



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 142 • NUMBER 082 • 2nd SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, April 18, 2008

—
Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 18, 2008

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

POINT OF ORDER

COMMENTS BY MEMBER FOR HOCHELAGA

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday during members' statements, I spoke without thinking when I described the government's unfair assessment of the actions of the Bloc Québécois regarding justice matters. I used some language that was quite likely unparliamentary.

Members know that I am committed to this institution and to decorum. I apologize and I withdraw my remarks.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his apology.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from April 17 consideration of the motion that Bill S-3, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (investigative hearing and recognizance with conditions), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Bill Siksay (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak to Bill S-3, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (investigative hearing and recognizance with conditions). This bill raises some very important issues and fundamental questions about our justice system and our respect for civil liberties and human rights. I believe that this legislation compromises key principles of our justice system.

I want to begin with a quotation cited by Yusra Siddiquee, a representative of the Canadian Muslim Lawyers Association, when he appeared before the Senate committee studying this bill. He quoted Justice Binnie of the Supreme Court of Canada, who said:

The danger in the "war on terrorism" lies not only in the actual damage the terrorists can do to us but what we can do to our own legal and political institutions by way of shock, anger, anticipation, opportunism or overreaction.

It is important to keep this in mind. We have to remember that these provisions and ones similar to them in many other countries grew out of the period immediately following the September 11, 2001 attacks on New York and Washington, a period when all of us were concerned for our security and anxious and fearful.

There are two major provisions in the bill before us, one for investigative hearings and the other for preventive detention. These were part of the Anti-terrorism Act that was passed in the period immediately following September 11, 2001. In that original legislation, these particular provisions sunsetted after five years.

Under the terms of the sunset clause, the provisions of the Anti-terrorism Act relating to investigative hearings and recognizance with conditions were set to expire on March 1, 2007 unless extended by a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament. A government motion to extend the measures without amendment for three years was defeated in the House of Commons on February 27, 2007 by a vote of 159 to 124, and the provisions ceased to have any force or effect.

That was the right decision. I am glad that the House took that decision. Now the government has reintroduced these provisions in this new legislation and that is the wrong decision. Both of these measures fundamentally compromise key principles of our justice system.

Let us consider first the provisions for investigative hearings. These provisions force someone to testify before a judge if he or she is suspected of having information about terrorist activity that has already occurred or that might occur. This provision directly compromises the right to remain silent, one of those fundamental principles of our justice system.

The refusal to testify at an investigative hearing can lead to one year of jail time. This can also reduce the right to silence for persons who are questioned by the RCMP or CSIS, in that if they are uncooperative with a police investigation, the possibility of having to go to an investigative hearing can be used to compel cooperation and compromise their right to remain silent.

Not everyone who chooses to remain silent is guilty. People may have very legitimate fears and concerns, such as fears and concerns about their own personal safety, for instance. Given the broad definition of terrorism in the Anti-terrorism Act, this provision is a problem, and the definition has come in for criticism over the years as well.

Government Orders

Many members who support this bill have said in debate that these are extraordinary measures that will be used in only the most serious of circumstances. I appreciate what RCMP Assistant Commissioner Mike McDonnell said before the Senate committee. He stated:

First, and most importantly, the RCMP recognizes that these provisions were intended for extraordinary situations and, as such, we approach them with restraint.

My preference would be to not go down that road until it is proven clearly that the measures already at our disposal are not effective in dealing with the challenges of terrorism faced in our country. Those good intentions are noble, and I believe the commitment made by the assistant commissioner is sincere, but as the expression goes, the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

These provisions represent a very serious departure and in reality could be used against people who are legitimately protesting or are viewed as dissidents by our society. They could be used to harass or even imprison such people.

This provision also puts a judge in the position of having to oversee an investigation. This is not the practice of our justice system and is not something that most judges have any experience with. This is a major departure, since investigations in our system are undertaken by police authorities.

Jason Gratl, the president of the B.C. Civil Liberties Association, put the concern this way:

The primary difficulty with investigative hearings is that they distort the functions of the judiciary and the Crown. In essence, the course of order-making power of the judiciary is brought to bear on an investigation. That power places prosecutors in the role of investigators, which is unlike their usual role. It also places the judiciary in the position of presiding over a criminal investigation.

The other provision, preventive detention or recognizance with conditions, is the other key part of this bill. Again, this compromises a key principle of our justice system: that one should be charged, convicted and sentenced in order to be jailed.

This provision would allow the arrest and detention of people without ever proving any allegation against them. It could make people subject to conditions on release, with severe limitations on their personal freedom, and again, even if they have never been convicted of any crime.

Jailing people because we think they might do something criminal is very problematic, to say the very least, and it is easily apparent how such a measure can be easily abused. It is very similar to the provisions of the security certificate legislation in our Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. Under that legislation, five men remain either in jail or subject to incredibly strict release conditions, house arrest conditions, even though they have never been convicted of any crime in Canada.

Hassan Almrei remains in jail at the Kingston Immigration Holding Centre, a double maximum security prison. He has been there for almost seven years now, ever since just immediately after September 11, even though he has never been charged with, let alone convicted of, any crime.

Adil Charkaoui, Mohamed Harkat, Mahmoud Jaballah and Mohammad Mahjoub are prisoners in their own homes, guarded by their spouses and others. These situations are very unjust. It is wrong for this to be included in the immigration legislation. It is

wrong to include this same kind of measure in our anti-terrorism legislation.

These measures open very serious files on individuals, files alleging that they have some connection to terrorism. These files are opened on people who have never been convicted of any crime. They can be based on allegations that have never been proven. How do they defend themselves in such circumstances?

In this corner of the House, we believe that the Criminal Code is the best way to deal with issues of terrorism. The NDP justice critic, the member for Windsor—Tecumseh, in his minority report on the Anti-terrorism Act review, said the following:

There is no act of terrorism that is not already a criminal offence punishable by the most stringent penalties under the Criminal Code. This is obviously the case for premeditated, cold-blooded murders; however, it is also true of the destruction of major infrastructures.

Moreover, when judges exercise their discretion during sentencing, they will consider the terrorist motive as an aggravating factor. They will find that the potential for rehabilitation is very low, that the risk of recidivism is very high and that deterrence and denunciation are grounds for stiffer sentencing. This is what they have always done in the past and there is no reason to think they will do differently in the future.

I can think of no offence related to terrorism that is not already included in the Criminal Code. I can think of no circumstance of a crime committed as part of an act of terrorism that would not be dealt with in the strictest, toughest way by our courts.

For instance, counselling to commit murder is already an offence under the Criminal Code. Being party to an offence is also a crime.

The crime of conspiracy is well established under the Criminal Code and deals with the planning of criminal activity. Let us be clear. In the conspiracy category, no crime actually has to be committed for someone to be found guilty of conspiracy under the Criminal Code.

We also have hate crime legislation that outlaws the promotion of hatred against a particular group.

It should also be noted that peace bond provisions already exist in the Criminal Code and can be exercised when there are reasonable grounds to believe that a person's life or well-being is threatened by another person. This provision has similar power to preventive detention, but more significant safeguards are built into the Criminal Code provision. No one has demonstrated to my satisfaction that this existing provision will not meet the needs of dealing with terrorist activity.

● (1010)

As Denis Barrette, spokesperson for the International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group and la Ligue des droits et libertés has said:

—Canadians would be better served and better protected if the authorities rely on the standard provisions of the Criminal Code. The use of arbitrary powers and the lowering of the standard of proof are no