We hope the Canadian government will do everything it can to resolve this situation.

* * *

[*English*]

THE BUDGET

Mr. Tim Uppal (Edmonton—Sherwood Park, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my research has shown me that fear of criticism is usually caused by an intense negative experience from one's past, perhaps a sponsorship program that did not go so well. A major symptom of this fear is having difficulties with decision making out of fear of being criticized. For example, let us say the Liberal leader said he would support the economic action plan. Then he said he may not. Then he said he may. Then he said he may not. Then he had his senators hold it up. Once he actually read the plan, he forced his senators to pass—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

* * *

HEAVY TRUCK TRAFFIC

Hon. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have always been opposed to heavy truck traffic in established communities, such as exists in the heart of our nation's capital.

Redirecting this traffic is a necessity, as constantly argued by numerous community members, such as myself and numerous petitioners who have signed petitions, which I have tabled in the House over the last few months.

It is with great sadness that we learned of the death of Mrs. Samantha Wong, a member of our community. She was killed yesterday when a cement truck collided with her vehicle on King Edward Avenue. Allow me to offer my most sincere condolences to her family.

Unfortunately, these tragic accidents happen all too frequently. Lower town residents have endured this situation long enough. Residential areas and heavy truck traffic do not mix.

We need a ring road around the national capital region, which means two bridges, one in the east and one in the west, so we can move all of the heavy truck traffic out of the core of Canada's capital city.

For the well-being of our communities and of our citizens, let us get this job done.

* * *

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Peterborough, CPC): Mr. Speaker, hear my voice; there is no need to put on your earmuffs for this Standing Order.

Much like the common garden snake, the Liberals have too thin a skin. They seem to forget, or they want people to forget that only three short months ago they were in league with both the separatists and the socialists. In fact, they liked separatism so much that one of their senators took up the cause for Newfoundland. They ran their election on a job-killing carbon tax, even as the world economy was heading into uncertainty. Canada would be suffering now if a carbon tax were in place.

The Conservatives have cut taxes. We have provided help for those hardest hit and invested in roads, bridges and other infrastructure.

The other side of the House has no plan—

• (1110)

Hon. Wayne Easter: Stick with John Tory, Dean. Stick with John Tory.

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: Thank you for hearing my voice.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Liberal leader to know that imposing a job-killing carbon tax and hiking the GST is no plan—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Welland.

* * *

CHILD CARE

Mr. Malcolm Allen (Welland, NDP): Mr. Speaker, thousands of workers are finding themselves unemployed or facing unemployment and the cold response from the government to the needs of Canadian families will unfortunately be felt largely by the most vulnerable, our children.

Statements by Members

It is time that the Conservative government stopped peddling the \$100 a month child care benefit as a national universal child care program.

By driving almost half a million Ontarians into poverty, the recession demands a sense of urgency from the government, if not a moral imperative to help those who cannot support themselves and their children.

Families need child care services. People cannot work or retrain for new jobs without them. Families living on low incomes spend every extra penny they receive just to survive. This includes the \$100 a month child care benefit that most often goes toward putting food on the table to feed their family.

Unlike the Conservative government, New Democrats will not turn our backs on the children of Canada. We will continue to fight to enact our early learning and child care act and establish the first truly universal child care and early learning program in Canada.

New Democrats gave us medicare. New Democrats will give us early child care.

* * *

[Translation]

THE CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to see that the light finally went on yesterday for my Liberal colleagues as they realized that they had to support the budget. Better late than never.

I was even more pleased to note that several of my Bloc Québécois colleagues are keen on our plan. They like it so much that they have gone to all the trouble of organizing a tour in Quebec to promote it.

I invite all my Quebec colleagues to go back to their ridings during constituency week and listen to their citizens tell them that enough is enough, that the nonsense has to stop, solutions are needed.

I would like to assure all our citizens that, at least on this side of the House, this government will do what it takes to defend the interests of all Quebecers.

* * *

ANTI-SCAB MOTION

Mr. Luc Desnoyers (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for the Bloc Québécois, the best way to acknowledge the outstanding contribution of all those who contribute to Quebec society on a daily basis is to show true respect for their rights, starting with the right to strike, by preventing the use of replacement workers during a strike or lockout.

Therefore, it is imperative that workers governed by federal labour legislation have the same rights as those governed by Quebec legislation, including a true right to strike.

Oral Questions

The example of Quebec, which adopted legislation more than 30 years ago, speaks volumes: the number and duration of labour conflicts has diminished. A fair balance of power is advantageous for everyone.

Therefore, I hope that the motion tabled in this House by the Bloc Québécois will receive the support of all parties.

* * *

WORLD WATER DAY

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, March 22 is World Water Day. This year, the theme for World Water Day is “Shared Water, Shared Opportunities”. It aims at highlighting the unique challenges of waterways that cross the political borders between countries.

The world’s 263 transboundary lake and river basins cross 145 countries and cover nearly half of the Earth’s land surface. This is to say nothing of the massive reservoirs of freshwater in underground aquifers.

In view of growing pressure on the world’s freshwater from population growth, pollution and climate change, it is important, now more than ever, that we work together both within Canada and on the international stage to protect our water resources.

World Water Day gives me the opportunity to call on the government to take the issue of water seriously and to create, in Canada, a truly national water strategy.

* * *

•(1115)

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians face a choice.

Our Prime Minister and this government have cut taxes for all Canadians. Someone does not believe in that.

Our Prime Minister and this government have reduced the GST from 7%, to 6%, to 5%. Someone opposes that, too. In fact, someone wants to raise the GST.

Our Prime Minister and this government have consistently opposed a job killing carbon tax. Someone wants to introduce it.

Our Prime Minister and this government introduce the \$1,200 a year for every child under six universal child care benefit. Someone admits that he just might take that away.

The choice is clear. Canadians can choose a strong leader who is making life more affordable for Canadians and their families or they can choose someone who has been getting in the way of that action and whose musings about raising taxes are dangerous during this time of global recession.

Who is that someone? That someone is the Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, another 83,000 Canadians lost their jobs in February. The number is staggering.

Since the election last fall, when the Prime Minister assured Canadians that a recession was unlikely, that there were good buying opportunities on the stock market and that his government would never run a deficit, the economy, on his watch, has tanked. In total, 295,000 Canadian jobs have evaporated.

He claims that he anticipated all of this. If that is true, why have his policies so badly failed thousands upon thousands of Canadian families?

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today's job numbers are sobering and we sympathize with every Canadian affected, but we are doing more than simply sympathizing with Canadians.

The benefits of our economic action plan would have taken effect sooner had the Liberals passed the budget earlier and not played their political games. The Liberal leader and the Liberal Party should apologize to all Canadians. Instead of cashing in on bad economic news and exploiting the hardships of Canadians, they should have acted constructively in dealing with this economic crisis.

We are dealing with this crisis. We are getting the job done.

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives will not build hope based on falsehoods and fiction.

The job creation target that the Conservatives announced in January has disappeared. They specifically promised 190,000 jobs. Instead, 83,000 Canadians lost their jobs in February, on top of 129,000 in January. The Conservative job loss rate in Canada is now twice as bad as in the United States.

Does the government even have a job creation target anymore? Does it stand by its promise of 190,000 jobs?

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal leader wants to blame everyone else. Members of the Liberal Party were consistently told that delays by them and by the senators would prevent the delivery of important employment insurance benefits. It was a surprise to the Liberal leader that there were employment insurance benefits in that package.

The Liberals should have known better. They should have acted to help Canadians but they did not. They bear the consequences.

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians will find cold comfort in that answer by the minister.

Under the Conservatives, the jobless rate in Canada has skyrocketed to 7.7%. Sadly, that is in line with the painful forecasts of all the independent analysts: the IMF, the OECD, Global Insight and the Parliamentary Budget Officer. The Toronto Dominion Bank says that half a million more jobs will be lost this year. Unemployment will rise to double digits, and that is after taking all the stimulus plans into account.

What do the Conservatives have to say to thousands of people who have no chance of finding a job when the government remains in—

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

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what Canadians understand is that they would have had no chance had the Liberals been in power. There is no question about that. In fact, they would have imposed a crushing carbon tax on our industries. They would have even deprived families of the universal child benefit that they consistently indicated they would do away with.

What has our government said? We will lower taxes, stimulate the economy and get money into the hands of the people who need it, and the Liberals refused. They stood in the way and now these are the—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine.

Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, under a Liberal government, 3.2 million jobs were created. We did not have those job losses. Canadians were not losing their jobs like they are under the Conservatives. Young Canadians aged 15 to 24 have lost 29,000 jobs just in February. That brings their total job loss to over 100,000 jobs since October.

Yes, it is very funny, is it not?

While everyone knows that the unemployment rate for visible minority youth is two to three times higher than the—

• (1120)

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. President of the Treasury Board.

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have two options. They have the option of the Conservative plan of cutting taxes, providing help for those hardest hit, investing in roads, in bridges and in infrastructure, or they can have the Liberal approach, which is no plan at all and a not so hidden agenda of imposing a crippling carbon tax and taking the money away from families who need it for child benefits.

[Translation]

Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the choice for Canadians is between 3.2 million new jobs under the Liberals and nearly 300 000 jobs lost under the Conservatives. For visible minorities, the unemployment rate is two to three times higher than for the general population. I think that the choice for Canadians and Quebecers is clear: jobs with the Liberals or unemployment with the Conservatives.

[English]

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, independent analysts, such as Dale Orr at Global Insight,

Oral Questions

have said is that it is not this government's fault and it was not Canada's fault that we have a weakness that was not foreseen. The weakness in the Canadian economy is entirely coming from the United States.

We reacted in order to get money into the hands of Canadians. It was the Liberal Party that stood in the way and continuously indicated that there was an overblown fear of what may in fact happen, and it was wrong.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Canada's employment numbers have plummeted for the fourth month in a row. In February alone, 111,000 full-time jobs disappeared—that is nearly 4,000 jobs per day. And this is just getting started. The rosy outlook that the Prime Minister was pushing in his Brampton speech this week could not be more off base.

When will the Conservatives wake up and smell the coffee? When will they acknowledge the scope of the crisis and recognize that their budget is utterly insufficient and inadequate?

[English]

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is ironic coming from a party that voted against every initiative. As critical as I have been of the Liberal Party for standing in the way and taking political advantage for short term benefit, I completely condemn what the Bloc Québécois has done in terms of stopping the budget initiatives that we brought forward.

The Bloc members voted against every initiative that would help ordinary working people and now that member has the audacity to stand and make that kind of a comment.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud of the Bloc Québécois' work because we are here to fight for Quebec, to fight for workers.

Under the Conservatives, Canada has lost 330,000 full-time jobs in the past year. That is a far cry from the 190,000 jobs that the Prime Minister promised we would see by the end of 2010. The Conservative budget will put thousands of workers out in the streets. That is why we voted against it and that is why we will continue to speak out against it.

Do the Conservatives realize that the budget is not good enough to deal with the crisis and job losses, and that the manufacturing and forestry sectors need much more vigorous measures?

[English]

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is the member who said that cutting taxes was not a good thing to do. That is the member who said that providing help for those who are hardest hit is not a good thing to do. He said that investing in roads, bridges and other infrastructure and helping people in the forestry industry was a bad thing to do.

Oral Questions

He voted against the budget, the budget that would have helped all of these industries and would have helped the ordinary working people in Quebec. He turned his back on the people of Quebec. This party stood up for the people in Quebec and Canada.

• (1125)

[Translation]

Mrs. Josée Beaudin (Saint-Lambert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today we are talking about the hundreds of thousands of people who have lost their jobs because of the economic crisis. A great many of them cannot collect employment insurance benefits and find themselves in dire straits. The criteria are so restrictive that, according to the department's own numbers, only 46% of those who lose their jobs collect benefits.

Does the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development realize that she must improve access to employment insurance and stop depriving 54% of those who lose their jobs of benefits?

[English]

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development and to the Minister of Labour, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that 82% of those who contribute to EI actually do receive benefits. The budget, which the member opposed, and all the processes that we put in place, do contain provisions. It contains provisions to help those who are unemployed. Five additional weeks of employment insurance will help 400,000 more people. Work-sharing agreements will be extended to a maximum of 52 weeks. There are all types of provisions for retraining and skills upgrading and that member opposed each one of them when the budget was before the House.

[Translation]

Mrs. Josée Beaudin (Saint-Lambert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, adding five weeks to the end of the benefit period is not good enough because it will not benefit all claimants.

Does the minister agree with the Bloc Québécois that eliminating the unjust and unjustifiable two-week waiting period would be the best way to help claimants who certainly need help during these tough times?

[English]

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development and to the Minister of Labour, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure what difficulty the member has with understanding that five additional weeks is greater than two additional weeks. Those who need assistance more and are looking for jobs longer need those benefits extended. These benefits are extended. In fact, the budget provided for those who are not even part of the employment insurance program. There are moneys for that as well, \$500 million, to help those people. The member and her party opposed each and every aspect of those proposals.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since the election the Conservative government has presided over the loss of 300,000 jobs. There were 129,000 Canadians thrown out of work in January, in February 110,000 full-time jobs disappeared and the unemployment rate is closing in on 8%. What is the finance minister saying? He says he is not surprised. He even expects the losses to continue for the whole year, admitting that Conservative policies are not working.

When will the government change course and actually create the jobs that Canadians need?

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we understand that this economic downturn is part of a larger global downturn. We sympathize with every Canadian affected, but I want to say that the member demonstrated that she does not care about some of the poorest in the country, which she represents in her riding. She voted against the budget that would have helped the very poor in this country. Why would she do that? Why would she turn her back on the poor of our country?

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that budget failed Canadian workers and the lowest-income people in Canada. In fact, one factor increasing job losses is foreign takeovers, even though agreements are in place to protect Canadian jobs. The government is not enforcing them, and jobs are being lost. It happened at Vale Inco, Xstrata and U.S. Steel.

Instead of making it easier for foreign companies to pillage our industries by raising the value for reviews to \$1 billion, why will the government not follow the example of Germany, which just passed a law tightening the rules for foreign takeovers? That would actually protect these jobs here in Canada.

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I can report to the House—and if the hon. member had read the budget implementation act, she would know—that for the first time in our history we have a national security test to ensure that we preserve our national security against foreign investors who seek to undermine that. I think that is an improvement.

We also, however, are open to foreign investment. Unlike the NDP, we think that when foreign companies invest in jobs and opportunities in Canada, that is a good thing. It is good not only for us here in Canada, but it also helps Canadian businesses invest overseas and create jobs elsewhere around the world, as well as new business opportunities for Canadians.

Obviously the NDP does not agree with that. It does not believe in that. It wants to have us shelled in. That is the NDP's choice, but it is not the choice of Canadians.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is not working very well for those workers who are losing their jobs.

This Tuesday the House voted to bring fairness to the EI system. The House voted to eliminate the two-week waiting period, to lower minimums to qualify, to include self-employed workers, to increase the wage replacement rate and to get more training for workers, but the government cannot even process EI claims properly. It takes three or four or five weeks to get any help.

If the government will not respect the will of the House to improve EI, will it at least get its act together to ensure those who can access EI are not delayed?

Oral Questions

• (1130)

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development and to the Minister of Labour, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we certainly sympathize with people who need to access EI because they have just lost their jobs, and we will do everything possible to ensure that their claims are expedited quickly. We have dedicated resources for that. We hired more people and asked for the hours to be extended for processing claims. We have done that. We have brought in people who had retired and we have included those who want to work overtime on a voluntary basis.

We will do what we have to in order to ensure people have their claims expedited.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for decades Ottawa-Gatineau has been Canada's silicon valley north. Now we learn that for the first time in seven years, Canada's knowledge-based job sectors lost over 2,500 net jobs, and all evidence indicates that job losses are now accelerating.

At Dell corporation, 1,500 jobs were lost; at Nortel, 500 more jobs were lost last year; at Mitel, it was 200-plus jobs; at March Networks, 20 jobs; at DragonWave, 20 jobs. The list goes on and on.

What is the government doing to support today's IT workers and to help create the knowledge-based jobs of tomorrow?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, obviously we are not pleased with the results of these job losses. This is something we are very concerned about.

The fact of the matter is that the very budget this hon. member voted for has a number of science and technology investments. They are found in Canada's economic action plan. For the Canada Foundation for Innovation, there is an extra \$750 million. For industrial research and development internships, there is another \$3.5 million. For the Institute for Quantum Computing, a world-class institution, there is \$50 million.

These are all science and technology investments and they will pay dividends in the years ahead.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here is what the government is doing. In four consecutive budgets, there has been no innovation strategy. On the venture capital front, on their watch, there was a drop in this region from \$350 million in 2005 to \$130 million last year. That is a 65% decline. There was only one venture capital deal last year in support of a new start-up.

Existing companies cannot raise money, they cannot commercialize and they cannot get any money in BDC's venture capital pools, because there is no new money. There are no new tax breaks for risk capital and no matching federal funds to match angel investments.

Once again, what are the minister and the government doing to support knowledge-based jobs?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is completely incorrect. In fact, the BDC is still in the venture capital business. In fact, we have invested more money into the Business Development Corporation, so that they can lend to small and medium-sized businesses.

We continue to invest in our knowledge infrastructure. That is what the knowledge infrastructure fund is all about. There is an extra \$2 billion in this budget, which he voted for, to help our colleges and universities deal with R and D investments and S and T investments in the future. There is \$87.5 million more money for graduate scholarships.

We are doing our part and we will be part of the renaissance of S and T, of new jobs and new opportunity.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lise Zarac (LaSalle—Émard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the job loss figures published today are so high that it is hard to take them in.

With 18,500 jobs lost in Quebec, it is as though two cities the size of Coaticook lost every job in one month.

What will the Conservatives do to get these people working again?

[*English*]

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the benefits of our economic action plan would have taken effect sooner had the Liberals passed the budget earlier and not played their political games. The Liberal leader, the Liberal Party and the member from Wascana should apologize to all Canadians.

The hon. member is cashing in on hard economic news, yet for weeks was standing up to say he would not pass the budget. Now the opposition is complaining about a two-week delay in EI. They are the ones who wasted over a month of Parliament by stalling this economic action plan.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lise Zarac (LaSalle—Émard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister's answers are still very theoretical and abstract. Good intentions will not put bread on peoples' tables.

For the 250 Cascades workers in East Angus who will not be going to work next week, the situation is much more concrete.

It is also concrete for the workers in the Consoltex factories in Cowansville who took a salary cut of 15% in order to keep their jobs, leaving them with \$100 less each week.

Is the minister sure that he understands that?

Oral Questions

•(1135)

[English]

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is nothing theoretical about people having to wait inordinate periods of time for employment insurance, yet that member and her party were responsible for delaying its implementation. People in places like Cowansville who may be affected by the downturn should look at their member and ask why she blocked this economic stimulus. Why did she stand in the way of getting this money into the hands of Canadians through infrastructure programs?

* * *

*[Translation]***FORESTRY INDUSTRY**

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebec's Natural Resources Minister Claude Béchard maintains that urgent help is needed for the forestry industry and that holding a summit will not cut it. He said that the industry needs money fast and that the only way to meet this need was through loans and loan guarantees, something the government refuses to recognize.

Instead of hiding behind false pretences, will the government finally provide the loans and loan guarantees everyone is calling for?

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and to the Minister of National Revenue, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my dear colleague of what Mr. Lazar, the president of the Forest Products Association of Canada, told the Subcommittee on Canadian Industrial Sectors yesterday morning. He applauded the measures taken by our government regarding the forestry industry, namely solutions that have to reflect what the real problem is or have to do with the markets.

Measures such as access to credit, EI work sharing, community development, product innovation and the pursuit of new markets have been applauded.

I would like to remind my colleague that she voted against all these measures.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary should know about the position of Quebec's foresters association.

Luc Bouthillier, a professor at the department of wood and forest sciences at Laval University, explained that nothing in the agreement, no specific clause or provision, prohibits loans or loan guarantees, and that, whatever we do, the United States will always use the same argument as grounds for challenge. He added that doing nothing is worse than risking a challenge.

Instead of docking and dodging, will the government help this industry in urgent need of help?

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and to the Minister of National Revenue, CPC): Mr. Speaker, not only have we announced a whole range of measures to help the forestry industry by providing assistance to workers, communities and the industry, but we are continuing to work together with them and the other

stakeholders, as we have been for the past several months. The Bloc Québécois cannot deny that our government is there and making a real difference. Could the Bloc stop with the little political games already and let us do our job? Ours is a responsible government which takes informed decisions—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Alfred-Pellan.

* * *

PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET OFFICER

Mr. Robert Carrier (Alfred-Pellan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Budget Officer pointed out that inadequate funding is preventing him from doing his job properly. If he does not receive the money earmarked for his budget, this will result in significant layoffs in his office before the end of the month, thereby limiting even further his ability to do his job.

Does the government's unwillingness to adequately fund the Parliamentary Budget Officer stem from its desire to silence anyone who does not share its views?

[English]

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Parliamentary Budget Officer reports to the parliamentary library and the parliamentary library reports to you. Therefore, I would invite you to answer the question.

[Translation]

Mr. Robert Carrier (Alfred-Pellan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government promised to create an independent agency. But, according to the Budget Officer, the current setup cannot guarantee this independence, and the fact that its duties are not governed directly by Parliament make it vulnerable to political interference.

Does the government intend to support the Parliamentary Budget Officer and do whatever it takes to ensure that he can fulfill his mandate free from any interference?

•(1140)

[English]

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out earlier, the matter relates to the parliamentary library, which reports to you. At some point I expect that you, or someone in your chair, will answer that question for the hon. member.

In the meantime, I would like to take a moment to celebrate the good work in Canada's economic action plan. It cuts taxes for the average family by \$500, it creates jobs building roads, bridges, hockey arenas and other new infrastructure, it helps people who have lost their jobs to find new ones and it injects billions of dollars into creating new wealth and getting our economy back on track. That is something to celebrate.

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

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Sadly, Mr. Speaker, the government's incompetence is causing job losses in every region and every sector. Nowhere are these job losses more preventable than in agriculture, if only the government would stand by its commitment. Instead, the minister consistently breaks his word. Promising \$12.4 million for crop losses in P.E.I., the government has only delivered \$3 million. Producers face financial ruin for crops that are still being lost in storage.

Will Conservatives stop making excuses, pay out the full \$12.4 million promised to—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as you know, this government stands up for its farmers. Through agri-recovery, we have in fact delivered financial support to P.E.I. potato farmers.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, employment figures released today show that 2,900 jobs were lost in my province, New Brunswick. That means 2,900 more families affected by the economic crisis and 2,900 more families forced to suffer because of the Conservatives' failure to act.

How many more jobs must be lost before the Conservative government understands and takes real action to get these New Brunswickers back to work?

[*English*]

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we in fact sympathize with every Canadian affected. Our government acted early and put forward a comprehensive plan.

When it comes to inaction, there is only one party that the member should ask, and that is his own party. Why did he and his fellow members stand in the way of ensuring this economic action plan was implemented? Why did he delay the benefits from which his constituents would have benefited?

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister should be asking why the government prorogued.

Six months ago the Prime Minister responded to one of the first plant closures in Ontario with the dismissive but prophetic pronouncement that “We can't guarantee your job”. Never were truer words spoken. The government has failed to get any job guarantees out of any auto maker, Xtrata, U.S. Steel or any foreign company that is taking jobs out of Canada.

When will the Conservative government stop—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Minister of Industry.

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are in the middle of a world economic downturn, so it is not surprising that in some sectors there have been, unfortunately, some job losses.

The government has worked hard on the auto sector well before the hon. member has cottoned on to the fact that there might be some issues. Over a year ago, my colleague, now the Minister of the Environment, launched our action plan for the auto sector. We have made investments for forward thinking investments in the future.

What I cannot understand is why the hon. members opposite are not celebrating the huge job victory from Bombardier this week, the \$1.53 billion order filled. Why are they not celebrating?

Hon. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for six months all the government's policies have delivered are pink slips to Canadians.

On October 2, workers facing plant closures might have taken the advice of the Prime Minister that stock prices were a buying opportunity and that their savings could see them through to retirement. Those who bought on that advice were burned by a further 24% decline in the market.

Why should Canadians buy their Prime Minister's rosy economic predictions today?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is thank goodness Canadians did not take the advice of the Liberal Party of Canada in the last election, when it wanted to impose a job killing carbon tax on them. Thank goodness Canadians saw through that. Thank goodness we do not have the Liberal Party in power, which would have meant thousands upon thousands of jobs lost because of its poor policies.

● (1145)

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada is being impacted by the global economic downturn. Nowhere is this more evident than in the significant job losses reported in February. Families affected by job losses are looking for economic leadership, not a hike in the GST and certainly not a job killing carbon tax proposed by the Liberal leader.

Could the President of the Treasury Board tell the House why enacting this plan is so important?

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today's job numbers are sobering, and we sympathize with every Canadian affected.

I thank the member for his hard work in terms of implementing the economic action plan. His vote in favour of it has helped his constituents.

Our government acted early and put forward a comprehensive plan to support Canadians, a plan that the IMF called “a strong fiscal package, large, timely and well targeted”.

Oral Questions

We are getting the job done, unlike the member for Wascana who has continually stood in the way.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how in tough economic times the government can find \$6 million to hire 18 of its friends for the Senate, yet at the same time cut \$6 million from Veterans Affairs in staffing allowances.

In fact, Robert Rutledge, the president of the Saint Anne's Hospital veterans group has written to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. He has said that he is very concerned about the 40 staff cuts at that hospital, which will seriously affect the night and day time services.

Why do the veterans who served in World War II and Korea have to suffer from the blatant abuse by the Conservative government?

Mr. Greg Kerr (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Sackville—Eastern Shore stated several times how pleased he was that the Conservative government put back in place so many programs for veterans, programs that were cut by the previous Liberal government.

We share the concerns. We meet regularly. We want to the very best we can for our veterans. I know the problem he has and his frustration. The very budget that supports these veterans, which his leader made him vote against, must make him very uneasy.

Veterans are concerned about the economic well-being of our country. They are concerned about everything else that Canadians are concerned about and they support this economic action plan.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, from VIP for veterans' widows, from SISIP to agent orange to allied veterans and on and on, the Conservative government has deliberately misled veterans and their families.

In 2005 the Prime Minister and the Minister of Veterans Affairs said to thousands of people in Gagetown that if a Conservative government were elected, they would look after everyone affected by the spraying, from 1958 to 1984. In fact, the Conservatives brought in a compensation package even worse than what the Liberals were going to do.

On four separate occasions, the Minister of Veterans Affairs said that he would call for a public inquiry into the spraying in Gagetown. Will the minister or his parliamentary secretary—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Greg Kerr (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member pointed out that we have moved on the issue of agent orange and all those poor people who suffered from that terrible incident. In fact, we settled with over 2,000 of those individuals, at \$20,000 a person. They are very satisfied with that.

The more discussions we have with them, the more concerned they are about where the economy is going, the more concerned they

are that the hon. member's leader is opposed to the very action plan that helps these very important people.

The hon. member knows full well we can never do enough for our veterans. The action plan is all about that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MILLENNIUM SUMMIT

Mr. Jean Dorion (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal government will not attend the third Millennium Summit, which will take place in Montreal. With the recent cuts to its bilateral aid to Africa, its record continues to lose lustre. Despite all the promises that were made in 2000 to eradicate hunger and poverty, they are still very much present in the world today.

Should we see the government's failure to attend this summit as a reflection of its complete lack of interest in achieving the millennium development goals and another example of its recent pulling away from Africa?

• (1150)

[*English*]

Hon. Jay Hill (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the member well knows, because our Minister of International Cooperation has clearly said this time after time, day after day, our assistance to African nations has actually increased under our government. It is continuing to increase over what the Liberals did before.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean Dorion (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to the United Nations, to achieve tangible development results, countries must allocate 0.7% of their GDP to international aid by 2015. Canada allocates only 0.34% of its GDP, which is nowhere near the target.

Is it not true that the government is not anxious to attend the summit because of its pitiful record?

[*English*]

Hon. Jim Abbott (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the House leader, has pointed out, Canada is doing very well in this area. We are doubling the amount of support we are giving to our African programs.

This is well under control. The people of Canada are very proud of the way we take our place in the world.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 2008, the Association of Professional Executives of the Public Service of Canada consulted its members, who condemned the “frustrating micromanagement”, the “centralized control in the Privy Council Office and the Prime Minister's Office” and the “increased paranoia about media”.

Oral Questions

Why have the Conservatives created a climate of mistrust within the public service? Why are the Conservatives trying to intimidate our dedicated public servants?

[English]

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is very proud of our public service. We are committed to a strong, effective and accountable public service for Canadians. We are leaders in terms of recruitment, retention, learning and development issues across the public service.

We understand our public service is a key ingredient to ensuring that our economic action plan is implemented and that Canadians benefit generally from the fine services of our public service.

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Association of Justice Counsel, which represents some 2,000 lawyers and notaries, feels betrayed. As allowed by amendments Parliament had made to the Public Service Act, the association tried to negotiate its first collective agreement, but the Conservatives reportedly used delaying tactics to prevent an agreement. These counsel are therefore subject to the salary cap imposed by the Conservatives on a salary base that dates back more than 20 years.

Why have the Conservatives betrayed these public servants?

[English]

Hon. Vic Toews (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we respect our public service. We also understand, as it does, that there is a global economic downturn and that all salaries of public servants need to be capped. We have capped them, essentially at 2.3%, 1.5%, 1.5% and 1.5%.

Hon. Wayne Easter: Are you counting the bonuses? How about the bonuses for the top executives like deputy ministers? Are you capping them?

Hon. Vic Toews: The member for Malpeque is pecking off there, but he will have his chance to ask a question later on.

* * *

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government's internal documents show over \$1.7 million was given by the federal government to the World Police and Fire Games in Quebec City. Shortly the games will be held in British Columbia, and there is a big gaping hole where the federal funding should be. What disrespect to British Columbia. Not a single Conservative MP from B.C. has raised this issue.

Why is the government refusing to fund the B.C. games and where is the \$1.7 million?

Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I find the question really incredible from a member from British Columbia who actually voted against Canada's economic action plan. The economic action plan is going to invest in British Columbia. It is going to extend EI benefits to British Columbians. It is going to invest in infrastructure, roads, bridges, sewers, everything that British Columbians need.

The member voted against it and now he stands up on this issue? I cannot understand it. He votes against British Columbians.

• (1155)

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, incredible. The question was on the \$1.7 million for the World Police and Fire Games. The government shows such disrespect that it will not even reply to the question. It is not even disrespecting British Columbians, it is disrespecting police officers and firefighters who lay their lives on the line every day in Canada. What they are asking for is \$1.7 million and what the government is giving them is the back of its hand.

It is a very simple question. Where is the \$1.7 million? Why will the government not honour their service by providing that funding for the World Police and Fire Games?

Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we honour the service of our police regularly on this side. We stand up for them and provide them support in all the areas the police ask for support, including hiring more officers. That is something this government did and we had no help from the NDP on that.

I point to the more than \$500 million of support that this government has provided to the 2010 games, games that are on budget and on track. We are supporting British Columbians through everything we are doing, including the economic action plan. I cannot understand why the member has voted against British Columbia at every opportunity he has had to do so.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Tim Uppal (Edmonton—Sherwood Park, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians across the country are feeling the pain of the global economic downturn. Under the leadership of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, the government put together an economic action plan to lead Canada through these difficult times.

Could the Minister of State for Transport please provide the House with details on how this government is getting money out the door and providing jobs for Canadians?

Hon. Rob Merrifield (Minister of State (Transport), CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely true that opposition members held up our action plan for far too long, and Canadians are hurting because of it. We are not waiting for them. We are investing in Canadians and in infrastructure in every province.

A perfect example is the hon. member was with me to announce a \$100 million project in Edmonton ring roads just on Friday. The amazing thing about this project is it will not only help Edmontonians and all the communities around it, but there will be shovels in the ground within 30 days.

*Points of Order***JUSTICE**

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Newton—North Delta, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, B.C., Alberta and Saskatchewan have now formed a united front to get the government to listen on gang violence. They want real changes, not photo op announcements, so the police and the courts can do their jobs and get the gangs off the streets.

When will the Conservatives finally listen to the western provinces so they can get the job done on gang violence?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Daniel Petit (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the opposition is finally joining in the fight against violent crime in this country. They should have been supporting us right from the last session. Canadians have spoken: they want their government to implement tough measures to fight crime and that is what we are doing.

A few weeks ago, the Minister of Justice announced a new bill to fight violence caused by gangs and organized crime in this country.

Our bill will deal with serious issues, such as drive-by shootings, as well as crimes against police and peace officers.

* * *

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Nicolas Dufour (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Ms. Louise Dandurand, of CREPUQ, is very clear and I quote:

Investing in areas related to the economy will not guarantee economic spinoffs. On the contrary. The impact of humanities research is far greater than what is evident from the balance sheet.

The government says that it conducted consultations before taking ideological control of university research. If university presidents, professors and students are all opposed and were not consulted, then who was?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we responded to the situation and we heard the suggestions of this community that wants more investment for science and technology and infrastructure. We listened and we took action.

* * *

[*English*]

ATLANTIC CANADA

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Saint John, New Brunswick's Long Wharf has always been an integral part of the city's port but the government is putting it on the chopping block anyway.

The Conservatives are about to approve the sale of the wharf for the rock bottom price of \$11 million. This is five times less than what it is worth. This deal would reduce port operations and the jobs of the longshoremen. This untendered, illegal sweetheart deal is not fair to taxpayers.

Will the minister stand in the House today and say that he will block this deal?

• (1200)

Hon. Keith Ashfield (Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are looking at all

options in Atlantic Canada to promote the economy of Atlantic Canada so that it grows, thrives and continues to perform at the level it is performing at.

I might also mention that the member and her party voted against every issue that we brought to the fore, including our economic action plan. She certainly has nothing to be proud of in that respect.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mrs. Kelly Block (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government continues to work together with our four western provinces to help create sustainable, innovative and strong communities. However, we all know that the west is not immune to what is happening elsewhere with the global recession.

Would the Minister of State for Economic Diversification tell the House how our government is investing in the western economy?

Hon. Lynne Yelich (Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar for the question and her ongoing concern about the west.

We are investing in the west. During these economic times, we are investing in trade, technology and commercialization. We are partnering up with the provinces and, as of next week, I will have signed four agreements with four prairie provinces that will be a \$200 million investment in the west.

A stronger west is a stronger Canada. I would remind the member from British Columbia, who made the request about the games, that Western Economic Diversification Canada has invested in those games.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Hon. Jim Abbott (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to your attention your ruling on the statement of the member for Edmonton—Sherwood Park.

I have had the privilege of representing the people of Kootenay—Columbia in this chamber now for 15 years and have seen an awful lot of things. Of all places in Canada, this place most of all is a place of freedom of speech. This is a place where we as members come and are accountable to each other and are held accountable by each other on behalf of the people of Canada, so naturally there is criticism.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is obvious that you were using the Speaker's ruling yesterday and the days before as a guide, without a doubt. However, my concern, as a long-term member of this House, is that the current interpretation by the Speaker may be dangerous. I am suggesting that it could very well be the thin edge of the wedge in terms of the freedom of speech that we must have in this chamber.

Points of Order

This is a place where we come and have a competition of ideas. In having the competition of ideas, the competition is guided by the referee, the Speaker in the House, so I would like to draw an analogy to a hockey game.

If, during the middle of a hockey game, there is a change in the way in which a referee ends up ruling on certain infractions that are now infractions that were not previously infractions, we end up in that hockey game with a whole changed game and an undesired result.

I would point out that if we look back to June 2006, the Liberals were the ones bringing their whole month of harpocrisy, which, obviously, was a play on our Prime Minister. They accused the Prime Minister of hiring a convicted fraud artist to work in the PMO.

I also would point out that Reg Alcock, a former Liberal minister, denied that he called the member for Calgary—Nose Hill sweetheart but explained that he had called our current defence minister a scumbag. These are unfortunate references that are historic and are in *Hansard*

We can also look at Bill Matthews, a former Liberal member in the House, who called the Prime Minister a liar and refused to apologize. I can even recall former Liberal minister Doug Young calling our friend, Deb Grey, more than a slab of bacon.

Those kinds of things have been going on in this place from time immemorial. I would suggest that in the same way that a referee in a hockey game might want to take a look at the tapes and consider the way in which the calls were made, how it may have changed the tenor of the game, that you might want to ask Mr. Speaker if he would do the same thing in reviewing his rulings and take another look at his current direction in which he is going.

I understand what he is attempting to achieve but in the same way that a referee who changes the rulings in a middle of a hockey game can completely ruin a hockey game and create infractions that are unintended, I believe we could be on the same course with the current rulings of the Speaker of this House.

●(1205)

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am rising on the same point generally and not to respond to the hon. member who just spoke.

I note in passing that the items he listed in his point of order where unparliamentary words were used, he listed cases where the Speaker found that they were unparliamentary. The Speaker has not changed the rule book at all. He is currently enforcing and articulating the rules as they are. Just because a member may have transgressed previously in using unparliamentary language does not provide licence for us to abandon the rules now.

The reason I need to rise on a point of order is to explicitly object to two statements that were made during statements by members. Members will recall exactly what they were and the script writers for the Conservative members will know exactly what I am referring to because they were very carefully scripted. These were the statements by the hon. member for Peterborough and the hon. member for Vegreville—Wainwright.

I should point out that this should not be taken as a personal attack. I am doing this for the sole purpose of ensuring that the Chair and the Speaker's ruling are respected. The reason we need to do that was set out in the Speaker's ruling yesterday. I will read the words, which state:

—that such provocative commentary only invites equally inflammatory responses and contributes greatly to the lowering of the tone of our proceedings.

Today I listened to the two members I mentioned make statements that began with generic references to policies or political parties, which the Speaker found to be acceptable, but in the middle or near the end the statements focused precisely on a partisan personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition.

If any members are in doubt about whether this happened, they should reread the statement of the member for Vegreville—Wainwright where he kept it generic or referred to a generic someone throughout the entire statement and at the very end turned it into a personal attack. That was sly, that was sharp and that was cute, but I think the Speaker will find that it offends the ruling he made yesterday.

I do not understand why the members on the government side have this virtually psychopathic addiction to partisan attacks but they appear to be scripted and co-ordinated, and they are there.

The Speaker has said that members' statements are out of bounds for that type of free speech. In normal debate, there is the to and fro and an opportunity to respond but members' statements, there is not.

To ensure respect for the Speaker's ruling yesterday, I am asking the Chair to review the blues and *Hansard* for those two statements and advise the House whether they were in order or out of order.

●(1210)

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all the members who have made a contribution to this discussion, including the member for Scarborough—Rouge River. He has been a member for some time and he has a lot of experience with these matters.

I would respectfully disagree with his interpretation of yesterday's ruling. I think the Speaker from his chair did leave open the possibility that during members' statements respectful disagreements by well-intentioned Canadians could be uttered. To suggest that we cannot disagree in this House would be to suggest there is no point for this House to exist in the first place. Disagreement is a natural part of democracy. In fact, I have never seen an instance where democracy has flourished without disagreement occurring.

I acknowledge some of the frustration with members across the way. It has been the intention of some on the Liberal side to shield their leader from any form of criticism and to forbid that criticism here in the House of Commons. What I think they will learn is that here in Canada by contrast to, say, czarist Russia, someone in a position of public leadership has to prepare himself or herself to face the criticism of his fellow countrymen not out of hatred or meanness, but out of openness and democracy.

Routine Proceedings

I would hope that anyone who is learned enough to live in the world of international academia, who has travelled the world and seen all of the various mutations of democracy, would come here open and willing to allow criticism to occur.

Mr. Speaker, you from your chair have done a fine job in your young career. I think that most members would recognize that you have come a very long way and are very proud to see you sitting in that chair.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of comments on the same point of order because it is important that you hear from all sides of the House in terms of what happened today. First of all, we appreciate that you stood up today and intervened early in the Standing Order 31 statement period to uphold the Speaker's ruling. That makes it very clear that there is an important principle here, which is that members should not be resorting to these unbelievable personal attacks and slaps on other people. That you intervened has now caused a point of order to be raised, and we should be saying that we are glad that intervention was made.

When is this going to stop? Things are really bad around here. People who watch us from the gallery or on CPAC are appalled at the kind of behaviour that takes place. To somehow characterize this as we are shutting down criticism or legitimate debate, that is not what this is about. This place is about debate, analysis and criticism and we do that every day, but this is about the kind of personal attacks that are being made.

We should be calling on the Speaker to stand by his ruling and to say to the majority of members of the House, I would dare say from all parties and maybe some people do not feel comfortable saying it, to support the Speaker's ruling. I believe that things have gone too far. We should be upholding our Speaker. How many times have we called on the Speaker to intervene and to bring back decorum? He is trying to do that, and we should support what he is trying to do. You did it today, Mr. Speaker.

I think this point of order is really mischievous. The Conservatives are trying to get around what is a very important principle here. We all know that is what it is about, so let us stick to the principle and let us stick to the issue of decorum.

Mr. Tim Uppal (Edmonton—Sherwood Park, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as you know, I was cut off during my member's statement before my time was up. I agree that decorum is very important in this House and it should include S.O. 31s. I respect your position as the Chair to preside over that. I would also ask you to look at *Hansard*. I was simply pointing out the fact that the Liberal Party and the Liberal leader were stalling the economic action plan. That plan is very important for Canadians. This is a fact. What I was saying was in no way a personal attack on anyone.

•(1215)

Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we on this side, the official opposition, the Liberal Party of Canada, support the ruling that the Speaker made the other day and your ruling today upholding the application of that ruling.

I would urge all members in this House, from all parties, including members of the governing party, to keep that ruling in mind when

they are preparing their statements, questions, or speeches to take part in the deliberations in the House.

The Deputy Speaker: I know the ruling yesterday is causing some desire for discussion, so I will allow one more intervention. The hon. member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek.

Mr. Wayne Marston (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I was elected in 2006. Since that time I attend the food court of a local mall and I try to do that each Saturday for a couple of hours. One of the things I hear about repeatedly is the disgraceful conduct in this place.

I want to commend and thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your actions today. I want to commend the Speaker for taking a stand on something that is so fundamental to the operation of this place.

The Deputy Speaker: As I mentioned, obviously the ruling from yesterday has provoked some discussion and it might take some time for some members to be able to adjust to it.

I will point out, as the Speaker's ruling from yesterday was brought up, that this policy does represent a shift and the shift will be from this point forward.

While the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation brought up some expressions in the past, I think the Chair is going to look at what happens now and going into the future.

The Speaker gave a very detailed explanation of the interpretation of the Standing Order and previous practice from Marleau and Montpetit and how that will be implemented going forward. If members have questions or concerns on how that will take place, they can bring them up directly with the Speaker. I am sure he can guide them in what will be allowed in the future.

I will point out one other difference. The idea of a personal attack is different from a comment made on a party in general or on a group, such as government, the official opposition, or a party. I think members might want to read that section of Marleau and Montpetit, chapter 13, page 526, where it states:

Expressions which are considered unparliamentary when applied to an individual Member have not always been considered so when applied "in a generic sense" or to a party.

That might be useful for members to examine as they adjust to the policy for S.O. 31s going into the future.

I will consider the matter closed at this point.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

PETITIONS

VOLUNTEER SERVICE MEDAL

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Nepean—Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a petition signed by dozens of my constituents calling on the Government of Canada respectfully to recognize by means of the issuance of a new Canadian volunteer service medal to be designated the “Governor General's Volunteer Service Medal for Volunteer Services by Canadians in Regular and Reserve Military Forces”.

This very important proposal comes from veterans in my constituency. They would like to see a solid recognition of these volunteer servicemen and servicewomen who have done so much to build on the proud tradition of the Canadian armed forces.

I am deeply honoured to have occasion to speak on their behalf and to present to this House a petition that would advance that cause for them.

● (1220)

CANADA POST

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Newton—North Delta, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, I would also like to commend you for your judgment call today in implementing the ruling of the Speaker. Good work, Mr. Speaker, keep it up.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present two petitions.

The first petition deals with the fact Canada Post has notified members of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers that it will withhold two weeks' pay as part of the changes in the compensation packages. More than 200 people have signed the petition opposing its unfair decision.

The petitioners ask Canada Post to stop this injustice and pay its employees all of their privileges.

TRUCK LICENCES

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Newton—North Delta, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition deals with the fact that Port Metro Vancouver has placed a moratorium on new truck licences for owner-operated truck drivers by allowing unlimited licences to company trucks. With too many licences in circulation already, it is hard for truckers to make a decent living. More than 2,000 people have signed a petition calling on the House of Commons to direct Port Metro Vancouver to place a moratorium on new licences and enact a new policy to fairly distribute licences.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to present a petition that is being circulated by members of the CAW, calling for a comprehensive overhaul of the employment insurance system.

The petitioners rightly point out that EI is a powerful economic stabilizer and, particularly during this deep recession, it is essential that this fundamental poverty prevention program be made more broadly accessible with better benefits.

Specifically, the petitioners are calling for a standardized 360 hours to qualify, an increased benefit period of at least 50 weeks, the

Routine Proceedings

elimination of the two-week waiting period, benefits at 60% of normal earnings based on the best 12 weeks, and a more flexible approach to work sharing.

The petitioners also point out that the government diverted \$54 billion of worker and employer contributions to EI to pay down the debt and deficit instead of using that money to provide help to the involuntarily unemployed during economic downturns. That misappropriation only heightens the moral obligation for the government to restore the integrity of the EI system.

While I know that it is against the rules of this chamber for members of Parliament to endorse a petition, let me just say that I very much welcome the opportunity to present this particular petition on behalf of the over 300,000 newly unemployed Canadians since the last election.

SRI LANKA

Mr. Paul Calandra (Oak Ridges—Markham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a number of petitions with respect to the situation that is unfolding in Sri Lanka.

The petitioners are calling on the Parliament of Canada to understand what is happening in Sri Lanka. As members will know, this government has led the way with respect to calling on the Government of Sri Lanka to immediately implement a ceasefire. We have provided in excess of \$4 million toward getting aid to some of the affected areas. It is a situation for which I have hosted many town hall meetings, and a number of members on this side of the House have done the same, to really raise awareness. I am very pleased to present these petitions.

● (1225)

Mr. Speaker, I also have another petition to present, again dealing with Sri Lanka.

The petitioners call on Parliament to do whatever it can to raise the awareness of a bill that is being brought forward through the parliament in Sri Lanka that would severely limit the rights of Christians in Sri Lanka.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I have one other petition to present on which I would beg for the indulgence of the House. This petition is similar to the first petition that I introduced with respect to what is happening in Sri Lanka, but unfortunately, it was not able to be certified. I would, with the unanimous consent of the House, like to present this petition, as well.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to present this petition?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

CANADA—COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Alex Atamanenko (British Columbia Southern Interior, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition that has been signed by people who are very worried about the free trade agreement between Canada and Colombia. They are pressing the Government of Canada to stop the free trade agreement negotiations that are underway between Canada and Colombia until a study can be carried out concerning the impact on human rights. They are also asking that the agreement be renegotiated along the principles of fair trade which would take environmental and social impacts fully into account while genuinely respecting labour rights and the rights of all affected parties.

[English]

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, hundreds of people in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are adding their voices to the thousands of Canadians across the country who are imploring Parliament and the government not to proceed with the Canada-Colombia trade deal.

It is for obvious reasons. The number of trade unionists who have been massacred in Colombia far surpasses that of any other country on the planet. Clearly, the human rights violations continue in Colombia.

The petitioners are asking the government to please stop negotiations and not to proceed any further until there is a full and impartial human rights assessment done on Colombia that indicates the extent, the scope, the width and breadth of the human rights violations that are taking place there consistently.

On behalf of the petitioners, I table this petition in the House.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Malcolm Allen (Welland, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I present a petition today on behalf of the Canadian Auto Workers Union which has taken a great leadership role when it comes to the position on employment insurance. I thank those who have signed this petition asking for the types of reforms that the EI system needs to help those workers who, at this point in their lives, are the most vulnerable, those who are unemployed, their families and their communities.

The types of reform are changing the hours rule, eliminating the two week waiting period and the opportunity to get benefits in a more reasoned and fair way across the country.

I commend the CAW for its leadership role and thank those who signed this petition. I would suspect we will be seeing literally thousands upon thousands of these petitions from across the country because of the situation in which the unemployed find themselves. I table this petition today.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 44 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 44—**Mr. Dennis Bevington:**

With regard to federal funding for the Mackenzie Valley Natural Gas Project announced by the Minister of the Environment on January 19, 2009, in detail: (a) what is the amount of funding the government is offering the project proponents; (b) what is the rationale for providing this funding; (c) what will the funding be used for; and (d) what short, medium and long term benefits will accrue to northern Canadians?

Hon. Jim Prentice (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the details of the financial offer presented to the project proponents on January 19, 2009 have not been made public as they are subject to cabinet confidence and will be part of a formal negotiation process between the Government of Canada and the Mackenzie gas project, MGP, proponents.

As owner of the resource, the Government of Canada has a role to play in ensuring that, if the project proceeds it unfolds in a manner that provides maximum benefits to Canadians from all perspectives: business, socio-economic and environmental. In particular, commercializing Canada's vast northern gas resources would greatly accelerate the economic development of the NWT and aboriginal communities, consistent with the government's northern strategy and sovereignty objectives; generate significant GDP impacts across Canada; and offset the forecast decline of the western Canadian sedimentary basin, thereby enhancing Canada's energy security. The Government of Canada, however, has been clear that the MGP is a commercial venture and that the ultimate decision as to whether the project proceeds rests with the private sector.

It has been estimated that the range of potential GDP impacts that would result from the development of the MGP would be \$40 billion to \$150 billion over 30 years, direct and indirect GDP impacts, depending on the extent of induced development, with employment gains ranging from 107,000 to 280,000 person-years. Furthermore, all provincial and territorial economies would benefit from the increased demand for materials and labour during the construction and operation phases of the project, and from the induced gas exploration and development activity it is expected to generate.

[English]

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

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

CANADA-EFTA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-2, An Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the States of the European Free Trade Association (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Switzerland), the Agreement on Agriculture between Canada and the Republic of Iceland, the Agreement on Agriculture between Canada and the Kingdom of Norway and the Agreement on Agriculture between Canada and the Swiss Confederation be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel has the floor to continue his speech. He had 12 minutes remaining before members' statements.

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to continue the debate on Bill C-2, Canada-EFTA Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, which we have been discussing today.

I would like to remind everyone that when it comes time to discuss a bill to implement a free trade agreement, it is important that we weigh the pros and cons in a responsible fashion. It is important because every sector is affected by trade between the countries. In this agreement, there are some significant sectors, some of which are of considerable influence in our economy.

For example, Quebec has aluminum, which is our leading export to Iceland, one of the signatories to this agreement. Nickel accounts for 80% of our exports to Norway, and that nickel comes from a mine in Ungava operated by Xstrata, a Swiss company. There is also the pharmaceutical sector. Switzerland is one of the world's leading producers of pharmaceuticals. Quebec has an industry that engages in the research, development and sale of generic and prescription drugs. This industry is very strong, because when the Parti Québécois was in power, the Government of Quebec decided to provide it with substantial assistance, with the result that an important structure was put in place. We also have to think about agriculture, because we sell and trade agricultural products with these countries. It was important to us that supply management not be on the table. Milk, poultry, eggs and so on are supply-managed products, and supply management makes the industry profitable. There has been no government assistance for this type of industry since supply management was introduced.

This type of free trade agreement therefore must be analyzed responsibly. There is also a whole other sector, and that is shipbuilding. This is an important part of this agreement, because Norway, for example, is a major shipbuilding nation and its shipyards have been subsidized in the past.

When we do such an analysis, it is important to get to the bottom of things. This free trade agreement is good for many industry sectors, but there is a problem when it comes to shipbuilding. That is why there are specific clauses on shipbuilding. The customs tariffs in effect will be phased out over 15 years, and there will also be a moratorium for a number of years. These clauses were included in the treaty because people knew there was a problem. This is

Government Orders

important because it is a crucial part of the discussions in this House. I am willing to debate it, but I have a concern. The shipbuilding industry is calling on Canada to develop a real Canadian marine policy that could solve the problems and keep this industry going.

Despite the fact that the industry, the Bloc Québécois and other parties in this House have been calling for it, the government will not listen. When the Minister of International Trade rose earlier to give his speech, he said nothing to reassure us.

● (1230)

He thinks that everything is for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Even though the industry believes that Canada needs a real marine policy, that is not important to him. This is worrisome. Instead of debating this bill, we should have reached a consensus in this House to pass it, because this agreement is good for the Quebec economy and the Canadian economy. Instead, we should at this very moment be debating a real marine policy for Canada, to reassure the entire shipbuilding sector and all other businesses, and to show them we are tackling the problems they have brought to our attention.

Thus, we will have to work very hard to convince this government of the need for a real marine policy for Canada. Once this bill passes, I hope the industry and all the parties, including the Conservatives, will understand that it is high time to do so. Now is the time. The tariffs will be gradually phased out over the next 15 years. That time period will also allow us to ensure that our industry can compete with Norway. That is the issue that we should have been addressing.

When conducting a thorough analysis of an issue as important as a free trade agreement, one must always weigh the pros and the cons. There are the pros I mentioned earlier, such as aluminum, nickel, the pharmaceutical industry, agriculture, and so on for Quebec. The agreement might even be good for pulp and paper mills. Once again, supply management has successfully been excluded, which is not the case with other agreements the government signed that jeopardized supply management. This time, the government listened to the Bloc Québécois and excluded supply management from the agreement.

For those who suggest that it would have been easier just to exclude shipbuilding from the treaty, I would point out that shipbuilding is one of Norway's economic strengths. Had we excluded shipbuilding, there would be no agreement, and we would not be talking about it today.

We have to adopt a conciliatory approach to these issues. We have to be open in our approach to these agreements, and we have to do a macroeconomic analysis of the advantages and disadvantages. When there is one sector in particular that could be disadvantaged, such as shipbuilding, we have to address the problem.

Government Orders

I was hoping the minister would talk about that today. Since the witnesses who appeared before the committee—and, indeed the entire shipbuilding industry—are uncomfortable about this, the Minister of International Trade could have told us that the government planned to deal with the problem, support the industry, and ensure that, once the 15 years are up, our industry will be competitive. If it can compete with Norway, it will be able to compete with every other shipbuilding concern in the world.

However, that is not the sense we are getting from the Conservative government. Time and again, it is all about their Conservative laissez-faire ideology. As it turns out, apply that approach to some sectors, and those sectors disappear. The opposition should attack that ideology and try to convince the Conservatives that, when it comes to shipbuilding, they must set their ideology aside and talk about a real Canadian marine policy. The industry would have found that reassuring.

At the same time, we have to act responsibly. The Bloc Québécois studied this free-trade agreement and weighed the advantages and disadvantages for all industries that will be affected. This is a first because the Canada-EFTA agreement covers Switzerland, Norway, Liechtenstein and Iceland. The real objective, for Quebecers, is to have a true free-trade agreement with the European Union. That is the objective.

• (1235)

Even the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Charest, who does not share my political views, is defending it. He recently travelled abroad in the middle of the economic crisis in Quebec. That is up to him. Nevertheless, he has taken a clear position on a free-trade agreement with the European Union, which reflects the unanimous position of the National Assembly of Quebec. Therefore, agreements with European countries are welcome. Naturally, given our population and the relative strength of our industries in Quebec or Canada, we have to be open to the world in order to develop. By not looking beyond our borders we will never be able to develop and reach our full potential. Just think of the aerospace sector and many others.

Therefore, we must be able to create a greater vision for the economy of the future, but also for the future of our economy. We believe this Canada-EFTA free-trade agreement is the way of the future with its advantages and disadvantages. Obviously, it puts shipbuilding at a disadvantage. Therefore, I hope that the government has heard everyone's position in this House, especially that of the Bloc Québécois, which has said that it is time for the government to sit down and adopt a real Canadian marine policy. The industry has been calling for it for many years. Naturally, starting today, we will support everything that can lead to a real Canadian marine policy so that, once the 15 years have passed, our shipbuilding industry will be able to compete with Norway and all other countries.

• (1240)

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly disappointed. The Bloc came here to change Ottawa, yet it seems that Ottawa has changed the Bloc Québécois. They come back with the same old free trade policies as George Bush, the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party. It is exactly the same thing, despite the fact that Quebec's workers are asking them to change their policy.

The Lauzon shipyard workers' union has clearly said:

We represent CSN-affiliated workers working at the Lévis shipyard. We stand with workers in all Canadian shipyards in supporting your efforts to exclude Canadian shipyards from the Canada-European Free Trade Association Free Trade Agreement.

It is very clear. Quebec's workers are telling the Bloc Québécois that they are on the wrong track and making a mistake. They are following the same old free trade policies that linger mainly in Canada. The United States has moved on to a fair trade approach. Here in Canada we are stuck with the old parties making the same old speeches, and this includes the Bloc Québécois.

Now, there is only one question I would like to ask. The Bloc seems to have something against the Quebec City area and the workers in Lévis. Workers in the Quebec City area are asking the Bloc Québécois to say no to this agreement, to take shipyards out of it. Is it that the Bloc Québécois is still upset with Quebec City and that they want to punish workers in the Quebec City area and those who work at the Lauzon shipyard because they did not vote the right way, that is, they did not vote for the Bloc Québécois during the last election? That is the only explanation—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Derek Lee): The hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel.

Mr. Mario Laframboise: Of course, the Bloc Québécois does not practice the same politics as the NDP. That party practices the politics of 30 years ago. Its political ideas date from 30 years ago. And the New Democrats will be practising the same politics for the next 30 years. That is their legacy.

I have a copy of the letter from the Lauzon shipyard workers' union and I will finish reading the paragraph. It says:

We are convinced that the creation of a Canadian marine policy would be much more profitable and beneficial for the shipbuilding industry than this kind of free trade agreement.

This is where the Bloc Québécois will help. The Bloc Québécois will ask the NDP to work towards creating a real Canadian marine policy. One thing I regret about this House is that the NDP does not attack the Conservatives' laissez-faire ideology. The NDP has decided to attack this agreement. However, as I said earlier, when looking at a free trade agreement, one must do so with macroeconomics in mind. I will not grandstand, as they tend to do, nor will I say that the NDP is attacking the aluminum industry, the nickel industry and the pharmaceutical industry. I will not say that about them. But the fact remains, when you practice the politics of 30 years ago, it is easy to return to old habits.

Mr. Alex Atamanenko (British Columbia Southern Interior, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my hon. colleague for his speech, but I would like him to answer the following question.

Government Orders

How is it that the three other parties in this House voted against the workers of Canada's shipbuilding industry? Clearly, in 15 years, Canada is going to lose that industry. The statistics are clear. It is also clear that the United States is protecting its shipbuilding industry, as are other countries.

How is it that, here in Canada, no one cares about the shipbuilding industry and we agreed to sign this agreement for no good reason, other than to have an agreement signed? I would like him to explain that.

• (1245)

Mr. Mario Laframboise: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the member knows very well that the very text of the agreement indicates special concern for shipbuilding: there is a 15-year period, a moratorium. Therefore the entire text is up for discussion. Naturally it is an important issue.

When looking at a free trade agreement from a macroeconomic perspective, there are positives and there are negatives. One of the negatives pertains to shipbuilding. Therefore, Canada must decide to tackle the problem. Of course, if the NDP decides to pout in its corner and not put any effort into making progress on a Canadian marine policy, there will be problems. That is why I stated in my speech that I was disappointed today that there was not unanimous support for Bill C-2 and for tackling a real Canadian marine policy.

Once again, it shows divisiveness. We are trying to make our colleagues understand that we have to put our partisanship aside and try to work on the real needs of the industry by developing a Canadian marine policy. When Bill C-2 is adopted, the Bloc Québécois will be available. We have 15 years to adopt a policy and to ensure that our shipbuilders will be competitive.

If they are able to compete with Norway, they will be able to compete with every other country. It is a good opportunity.

If the NDP decides to stay in its corner and to do everything it can to prevent a discussion of this issue and if the Conservatives are no longer keen on it, they will have the backing of the NDP for not having a Canadian marine policy. That is the situation we find ourselves in.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I quite like the member, but he is misleading Quebeckers.

More than half of all Quebeckers want fair trade. That is what most Quebeckers want. But the Bloc Québécois is aligning with the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party, both of which are championing John McCain and George W. Bush's behind-the-times ideas. It is absurd to suggest that we cannot protect certain strategic industries.

Workers in the Lévis and Lauzon shipyards have asked the Bloc Québécois to vote in favour of the NDP amendment to exclude shipbuilding from the agreement. The United States have done so systematically. Under their Jones act, they have excluded shipbuilding and shipyards to ensure that the industry can make a full contribution to their economy.

The NDP is the only party in the House that says that shipyards deserve our support and should be excluded from the agreement.

This is the only way to force the government to come up with a proper marine policy.

Why is the Bloc supporting an agreement that sells out shipbuilding when the NDP is offering a solution that would bring in a marine policy? Saying that we might come up with something someday is not good enough. This agreement will kill shipbuilding. That is what shipyard workers all over Canada, including those in the Lauzon shipyard, have told us.

They have made their needs clear. Why is the NDP the only party listening to these workers?

Mr. Mario Laframboise: Mr. Speaker, one thing is certain, and that is that the Bloc Québécois wants to protect the values and interests of Quebeckers. The government says it is open to discussions with the world. At a time of crisis, the Premier of Quebec took the trouble to spend a few weeks discussing a possible free trade agreement between Quebec and the rest of the European Union with EU representatives. We have to keep in mind that Quebec has a population of 7 million, while Canada has a population of 33 million. If we want to lead the world in aluminum, nickel, aerospace and many other industries, we have to be able to open up to world markets.

Obviously, when we enter into agreements and analyze them on a macroeconomic level, we see that they have advantages and disadvantages. One of the disadvantages of this agreement has to do with the shipbuilding sector. However, because of the political divide in this House, which is supported by the NDP, we are unable to tackle the issue of a real shipbuilding policy.

• (1250)

[English]

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important debate, which is why the NDP is following through, as we have at each level of the debate, to ensure the voices of shipyard workers from coast to coast are actually heard in this debate.

As members well know, there is an Ottawa bubble that is incredibly strong for new members of Parliament, the Conservatives, Liberals and even Bloc members. They come here and forget about the interests of their constituents. It happens time and time again. We see these with trade agreements that sell out Canadians and sell out Canadian jobs.

Essentially, we have Conservative and Liberal MPs who only listen to corporate CEOs, even as those corporate CEOs are moving jobs offshore to other countries, to the third world where they can pay miserable wages and then sell their goods back in Canada. The result has been a hemorrhaging of manufacturing jobs over the last few years, hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs lost, and still the government persists in bringing forward sellout agreements, agreements that have not been negotiated with any strength, that have not been negotiated with the interests of the country in mind, but are simply agreements that sell out various sectors of the Canadian economy in the hope that somehow, magically, through George Bush-style free trade agreements, there will be economic benefits.

Government Orders

The reality, which Statistics Canada tells us very clearly, is that approach does not work. Over the last 20 years, for about three-quarters of Canadian families, their real income has actually gone down, and many of them are listening today. They have seen how disastrous right-wing economic policies, including George Bush-style free trade agreements, have been for the country. They are earning less now than they were 20 years ago. If that is not a silent economic crisis, I do not know what is.

The whole basis that somehow throwing these agreements out and selling out various sectors creates jobs in Canada simply does not work and does not hold up. It is very clear. When the bottom line of these agreements and the whole lack of industrial strategies in a whole variety of sectors does not work, one would think the government would think twice, but no, from Liberals to Conservatives, it is just the same old thing.

Perhaps that is why the NDP representation in this House over the last few years has tripled. It is because people are saying that it does not work in their communities. People are tired of working for minimum wage jobs and are tired of seeing their manufacturing facilities close down.

We saw that with the softwood sellout, which the Liberals and Bloc Québécois members now regret supporting. They are trying to distance themselves as the penalties now start coming into play, with \$68 million last week and probably \$400 million that softwood communities and small softwood companies, the ones that have survived, will have to pay when the next decision comes down.

It is absolutely absurd and now, the opposition parties that helped the Conservatives drive the getaway car in the softwood sellout, are trying to pretend that they were not in the car. Canadians are not fooled by that.

Now we have an agreement coming forward that every representative, whether a worker's representative or an owner's representative, representing shipbuilding across this country from coast to coast, have said will kill our shipbuilding industry. It has been unanimous. We are not talking about some difference of opinion. We are talking about unanimous recommendations to carve out shipbuilding from the agreement and yet not one Conservative MP has stood up for shipbuilding, even though, in many cases, they represent shipbuilding workers in their ridings. The Bloc Québécois, as I mentioned in French just a few minutes ago, despite being pressed by shipyard workers in Lévis, Quebec, is refusing to stand up for shipyard workers.

Only one party in this Parliament is standing up for shipyard workers and that is the NDP and that is because we have our own shipbuilding critic, the member of Parliament for Sackville—Eastern Shore. We have a new member of Parliament for Welland who represents the shipbuilding workers there and who is doing a terrific job as well.

• (1255)

We represent our constituents. We are standing up for shipbuilding workers. It is not as if the members can pretend they have not heard. Hundreds and hundreds of letters have been pouring in, especially to Liberal MP offices, telling them to support the NDP's amendment for the carve out. More are coming in as we speak. So many are coming

in that fax machines have been having difficulty keeping up. The letters say, unanimously, "Support the carve out".

I read one of the many letters into the record earlier and I will do it again. It said:

One of the most surprising things to me as a shipyard worker is that all stakeholders in the industry including owners, operators and unions from coast-to-coast have emphasized the need for this support during the many committee meetings that were held on the use of free trade talks. It's a shame that the Liberal party of Canada feels that it has to remain a puppet of the Conservative government in supporting another bad free trade deal for Canada.

These letters are pouring in and they are heartfelt. The shipyard workers are saying that Canada has, by far, the world's longest coastline and a proud shipbuilding tradition. In fact, just a few decades ago we had the fourth largest navy on the entire planet. Shipbuilding yards were turning out ships in Vancouver. We had ships coming out every week. We had tens of thousands of shipbuilding jobs.

The reason that industry is now on its deathbed is because of a completely irresponsible approach by the former Liberal government and continued by the Conservative government. Now we have a coffin that is being presented in the middle of the House of Commons by the Conservative government through Bill C-2, which would kill and finish off our shipbuilding sector.

Liberals and Bloc members say that is okay, that they are all right, they are MPs and that they do not care about the workers in this country. What are they basing their vote on? There is some sort of airy-fairy theory that somehow Canada will be advantaged. There has been absolutely no economic impact analysis of this agreement. Not one Liberal MP, Conservative MP or Bloc Québécois MP has actually said that maybe we need to know how many jobs will be lost from this.

It is absurd that the Ottawa bubble corrupts every MP who comes from other parties. They seem incapable of standing up for Canada and for Canadians jobs once they get elected to Parliament. It is appalling. They cannot say that they did not know. Those letters are coming in, letters that the NDP has read into the record, letters from the B.C. marine workers, Davie shipyard and the Halifax shipyards. It is pretty conclusive.

What happens next? Well, we are now starting debate on third riding. In a few moments I will offering a motion that will carve out shipbuilding from this agreement.

What we are saying is that, over the next two weeks, those shipbuilding workers who are listening in today, those shipbuilding workers who have been sending their letters to Liberal MPs and those shipbuilding workers in Quebec who have been indicating to the Bloc Québécois that they should be voting for this carve-out will get another opportunity.

Over the next week, they need to let their voices be heard. They need to ensure that those MPs who are so willing to sell out our shipbuilding industry for some vague advantage that might come, although there is no economic analysis so they cannot really pinpoint anything, but those MPs will be forced to make a choice. They need to know that if they vote to sell out shipbuilding, they will not come back to the next Parliament. It needs to be that clear.

Government Orders

We have precedents for that. We all recall the softwood sell-out that supported by the Bloc and the Liberals. Many of those Liberal MPs who voted for the softwood lumber agreement, particularly in northern Ontario and northern Manitoba, are no longer here. People in northern Ontario and in northern Manitoba said “No, if you are not going to represent us, we are not going to return you to Parliament”. Those Liberal MPs are no longer here.

● (1300)

The Liberal MP from Welland, who was a flamboyant free trader on the George Bush model, is no longer here and has been replaced by a dedicated social democrat who is standing up for the workers in the riding of Welland.

More and more Canadians are saying that they do not want the old speeches that they have been hearing for 20 years that eventually something will happen, eventually our quality of life will improve, eventually we will get higher incomes, while all the money continues to be concentrated in a few people's hands. Corporate CEOs and corporate lawyers are making more money than ever. In fact, the wealthiest Canadians now take most of Canada's income. Middle class and working class families have lost ground. Their real incomes have gone down, even the hours worked have increased substantially. However, the policies that have been adopted by Liberal and Conservative governments have put the focus on the wealthiest of Canadians to the exclusion of everyone else. Increasingly, Canadians are waking up to that fact.

This is a call out for shipbuilding workers in Victoria, British Columbia and Nanaimo, B.C., shipbuilders with that proud tradition that I mentioned in Vancouver, British Columbia in the Washington yards. They need to contact their Liberal MPs and telling Conservative MPs that this sellout is completely unacceptable. Over the next week, they need to make their voices heard.

Shipbuilding workers in southern Ontario in the Welland yards, who, unfortunately, have a terrific MP, also need to make their voices heard.

[*Translation*]

People in Lévis, the workers at the Lauzon shipyard, must tell the Bloc Québécois that it is unacceptable for the Bloc to penalize Quebec City because the citizens did not vote the right way. This shipbuilding sell-out is unacceptable. These workers made it clear but they must work to make it even more clear since the Bloc does not seem to understand that this sell-out deal is even worse than the softwood lumber sell-out, which cost Quebec workers thousands of jobs. Those workers lost their jobs because the Bloc, instead of defending Quebec's interests, simply decided to go with the same old free trade policies as George Bush, the Conservatives and the Liberals. The Bloc refused to defend Quebec's interests, while these workers should have been listened to.

[*English*]

The shipbuilding workers in Nova Scotia have sent in hundreds of letters and they cannot be more clear, but they need to phone the MPs for Halifax West and Dartmouth—Cole Harbour who are refusing to stand up for their constituents.

The shipyard workers in Marystown, Newfoundland and Labrador, who have a very good member in the MP for St. John's

East, but all of the other Newfoundland and Labrador MPs are trying to vote for an agreement that kills the jobs in Marystown. We heard that from shipyard workers across the country. Over the next week, because we will not be in session, they need to let their MPs know that this is unacceptable, that they must stand up for Canadian jobs and for their community.

The reality we face is a House where one party is defending Canadian jobs and standing up for Canada and three parties that are selling us out. They are not even selling us out with anything tangible to give us. We have no economic impact statement, nothing that actually says what advantages are here. They say that it is symbolic. I am sorry but the shipyard workers of Canada need more than symbolism. They need jobs. They need a maritime policy that actually creates more jobs. They do not need an agreement that, as shipyard workers have so clearly said to the Parliament of Canada, kills their industry.

The Conservatives say that in 30 years they will be investing more money. Well, in 30 years there will not be any shipyards left. The Liberals say that some day they will be in government and they will put a policy in place. Well, there will not be any shipyards left.

● (1305)

[*Translation*]

The Bloc Québécois says that it will defend Quebec's interests, except when it comes to shipbuilding. It is ready to sell out in terms of the workers' interests because it believes that Quebec will eventually come out on top. But the Bloc Québécois has nothing tangible to show because there has never been an impact study. The Bloc cannot provide any arguments that counterbalance what is being sold.

[*English*]

With that very clear point, I know that the hundreds of shipyard workers who have been writing to members of Parliament and the thousands of other shipyard workers across the country will be impacted by this agreement unless we get the carve-out that the NDP is proposing. We ask the shipyard workers to write in.

I will complete my speech by moving the following amendment. I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word “That” and substituting the following: “Bill C-2, An Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the States of the European Free Trade Association (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Switzerland), the Agreement on Agriculture between Canada and the Republic of Iceland, the Agreement on Agriculture between Canada and the Kingdom of Norway and the Agreement on Agriculture between Canada and the Swiss Confederation, be not now read a third time but be referred back to the Standing Committee on International Trade for the purpose of reconsidering clause 33 with a view to re-examining the phase-out of shipbuilding protections.”

The Deputy Speaker: The amendment is in order.

Questions and comments. The hon. member for Sackville—Eastern Shore.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I again want to highlight my hon. colleague, who has done an outstanding job in committee and the House by raising the spectre of what may happen to the shipbuilding industry if these particular policies carry on.

Government Orders

My hon. colleague is a learned gentleman. He is not asking for anything that is against the WTO or the GATS. He is not asking for anything illegal. What he is asking for is fairness in representation of the facts when it comes to shipyard workers, shipowners and shipbuilders in the five major yards we have left in Canada.

We know for certain that if we were to get the carve-out of shipbuilding, Norway would raise concerns and might back away from it. That leads to one of the questions I would like to ask my hon. colleague. Why would Norway be so hinged on shipbuilding? We understand that there is a scaled reduction of the tariff over 15 years, but we know very well that favourable tax policies in Norway can offset that.

The reality is that our largest trading partner is the United States, and this is the crux of the matter in my argument. Every single FTA it has signed since 1924 specifically carves out shipbuilding and marine services. It is our largest trading partner. Why would Canada not legally do the same, in order to protect the interests of our shipyards and workers in this country?

• (1310)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the member for Sackville—Eastern Shore, who has been the foremost advocate for shipbuilding workers across the country and the foremost advocate for having a national shipbuilding strategy here in Canada. He has done real honour in the House by his actions.

The workers, the owners, and every single representative and witness representing the shipbuilding industry have told us time and time again in committee, “This will kill us”. Every single one said it.

Yet Liberals, Conservatives and Bloc members have said they don't care. They have some airy-fairy approach to the George W. Bush style of free trade, and they think it has to work, even though there are no economic impact statements at all to justify it. They just figure that somehow Canada is going to come out ahead. That is just not good enough for the hard-working shipbuilding workers across this country from coast to coast.

Every other country does this. As the member mentioned, the Jones Act protects the United States' shipbuilding industry so that the U.S.A. can continue to build it in a very viable way. This one kills the shipbuilding industry with 1,000 cuts instantly. As soon as it is approved, it shuts off certain sectors from Canadians in terms of being able to build ships, and that continues until the inexorable end of our shipbuilding industry.

The member for Sackville—Eastern Shore asked a very intelligent question. The reality is that every member of the House should be standing up to vote for this NDP amendment.

Mr. Wayne Marston (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Burnaby—New Westminster on behalf of U.S. steelworkers and the former Dofasco workers of Hamilton, who produced his steel.

Earlier in the debate on this particular motion, I think we heard the member for Sackville—Eastern Shore talk about the command centres of our ships now looking like they are from *Star Trek* or some futuristic place. In fact, Canada is a leading nation in the development of shipping. I cannot help but remember that just recently we passed the 50th anniversary of the death of the Avro

Arrow. I am very fearful that we are at the beginning of the end for the shipbuilding industry in Canada. For steelmakers across this country, who rely on making steel for auto manufacturing and for vessels, this is crucial.

I want to thank the member and again refer to the fact that the United States, since the Jones Act of 1920, has been doing exactly what this member has asked. Did the member try to put this through a committee similar to this?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, the member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek has been a strong advocate for Canadian workers and Canadian jobs. I wish we had more members like him in the House. We have 37 members like him, but we need to have 137 so that these kinds of sellouts actually stop. We are working on it. The number of members providing strong representation for workers has tripled in the House over the past few years. If it triples again, we will not see any more of these sellouts.

It would be an important step in the Canadian Parliament to stop the Ottawa bubble and actually start thinking about ordinary people across this country, rather than just corporate CEOs and bankers, which is what Liberals and Conservatives seem to love. They love giving money to bankers and corporate CEOs. They do not seem to think very often about the hard-working ordinary Canadians who pay their taxes and actually pay their salaries.

The question asked whether this issue had been raised. It was raised in committee repeatedly by every single representative from the shipbuilding industry, both owners and workers. It was every single one. The member is quite right to point this out. We have Liberals and Conservatives not even bothering to listen. They do not even bother to listen to the impact of their decisions. They did not even want to read the bill. They just wanted to push it right through.

In fact, Liberals moved to cut off witnesses. We had Liberals and Conservatives saying that they did not really want to hear from shipbuilding representatives. They did not really care about that. Somebody said that there were going to be some benefits in this deal, and even though there had been no economic analysis whatsoever, they were just going to pass it through, throw it on the House of Commons and see what happened.

That worked really well for the softwood sellout, did it not? Thousands upon thousands of jobs were lost because members in the House did not do their job. We told them what the impact would be: hundreds of millions of dollars in fines, softwood communities devastated, closures of mills and money going down to the United States. What did they do? They voted it through. We are giving them a last chance to do the right thing.

Government Orders

• (1315)

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe that the United States has shown a lot of common sense in past history by protecting its shipbuilding industry through the Jones Act of 1920. Why would the members opposite have such a lack of common sense and not follow the United States? They seem to want to follow the United States in every other field of endeavour. Why would they not follow them in this one?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question from my colleague for Elmwood—Transcona. The answer is that they are stuck in the past. They are dinosaurs on trade policy. The rest of the world is moving to fair trade. We are seeing a fundamental change, because the old George W. Bush style of free trade policy simply did not work.

We now have fair trade in place in Washington. The Barack Obama administration was elected on that basis, yet here, the last relics of the George W. Bush style of free trade are still in place in the House of Commons. Canadians need to know that we have these relics. They are trade illiterates. They are folks who just take whatever is given to them on free trade without checking facts, without checking what has actually happened to middle-class family incomes and without checking the impacts of each and every one of these agreements that Liberals and Conservatives love to sign, but do not seem to want to read.

I think that is why we need to look at best practices. The member for Elmwood—Transcona asks a very valid question. The U.S. has a viable and vibrant shipbuilding sector because, under the Jones Act, they exempt shipbuilding from international trade agreements. That is a best practice that has led to thousands of new shipbuilding jobs in the United States. The NDP is simply saying that we want to adopt that best practice here and carve shipbuilding out of this agreement.

Mr. Malcolm Allen (Welland, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of the old adage about the barn door and trying to catch the horses after the barn door is closed. To be honest, the dry dock doors are about to shut and the last ship is about to sail away.

I commend my hon. colleague, who has fought vociferously and passionately and courageously to save shipyards across the country. Could I ask him what he thinks will happen to those communities where those shipyard workers are?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, we know what will happen. They will lose their jobs, and their families will lose their breadwinners.

This is why we are saying through you, Mr. Speaker, to the country at large that this is the time when shipyard workers need to speak out. Those hundreds of letters have had some impact—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Sackville—Eastern Shore.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we know where the government's attention is. We heard it today in question period, when it could not even get a simple question correct. With all the people working in government, with all the statistical information that the government could have, in response to a simple question by one of our colleagues from the Bloc Québécois on EI, it had the audacity to deliberately mislead the

House of Commons and Canada by telling us that 82% of EI claimants get EI. Where did that figure come from? The truth is that fewer than 40% of the people who claim for EI actually receive it. Where did that figure of 82% come from? It is unbelievable.

Here is another place where the government's attention is. Page 8 of *Quorum* shows that in 2007 the ten highest-paid bureaucrats in the government got bonuses of 25%, 33%, 28%, 24%, 15%.

What does the government tell the shipyard workers? “We are going to phase out your industry. You might be able to collect EI if you qualify”.

Well, shipyard workers do not want EI. They want to have jobs and look after themselves.

I get a kick out of the Liberals and the Bloc when they say that they want to have a national policy. We already have one. In 2001, the then industry minister, Brian Tobin, struck a committee made up of labour and industry. It came together with the “Breaking Through” document. It presented five major recommendations to assist the industry and put it on sound financial footing. Some of the elements were a combination of what we call structured facility financing and accelerated cost capital allowance, but in order for them to work, they had to be together.

Yes, the government did put in SFF, but not for the five-year term that we and industry and labour had asked for, and not with ACCA. We needed to have them together. It was a straightforward recommendation that would have put this industry on sound footing. It did not happen.

That report is still collecting dust on the Minister of Industry's desk. How frustrating it is that almost eight years after these workers, companies and groups got together to do that report, trusting that something might move, it has not happened.

We have heard from Liberals. The hon. member for Halifax West, when he was the fisheries minister, stood in the shipyards and said, “Don't worry, folks. We're going to build those big new mid-shore Coast Guard vessels right here”.

Four years later and with a Conservative government, we still do not have them, yet what do the Conservatives announce in a budget? Instead of the \$22 billion worth of work that we need over 20 years for building the JSS support vessels, the Coast Guard vessels, the icebreakers, the laker fleets, the ferry fleets, et cetera, we got what we call the “canoe budget” of \$175 million to build some hovercraft and do some mid-life refits on some vessels.

That \$175 million is important. There is no doubt about it. However, the major yards, except for the refits, are not going to be building hovercraft. It just does not happen.

In reality, very much more was required and very little was delivered.

Government Orders

The Conservatives are nice people individually. There is not one of them I would not want as my neighbour. We have to ask ourselves, though, what they, with their Liberal friends and their Bloc friends, would collectively tell the shipbuilding industry, when in committee after committee they heard and heard again that these trade deals may very well be the end of us in the future.

It is not just EFTA alone that will kill this industry. Once we put in this trade deal with EFTA, then Korea is knocking on our door, and Korea has said very clearly that shipbuilding and the auto sector will be major factors in our trade talks.

That is where the deal will be killed. That is when shipbuilding says goodbye in this country.

The government may want to remain true to its word down the road and say that we are going to build the *Diefenbaker* here in Canada. The irony of it is that in order for a yard to do it, the government may have to subsidize that yard to get it done, as it did for the Irvings in the 1980s. It gave them millions of dollars to upgrade the yard. They built the frigates. Then it gave them \$55 million to shut it down. That was the Conservatives and the Liberals.

• (1320)

The reality is that we have an industry that can be viable, that can hire thousands of people.

I will relate an incident that happened yesterday. The EnCana Corporation, with the Deep Panuke project, announced that Irving in Halifax will be building an offshore vessel. It is a \$60 million contract. All of a sudden, 200 additional workers will come back in, \$20 million will be offset to the economy in payroll and income taxes, and there will be \$14 million of direct input into the Halifax-Dartmouth area.

That is one supply vessel, at \$60 million. Can members imagine what billions of dollars of work would do, not just in Halifax, but in Marystown, Lévis, Welland, and the Washington yards in Victoria, what it would do for a stimulus package in this country? We do not have to subsidize it; we have to invest.

The men and women in the military deserve new navy fleets. The men and women in the Coast Guard deserve those new vessels. The men and women who ply the Great Lakes deserve new laker fleets, and the men and women who serve our ferries and transportation on the east and west coasts and in the Great Lakes areas deserve to have those new ferries.

We certainly do not want to see another example of the BC Ferries corporation having three vessels built in Germany at a cost of \$540 million and not one job created in B.C. because of it. Then what does the BC Ferries corporation ask? They want a waiver of the 25% import duty charges. They want to waive it, because if they do not get it, what will happen is that they may have to raise rates on the ferries. It is blackmail. That is exactly what they are doing to the government. I hope the government says very politely to the BC Ferries corporation, "No, you must pay those duties coming in."

George MacPherson, a B.C. shipyard worker, said very clearly, if the government had invested that money properly, it could have built those ships for probably less than what it did in Germany, because 40¢ on every dollar would have gone immediately back into the

economy through income payroll taxes. That does not include the offset jobs that would have been there.

Of course, the Conservatives are very serious about economic plans and they like to create jobs. We saw a classic example of that just a while ago when 18 of their friends entered the Senate for \$6 million. What a great economic stimulus package that was.

I could be wrong on this one but I would not mind testing it: I do not think there is one member of Parliament in the House who was asked by any constituent to request that the Prime Minister put 18 more of his friends in the Senate to get the economy going. That is where it is, the Senate.

That is not what Canadians are asking for. They are asking for jobs and for the ability to look after their own families, to pay their taxes and live in their communities.

We have five major yards left in this country. Since 2001, since the "Breaking Through" report, we have consistently, over and over again, asked the previous government and the current government to pay half as much attention to the shipbuilding industry as it does the aerospace industry.

It was not lost on anyone when the Conservatives stood and bragged about an investment of over \$300 million in the aerospace industry. What happened because of it? Some very good news: Bombardier-Canadair with a more than \$1 billion contract. That, in my opinion, is a sound investment.

I know this sounds like a socialist-democratic idea that the ghosts of Tommy Douglas, Stanley Knowles and J.S. Woodsworth are coming back to filter through the House of Commons, but imagine the concept of using Canadian taxpayers' dollars to hire Canadian workers to work in Canadian shipyards, work with Canadian companies, and build Canadian ships.

That is such a far-fetched idea. It must be some crazy NDPer saying this. The reality is that this is what Canadians are asking for. They want investments in strategic industries that will build the economy of tomorrow. They want to make sure that their tax dollars go to hire their friends and their neighbours so that they in turn have jobs to look after their families.

For the government to sell out the shipyard workers and the companies through this EFTA deal means that Korea is next, and what else after that? Yet we have reported over and over again that there is nothing wrong, nothing illegal, no trade disputes at all, in carving shipbuilding out of that debate.

We can have the EFTA deal. We do not mind it at all. In fact, we would like the government to promote the EFTA deal, but leave shipbuilding out of it, because that will eventually hurt our industry.

•(1325)

In 2003, when I questioned the then deputy prime minister, John Manley, in this House, we heard him say that the shipbuilding industry, in his view, was a sunset industry, that it was time to get over it and move on. That is what he said in 2003.

I honestly believe there are a lot of Liberals, a lot of Conservatives and the bureaucrats behind it who still believe that and would trade off this industry for something else. That is inexplicable. It is unbelievable that two major parties in the House who have been governing this country since Confederation can have such a dim view of shipbuilding in this country.

The reality is that with sound investment and the proper protection this industry can grow and be a bright light in the future for our economy.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Sackville—Eastern Shore will have nine minutes left in the time allotted to him the next time the bill is debated in the House.

•(1330)

[*Translation*]

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

[*Translation*]

STANDING ORDERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Hon. Maxime Bernier (Beauce, CPC) moved:

That Standing Order 89 be amended by deleting the words "and of second reading of a private Member's public bill originating in the Senate"; and Standing Order 86.2(2) be amended by deleting the words "a Senate public bill or".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to my private members' business motion M-277. I am grateful to my colleague, the member for Crowfoot, for having developed this initiative in the last Parliament. Given the urgency of the motion, the member asked me to bring the motion forward and I am happy and privileged to do so.

The motion proposes to change the House of Commons Standing Orders so that Senate private members' business items are treated in the same way as House of Commons private members' business items. It is very important that they be treated fairly. As all members of the House of Commons know, at the start of each Parliament a list of members for the consideration of private members' business is established. A random draw is held to establish the order in which members' names will be added to the order of precedence, which is the list of members' bills and motions that will be considered by the House. Once the draw has been held, the order of precedence lists 30 members of the House who have the privilege of seeing their ideas, bills or motions debated in the House.

Of course, cabinet ministers, parliamentary secretaries, the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker are excluded from the list. The principle behind the establishment of the list is that each member

Private Members' Business

should have an opportunity in a Parliament to have a private members' business item—something that is important to the member, his or her constituents and all Canadians—debated in the House of Commons. This principle was enunciated in 2002 in the 66th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs on private members' business, a report that was very short and to the point.

Of course, a member can have one of his or her private members' business items debated only if his or her name has been added to the order of precedence. Other members must wait until their name is transferred from the list to the order of precedence. This ensures a fair process for the consideration of private members' business in the House. Unfortunately, there is a problem with the Standing Orders and that is why we have a motion before us today.

The problem is that our current rules treat Senate private members' business differently from House private members' business. Private members' business items coming from the Senate to the House of Commons are automatically and immediately added to the order of precedence. I will repeat that, so we all understand: once they are sponsored and introduced by a member of the House of Commons private members' bills coming from the Senate are automatically and immediately added to the order of precedence, ahead of the members of this House. This means that Senate private members' business items get preferential treatment in the House of Commons, unlike bills by members of this House. Senate private members' business items can jump the queue that is established for the management of House private members' business items. Senators are taking advantage of the loophole in the Standing Orders and are sending an increasing number of private members' bills to the House.

To be fair, let us look at what happens in the Senate. In the Senate, there is no list for the consideration of private members' business or an order of precedence. Senate private members' business items are introduced are added to the order paper and can be debated on any given day. However, in practice, the Senate rules allow the party with a majority in the Senate to control which private members' items are advanced and which ones die on the order paper.

So, even if the Rules of the Senate provide for equal treatment in theory, in fact, this is not the case. And unlike the House, where a member can bring forward only one of his or her items in a Parliament, Senators can advance an unlimited number of private members' business items. For example, Senator Grafstein has seven bills on the order paper in the Senate at the present time.

•(1335)

Some may say that we in this House should not worry about a few Senate private members' items. To them, I would point out that senators have already introduced 29 Senate private members' items. That is an average of one bill per day that the Senate has sat during this Parliament.

Private Members' Business

Since the order of precedence in the House is only replenished when the number of items falls to 15 after the House has dealt with private members' business items—as I said earlier, the order of precedence is made up of 30 private members' bills or motions—Senate private members' bills that are sent to the House and added to the order of precedence can delay the adding of new members of the House to the order of precedence.

That is why this procedure is unfair. Other members of the House have to wait indefinitely for the day their name appears on the order of precedence.

If senators keep introducing one new item per day, these items will be sent to the House, and the next members in line will not be able to bring their items forward until the fall or even later. It is basic math.

That is unfair to the members of this House who are awaiting the next replenishment of the order of precedence so they can bring forward one of their motions or bills. We need to ensure that the Standing Orders treat Senate private members' items the same way that House business items are treated. That is what my motion proposes to do, and I hope that many of the parties and members of the House will support it.

Motion M-277 would change the Standing Orders of the House of Commons so that members who are added to the order of precedence have to choose between bringing forward one of their items or sponsoring a Senate private member's bill. Members who want to sponsor a Senate private member's item would still be able to do so—but only when their name is added to the order of precedence.

This motion would provide for fairness in the way we handle House and Senate bills. Fair treatment will benefit all members of this House. I therefore call on all members of this House to support motion M-277.

Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the member for Beauce. With regard to House of Commons private members' bills that make it through three readings in this House and find a sponsor in the Senate, are they treated differently in the Senate than Senate private members' bills?

Does the Senate treat its own bills differently than those originating in the House?

Hon. Maxime Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the member has asked a very good question about the rules of the Senate and the answer can be found in those rules. However, I can say, as I mentioned earlier in my speech, that we are discussing changing the Standing Orders of the House.

The most important point is that in the Senate they have their own way of doing things and this results in a privilege. I would not be worried. I believe that the members of the Senate would be in favour of rules that guarantee equitable treatment for all members in this House and also for the senators.

We have been elected by the citizens and we should be able to present a bill. In theory, if someone's bill is 60th on the order of precedence, the chances of it being presented and debated in this House within one session are minimal.

Therefore, we want to ensure that members elected by the people can present bills that are a priority for the citizens in their riding and for Canadians and that this list is treated fairly.

• (1340)

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the motion from the member for Beauce touches on a subject that is very, very worrisome. It is so worrisome that it is currently being studied by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs that I sit on and that has representatives from every party in this House. We began a serious study because there are considerable issues with the amendments to the Standing Orders proposed by the member for Beauce.

Does the member not feel that his action is a bit premature at this time, given that his motion or proposal is being studied by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs? Does he not find it a bit premature to put forward a motion on this since the entire Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs is studying this very seriously?

Hon. Maxime Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear my colleague say she takes my motion seriously. I am also glad to hear that the committee is looking at this very issue. I wonder whether the committee is conducting a study because I have put forward this motion in the House. Perhaps that is what prompted the committee members to study this issue.

From what the member says, I can see that this is a problem for everyone, and it is so important that the committee is looking into this and I have moved this motion, in the interests of democracy. The study can go on at the same time as the debate on this bill, and I will be very open to any recommendations the committee may make. The important thing is to treat House of Commons private members' bills and Senate private members' bills equally. I am glad that the House is holding this debate today and that the committee is looking at this issue. I hope this motion will be passed in the near future.

[English]

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the two colleagues who just raised questions a moment ago were both members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs on which I also sit. Since it is comments as well as questions, I will observe, for the benefit of the last questioner, that it is not really the fault of any member that his or her item of private members' business comes up when it does.

Members have very little flexibility. I suppose one could trade down, but that might involve trading very far down the list, and one would have to find a willing partner with whom to trade. I think perhaps that explains the timing.

It was our decision, as a committee, to undertake that study. No member who is undertaking business can be faulted for dealing with it in the spot to which the House has assigned that member.

Private Members' Business

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maxime Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I agree completely with my colleague. I think that all the members of this House also share the view that there should be equal treatment, and that is the aim of this motion.

[*English*]

Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the motion before the House is fraught with problems. I would urge all colleagues in the House not to vote in favour of it.

I will give a little of the history.

For many years, members of Parliament sought to increase the role of the private member. Until the 1980s, a private member's bill or motion was debated for one hour, usually talked out, mainly by a designated government member, and then the item would fall to the bottom of the list and disappear forever. All this began to change following the adoption of the McGrath committee report in 1986. Since then, and gradually, the procedures have been changed.

First, some private members' business items have become votable. Then a further change made most of those items votable, which as all hon. members in the House will know is the system still in effect right now.

Before the landmark changes of 1986, private members' bills dealt almost exclusively with riding name changes and other similar non-controversial issues. Today, however, things are very different. For example, in 2005, part VII of the Official Languages Act was given judicial status by way of a private member's bill from a senator and in the House by the then MP Don Boudria. All parties in the House supported that bill. The hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst was an enthusiastic supporter of the measure.

If we move on to the 39th Parliament, the international development assistance was placed under a new accountability regime, thanks again to a private member's bill sponsored by the hon. member for Scarborough—Guildwood.

The Kelowna Accord Implementation Act and the Kyoto Implementation Act were both private members' bills. The latter was authored by the hon. member for Honoré-Mercier. I would like to congratulate all those members.

The question that needs to be asked is this. How did these bills become law? First, they became law because a member of Parliament proposed the measure in question. Second, they passed the House of Commons because a majority of the members sitting voted for those bills. Finally, the Senate gave these bills a priority status and passed them, as well. That is how those bills were passed. This is how private members' bills that originate in this House are passed and become statute laws of Canada.

The motion that we have before us reads:

That Standing Order 89 be amended by deleting the words "and of second reading of a private Member's public bill originating in the Senate"; and Standing Order 86.2 (2) be amended by deleting the words "a Senate public bill or".

Now while some members may mistakenly believe that if fewer Senate bills were on the House order of precedence, more House bills would pass, but the effect is the exact opposite. In fact, we in

the House give priority to the small number of Senate private members' bills that reach our House and in exchange our private members' bills receive priority in the other House. It does not mean the House always gets its way, but it does mean that the absence of this reciprocal agreement would be to the disadvantage of the House.

When the member for Beauce says that he only wants reciprocity, in fact, if one looks at the system that exists in the Senate, there is reciprocity with the system that we have in the House to deal with private members' bills originating from the Senate.

Senate private members' bills would be relegated to the bottom of the list on the House side, while House bills would go to the bottom of the Senate list rather than to the top, as is currently the case. I will speculate as to who would come out the winner in a minute.

All the reform measures for which hon. members have fought for years would disappear with the passage of this motion. Private members' bills would almost never become law in the future. The only winners in this scheme, in my view, could possibly be the Conservative House leader and his colleagues around the cabinet. If it were another party in power and a member of that party proposed this change to the Standing Orders, I would rise and say the same thing, even if it were my own party sitting on the other side.

• (1345)

It would mean that many fewer private members' bills would ever have the chance of becoming law. The 1986 reforms and the reforms subsequent to those virtually guarantee that when we table a private member's bill it stands a good chance of becoming law.

Should Motion No. 277 sponsored by the member for Beauce actually be adopted in the House and the Standing Orders changed, we would be disadvantaging ourselves. More and more power would be drawn away from Parliament and placed into the hands of the Prime Minister and the governing party. I do not believe for one minute that this scheme originated in the mind of the hon. member for Beauce. I will leave it to others to speculate as to where it actually originated, but I have to say it would be one giant step backward for the backbench should it succeed and one very sweet victory for any government that is secretive, unaccountable and—

• (1350)

Mr. Scott Reid: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I could be wrong but I think it may be against the practices of the House to speculate on the motives of other members.

The hon. member was leaving it to us to speculate as to where this originated. We know where it originated because it was mentioned in the hon. member's speech. It originated with the member for Crowfoot in the previous Parliament. That was stated earlier in debate.

Hon. Marlene Jennings: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for that enlightening information. We now know where this motion originated.

Private Members' Business

I come back to the point that if this motion should be adopted, members would be disadvantaged. Members of the opposition and backbench members of the current governing party or any future governing party would be disadvantaged. That is why I am against this motion and I am calling on all members in the House to vote against it.

It is unfortunate that a member would seek to modify the current Standing Orders of the House to disempower backbench MPs rather than to further empower backbench MPs. This motion would reduce the chances that each of us has of a bill, if and when it came up for debate, being adopted, going to the Senate, being treated with priority, which it should, and becoming the law of the land.

This motion would put us back to pre-1986. While I found the movie *Back to the Future* to be interesting, I do not know about anyone else, but I have no interest in reliving it here. I was not here prior to 1986. I came here in 1997. I thought we had a pretty good system. I have no problem whatsoever looking at our system here and actually learning what the system is in the Senate and whether the Senate treats private bills from senators differently, with more priority, than it treats private members' bills that originate in this House, are adopted here and are sent to the other place.

That is the point that needs to be looked at. That is the point the procedure and House affairs committee is looking at, which is why I believe that the member's motion is premature and has not been properly researched and thought out. One looks for reciprocity and reciprocity means that if the Senate gives priority to its private bills, it should give priority to private members' bills from this House.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak about the motion by the member for Beauce. This motion aims to amend the House of Commons Standing Orders with regard to private member's business. More precisely, the motion aims to amend the way in which Senate private members' bills are dealt with by the House. I would like to summarize the situation.

Currently, the Standing Orders state that when a Senate private member's bill is sent to the House, any member can sponsor the bill and undertake its first reading in the House. Once it has undergone first reading, the bill immediately drops to the bottom of the order of precedence for second reading in the House. A member who sponsors a senator's bill does not lose their place on the list for consideration of private members' business. They can therefore, when their turn comes, introduce another bill or motion of their choice.

The member for Beauce is proposing that Senate private members' bills receive the same treatment as House of Commons private members' bills. If a member chooses to sponsor a Senate bill, he would have to, henceforth, use his turn on the order of precedence for Senate bills and could not introduce another bill or motion. The government has already attempted to justify this change by telling us that the House has been inundated with Senate private members' bills. Let us take a closer look at this claim.

During the second session of the 37th Parliament, in 153 sitting days, four Senate private members' bills were introduced in the House. In the third session of the same Parliament, in 55 days, four

Senate private members' bills were also introduced in the House. In the 38th Parliament, in 159 sitting days, five Senate private members' bills were introduced compared to six in 175 sittings days in the first session of the 39th Parliament. This rose to nine in the 117 days of the second session of the 39th Parliament.

I do not see a drastic or dramatic increase in the numbers, especially since certain bills, such as the one on heritage lighthouses, have come up more than once, because they keep dying on the order paper. That observation led me to question what the member's real motives are for proposing these amendments to the Standing Orders.

We are all aware that this government is obsessed with reforming the Senate, without consulting Quebec and the provinces. We are all aware of the government's desire to drastically and unilaterally reform the Senate, failing which they have threatened to abolish it. The government wants to carry out this Senate reform bit by bit, through several bills, rather than amending the Constitution, which is what it should do. In that regard, I would remind the House that the Canadian Constitution is a federal constitution. There are therefore very good reasons for ensuring that a change in the fundamental characteristics of the Senate should not be affected by one Parliament alone, but rather be part of a multilateral constitutional process involving Quebec and the provinces. Furthermore, on November 7, 2007, the former Quebec intergovernmental affairs minister, Benoît Pelletier, reiterated Quebec's traditional position by stating:

The Government of Quebec does not believe that this falls exclusively under federal jurisdiction. Given that the Senate is a crucial part of the Canadian federal compromise, it is clear to us that under the Constitution Act, 1982, and the Regional Veto Act, the Senate can be neither reformed nor abolished without Quebec's consent.

On that very day, Quebec's National Assembly unanimously passed the following motion:

That the National Assembly of Québec reaffirm to the federal government and to the Parliament of Canada that no modification to the Canadian Senate may be carried out without the consent of the Government of Québec and the National Assembly.

Getting back to the motion moved by the member for Beauce, given the situation I described, we have every reason to question the government's motives. Is this an attempt to muzzle the Senate? It certainly looks that way. If the government were serious about Senate reform, it would proceed with a constitutional amendment. But it is reluctant to take that approach because it knows as well as we do that Canada's Constitution cannot be amended.

Over the past two years, it has tried to introduce reforms through a series of possibly unconstitutional bills, which it failed to move through the legislative process. As a result, it has resorted to attempts to weaken the Senate's power by changing the Standing Orders. This government is stooping to new lows.

● (1355)

In addition, given the blatantly partisan tactics with which this government is familiar, I also wonder whether it would be in such a hurry to amend the House of Commons Standing Orders if the government held a majority in the Senate. Somehow, I doubt it.

All that is to say that the Bloc Québécois will not support the motion by the member for Beauce. Although we feel that the Senate is a useless institution that should be abolished in a round of constitutional talks, we have to live with the fact that, for the time being, this institution exists and is an integral part of Parliament. Consequently, we feel that the Standing Orders, especially as regards relations between the two houses of Parliament, should not be amended lightly without a serious study of the impacts of the proposed amendments.

We are of the opinion that the appropriate forum for such a study is the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. Until the committee has looked seriously at this issue, there is no need to amend the Standing Orders. Consequently, the motion by the member for Beauce is premature, in our opinion.

● (1400)

[English]

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand in the House today to speak for the NDP to Motion No. 277.

I have been a member of this House since 1997 and private members' business has changed quite a lot. I can remember the days when we had to go before a committee and argue whether or not our bill or motion should be votable. Most were not votable and only a few made it through. However, the system has changed a lot and I think all of us in this place highly value private members' business.

We are in a tradition that is very strong on parties and private members' business is one of the few areas that we have left where members can advance an item that pertains to their riding or an issue that they care deeply about that they want to see go through the House.

Private members' business is something we all highly prize and enjoy and something we want to see continued.

In looking at private members' business, one of the important issues is the principle of equality that it brings. We have a system of having a draw and we have the order of precedence. When I explain that to my constituents or to people who are interested in a certain bill or motion, they have some trouble understanding this rather archaic system of actually having a draw, like a lottery, but that is the system we use.

However, it does give an opportunity to all members and does not put some members above others. It is a system that, through the lottery and through the order of precedence, allows members to have their bills or motions come forward.

I began with that point because the sense of equality and the sense that there is no discrimination among members in the House is very important in how we deal with private members' business.

I thank the member for Beauce for bringing this motion forward but it is unfortunate that he is now being blamed for bringing it forward because the procedure and House affairs committee happens to be studying this. However, his motion came forward because his name was drawn and he had a right to do that. We cannot nail the person and then say that somehow they should not have done that.

Private Members' Business

The procedure and House affairs committee, of which I am not a member but I did go to one meeting, only decided to study this issue after this motion came forward. Therefore, to somehow deny the member the first hour or a subsequent hour of debate is unfair. I wanted to say that because I thought it was a bit unfair to go down that path.

I agree with the member from the Bloc who just said that we should not change the Standing Orders lightly. The Standing Orders are a very complex set of rules and they arrived where they are for a thousand and one reasons. To change them, one needs to look at them carefully. I am glad the procedure and House affairs committee is doing that study because we need to get more information in terms of how the Senate deals with business comes from the House of Commons. There has been some general understanding about what happens but we need to have a better sense of how it deals with the priorities and whether or not there will be impacts.

We in the NDP had quite a lively debate in our caucus about this motion. We felt that the underlying principle here was the need to be fair to members in the House of Commons. This idea that bills or motions coming from the Senate are automatically placed ahead in the queue is something that, quite frankly, we find very frustrating.

I think the tendency today in the debate has been to somehow suggest that if this motion were to go through, it would eliminate opportunities for members of the Senate to bring items of business forward and, of course, that is not the case. What is being suggested here is that what would be left behind is their automatic entrance into the order of precedence.

What would happen, if this motion were to pass, is that something which came from the Senate would need to be sponsored by a member who was in the order of precedence in the House of Commons by a member of Parliament. We would all have that choice. We could choose one of our own items or something that came from the Senate but it would be very clear that we could not, in effect, double-dip.

● (1405)

The need for members to have a sense of equality and fairness about how we are treated in terms of private members' business is what underlies this debate. I was a little worried when I heard the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine characterize this motion as something that would disempower members in the House of Commons. My understanding is that the motion is being put forward to ensure members retain the order of precedence and that it does not get bumped by bills or motions coming from the Senate.

This idea that we are disempowering ourselves makes me wonder if the member knows something that we do not know, that there is some kind of retaliation that will take place. That does concern me because I do not think we want to get into that. This is about our Standing Orders. This is about how we treat our members, how we receive our business and how we deal with it, and we should focus on that.

Private Members' Business

This is the first hour of debate. There will be a second hour of debate. The procedure and house affairs committee is looking at this quite closely, which is a good thing. Maybe, as a result of that examination, which is not mutually exclusive to the member's motion today, we might have a better understanding of what happens in the Senate and be able to arrive at some kind of understanding about what needs to be done in terms of changes to the Standing Orders.

At this point, for us in the NDP, although there may be various opinions among our members, we are generally supportive of the principle of ensuring that there is fairness and equality for private members' business. We think that is very important.

We do realize that we need to proceed carefully. We are perfectly okay with the fact that the procedure and house affairs committee is looking into that. Our member on that committee will be very involved. I think it is possible that by the time the committee has done its study, we will be getting close to the second hour of debate. Maybe there will be some more informed opinion about what we might want to do with this motion.

I do not think we should automatically can the idea on the basis of almost implied threats that come through to the members of this place from the Senate. I really do not want to buy into that and I do not want to see us get into that kind of debate. We should look at our Standing Orders from the point of view of the needs of members in the House of Commons and we should take it under careful consideration.

Those are some of the comments that we have about this motion. We look forward to the continuing information that will come forward in the debate that will take place. We will see where it goes. Hopefully, we can stick to this principle of equality for members of the House of Commons and ensure there are fair rules in place.

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am going to start where my hon. colleague from the New Democratic Party left off, which is on the subject of the implied potential from the Liberal member's comments earlier, vis-à-vis some kind of retaliation in the Senate. The apparent threat was that senators would decide not to allow private members' business from the House to go forward and this would result in all members being disenfranchised.

This is implausible for two reasons. First of all, it is beneath our hon. colleagues in the other place. They would do no such thing because they are just as honourable and just as dedicated to the public interest as are members here. Second and equally fundamentally is the fact that the rules of the Senate do not permit that kind of action. They do not permit a change to the standing orders of the Senate that would cause private members' business from the House to be in some way pushed off the order paper. Indeed that is not what is happening here with Senate legislation in this House. The rules do not permit that.

The Senate cycles through its entire agenda every day. It has no order of precedence in the form that the House of Commons has. Therefore, there is no standing order that states that House of Commons private members' bills will arise at a certain spot.

The analogy I have used elsewhere for how it works in the Senate is it is similar to a sushi bar and all the little boats that float by at the sushi bar are equivalent to items of business. They all go past and we pick out the ones we want for the day. Every day the Senate could decide to be malicious and refuse to deal with items of private members' business originating in the House, but they would have to do it every day. They would all have to reaffirm that they are all acting maliciously in order to get back at the House of Commons.

That is a highly implausible course of action given their personalities. Indeed, even if they were malicious people it would be hard to keep that up on an ongoing basis. I think that threat is implausible.

Let me go back to some of the facts about how this motion will affect private members' business in this House. Our rules currently allow for one item of private members' business to be discussed every sitting day. On average, there are 132 sitting days in Parliament in a year. The first 20 days of a parliamentary session are used for other purposes and no private members' business is considered. We are left with 112 sitting days. It takes two sitting days to get a private member's item through at second reading in the House of Commons and on to committee. That leaves 66 items that can be dealt with in an average year, if nothing else intrudes and takes up the time available for private members' business, such as Senate private members' bills.

Given the number of members of Parliament who are eligible to bring forward private members' bills, that means that in four years, each member can expect to get one item through, assuming we have a four year Parliament.

Every time something else intrudes on that, such as a Senate bill that pushes its way up the order of precedence, the practical effect is that some member of Parliament gets dumped off the bottom of the list. In practice, in examining previous years, we find that most members of Parliament do not make it onto the order of precedence to get their items of business discussed in any given Parliament.

I know of members on my side of the House who have been here since 1993 who have not yet had private members' business come up. On average, members have managed to get one item every four parliaments. That is a statistical average going back over the past four parliaments. I am down around numbers 106 to 170, which is outside the order of precedence. I do not anticipate I will be able to get my item into the order of precedence, whether or not Senate bills come up.

Clearly there are members further up the list who have a realistic prospect, unless Senate bills push their items out of the way. The goal is to make sure that those individuals do not have their items pushed off the order paper.

If a member who is closer to the top of the list chooses to do so, he or she is free to sponsor a Senate private member's bill that has passed through the Senate. He or she would lose his or her place to produce his or her own bill. That is what our rules would allow for, if changed in the manner proposed by my hon. colleague from Beauce in his motion. That seems reasonable.

There is good reason to drop one's own item and pick up an item recommended and passed through the Senate. For one thing, it has already made it through the other place. It stands a very good chance of actually making its way into law because it is halfway through the legislative journey through the two chambers. Many items coming from the Senate have considerable merit as pieces of legislation, so there are reasons to do it.

● (1410)

What is not reasonable is that the way it works now, any member, whether high on the list of precedence or not, can sponsor a bill that is passed through the Senate and push every single other item of private members' business in this House down a notch, thereby pushing somebody off the list. For every Senate bill that is preferred in this manner, inevitably one member will fall off the list. Every single time that occurs, one member drops off that list and his or her item of private members' business will not be discussed.

The more items that come from the Senate, the more this happens. I believe the number may be rising. It may not be rising to the point that it is going to push all business off the list, which I think was the point my colleague from the Bloc Québécois was raising. Nevertheless, every time a Senate bill is preferred in this manner, one member of this chamber loses his or her ability to raise an item of business. That is pretty significant.

I want to emphasize again that this is not discrimination against items from the Senate. They are perfectly sponsorable under the rules in exactly the same manner as a bill that has originated here can be picked up.

My colleague from Beauce chose to raise this item of business even though the original concept came from the member for Crowfoot rather than something that sprang fully formed from his own head like the goddess Athena sprang from the head of Zeus. Nonetheless, he is doing something he believes makes sense and is credible because he can see a good idea when he recognizes it, in the same way any member of this House can spot a good idea coming from the Senate and choose to adopt it. I suspect that practice would continue for the reasons that I offered earlier.

Now I will deal with the technical aspects of the motion.

The motion's meaning is not obvious in the way it reads. In order to aid any member who is having trouble understanding the exact mechanical way in which it works, I will read it and then go into how the rules have changed. The motion reads as follows:

That Standing Order 89 be amended by deleting the words "and of second reading of a private Member's public bill originating in the Senate"; and Standing Order 86.2 (2) be amended by deleting the words "a Senate public bill or".

That, of course, does not tell us anything. I will now turn to the Standing Orders. When I read the relevant Standing Orders it will start to make sense.

Standing Order 86.2(2) currently reads as follows:

A Member shall not lose his or her place on the List for the Consideration of Private Members' Business by virtue of sponsoring a Senate public bill or a private bill,—

A private bill is a bill that concerns one individual.

—but no Member may sponsor more than one such bill during a Parliament.

Private Members' Business

We would drop the words, "a Senate public bill or" from that, and it would read, "A Member shall not lose his or her place on the List for the Consideration of Private Members' Business by virtue of sponsoring a private bill, but no Member may sponsor more than one such bill during a Parliament". That is the change that would occur to that Standing Order.

Standing Order 89 would be changed from the current wording, which is the following:

The order for the first consideration of any subsequent stages of a bill already considered during Private Members' Business, of second reading of a private bill and of second reading of a private Member's public bill originating in the Senate shall be placed at the bottom of the order of precedence.

That means the bottom of the order of precedence for private members' business. Effectively, it means the next vacancy, typically about 30 spots down the list and ahead of every other item of private members' business. That would be changed to drop the words "and of second reading of a private Member's public bill originating in the Senate". That would be removed.

I think that explains the technical changes. The result would be that Senate private members' bills would still be able to move forward, but would not push private members' business from other MPs out of the way in so doing.

● (1415)

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my inclination to oppose this motion, remembering that once this motion is passed by the House, it becomes an amendment to our Standing Orders, and once it is there, the only way we can change or modify it is to back it out. I am not sure that all members—

The Deputy Speaker: I apologize for interrupting the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River, but I believe the Minister of Health wants to rise on a point of order.

* * *

CANADA-EFTA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

BILL C-2—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the third reading stage of Bill C-2, Canada-EFTA Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act.

Under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice that a minister of the Crown will propose at the next sitting a motion to allot a specific number of days or time or hours for consideration and disposal of proceedings at the said stage.

* * *

STANDING ORDERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the motion to amend our Standing Orders, I am hopeful members will have a chance to think this through carefully. It appears that the procedure and House affairs committee, probably as a result of this motion, has undertaken a look at this procedure.

Private Members' Business

I do not think the government would care too much about this matter. Private members' business is usually not on the government agenda at all. However, I think backbenchers, members who are not members of the cabinet, would have a concern. The matter has at least an indirect and perhaps a direct impact on our ability to get our bills, not our motions, passed fully through the House and the Senate.

I look back about 25 to 30 years ago when the House went through a whole lot of reforms and changes to produce greater empowerment of backbenchers. Private members' business is one of the envelopes of activities that members, who are not members of the government cabinet, have to produce changes in policy and legislation.

It has been recognized by most of us that the route to passage of a private member's bill through the House and through the Senate is a little easier if it is a Senate bill coming to the House, rather than a House bill going to the Senate. There are more MPs and fewer senators. There are more impediments and greater competition in the House to get matters into the stage where they are voted on than it is in the Senate where there are just a few senators.

I also have to point out that we would not normally expect that we would get a lot of original legislation from the Senate. The Senate is not an elected body and one would not think that it would be purporting to generate large volumes of original legislation. It simply, and I say this respectfully, is not the place of the Senate to be a house that generates a lot of original legislation, but it does from time to time, produce private members' business, which is very respectable and quite ready for prime time.

However, we have noticed the numbers increasing over the last few years. It is a practical fact that it is statistically harder for a member of the House to get a bill dealt with in the House and then over to the Senate and fully passed than it is for a senator to get a bill through that house and get it over to this House and passed here.

Members, in looking at this motion, are reacting to that practical fact. It was never intended that it be easier for senators to get their private members' bills passed than it was for MPs. That is simply the way the two sets of rules and the workings of Parliament are at this point.

We have addressed the issue of whether there would be an impact in the Senate of a change to our rules here. It would be naive to expect that there would not be a reaction. If we are not to accord in the House full respect to a bill fully passed by the Senate, why would we expect the Senate would accord full respect to a bill passed in this House and sent there? I think it is naive to suggest that senators would go on with their business and not pay attention to this.

In order to find out, we have to deal with the Senate. For that purpose, I suggest some kind of a conference between the House and the Senate.

I suggest there will be an impact on our private members' business. It will be potentially kneecapped in the Senate because of disinterest in the Senate, feigned or otherwise, as a result of us making it much more difficult for Senate bills that have been approved there to be made into law here in the House. We should not

underestimate that. The Senate is not oblivious to what happens in the House. I think we all understand that.

● (1420)

As I mentioned before, the motion by the originating member is catalytic. It should be seen as that. It has caught the attention of both Houses. It is being dealt with by the procedure and House affairs committee. Maybe one of the solutions is to cap the number of Senate private member bills that we allow into the order of precedence in this House in a session, and cap them at a reasonable number. The committee will look at this.

However, in my view, we should not pass this motion. If we pass it, my experience tells me that there will have to be a subsequent change and we will have to back the motion out and deal with it in another way.

Therefore, we should not pass the motion. We should clearly await the disposition of this by the procedure and House affairs committee. Our colleagues are studying this. I have great confidence that if they finish their study in time and report back to us, they will have an arrangement that would suit us and suit our counterparts in the Senate.

● (1425)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Yukon. He will have a 10 minute slot to fill, but we only have about four minutes before the end of today's proceedings.

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find this a little strange. We have a bicameral system, with two Houses of Parliament and, in a number of ways, with very similar powers. As a member from the Bloc outlined, one House in a session of Parliament has only four questions. In fact, in the first session of this Parliament, it had zero questions. It is so lopsided. I do not know why this would even be an issue. It is statistically not a substantive issue.

Colleagues who have spoken before in the House have outlined how, in a number of cases, the laws of Canada have been much improved by amendments in the other place. Certain experts have been appointed to that body. They do detailed studies in certain areas, studies that members of the House of Commons do not have time to perform.

A whole list of legislation has been much improved, and Canadians would agree with that. Legislators in both Houses would agree it has been much improved because of the input from the Senate. Because this has not been abused and because it happens rarely, we should not spend a lot of time on this. There are a lot of other Standing Orders that need to be dealt with much more rapidly.

There is a take note debate on the Standing Orders at the beginning of every Parliament in which everyone can put forward their opinions. I know we all have a lot of opinions on things that should be changed.

Unfortunately, that debate occurs between the 60th and the 90th day of the first session of a Parliament. I do not think, when that provision was put in place, anyone thought we would ever have a first session of Parliament last only 13 days, which is what happened this time. As the 60th to 90th day never occurred, we could not have that debate.

Private Members' Business

Therefore, I ask for a ruling from the Speaker. It was the spirit of the amendment that there be a take note debate on the Standing Orders at the beginning of every Parliament. In the spirit of that, would he allow it to now occur in the second session of Parliament because the first session of Parliament was so strangely abbreviated? We could still have that take note debate and all members of the House could put forward their ideas on the Standing Orders, such as the ones before us.

The Deputy Speaker: The Speaker will take under advisement the point the member for Yukon raised.

The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper.

[*Translation*]

It being 2:30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, March 23 at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 24(1) and 28(2).

(The House adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. ANDREW SCHEER

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MS. DENISE SAVOIE

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BARRY DEVOLIN

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

HON. MAURIL BÉLANGER

MS. LIBBY DAVIES

MR. JACQUES GOURDE

MR. MICHEL GUIMOND

HON. JAY HILL

HON. GORDON O'CONNOR

MR. JOE PRESTON

MR. MARCEL PROULX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Fortieth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Hon. Jim, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation	Kootenay—Columbia	British Columbia	CPC
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane, Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism)	Calgary—Nose Hill	Alberta	CPC
Aglukkaq, Hon. Leona, Minister of Health	Nunavut	Nunavut	CPC
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	Ontario	CPC
Allen, Malcolm	Welland	Ontario	NDP
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	New Brunswick	CPC
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	Ontario	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, Minister of Labour	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	Alberta	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	CPC
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Saskatchewan	CPC
André, Guy	Berthier—Maskinongé	Québec	BQ
Andrews, Scott	Avalon	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	Ontario	NDP
Arthur, André	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier	Québec	Ind.
Ashfield, Hon. Keith, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Fredericton	New Brunswick	CPC
Ashton, Niki	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Asselin, Gérard	Manicouagan	Québec	BQ
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	British Columbia	NDP
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Québec	BQ
Bagnell, Hon. Larry	Yukon	Yukon	Lib.
Bains, Hon. Navdeep	Mississauga—Brampton South	Ontario	Lib.
Baird, Hon. John, Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Ottawa West—Nepean	Ontario	CPC
Baudin, Josée	Saint-Lambert	Québec	BQ
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	Québec	BQ
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	Alberta	CPC
Bernier, Hon. Maxime	Beauce	Québec	CPC
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio	Vaughan	Ontario	Lib.
Bevington, Dennis	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	NDP
Bezan, James	Selkirk—Interlake	Manitoba	CPC
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie	Québec	BQ
Black, Dawn	New Westminster—Coquitlam	British Columbia	NDP
Blackburn, Hon. Jean-Pierre, Minister of National Revenue and Minister of State (Agriculture)	Jonquière—Alma	Québec	CPC
Blais, Raynald	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Québec	BQ
Blaney, Steven	Lévis—Bellechasse	Québec	CPC
Block, Kelly	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	Saskatchewan	CPC
Bonsant, France	Compton—Stanstead	Québec	BQ
Bouchard, Robert	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Québec	BQ
Boucher, Sylvie, Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women	Beauport—Limoulou	Québec	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Boughen, Ray	Palliser	Saskatchewan	CPC
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	Québec	BQ
Braid, Peter	Kitchener—Waterloo	Ontario	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Saskatchewan	CPC
Brisson, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Brown, Gord	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Lois	Newmarket—Aurora	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	Ontario	CPC
Bruinooge, Rod	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	CPC
Brunelle, Paule	Trois-Rivières	Québec	BQ
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Cadman, Dona	Surrey North	British Columbia	CPC
Calandra, Paul	Oak Ridges—Markham	Ontario	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CPC
Cannan, Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	British Columbia	CPC
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Cannon, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Pontiac	Québec	CPC
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Québec	BQ
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Carrier, Robert	Alfred-Pellan	Québec	BQ
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley	Nova Scotia	Ind.
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	CPC
Charlton, Chris	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	NDP
Chong, Hon. Michael	Wellington—Halton Hills	Ontario	CPC
Chow, Olivia	Trinity—Spadina	Ontario	NDP
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	Ontario	NDP
Clarke, Rob	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River	Saskatchewan	CPC
Clement, Hon. Tony, Minister of Industry	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Ontario	CPC
Coady, Siobhan	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Coderre, Hon. Denis	Bourassa	Québec	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—Tecumseh	Ontario	NDP
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Québec	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup	Québec	BQ
Crombie, Bonnie	Mississauga—Streetsville	Ontario	Lib.
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	NDP
Cummins, John	Delta—Richmond East	British Columbia	CPC
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
D'Amours, Jean-Claude	Madawaska—Restigouche	New Brunswick	Lib.
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	Ontario	CPC
Davies, Don	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	NDP
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
Day, Hon. Stockwell, Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway	Okanagan—Coquihalla	British Columbia	CPC
DeBellefeuille, Claude	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Québec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dechert, Bob	Mississauga—Erindale	Ontario	CPC
Del Mastro, Dean, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Peterborough	Ontario	CPC
Demers, Nicole	Laval	Québec	BQ
Deschamps, Johanne	Laurentides—Labelle	Québec	BQ
Desnoyers, Luc	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	Québec	BQ
Devolin, Barry, The Acting Speaker	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	Ontario	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	NDP
Dhaliwal, Sukh	Newton—North Delta	British Columbia	Lib.
Dhalla, Ruby	Brampton—Springdale	Ontario	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Québec	Lib.
Dorion, Jean	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	Québec	BQ
Dosanjh, Hon. Ujjal	Vancouver South	British Columbia	Lib.
Dreeshen, Earl	Red Deer	Alberta	CPC
Dryden, Hon. Ken	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Québec	BQ
Dufour, Nicolas	Repentigny	Québec	BQ
Duncan, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CPC
Duncan, Kirsty	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Duncan, Linda	Edmonton—Strathcona	Alberta	NDP
Dykstra, Rick, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	St. Catharines	Ontario	CPC
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Faille, Meili	Vaudreuil-Soulanges	Québec	BQ
Fast, Ed	Abbotsford	British Columbia	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development	Haldimand—Norfolk	Ontario	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Fletcher, Hon. Steven, Minister of State (Democratic Reform)	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	Manitoba	CPC
Folco, Raymonde	Laval—Les Îles	Québec	Lib.
Foote, Judy	Random—Burin—St. George's	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Freeman, Carole	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	Québec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Québec	BQ
Galipeau, Royal	Ottawa—Orléans	Ontario	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Ontario	CPC
Garneau, Marc	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Québec	Lib.
Gaudet, Roger	Montcalm	Québec	BQ
Glover, Shelly, Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	CPC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Wascana	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Goodyear, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Science and Technology)	Cambridge	Ontario	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and to the Minister of National Revenue	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	Québec	CPC
Gravelle, Claude	Nickel Belt	Ontario	NDP
Grewal, Nina	Fleetwood—Port Kells	British Columbia	CPC
Guarnieri, Hon. Albina	Mississauga East—Cooksville	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Rivière-du-Nord	Québec	BQ
Guergis, Hon. Helena, Minister of State (Status of Women)	Simcoe—Grey	Ontario	CPC
Guimond, Claude	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	Québec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord	Québec	BQ
Hall Findlay, Martha	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	CPC
Harris, Jack	St. John's East	Newfoundland and Labrador	NDP
Harris, Richard	Cariboo—Prince George	British Columbia	CPC
Hawn, Laurie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Edmonton Centre	Alberta	CPC
Hiebert, Russ	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale	British Columbia	CPC
Hill, Hon. Jay, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Prince George—Peace River	British Columbia	CPC
Hoback, Randy	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	CPC
Hoepfner, Candice	Portage—Lisgar	Manitoba	CPC
Holder, Ed	London West	Ontario	CPC
Holland, Mark	Ajax—Pickering	Ontario	Lib.
Hughes, Carol	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing	Ontario	NDP
Hyer, Bruce	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Ontario	NDP
Ignatieff, Michael, Leader of the Opposition	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Jean, Brian, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Fort McMurray—Athabasca	Alberta	CPC
Jennings, Hon. Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Québec	Lib.
Julian, Peter	Burnaby—New Westminster	British Columbia	NDP
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission	British Columbia	CPC
Kania, Andrew	Brampton West	Ontario	Lib.
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	South Shore—St. Margaret's	Nova Scotia	CPC
Kennedy, Gerard	Parkdale—High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CPC
Kent, Hon. Peter, Minister of State of Foreign Affairs (Americas)	Thornhill	Ontario	CPC
Kerr, Greg, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	West Nova	Nova Scotia	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development and to the Minister of Labour	Souris—Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	CPC
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	Ontario	CPC
Laforest, Jean-Yves	Saint-Maurice—Champlain	Québec	BQ
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	Québec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lake, Mike, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry ...	Edmonton—Mill Woods— Beaumont.....	Alberta	CPC
Lalonde, Francine	La Pointe-de-l'Île.....	Québec	BQ
Lauzon, Guy.....	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	Ontario	CPC
Lavallée, Carole	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert.....	Québec	BQ
Layton, Hon. Jack.....	Toronto—Danforth.....	Ontario	NDP
Lebel, Hon. Denis, Minister of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec).....	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean.....	Québec	CPC
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour.....	New Brunswick.....	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River ...	Ontario	Lib.
Lemay, Marc	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	Québec	BQ
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture.....	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell .	Ontario	CPC
Leslie, Megan	Halifax	Nova Scotia.....	NDP
Lessard, Yves.....	Chambly—Borduas	Québec	BQ
Lévesque, Yvon	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik —Eeyou	Québec	BQ
Lobb, Ben	Huron—Bruce.....	Ontario	CPC
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.....	Saskatchewan	CPC
Lunn, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Sport)	Saanich—Gulf Islands	British Columbia	CPC
Lunney, James.....	Nanaimo—Alberni.....	British Columbia	CPC
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island....	Lib.
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of National Defence and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway.....	Central Nova	Nova Scotia.....	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety	Oxford	Ontario	CPC
Malhi, Hon. Gurbax	Bramalea—Gore—Malton.....	Ontario	Lib.
Malo, Luc.....	Verchères—Les Patriotes	Québec	BQ
Maloway, Jim.....	Elmwood—Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Mark, Inky.....	Dauphin—Swan River— Marquette.....	Manitoba	CPC
Marston, Wayne	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek .	Ontario	NDP
Martin, Hon. Keith.....	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Lib.
Martin, Pat.....	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Tony.....	Sault Ste. Marie.....	Ontario	NDP
Masse, Brian.....	Windsor West	Ontario	NDP
Mathysen, Irene	London—Fanshawe.....	Ontario	NDP
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	British Columbia	CPC
McCallum, Hon. John	Markham—Unionville.....	Ontario	Lib.
McColeman, Phil.....	Brant	Ontario	CPC
McGuinty, David.....	Ottawa South.....	Ontario	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John	Scarborough—Guildwood.....	Ontario	Lib.
McLeod, Cathy.....	Kamloops—Thompson— Cariboo	British Columbia	CPC
McTeague, Hon. Dan	Pickering—Scarborough East ..	Ontario	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga	Québec	BQ
Ménard, Serge	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	Québec	BQ
Mendes, Alexandra.....	Brossard—La Prairie	Québec	Lib.
Menzies, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance..	Macleod	Alberta	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Merrifield, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Transport)	Yellowhead	Alberta	CPC
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Ontario	CPC
Milliken, Hon. Peter, Speaker of the House of Commons	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria	Beaches—East York	Ontario	Lib.
Moore, Hon. James, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	CPC
Moore, Rob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Fundy Royal	New Brunswick	CPC
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	Québec	BQ
Mulcair, Thomas	Outremont	Québec	NDP
Murphy, Brian	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	New Brunswick	Lib.
Murphy, Hon. Shawn	Charlottetown	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Murray, Joyce	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Nadeau, Richard	Gatineau	Québec	BQ
Neville, Hon. Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Nicholson, Hon. Rob, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Niagara Falls	Ontario	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	Ontario	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon, Minister of State and Chief Government Whip	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	Ontario	CPC
O'Neill-Gordon, Tilly	Miramichi	New Brunswick	CPC
Obhrai, Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Calgary East	Alberta	CPC
Oda, Hon. Bev, Minister of International Cooperation	Durham	Ontario	CPC
Oliphant, Robert	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Ouellet, Christian	Brome—Missisquoi	Québec	BQ
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Québec	Lib.
Paillé, Pascal-Pierre	Louis-Hébert	Québec	BQ
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	Québec	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mégantic—L'Érable	Québec	CPC
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Québec	Lib.
Payne, LaVar	Medicine Hat	Alberta	CPC
Pearson, Glen	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Petit, Daniel, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	Québec	CPC
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	Québec	BQ
Poilievre, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Nepean—Carleton	Ontario	CPC
Pomerleau, Roger	Drummond	Québec	BQ
Prentice, Hon. Jim, Minister of the Environment	Calgary Centre-North	Alberta	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Ontario	CPC
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Québec	Lib.
Rae, Hon. Bob	Toronto Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Rafferty, John	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	Ontario	NDP
Raitt, Hon. Lisa, Minister of Natural Resources	Halton	Ontario	CPC
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	Alberta	CPC
Ratansi, Yasmin	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Rathgeber, Brent	Edmonton—St. Albert	Alberta	CPC
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Ontario	CPC
Richards, Blake	Wild Rose	Alberta	CPC
Richardson, Lee	Calgary Centre	Alberta	CPC
Rickford, Greg	Kenora	Ontario	CPC
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	CPC
Rodriguez, Pablo	Honoré-Mercier	Québec	Lib.
Rota, Anthony	Nipissing—Timiskaming	Ontario	Lib.
Roy, Jean-Yves	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis— Matane—Matapédia	Québec	BQ
Russell, Todd	Labrador	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Savage, Michael	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Savoie, Denise, The Acting Speaker	Victoria	British Columbia	NDP
Saxton, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	North Vancouver	British Columbia	CPC
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Québec	Lib.
Scheer, Andrew, The Deputy Speaker	Regina—Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	CPC
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	Ontario	CPC
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shea, Hon. Gail, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	CPC
Shiple, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Ontario	CPC
Shory, Devinder	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CPC
Siksay, Bill	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Silva, Mario	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Simson, Michelle	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	Manitoba	CPC
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	Alberta	CPC
St-Cyr, Thierry	Jeanne-Le Ber	Québec	BQ
Stanton, Bruce	Simcoe North	Ontario	CPC
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	Alberta	CPC
Strahl, Hon. Chuck, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	British Columbia	CPC
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas— Flamborough—Westdale	Ontario	CPC
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Thi Lac, Ève-Mary Thai	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	Québec	BQ
Thibeault, Glenn	Sudbury	Ontario	NDP
Thompson, Hon. Greg, Minister of Veterans Affairs	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	CPC
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	Ontario	CPC
Toews, Hon. Vic, President of the Treasury Board	Provencher	Manitoba	CPC
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Ontario	Lib.
Trost, Bradley	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Saskatchewan	CPC
Trudeau, Justin	Papineau	Québec	Lib.
Tweed, Merv	Brandon—Souris	Manitoba	CPC
Uppal, Tim	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	Alberta	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Valeriotte, Francis	Guelph	Ontario	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	Ontario	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Minister of Public Safety	York—Simcoe	Ontario	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CPC
Verner, Hon. Josée, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister for La Francophonie	Louis-Saint-Laurent	Québec	CPC
Vincent, Robert	Shefford	Québec	BQ
Volpe, Hon. Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	Ontario	CPC
Warawa, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Langley	British Columbia	CPC
Warkentin, Chris	Peace River	Alberta	CPC
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North	Manitoba	NDP
Watson, Jeff	Essex	Ontario	CPC
Weston, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	British Columbia	CPC
Weston, Rodney	Saint John	New Brunswick	CPC
Wilfert, Hon. Bryon	Richmond Hill	Ontario	Lib.
Wong, Alice, Parliamentary Secretary for Multiculturalism	Richmond	British Columbia	CPC
Woodworth, Stephen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	CPC
Wrzesnewskyj, Borys	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Yelich, Hon. Lynne, Minister of State (Western Economic Diversi- fication)	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CPC
Young, Terence	Oakville	Ontario	CPC
Zarac, Lise	LaSalle—Émard	Québec	Lib.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session—Fortieth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (28)		
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane, Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism)	Calgary—Nose Hill	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, Minister of Labour	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	CPC
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	CPC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	CPC
Dreeshen, Earl	Red Deer	CPC
Duncan, Linda	Edmonton—Strathcona	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	CPC
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister	Calgary Southwest	CPC
Hawn, Laurie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Edmonton Centre	CPC
Jean, Brian, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Fort McMurray—Athabasca	CPC
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism	Calgary Southeast	CPC
Lake, Mike, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont	CPC
Menzies, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Macleod	CPC
Merrifield, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Transport)	Yellowhead	CPC
Obhrai, Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs	Calgary East	CPC
Payne, LaVar	Medicine Hat	CPC
Prentice, Hon. Jim, Minister of the Environment	Calgary Centre-North	CPC
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	CPC
Rathgeber, Brent	Edmonton—St. Albert	CPC
Richards, Blake	Wild Rose	CPC
Richardson, Lee	Calgary Centre	CPC
Shory, Devinder	Calgary Northeast	CPC
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	CPC
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	CPC
Uppal, Tim	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	CPC
Warkentin, Chris	Peace River	CPC
BRITISH COLUMBIA (36)		
Abbott, Hon. Jim, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Cooperation	Kootenay—Columbia	CPC
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	NDP
Black, Dawn	New Westminster—Coquitlam	NDP
Cadman, Dona	Surrey North	CPC
Cannan, Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	CPC
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	NDP
Cummins, John	Delta—Richmond East	CPC
Davies, Don	Vancouver Kingsway	NDP
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Day, Hon. Stockwell, Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dhaliwal, Sukh	Newton—North Delta	Lib.
Dosanjh, Hon. Ujjal	Vancouver South	Lib.
Duncan, John, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Vancouver Island North	CPC
Fast, Ed.	Abbotsford	CPC
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Grewal, Nina	Fleetwood—Port Kells	CPC
Harris, Richard	Cariboo—Prince George	CPC
Hiebert, Russ	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale	CPC
Hill, Hon. Jay, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Prince George—Peace River	CPC
Julian, Peter	Burnaby—New Westminster	NDP
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission	CPC
Lunn, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Sport)	Saanich—Gulf Islands	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CPC
Martin, Hon. Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	Lib.
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	CPC
McLeod, Cathy	Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo	CPC
Moore, Hon. James, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	CPC
Murray, Joyce	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Savoie, Denise, The Acting Speaker	Victoria	NDP
Saxton, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	North Vancouver	CPC
Siksay, Bill	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Strahl, Hon. Chuck, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	CPC
Warawa, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Langley	CPC
Weston, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	CPC
Wong, Alice, Parliamentary Secretary for Multiculturalism	Richmond	CPC
MANITOBA (14)		
Ashton, Niki	Churchill	NDP
Bezan, James	Selkirk—Interlake	CPC
Bruinooge, Rod	Winnipeg South	CPC
Fletcher, Hon. Steven, Minister of State (Democratic Reform)	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	CPC
Glover, Shelly, Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages	Saint Boniface	CPC
Hoepfner, Candice	Portage—Lisgar	CPC
Maloway, Jim	Elmwood—Transcona	NDP
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	CPC
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Hon. Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	CPC
Toews, Hon. Vic, President of the Treasury Board	Provencher	CPC
Tweed, Merv	Brandon—Souris	CPC
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North	NDP
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	CPC
Ashfield, Hon. Keith, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Fredericton	CPC
D'Amours, Jean-Claude	Madawaska—Restigouche	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour	Lib.
Moore, Rob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Fundy Royal	CPC
Murphy, Brian	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	Lib.
O'Neill-Gordon, Tilly	Miramichi	CPC
Thompson, Hon. Greg, Minister of Veterans Affairs	New Brunswick Southwest	CPC
Weston, Rodney	Saint John	CPC
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (7)		
Andrews, Scott	Avalon	Lib.
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Coady, Siobhan	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	Lib.
Foote, Judy	Random—Burin—St. George's	Lib.
Harris, Jack	St. John's East	NDP
Russell, Todd	Labrador	Lib.
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Bevington, Dennis	Western Arctic	NDP
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley	Ind.
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	South Shore—St. Margaret's	CPC
Kerr, Greg, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	West Nova	CPC
Leslie, Megan	Halifax	NDP
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of National Defence and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway	Central Nova	CPC
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West	Lib.
Savage, Michael	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	NDP
NUNAVUT (1)		
Aglukkaq, Hon. Leona, Minister of Health	Nunavut	CPC
ONTARIO (106)		
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	CPC
Allen, Malcolm	Welland	NDP
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	CPC
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	NDP
Bains, Hon. Navdeep	Mississauga—Brampton South	Lib.
Baird, Hon. John, Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Ottawa West—Nepean	CPC
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio	Vaughan	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Braid, Peter	Kitchener—Waterloo	CPC
Brown, Gord	Leeds—Grenville	CPC
Brown, Lois	Newmarket—Aurora	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	CPC
Calandra, Paul	Oak Ridges—Markham	CPC
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	Oshawa	CPC
Charlton, Chris	Hamilton Mountain	NDP
Chong, Hon. Michael	Wellington—Halton Hills	CPC
Chow, Olivia	Trinity—Spadina	NDP
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP
Clement, Hon. Tony, Minister of Industry	Parry Sound—Muskoka	CPC
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—Tecumseh	NDP
Crombie, Bonnie	Mississauga—Streetsville	Lib.
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	CPC
Dechert, Bob	Mississauga—Erindale	CPC
Del Mastro, Dean, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	Peterborough	CPC
Devolin, Barry, The Acting Speaker	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	NDP
Dhalla, Ruby	Brampton—Springdale	Lib.
Dryden, Hon. Ken	York Centre	Lib.
Duncan, Kirsty	Etobicoke North	Lib.
Dykstra, Rick, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	St. Catharines	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development	Haldimand—Norfolk	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	CPC
Galipeau, Royal	Ottawa—Orléans	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CPC
Goodyear, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Science and Technology)	Cambridge	CPC
Gravelle, Claude	Nickel Belt	NDP
Guarnieri, Hon. Albina	Mississauga East—Cooksville	Lib.
Guergis, Hon. Helena, Minister of State (Status of Women)	Simcoe—Grey	CPC
Hall Findlay, Martha	Willowdale	Lib.
Holder, Ed	London West	CPC
Holland, Mark	Ajax—Pickering	Lib.
Hughes, Carol	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking	NDP
Hyer, Bruce	Thunder Bay—Superior North	NDP
Ignatieff, Michael, Leader of the Opposition	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Kania, Andrew	Brampton West	Lib.
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Kennedy, Gerard	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Kent, Hon. Peter, Minister of State of Foreign Affairs (Americas)	Thornhill	CPC
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	CPC
Lauzon, Guy	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	CPC
Layton, Hon. Jack	Toronto—Danforth	NDP
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	CPC
Lobb, Ben	Huron—Bruce	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety	Oxford	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Malhi, Hon. Gurbax	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Lib.
Marston, Wayne	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek	NDP
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste. Marie	NDP
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	NDP
Mathysen, Irene	London—Fanshawe	NDP
McCallum, Hon. John	Markham—Unionville	Lib.
McColeman, Phil	Brant	CPC
McGuinty, David	Ottawa South	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John	Scarborough—Guildwood	Lib.
McTeague, Hon. Dan	Pickering—Scarborough East	Lib.
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	CPC
Milliken, Hon. Peter, Speaker of the House of Commons	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria	Beaches—East York	Lib.
Nicholson, Hon. Rob, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Niagara Falls	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon, Minister of State and Chief Government Whip	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	CPC
Oda, Hon. Bev, Minister of International Cooperation	Durham	CPC
Oliphant, Robert	Don Valley West	Lib.
Pearson, Glen	London North Centre	Lib.
Poilievre, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Nepean—Carleton	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	CPC
Rae, Hon. Bob	Toronto Centre	Lib.
Rafferty, John	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	NDP
Raitt, Hon. Lisa, Minister of Natural Resources	Halton	CPC
Ratansi, Yasmin	Don Valley East	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	CPC
Rickford, Greg	Kenora	CPC
Rota, Anthony	Nipissing—Timiskaming	Lib.
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	CPC
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Lib.
Shiple, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	CPC
Silva, Mario	Davenport	Lib.
Simson, Michelle	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Stanton, Bruce	Simcoe North	CPC
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale	CPC
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Thibeault, Glenn	Sudbury	NDP
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	CPC
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Lib.
Valeriotte, Francis	Guelph	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Minister of Public Safety	York—Simcoe	CPC
Volpe, Hon. Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	CPC
Watson, Jeff	Essex	CPC
Wilfert, Hon. Bryon	Richmond Hill	Lib.
Woodworth, Stephen	Kitchener Centre	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Wrzesnewskyj, Borys	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Young, Terence	Oakville	CPC
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)		
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Lib.
Murphy, Hon. Shawn	Charlottetown	Lib.
Shea, Hon. Gail, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Egmont	CPC
QUÉBEC (75)		
André, Guy	Berthier—Maskinongé	BQ
Arthur, André	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier	Ind.
Asselin, Gérard	Manicouagan	BQ
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Beaudin, Josée	Saint-Lambert	BQ
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	BQ
Bernier, Hon. Maxime	Beauce	CPC
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie	BQ
Blackburn, Hon. Jean-Pierre, Minister of National Revenue and Minister of State (Agriculture)	Jonquière—Alma	CPC
Blais, Raynald	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	BQ
Blaney, Steven	Lévis—Bellechasse	CPC
Bonsant, France	Compton—Stanstead	BQ
Bouchard, Robert	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	BQ
Boucher, Sylvie, Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women	Beauport—Limoilou	CPC
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Brunelle, Paule	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Cannon, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Pontiac	CPC
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carrier, Robert	Alfred-Pellan	BQ
Coderre, Hon. Denis	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska— Rivière-du-Loup	BQ
DeBellefeuille, Claude	Beauharnois—Salaberry	BQ
Demers, Nicole	Laval	BQ
Deschamps, Johanne	Laurentides—Labelle	BQ
Desnoyers, Luc	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Dorion, Jean	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dufour, Nicolas	Repentigny	BQ
Faille, Meili	Vaudreuil-Soulanges	BQ
Folco, Raymonde	Laval—Les Îles	Lib.
Freeman, Carole	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	BQ
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Garneau, Marc	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Gaudet, Roger	Montcalm	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and to the Minister of National Revenue	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	CPC
Guay, Monique	Rivière-du-Nord	BQ
Guimond, Claude	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord	BQ
Jennings, Hon. Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Laforest, Jean-Yves	Saint-Maurice—Champlain	BQ
Laframboise, Mario	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	La Pointe-de-l'Île	BQ
Lavallée, Carole	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	BQ
Lebel, Hon. Denis, Minister of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	CPC
Lemay, Marc	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	BQ
Lessard, Yves	Chambly—Borduas	BQ
Lévesque, Yvon	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	BQ
Malo, Luc	Verchères—Les Patriotes	BQ
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga	BQ
Ménard, Serge	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	BQ
Mendes, Alexandra	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	BQ
Mulcair, Thomas	Outremont	NDP
Nadeau, Richard	Gatineau	BQ
Ouellet, Christian	Brome—Missisquoi	BQ
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Paillé, Pascal-Pierre	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Mégantic—L'Érable	CPC
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Petit, Daniel, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	CPC
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Drummond	BQ
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Rodriguez, Pablo	Honoré-Mercier	Lib.
Roy, Jean-Yves	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia	BQ
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
St-Cyr, Thierry	Jeanne-Le Ber	BQ
Thi Lac, Ève-Mary Thai	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Trudeau, Justin	Papineau	Lib.
Verner, Hon. Josée, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister for La Francophonie	Louis-Saint-Laurent	CPC
Vincent, Robert	Shefford	BQ
Zarac, Lise	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CPC
Block, Kelly	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Boughen, Ray	Palliser	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CPC
Clarke, Rob	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River ..	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Wascana.....	Wascana	Lib.
Hoback, Randy	Prince Albert	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development and to the Minister of Labour	Souris—Moose Mountain	CPC
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.....	CPC
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board.....	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CPC
Scheer, Andrew, The Deputy Speaker	Regina—Qu'Appelle	CPC
Trost, Bradley	Saskatoon—Humboldt	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	CPC
Yelich, Hon. Lynne, Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)	Blackstrap	CPC
YUKON (1)		
Bagnell, Hon. Larry	Yukon.....	Lib.

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of March 13, 2009 — 2nd Session, 40th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Bruce Stanton	Vice-Chairs:	Jean Crowder Todd Russell	
Harold Albrecht Larry Bagnell Mauril Bélanger	Rob Clarke John Duncan	Marc Lemay Yvon Lévesque	LaVar Payne Greg Rickford	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Michael Chong	Greg Kerr	Brent Rathgeber
Mike Allen	Nathan Cullen	Ed Komarnicki	Scott Reid
Dean Allison	John Cummins	Daryl Kramp	Blake Richards
Rob Anders	Patricia Davidson	Mike Lake	Lee Richardson
David Anderson	Bob Dechert	Guy Lauzon	Andrew Saxton
Charlie Angus	Dean Del Mastro	Pierre Lemieux	Gary Schellenberger
Niki Ashton	Jean Dorion	Megan Leslie	Bev Shipley
Gérard Asselin	Earl Dreshen	Ben Lobb	Devinder Shory
Carolyn Bennett	Ken Dryden	Tom Lukiwski	Joy Smith
Leon Benoit	Kirsty Duncan	James Lunney	Kevin Sorenson
Maxime Bernier	Rick Dykstra	Dave MacKenzie	Brian Storseth
Dennis Bevington	Ed Fast	Inky Mark	David Sweet
James Bezan	Royal Galipeau	Pat Martin	David Tilson
Steven Blaney	Cheryl Gallant	Tony Martin	Bradley Trost
Kelly Block	Shelly Glover	Colin Mayes	Justin Trudeau
Sylvie Boucher	Peter Goldring	Phil McColeman	Merv Tweed
Ray Boughen	Jacques Gourde	Cathy McLeod	Tim Uppal
Peter Braid	Nina Grewal	Ted Menzies	Dave Van Kesteren
Garry Breitkreuz	Richard Harris	Larry Miller	Maurice Vellacott
Gord Brown	Laurie Hawn	Rob Moore	Mike Wallace
Lois Brown	Russ Hiebert	Anita Neville	Mark Warawa
Patrick Brown	Randy Hoback	Rick Norlock	Chris Warkentin
Rod Bruinooge	Candice Hoepfner	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Jeff Watson
Dona Cadman	Ed Holder	Deepak Obhrai	John Weston
Paul Calandra	Carol Hughes	Daniel Petit	Rodney Weston
Blaine Calkins	Bruce Hyer	Pierre Poilievre	Alice Wong
Ron Cannan	Brian Jean	Joe Preston	Stephen Woodworth
Colin Carrie	Randy Kamp	John Rafferty	Terence Young
Rick Casson	Gerald Keddy	James Rajotte	

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

Chair:

Paul Szabo

Vice-Chairs:Russ Hiebert
Bill SiksayKelly Block
Bob DechertEarl Dreshen
Carole FreemanPierre Poilievre
Michelle SimsonÈve-Mary Thāi Thi Lac
Borys Wrzesnewskyj

(11)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe Comartin
John Cummins

Patricia Davidson
Claude DeBellefeuille
Dean Del Mastro
Jean Dorion
John Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Christiane Gagnon
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Shelly Glover
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Michel Guimond
Martha Hall Findlay
Jack Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp

Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Pierre Lemieux
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Jim Maloway
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Réal Ménard
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Anita Neville
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
Robert Oliphant
Pierre Paquette
LaVar Payne
Daniel Petit
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Brent Rathgeber

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Lee Richardson
Greg Rickford
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:	Larry Miller	Vice-Chairs:	André Bellavance Mark Eyking	
Alex Atamanenko	Randy Hoback	Blake Richards	Brian Storseth	(12)
France Bonsant	Pierre Lemieux	Bev Shipley	Francis Valeriote	
Wayne Easter				

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Rick Casson	Carol Hughes	Joe Preston
Harold Albrecht	Michael Chong	Brian Jean	James Rajotte
Malcolm Allen	Rob Clarke	Randy Kamp	Brent Rathgeber
Mike Allen	Joe Comartin	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid
Dean Allison	Nathan Cullen	Greg Kerr	Lee Richardson
Rob Anders	John Cummins	Ed Komarnicki	Greg Rickford
David Anderson	Patricia Davidson	Daryl Kramp	Andrew Saxton
Charlie Angus	Bob Dechert	Mike Lake	Gary Schellenberger
Niki Ashton	Dean Del Mastro	Guy Lauzon	Devinder Shory
Carolyn Bennett	Jean Dorion	Ben Lobb	Joy Smith
Leon Benoit	Earl Dreeshen	Tom Lukiwski	Kevin Sorenson
Maxime Bernier	John Duncan	James Lunney	Bruce Stanton
James Bezan	Kirsty Duncan	Dave MacKenzie	Peter Stoffer
Steven Blaney	Rick Dykstra	Inky Mark	David Sweet
Kelly Block	Ed Fast	Pat Martin	David Tilson
Sylvie Boucher	Royal Galipeau	Tony Martin	Bradley Trost
Ray Boughen	Cheryl Gallant	Colin Mayes	Merv Tweed
Peter Braid	Shelly Glover	Phil McColeman	Tim Uppal
Garry Breitkreuz	Yvon Godin	Cathy McLeod	Dave Van Kesteren
Gord Brown	Peter Goldring	Ted Menzies	Maurice Vellacott
Lois Brown	Jacques Gourde	Rob Moore	Mike Wallace
Patrick Brown	Claude Gravelle	Joyce Murray	Mark Warawa
Rod Bruinooge	Nina Grewal	Anita Neville	Chris Warkentin
Paule Brunelle	Claude Guimond	Rick Norlock	Jeff Watson
Dona Cadman	Richard Harris	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	John Weston
Paul Calandra	Laurie Hawn	Deepak Obhrai	Rodney Weston
Blaine Calkins	Russ Hiebert	LaVar Payne	Alice Wong
Ron Cannan	Candice Hoepfner	Daniel Petit	Stephen Woodworth
Serge Cardin	Ed Holder	Pierre Poilievre	Terence Young
Colin Carrie			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOOD SAFETY

Chair:		Vice-Chair:		
Malcolm Allen	André Bellavance	Wayne Easter	Bev Shipley	(7)
David Anderson	Carolyn Bennett	Larry Miller		

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Gary Schellenberger

Vice-Chairs:

Carole Lavallée
Scott Simms

Charlie Angus
Rod Bruinooge
Dean Del Mastro

Ruby Dhalla
Shelly Glover

Nina Grewal
Roger Pomerleau

Pablo Rodriguez
Tim Uppal

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Niki Ashton
Alex Atamanenko
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Kelly Block
Robert Bouchard
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Rob Clarke
Bonnie Crombie
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen

John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Don Davies
Libby Davies
Bob Dechert
Jean Dorion
Earl Dreeshen
Nicolas Dufour
John Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Hedy Fry
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Marc Garneau
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Monique Guay
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Mark Holland
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Jim Karygiannis
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp

Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Wayne Marston
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Réal Ménard
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Brian Murphy
Richard Nadeau
Anita Neville
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
Robert Oliphant
Massimo Pacetti
Pascal-Pierre Paillé
LaVar Payne
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
John Rafferty
James Rajotte

Brent Rathgeber
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Lee Richardson
Greg Rickford
Andrew Saxton
Francis Scarpaleggia
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Bill Siksay
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Glenn Thibeault
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: David Tilson

Vice-Chairs: Maurizio Bevilacqua
Thierry St-Cyr

Paul Calandra
Olivia Chow
Jean Dorion

Rick Dykstra
Nina Grewal

Jim Karygiannis
Alexandra Mendes

Devinder Shory
Alice Wong

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
James Bezan
Dawn Black
Steven Blaney
Kelly Block
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Dona Cadman
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Rob Clarke
Joe Comartin
Paul Crête
Bonnie Crombie

John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Don Davies
Libby Davies
Bob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
Johanne Deschamps
Sukh Dhaliwal
Earl Dreshen
John Duncan
Ed Fast
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Shelly Glover
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Monique Guay
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Andrew Kania
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Francine Lalonde
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Pierre Lemieux
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Brian Masse
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Richard Nadeau
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
Robert Oliphant
LaVar Payne
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Brent Rathgeber

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Lee Richardson
Greg Rickford
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Michelle Simson
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Ève-Mary Thai Thi Lac
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Lise Zarac

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair: James Bezan

Vice-Chairs:

Bernard Bigras
Francis Scarpaleggia

Peter Braid
Blaine Calkins
Linda Duncan

David McGuinty
Christian Ouellet

Justin Trudeau
Mark Warawa

Jeff Watson
Stephen Woodworth

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
André Bellavance
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
Dennis Bevington
Steven Blaney
Kelly Block
France Bonsant
Robert Bouchard
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Paule Brunelle
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe Comartin
Jean Crowder

Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
Jean Dorion
Earl Dreeshen
Nicolas Dufour
John Duncan
Kirsty Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Marc Garneau
Shelly Glover
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Bruce Hyer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Pierre Lemieux
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Thomas Mulcair
Joyce Murray
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
LaVar Payne
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
John Rafferty
James Rajotte
Brent Rathgeber
Geoff Regan

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Lee Richardson
Greg Rickford
Pablo Rodriguez
Denise Savoie
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
David Tilson
Alan Tonks
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Francis Valeriote
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Chris Warkentin
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Alice Wong
Terence Young

FINANCE

Chair:	James Rajotte	Vice-Chairs:	Jean-Yves Laforest Massimo Pacetti	
Maxime Bernier Robert Carrier Bob Dechert	Daryl Kramp John McCallum	John McKay Ted Menzies	Thomas Mulcair Mike Wallace	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Harold Albrecht Mike Allen Dean Allison Rob Anders David Anderson G�rard Asselin Navdeep Bains Leon Benoit James Bezan Steven Blaney Kelly Block Sylvie Boucher Ray Boughen Diane Bourgeois Peter Braid Garry Breitzkreuz Scott Brison Gord Brown Lois Brown Patrick Brown Rod Bruinooge Dona Cadman Paul Calandra Blaine Calkins Ron Cannan Colin Carrie Rick Casson Chris Charlton Michael Chong David Christopherson Rob Clarke	Siobhan Coady Denis Coderre Jean Crowder Nathan Cullen John Cummins Patricia Davidson Libby Davies Dean Del Mastro Ruby Dhalla Jean Dorion Earl Dreeshen John Duncan Rick Dykstra Meili Faille Ed Fast Royal Galipeau Cheryl Gallant Shelly Glover Peter Goldring Jacques Gourde Nina Grewal Martha Hall Findlay Jack Harris Richard Harris Laurie Hawn Russ Hiebert Randy Hoback Candice Hoepfner Ed Holder Brian Jean Peter Julian	Randy Kamp Gerald Keddy Greg Kerr Ed Komarnicki Mike Lake Guy Lauzon Jack Layton Pierre Lemieux Ben Lobb Tom Lukiwski James Lunney Dave MacKenzie Jim Maloway Inky Mark Pat Martin Colin Mayes Phil McColeman David McGuinty Cathy McLeod Larry Miller Maria Minna Rob Moore Rick Norlock Tilly O'Neill-Gordon Deepak Obhrai LaVar Payne Daniel Petit Pierre Poilievre Joe Preston Bob Rae Brent Rathgeber	Scott Reid Blake Richards Lee Richardson Greg Rickford Anthony Rota Jean-Yves Roy Andrew Saxton Gary Schellenberger Bev Shipley Devinder Shory Bill Siksay Joy Smith Kevin Sorenson Bruce Stanton Brian Storseth David Sweet David Tilson Bradley Trost Merv Tweed Tim Uppal Dave Van Kesteren Maurice Vellacott Mark Warawa Chris Warkentin Judy Wasylcyia-Leis Jeff Watson John Weston Rodney Weston Alice Wong Stephen Woodworth Terence Young
--	--	--	---

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Rodney Weston

Vice-Chairs:

Raynald Blais
Lawrence MacAulay

Mike Allen
Scott Andrews
Gerry Byrne

Blaine Calkins
Randy Kamp

Yvon Lévesque
Peter Stoffer

Dave Van Kesteren
John Weston

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Malcolm Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
G rard Asselin
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Kelly Block
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen

John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
Earl Dreeshen
John Duncan
Linda Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Roger Gaudet
Shelly Glover
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Jack Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Carol Hughes
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mario Laframboise
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
LaVar Payne
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Brent Rathgeber
Scott Reid

Blake Richards
Lee Richardson
Greg Rickford
Jean-Yves Roy
Todd Russell
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Scott Simms
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Kevin Sorenson	Vice-Chairs:	Paul Crête Bernard Patry	
Jim Abbott Lois Brown Johanne Deschamps	Paul Dewar Peter Goldring	James Lunney Deepak Obhrai	Glen Pearson Bob Rae	(12)

Associate Members

Harold Albrecht	Dean Del Mastro	Mike Lake	Scott Reid
Mike Allen	Jean Dorion	Francine Lalonde	Blake Richards
Dean Allison	Ujjal Dosanjh	Guy Lauzon	Lee Richardson
Rob Anders	Earl Dreeshen	Jack Layton	Greg Rickford
David Anderson	Ken Dryden	Pierre Lemieux	Michael Savage
Claude Bachand	John Duncan	Ben Lobb	Andrew Saxton
Larry Bagnell	Rick Dykstra	Tom Lukiwski	Gary Schellenberger
Leon Benoit	Mark Eyking	Dave MacKenzie	Bev Shipley
Maxime Bernier	Ed Fast	Inky Mark	Devinder Shory
James Bezan	Raymonde Folco	Wayne Marston	Bill Siksay
Dawn Black	Judy Foote	Keith Martin	Mario Silva
Steven Blaney	Hedy Fry	Pat Martin	Joy Smith
Kelly Block	Royal Galipeau	Brian Masse	Thierry St-Cyr
Sylvie Boucher	Cheryl Gallant	Colin Mayes	Bruce Stanton
Ray Boughen	Marc Garneau	Phil McColeman	Brian Storseth
Peter Braid	Shelly Glover	David McGuinty	David Sweet
Garry Breitkreuz	Jacques Gourde	John McKay	Paul Szabo
Gord Brown	Nina Grewal	Cathy McLeod	Ève-Mary Thאי Thi Lac
Patrick Brown	Monique Guay	Dan McTeague	David Tilson
Rod Bruinooge	Claude Guimond	Ted Menzies	Alan Tonks
Dona Cadman	Richard Harris	Larry Miller	Bradley Trost
Paul Calandra	Laurie Hawn	Rob Moore	Merv Tweed
Blaine Calkins	Russ Hiebert	Brian Murphy	Tim Uppal
Ron Cannan	Randy Hoback	Richard Nadeau	Dave Van Kesteren
Serge Cardin	Candice Hoepfner	Rick Norlock	Maurice Vellacott
Colin Carrie	Ed Holder	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Mike Wallace
Rick Casson	Bruce Hyer	Massimo Pacetti	Mark Warawa
Michael Chong	Brian Jean	LaVar Payne	Chris Warkentin
Rob Clarke	Peter Julian	Daniel Petit	Jeff Watson
Joe Comartin	Randy Kamp	Pierre Poilievre	John Weston
Irwin Cotler	Jim Karygiannis	Joe Preston	Rodney Weston
Nathan Cullen	Gerald Keddy	John Rafferty	Alice Wong
John Cummins	Greg Kerr	James Rajotte	Stephen Woodworth
Patricia Davidson	Ed Komarnicki	Yasmin Ratansi	Borys Wrzesnewskyj
Bob Dechert	Daryl Kramp	Brent Rathgeber	Terence Young

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Scott Reid	Vice-Chairs:	Mario Silva Ève-Mary Thאי Thi Lac	
Irwin Cotler	Russ Hiebert	Wayne Marston	David Sweet	(7)

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:

Derek Lee

Vice-Chairs:Rob Anders
Pat MartinDiane Bourgeois
Patrick BrownPaul Calandra
Jacques GourdeMartha Hall Findlay
Dan McTeagueJean-Yves Roy
Chris Warkentin

(11)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Bob Dechert	Jean-Yves Laforest	Lee Richardson
Harold Albrecht	Dean Del Mastro	Mike Lake	Greg Rickford
Mike Allen	Paul Dewar	Guy Lauzon	Denise Savoie
Dean Allison	Earl Dreeshen	Pierre Lemieux	Andrew Saxton
David Anderson	John Duncan	Ben Lobb	Gary Schellenberger
Leon Benoit	Rick Dykstra	Tom Lukiwski	Bev Shipley
Maxime Bernier	Meili Faille	James Lunney	Devinder Shory
James Bezan	Ed Fast	Dave MacKenzie	Joy Smith
Steven Blaney	Royal Galipeau	Jim Maloway	Kevin Sorenson
Kelly Block	Cheryl Gallant	Inky Mark	Bruce Stanton
Sylvie Boucher	Shelly Glover	Colin Mayes	Brian Storseth
Ray Boughen	Yvon Godin	Phil McColeman	David Sweet
Peter Braid	Peter Goldring	Cathy McLeod	Glenn Thibeault
Garry Breitkreuz	Nina Grewal	Ted Menzies	David Tilson
Gord Brown	Jack Harris	Larry Miller	Bradley Trost
Lois Brown	Richard Harris	Rob Moore	Merv Tweed
Rod Bruinooge	Laurie Hawn	Thomas Mulcair	Tim Uppal
Dona Cadman	Russ Hiebert	Richard Nadeau	Dave Van Kesteren
Blaine Calkins	Randy Hoback	Rick Norlock	Maurice Vellacott
Ron Cannan	Candice Hoepfner	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Mike Wallace
Colin Carrie	Ed Holder	Deepak Obhrai	Mark Warawa
Robert Carrier	Carol Hughes	LaVar Payne	Judy Wasylycia-Leis
Rick Casson	Brian Jean	Daniel Petit	Jeff Watson
Chris Charlton	Peter Julian	Pierre Poilievre	John Weston
Michael Chong	Randy Kamp	Joe Preston	Rodney Weston
David Christopherson	Gerald Keddy	James Rajotte	Alice Wong
Rob Clarke	Greg Kerr	Brent Rathgeber	Stephen Woodworth
John Cummins	Ed Komarnicki	Scott Reid	Terence Young
Patricia Davidson	Daryl Kramp	Blake Richards	

HEALTH**Chair:** Joy Smith**Vice-Chairs:**Joyce Murray
Judy Wasylycia-LeisCarolyn Bennett
Patrick Brown
Colin CarriePatricia Davidson
Nicolas DufourKirsty Duncan
Luc MaloCathy McLeod
Tim Uppal

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Malcolm Allen
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Guy André
Alex Atamanenko
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Kelly Block
Robert Bouchard
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Jean CrowderNathan Cullen
John Cummins
Bob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
Jean Dorion
Earl Dreeshen
John Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Carole Freeman
Hedy Fry
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Shelly Glover
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Carol Hughes
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Gerard Kennedy
Greg Kerr
Ed KomarnickiDaryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Pierre Lemieux
Megan Leslie
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Keith Martin
Pat Martin
Brian Masse
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Maria Minna
Rob Moore
Anita Neville
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
Robert Oliphant
Pascal-Pierre Paillé
LaVar Payne
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe PrestonJames Rajotte
Brent Rathgeber
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Lee Richardson
Greg Rickford
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Lise Zarac

**HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH
DISABILITIES**

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chairs:	Raymonde Folco Yves Lessard	
Josée Beaudin Dona Cadman Ron Cannan	Ed Komarnicki Ben Lobb	Tony Martin Maria Minna	Michael Savage Maurice Vellacott	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Patricia Davidson	Mike Lake	Pablo Rodriguez
Harold Albrecht	Libby Davies	Guy Lauzon	Todd Russell
Malcolm Allen	Bob Dechert	Pierre Lemieux	Denise Savoie
Mike Allen	Dean Del Mastro	Tom Lukiwski	Andrew Saxton
Rob Anders	Luc Desnoyers	James Lunney	Gary Schellenberger
David Anderson	Jean Dorion	Lawrence MacAulay	Judy Sgro
Leon Benoit	Earl Dreeshen	Dave MacKenzie	Bev Shipley
Maxime Bernier	Nicolas Dufour	Inky Mark	Devinder Shory
James Bezan	John Duncan	Wayne Marston	Bill Siksay
Steven Blaney	Rick Dykstra	Pat Martin	Joy Smith
Kelly Block	Ed Fast	Irene Mathysen	Kevin Sorenson
Sylvie Boucher	Carole Freeman	Colin Mayes	Thierry St-Cyr
Ray Boughen	Hedy Fry	Phil McColeman	Bruce Stanton
Peter Braid	Royal Galipeau	Cathy McLeod	Brian Storseth
Garry Breitzkreuz	Cheryl Gallant	Ted Menzies	David Sweet
Gord Brown	Shelly Glover	Larry Miller	David Tilson
Lois Brown	Yvon Godin	Rob Moore	Bradley Trost
Patrick Brown	Peter Goldring	Anita Neville	Justin Trudeau
Rod Bruinooge	Jacques Gourde	Rick Norlock	Merv Tweed
Paul Calandra	Nina Grewal	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Tim Uppal
Blaine Calkins	Richard Harris	Deepak Obhrai	Francis Valeriotte
Colin Carrie	Laurie Hawn	Christian Ouellet	Dave Van Kesteren
Rick Casson	Russ Hiebert	LaVar Payne	Mike Wallace
Chris Charlton	Randy Hoback	Daniel Petit	Mark Warawa
Michael Chong	Candice Hoeppner	Pierre Poilievre	Chris Warkentin
Olivia Chow	Ed Holder	Joe Preston	Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
David Christopherson	Brian Jean	James Rajotte	Jeff Watson
Rob Clarke	Peter Julian	Brent Rathgeber	John Weston
Siobhan Coady	Randy Kamp	Scott Reid	Rodney Weston
Jean Crowder	Gerald Keddy	Blake Richards	Alice Wong
Nathan Cullen	Gerard Kennedy	Lee Richardson	Stephen Woodworth
John Cummins	Greg Kerr	Greg Rickford	Terence Young
Jean-Claude D'Amours	Daryl Kramp		

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:	Michael Chong	Vice-Chairs:	Robert Bouchard Anthony Rota	
Gord Brown Siobhan Coady Marc Garneau	Mike Lake Brian Masse	Dave Van Kesteren Robert Vincent	Mike Wallace Chris Warkentin	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Nathan Cullen	Ed Komarnicki	Brent Rathgeber
Harold Albrecht	John Cummins	Daryl Kramp	Scott Reid
Mike Allen	Patricia Davidson	Guy Lauzon	Blake Richards
Dean Allison	Don Davies	Carole Lavallée	Lee Richardson
Rob Anders	Libby Davies	Jack Layton	Greg Rickford
David Anderson	Bob Dechert	Pierre Lemieux	Jean-Yves Roy
Scott Andrews	Dean Del Mastro	Ben Lobb	Andrew Saxton
Charlie Angus	Sukh Dhaliwal	Tom Lukiwski	Francis Scarpaleggia
André Arthur	Jean Dorion	James Lunney	Gary Schellenberger
Gérard Asselin	Earl Dreesen	Dave MacKenzie	Judy Sgro
Navdeep Bains	John Duncan	Luc Malo	Bev Shipley
Leon Benoit	Rick Dykstra	Jim Maloway	Devinder Shory
Maxime Bernier	Ed Fast	Inky Mark	Bill Siksay
Dennis Bevington	Carole Freeman	Wayne Marston	Mario Silva
James Bezan	Hedy Fry	Pat Martin	Joy Smith
Steven Blaney	Royal Galipeau	Tony Martin	Kevin Sorenson
Kelly Block	Cheryl Gallant	Colin Mayes	Bruce Stanton
Sylvie Boucher	Shelly Glover	Phil McColeman	Peter Stoffer
Ray Boughen	Yvon Godin	David McGuinty	Brian Storseth
Peter Braid	Peter Goldring	John McKay	David Sweet
Garry Breitkreuz	Jacques Gourde	Cathy McLeod	Glenn Thibeault
Scott Brison	Claude Gravelle	Ted Menzies	David Tilson
Lois Brown	Nina Grewal	Larry Miller	Bradley Trost
Patrick Brown	Claude Guimond	Rob Moore	Justin Trudeau
Rod Bruinooge	Richard Harris	Rick Norlock	Merv Tweed
Dona Cadman	Laurie Hawn	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Tim Uppal
Paul Calandra	Russ Hiebert	Deepak Obhrai	Francis Valeriote
Blaine Calkins	Randy Hoback	Massimo Pacetti	Maurice Vellacott
Ron Cannan	Candice Hoepfner	LaVar Payne	Joseph Volpe
Serge Cardin	Ed Holder	Daniel Petit	Mark Warawa
Colin Carrie	Bruce Hyer	Pierre Poilievre	Jeff Watson
Rick Casson	Brian Jean	Roger Pomerleau	John Weston
David Christopherson	Randy Kamp	Joe Preston	Rodney Weston
Rob Clarke	Andrew Kania	John Rafferty	Alice Wong
Joe Comartin	Gerald Keddy	James Rajotte	Stephen Woodworth
Jean Crowder	Greg Kerr	Yasmin Ratansi	Terence Young

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY IN CANADA

Chair:	Michael Chong	Vice-Chairs:	Francis Valeriote Robert Vincent	
Mike Lake	Brian Masse			(5)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CANADIAN INDUSTRIAL SECTORS

Chair: Dave Van Kesteren

Vice-Chairs: Robert Bouchard
Marc Garneau

Mike Lake

Glenn Thibeault

(5)

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair: Lee Richardson

Vice-Chairs: John Cannis
Serge Cardin

Dean Allison
Scott Brison
Ron Cannan

Claude Guimond
Richard Harris

Ed Holder
Peter Julian

Gerald Keddy
Mario Silva

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Malcolm Allen
Mike Allen
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Navdeep Bains
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Kelly Block
Robert Bouchard
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Siobhan Coady
Paul Crête
Bonnie Crombie

Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
Johanne Deschamps
Paul Dewar
Sukh Dhaliwal
Ruby Dhalla
Jean Dorion
Earl Dreshen
John Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Wayne Easter
Ed Fast
Judy Foote
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Shelly Glover
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Bruce Hyer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp

Mike Lake
Francine Lalonde
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Wayne Marston
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Thomas Mulcair
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
Robert Oliphant
LaVar Payne
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
John Rafferty
James Rajotte
Yasmin Ratansi
Brent Rathgeber
Geoff Regan
Scott Reid

Blake Richards
Greg Rickford
Anthony Rota
Michael Savage
Denise Savoie
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Ève-Mary Thāi Thi Lac
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Bryon Wilfert
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair: Ed Fast

Vice-Chairs: Réal Ménard
Brian Murphy

Joe Comartin
Ujjal Dosanjh
Dominic LeBlanc

Marc Lemay
Rob Moore

Rick Norlock
Daniel Petit

Brent Rathgeber
Brian Storseth

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Larry Bagnell
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Kelly Block
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Irwin Cotler
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Don Davies

Libby Davies
Bob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
Jean Dorion
Earl Dreeshen
John Duncan
Linda Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Carole Freeman
Hedy Fry
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Shelly Glover
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Jack Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Mark Holland
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Jim Karygiannis
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake

Guy Lauzon
Carole Lavallée
Derek Lee
Pierre Lemieux
Megan Leslie
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Wayne Marston
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
John McKay
Cathy McLeod
Serge Ménard
Alexandra Mendes
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Maria Mourani
Anita Neville
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
Robert Oliphant
LaVar Payne
Pierre Poilievre
Roger Pomerleau
Joe Preston
Bob Rae
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Lee Richardson
Greg Rickford
Denise Savoie
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Bill Siksay
Michelle Simson
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
David Sweet
Ève-Mary Thāi Thi Lac
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young

LIAISON

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:	Shawn Murphy	
Leon Benoit	Ed Fast	Joe Preston	Bruce Stanton	(26)
Maxime Bernier	Hedy Fry	James Rajotte	David Sweet	
James Bezan	Peter Goldring	Lee Richardson	Paul Szabo	
Steven Blaney	Andrew Kania	Gary Schellenberger	David Tilson	
Garry Breitkreuz	Derek Lee	Joy Smith	Merv Tweed	
Michael Chong	Larry Miller	Kevin Sorenson	Rodney Weston	

Associate Members

Rob Anders	Nathan Cullen	Carole Lavallée	Todd Russell
Claude Bachand	Patricia Davidson	Yves Lessard	Francis Scarpaleggia
Mauril Bélanger	Mark Eyking	Lawrence MacAulay	Judy Sgro
André Bellavance	Raymonde Folco	Pat Martin	Bill Siksay
Maurizio Bevilacqua	Royal Galipeau	Brian Masse	Scott Simms
Bernard Bigras	Yvon Godin	Irene Mathysen	Thierry St-Cyr
Raynald Blais	Michel Guimond	Réal Ménard	Peter Stoffer
Robert Bouchard	Jack Harris	Brian Murphy	Alan Tonks
John Cannis	Russ Hiebert	Joyce Murray	Joseph Volpe
Serge Cardin	Mark Holland	Massimo Pacetti	Judy Wasylcia-Leis
David Christopherson	Daryl Kramp	Bernard Patry	Bryon Wilfert
Paul Crête	Jean-Yves Laforest	Marcel Proulx	Lise Zarac
Jean Crowder	Mario Laframboise	Anthony Rota	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:	Shawn Murphy	
Leon Benoit	David Sweet	Paul Szabo	Merv Tweed	(7)
Joe Preston				

NATIONAL DEFENCE**Chair:** Maxime Bernier**Vice-Chairs:**Claude Bachand
Bryon WilfertDawn Black
Steven Blaney
Ray BoughenDenis Coderre
Cheryl GallantLaurie Hawn
Anita NevillePascal-Pierre Paillé
LaVar Payne

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Guy André
Larry Bagnell
Leon Benoit
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Robert Bouchard
Sylvie Boucher
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Paul Crête
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Patricia DavidsonBob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
Johanne Deschamps
Paul Dewar
Jean Dorion
Earl Dreeshen
Nicolas Dufour
John Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Christiane Gagnon
Royal Galipeau
Shelly Glover
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Albina Guarnieri
Monique Guay
Jack Harris
Richard Harris
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Mark Holland
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl KrampMike Lake
Francine Lalonde
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Megan Leslie
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Serge Ménard
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Maria Mourani
Richard Nadeau
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Brent Rathgeber
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Lee Richardson
Greg RickfordAnthony Rota
Todd Russell
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Scott Simms
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Paul Szabo
Ève-Mary Thai Thi Lac
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth
Borys Wrzesnewskyj
Terence Young

NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair: Leon Benoit

Vice-Chairs: Nathan Cullen
Alan Tonks

Mike Allen
David Anderson
Navdeep Bains

France Bonsant
Paule Brunelle

Russ Hiebert
Geoff Regan

Devinder Shory
Bradley Trost

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
Scott Andrews
Larry Bagnell
André Bellavance
Maxime Bernier
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Bernard Bigras
Steven Blaney
Kelly Block
Robert Bouchard
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong

Rob Clarke
Jean Crowder
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
Jean Dorion
Earl Dreesen
John Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Shelly Glover
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Claude Gravelle
Nina Grewal
Jack Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Carol Hughes
Bruce Hyer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
LaVar Payne
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
John Rafferty
James Rajotte
Brent Rathgeber

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Lee Richardson
Greg Rickford
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Glenn Thibeault
David Tilson
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair: Steven Blaney

Vice-Chairs: Yvon Godin
Lise Zarac

Michael Chong
Jean-Claude D'Amours
Royal Galipeau

Shelly Glover
Monique Guay

Pierre Lemieux
Richard Nadeau

Daniel Petit
Pablo Rodriguez

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Alex Atamanenko
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Rob Clarke
Joe Comartin
John Cummins

Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
Jean Dorion
Earl Dreeshen
John Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Claude Gravelle
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Carol Hughes
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake

Guy Lauzon
Carole Lavallée
Jack Layton
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
Pascal-Pierre Paillé
LaVar Payne
Pierre Poilievre
Roger Pomerleau
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Brent Rathgeber
Scott Reid
Blake Richards

Lee Richardson
Greg Rickford
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylycia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Joe Preston	Vice-Chairs:	Michel Guimond Marcel Proulx	
Harold Albrecht Kelly Block Rodger Cuzner	Claude DeBellefeuille Yvon Godin	Marlene Jennings Guy Lauzon	Tom Lukiwski Scott Reid	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	David Christopherson	Greg Kerr	Blake Richards
Mike Allen	Rob Clarke	Ed Komarnicki	Lee Richardson
Dean Allison	Joe Comartin	Daryl Kramp	Greg Rickford
Rob Anders	John Cummins	Mike Lake	Andrew Saxton
David Anderson	Patricia Davidson	Pierre Lemieux	Gary Schellenberger
Charlie Angus	Libby Davies	Ben Lobb	Bev Shipley
G�rard Asselin	Bob Dechert	James Lunney	Devinder Shory
Mauril B�langer	Dean Del Mastro	Dave MacKenzie	Joy Smith
Leon Benoit	Earl Dreeshen	Inky Mark	Kevin Sorenson
Maxime Bernier	John Duncan	Pat Martin	Bruce Stanton
James Bezan	Rick Dykstra	Colin Mayes	Brian Storseth
Steven Blaney	Ed Fast	Phil McColeman	David Sweet
Sylvie Boucher	Christiane Gagnon	Cathy McLeod	David Tilson
Ray Boughen	Royal Galipeau	Alexandra Mendes	Bradley Trost
Peter Braid	Cheryl Gallant	Ted Menzies	Merv Tweed
Garry Breitkreuz	Shelly Glover	Larry Miller	Tim Uppal
Gord Brown	Peter Goldring	Rob Moore	Dave Van Kesteren
Lois Brown	Jacques Gourde	Joyce Murray	Maurice Vellacott
Patrick Brown	Nina Grewal	Rick Norlock	Mike Wallace
Rod Bruinooge	Richard Harris	Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	Mark Warawa
Dona Cadman	Laurie Hawn	Deepak Obhrai	Chris Warkentin
Paul Calandra	Russ Hiebert	Pierre Paquette	Jeff Watson
Blaine Calkins	Randy Hoback	LaVar Payne	John Weston
Ron Cannan	Candice Hoeppner	Daniel Petit	Rodney Weston
Colin Carrie	Ed Holder	Louis Plamondon	Alice Wong
Rick Casson	Brian Jean	Pierre Poilievre	Stephen Woodworth
Chris Charlton	Randy Kamp	James Rajotte	Terence Young
Michael Chong	Gerald Keddy	Brent Rathgeber	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Harold Albrecht	Vice-Chair:		
Chris Charlton	Claude DeBellefeuille	Marcel Proulx	Scott Reid	(5)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GIFTS UNDER THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Chair:	Scott Reid	Vice-Chair:		
Chris Charlton	Claude DeBellefeuille	Marlene Jennings		(4)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:**

Shawn Murphy

Vice-Chairs:David Christopherson
Daryl KrampBonnie Crombie
Luc DesnoyersMeili Faille
Yasmin RatansiAndrew Saxton
Bev ShipleyJohn Weston
Terence Young

(11)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
 Harold Albrecht
 Malcolm Allen
 Mike Allen
 Dean Allison
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Leon Benoit
 Maxime Bernier
 James Bezan
 Steven Blaney
 Kelly Block
 Sylvie Boucher
 Ray Boughen
 Diane Bourgeois
 Peter Braid
 Garry Breitkreuz
 Gord Brown
 Lois Brown
 Patrick Brown
 Rod Bruinooge
 Dona Cadman
 Paul Calandra
 Blaine Calkins
 Ron Cannan
 Colin Carrie
 Rick Casson
 Michael Chong
 Rob Clarke

Denis Coderre
 John Cummins
 Patricia Davidson
 Bob Dechert
 Dean Del Mastro
 Paul Dewar
 Jean Dorion
 Earl Dreeshen
 John Duncan
 Rick Dykstra
 Ed Fast
 Royal Galipeau
 Cheryl Gallant
 Shelly Glover
 Peter Goldring
 Jacques Gourde
 Nina Grewal
 Martha Hall Findlay
 Richard Harris
 Laurie Hawn
 Russ Hiebert
 Randy Hoback
 Candice Hoepfner
 Ed Holder
 Brian Jean
 Peter Julian
 Randy Kamp
 Gerald Keddy
 Gerard Kennedy

Greg Kerr
 Ed Komarnicki
 Mike Lake
 Guy Lauzon
 Jack Layton
 Pierre Lemieux
 Ben Lobb
 Tom Lukiwski
 James Lunney
 Dave MacKenzie
 Jim Maloway
 Inky Mark
 Pat Martin
 Colin Mayes
 Phil McColeman
 Cathy McLeod
 Ted Menzies
 Larry Miller
 Rob Moore
 Thomas Mulcair
 Richard Nadeau
 Anita Neville
 Rick Norlock
 Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
 Deepak Obhrai
 LaVar Payne
 Daniel Petit
 Pierre Poilievre
 Joe Preston

James Rajotte
 Brent Rathgeber
 Scott Reid
 Blake Richards
 Lee Richardson
 Greg Rickford
 Gary Schellenberger
 Devinder Shory
 Joy Smith
 Kevin Sorenson
 Bruce Stanton
 Brian Storseth
 David Sweet
 David Tilson
 Bradley Trost
 Merv Tweed
 Tim Uppal
 Dave Van Kesteren
 Maurice Vellacott
 Mike Wallace
 Mark Warawa
 Chris Warkentin
 Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
 Jeff Watson
 Rodney Weston
 Alice Wong
 Stephen Woodworth
 Borys Wrzesnewskyj

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:

Garry Breitkreuz

Vice-Chairs:Jack Harris
Mark HollandAndrew Kania
Dave MacKenzie
Phil McColemanSerge Ménard
Maria MouraniRick Norlock
Robert OliphantBrent Rathgeber
Blake Richards

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Claude Bachand
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Kelly Block
France Bonsant
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Olivia Chow
Rob Clarke

Joe Comartin
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Don Davies
Bob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
Earl Dreeshen
John Duncan
Kirsty Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Raymonde Folco
Judy Foote
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Shelly Glover
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Inky Mark
Wayne Marston
Pat Martin
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Cathy McLeod
Réal Ménard
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Brian Murphy
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
LaVar Payne
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Bob Rae
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

Lee Richardson
Greg Rickford
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Bill Siksay
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young

STATUS OF WOMEN

Chair:

Hedy Fry

Vice-Chairs:
Patricia Davidson
Irene MathyssenSylvie Boucher
Nicole DemersJohanne Deschamps
Candice HoepfnerCathy McLeod
Anita NevilleTilly O'Neill-Gordon
Lise Zarac

(11)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
 Harold Albrecht
 Mike Allen
 Dean Allison
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Niki Ashton
 Carolyn Bennett
 Leon Benoit
 Maxime Bernier
 James Bezan
 Dawn Black
 Steven Blaney
 Kelly Block
 France Bonsant
 Ray Boughen
 Peter Braid
 Garry Breitkreuz
 Gord Brown
 Lois Brown
 Patrick Brown
 Rod Bruinooge
 Dona Cadman
 Paul Calandra
 Blaine Calkins
 Ron Cannan
 Colin Carrie
 Rick Casson
 Chris Charlton
 Michael Chong

Olivia Chow
 Rob Clarke
 Jean Crowder
 John Cummins
 Libby Davies
 Bob Dechert
 Dean Del Mastro
 Jean Dorion
 Earl Dreeshen
 John Duncan
 Linda Duncan
 Rick Dykstra
 Ed Fast
 Royal Galipeau
 Cheryl Gallant
 Shelly Glover
 Peter Goldring
 Jacques Gourde
 Nina Grewal
 Richard Harris
 Laurie Hawn
 Russ Hiebert
 Randy Hoback
 Ed Holder
 Carol Hughes
 Brian Jean
 Randy Kamp
 Gerald Keddy
 Greg Kerr

Ed Komarnicki
 Daryl Kramp
 Mike Lake
 Guy Lauzon
 Jack Layton
 Pierre Lemieux
 Megan Leslie
 Ben Lobb
 Tom Lukiwski
 James Lunney
 Dave MacKenzie
 Inky Mark
 Pat Martin
 Colin Mayes
 Phil McColeman
 Ted Menzies
 Larry Miller
 Rob Moore
 Rick Norlock
 Deepak Obhrai
 LaVar Payne
 Glen Pearson
 Daniel Petit
 Pierre Poilievre
 Joe Preston
 James Rajotte
 Brent Rathgeber
 Scott Reid
 Blake Richards

Lee Richardson
 Greg Rickford
 Andrew Saxton
 Gary Schellenberger
 Bev Shipley
 Devinder Shory
 Michelle Simson
 Joy Smith
 Kevin Sorenson
 Bruce Stanton
 Brian Storseth
 David Sweet
 Ève-Mary Thאי Thi Lac
 David Tilson
 Bradley Trost
 Merv Tweed
 Tim Uppal
 Dave Van Kesteren
 Maurice Vellacott
 Mike Wallace
 Mark Warawa
 Chris Warkentin
 Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
 Jeff Watson
 John Weston
 Rodney Weston
 Alice Wong
 Stephen Woodworth
 Terence Young

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:	David Sweet	Vice-Chairs:	Judy Sgro Peter Stoffer	
Guy André Scott Andrews Rob Clarke	Judy Foote Roger Gaudet	Greg Kerr Ben Lobb	Phil McColeman Tilly O'Neill-Gordon	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	John Cummins	Mike Lake	Blake Richards
Harold Albrecht	Patricia Davidson	Guy Lauzon	Lee Richardson
Mike Allen	Bob Dechert	Pierre Lemieux	Greg Rickford
Dean Allison	Dean Del Mastro	Megan Leslie	Michael Savage
Rob Anders	Earl Dreeshen	Tom Lukiwski	Andrew Saxton
David Anderson	John Duncan	James Lunney	Gary Schellenberger
Claude Bachand	Rick Dykstra	Dave MacKenzie	Bev Shipley
Leon Benoit	Ed Fast	Luc Malo	Devinder Shory
Maxime Bernier	Carole Freeman	Inky Mark	Joy Smith
James Bezan	Royal Galipeau	Wayne Marston	Kevin Sorenson
Dawn Black	Cheryl Gallant	Pat Martin	Bruce Stanton
Steven Blaney	Shelly Glover	Tony Martin	Brian Storseth
Kelly Block	Yvon Godin	Colin Mayes	David Tilson
Sylvie Boucher	Peter Goldring	Cathy McLeod	Bradley Trost
Ray Boughen	Jacques Gourde	Ted Menzies	Merv Tweed
Peter Braid	Nina Grewal	Larry Miller	Tim Uppal
Garry Breitzkreuz	Jack Harris	Rob Moore	Dave Van Kesteren
Gord Brown	Richard Harris	Rick Norlock	Maurice Vellacott
Lois Brown	Laurie Hawn	Deepak Obhrai	Mike Wallace
Patrick Brown	Russ Hiebert	LaVar Payne	Mark Warawa
Rod Bruinooge	Randy Hoback	Glen Pearson	Chris Warkentin
Dona Cadman	Candice Hoepfner	Daniel Petit	Jeff Watson
Paul Calandra	Ed Holder	Pierre Poilievre	John Weston
Blaine Calkins	Brian Jean	Joe Preston	Rodney Weston
Ron Cannan	Randy Kamp	James Rajotte	Alice Wong
Colin Carrie	Gerald Keddy	Brent Rathgeber	Stephen Woodworth
Rick Casson	Ed Komarnicki	Scott Reid	Terence Young
Michael Chong	Daryl Kramp		

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CANADIAN MISSION IN AFGHANISTAN

Chair:	Rick Casson	Vice-Chair:	Bryon Wilfert	
Jim Abbott Claude Bachand Denis Coderre	Paul Crête Paul Dewar Laurie Hawn	Greg Kerr Dave MacKenzie	Deepak Obhrai Bob Rae	(12)

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs: Sharon Carstairs
Peter Goldring

Joint Vice-Chair: Mauril Bélanger

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Stephen Greene
Mobina S.B. Jaffer

Jean Lapointe
Terrance Stratton

Gérard Asselin
Carolyn Bennett
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Ed Holder

Carol Hughes
Gurbax Malhi
Louis Plamondon
Scott Reid
Greg Rickford

(17)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Kelly Block
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Gerry Byrne
Dona Cadman
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke

John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
Earl Dreeshen
Ken Dryden
John Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Shelly Glover
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Candice Hoepfner
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake

Guy Lauzon
Carole Lavallée
Pierre Lemieux
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
LaVar Payne
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Roger Pomerleau
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Brent Rathgeber
Blake Richards

Lee Richardson
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: J. Trevor Eyton
Andrew Kania

Joint Vice-Chairs: Royal Galipeau
Brian Masse

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

George Baker
John Bryden
Fred Dickson

Céline Hervieux-Payette
Wilfred P. Moore
John Wallace

Gérard Asselin
Dona Cadman
Earl Dreeshen
Christiane Gagnon
Randy Hoback

Derek Lee
Andrew Saxton
Paul Szabo
Terence Young

(19)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Leon Benoit
Maxime Bernier
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Kelly Block
Sylvie Boucher
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitkreuz
Gord Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke

John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Dean Del Mastro
John Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Carole Freeman
Cheryl Gallant
Shelly Glover
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Candice Hoepfner
Ed Holder
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mario Laframboise
Mike Lake

Guy Lauzon
Marc Lemay
Pierre Lemieux
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Réal Ménard
Serge Ménard
Ted Menzies
Larry Miller
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Tilly O'Neill-Gordon
Deepak Obhrai
LaVar Payne
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Brent Rathgeber
Scott Reid

Blake Richards
Lee Richardson
Greg Rickford
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Merv Tweed
Tim Uppal
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
Alice Wong
Stephen Woodworth

Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. ANDREW SCHEER

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MS. DENISE SAVOIE

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BARRY DEVOLIN

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Stephen Harper	Prime Minister
Hon. Rob Nicholson	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Jean-Pierre Blackburn	Minister of National Revenue and Minister of State (Agriculture)
Hon. Greg Thompson	Minister of Veterans Affairs
Hon. Marjory LeBreton	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister of State (Seniors)
Hon. Chuck Strahl	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. Peter MacKay	Minister of National Defence and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway
Hon. Stockwell Day	Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway
Hon. Vic Toews	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Rona Ambrose	Minister of Labour
Hon. Diane Finley	Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development
Hon. Bev Oda	Minister of International Cooperation
Hon. Jim Prentice	Minister of the Environment
Hon. John Baird	Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Hon. Lawrence Cannon	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Tony Clement	Minister of Industry
Hon. Jim Flaherty	Minister of Finance
Hon. Josée Verner	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister for La Francophonie
Hon. Jay Hill	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Peter Van Loan	Minister of Public Safety
Hon. Gerry Ritz	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board
Hon. Jason Kenney	Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism
Hon. Christian Paradis	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Hon. James Moore	Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages
Hon. Leona Aglukkaq	Minister of Health
Hon. Lisa Raitt	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Gail Shea	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Gary Lunn	Minister of State (Sport)
Hon. Gordon O'Connor	Minister of State and Chief Government Whip
Hon. Helena Guergis	Minister of State (Status of Women)
Hon. Diane Ablonczy	Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism)
Hon. Rob Merrifield	Minister of State (Transport)
Hon. Lynne Yelich	Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)
Hon. Steven Fletcher	Minister of State (Democratic Reform)
Hon. Gary Goodyear	Minister of State (Science and Technology)
Hon. Denis Lebel	Minister of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)
Hon. Keith Ashfield	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. Peter Kent	Minister of State of Foreign Affairs (Americas)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Pierre Poilievre	to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Rob Moore	to the Minister of Justice
Mr. Daniel Petit	to the Minister of Justice
Mr. Jacques Gourde	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and to the Minister of National Revenue
Mr. Greg Kerr	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mr. John Duncan	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Mr. Laurie Hawn	to the Minister of National Defence
Mr. Gerald Keddy	to the Minister of International Trade
Mr. Andrew Saxton	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Ed Komarnicki	to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development and to the Minister of Labour
Hon. Jim Abbott	to the Minister of International Cooperation
Mr. Mark Warawa	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Brian Jean	to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Mr. Deepak Obhrai	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Mike Lake	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Ted Menzies	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Tom Lukiwski	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mr. Dave MacKenzie	to the Minister of Public Safety
Mr. Pierre Lemieux	to the Minister of Agriculture
Mr. David Anderson	to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board
Mr. Rick Dykstra	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mrs. Alice Wong	for Multiculturalism
Mr. Dean Del Mastro	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mrs. Sylvie Boucher	for Status of Women
Mrs. Shelly Glover	for Official Languages
Mr. Colin Carrie	to the Minister of Health
Mr. Randy Kamp	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans

CONTENTS

Friday, March 13, 2009

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada-EFTA Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act

Mr. Day.....	1723
Bill C-2, Third reading.....	1723
Mr. Stoffer.....	1725
Mr. Laframboise.....	1726
Mr. Richardson.....	1726
Mr. Bains.....	1727
Mr. Richardson.....	1728
Mr. Julian.....	1729
Mr. Stoffer.....	1729
Mr. Laframboise.....	1730

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Young Canada Week

Mr. Lobb.....	1731
---------------	------

Parks Canada

Mr. Bagnell.....	1731
------------------	------

St. Patrick's Day

Mr. Paquette.....	1731
-------------------	------

Junior Citizen of the Year

Mrs. Hughes.....	1731
------------------	------

Marguerite MacDonald

Mrs. Glover.....	1731
------------------	------

Immigration

Mrs. Simson.....	1732
------------------	------

Tourism

Mr. Rickford.....	1732
-------------------	------

Laura Archer

Ms. Brunelle.....	1732
-------------------	------

The Budget

Mr. Uppal.....	1732
----------------	------

Heavy Truck Traffic

Mr. Bélanger.....	1732
-------------------	------

Liberal Party of Canada

Mr. Del Mastro.....	1733
---------------------	------

Child Care

Mr. Allen (Welland).....	1733
--------------------------	------

The Conservative Government

Mrs. Boucher.....	1733
-------------------	------

Anti-scab Motion

Mr. Desnoyers.....	1733
--------------------	------

World Water Day

Mr. Scarpaleggia.....	1734
-----------------------	------

The Economy

Mr. Benoit.....	1734
-----------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS

The Economy

Mr. Goodale.....	1734
Mr. Toews.....	1734
Mr. Goodale.....	1734
Mr. Toews.....	1734
Mr. Goodale.....	1734
Mr. Toews.....	1735
Mrs. Jennings.....	1735
Mr. Toews.....	1735
Mrs. Jennings.....	1735
Mr. Toews.....	1735

Employment

Mr. Paquette.....	1735
Mr. Toews.....	1735
Mr. Paquette.....	1735
Mr. Toews.....	1735
Mrs. Beaudin.....	1736
Mr. Komarnicki.....	1736
Mrs. Beaudin.....	1736
Mr. Komarnicki.....	1736
Ms. Davies (Vancouver East).....	1736
Mr. Toews.....	1736
Ms. Davies (Vancouver East).....	1736
Mr. Clement.....	1736
Ms. Davies (Vancouver East).....	1736
Mr. Komarnicki.....	1737
Mr. McGuinty.....	1737
Mr. Clement.....	1737
Mr. McGuinty.....	1737
Mr. Clement.....	1737
Mrs. Zarac.....	1737
Mr. Toews.....	1737
Mrs. Zarac.....	1737
Mr. Toews.....	1738

Forestry Industry

Mrs. DeBellefeuille.....	1738
Mr. Gourde.....	1738
Mrs. DeBellefeuille.....	1738
Mr. Gourde.....	1738

Parliamentary Budget Officer

Mr. Carrier.....	1738
Mr. Poilievre.....	1738
Mr. Carrier.....	1738
Mr. Poilievre.....	1738

Agriculture and Agri-food

Mr. Easter.....	1739
Mr. Lemieux.....	1739

employment

Mr. D'Amours.....	1739
Mr. Toews.....	1739

The Economy	
Ms. Guarnieri.....	1739
Mr. Clement.....	1739
Ms. Guarnieri.....	1739
Mr. Clement.....	1739
Mr. Norlock.....	1739
Mr. Toews.....	1739
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Stoffer.....	1740
Mr. Kerr.....	1740
Mr. Stoffer.....	1740
Mr. Kerr.....	1740
Millennium Summit	
Mr. Dorion.....	1740
Mr. Hill.....	1740
Mr. Dorion.....	1740
Mr. Abbott.....	1740
Public Service of Canada	
Mr. Proulx.....	1740
Mr. Toews.....	1741
Mr. Proulx.....	1741
Mr. Toews.....	1741
Government Funding	
Mr. Julian.....	1741
Mr. Del Mastro.....	1741
Mr. Julian.....	1741
Mr. Del Mastro.....	1741
The Economy	
Mr. Uppal.....	1741
Mr. Merrifield.....	1741
Justice	
Mr. Dhaliwal.....	1742
Mr. Petit.....	1742
Research and development	
Mr. Dufour.....	1742
Mr. Clement.....	1742
Atlantic Canada	
Ms. Leslie.....	1742
Mr. Ashfield.....	1742
The Economy	
Mrs. Block.....	1742
Mrs. Yelich.....	1742
Points of Order	
Statements by Members	
Mr. Abbott.....	1742
Mr. Lee.....	1743
Mr. Poilievre.....	1743
Ms. Davies (Vancouver East).....	1744
Mr. Uppal.....	1744
Mrs. Jennings.....	1744
Mr. Marston.....	1744
The Deputy Speaker.....	1744

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Lukiwski.....	1744
Petitions	
Volunteer Service Medal	
Mr. Poilievre.....	1745
Canada Post	
Mr. Dhaliwal.....	1745
Truck Licences	
Mr. Dhaliwal.....	1745
Employment Insurance	
Ms. Charlton.....	1745
Sri Lanka	
Mr. Calandra.....	1745
Canada—Colombia Free Trade Agreement	
Mr. Atamanenko.....	1746
Mr. Julian.....	1746
Employment Insurance	
Mr. Allen (Welland).....	1746
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lukiwski.....	1746

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada-EFTA Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act	
Bill C-2. Third reading.....	1747
Mr. Laframboise.....	1747
Mr. Julian.....	1748
Mr. Atamanenko.....	1748
Mr. Julian.....	1749
Amendment.....	1751
Mr. Stoffer.....	1751
Mr. Marston.....	1752
Mr. Maloway.....	1753
Mr. Allen (Welland).....	1753
Mr. Stoffer.....	1753

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Standing Orders of the House of Commons	
Mr. Bernier.....	1755
Motion.....	1755
Mrs. Jennings.....	1756
Mrs. DeBellefeuille.....	1756
Mr. Reid.....	1756
Mrs. Jennings.....	1757
Mrs. DeBellefeuille.....	1758
Ms. Davies (Vancouver East).....	1759
Mr. Reid.....	1760
Mr. Lee.....	1761
Canada-EFTA Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act	
Bill C-2—Notice of time allocation motion	
Mrs. Aglukkaq.....	1761
Standing Orders of the House of commons	
Motion.....	1761

Mr. Lee.....	1761
Mr. Bagnell.....	1762

APPENDIX

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and
Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les
Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>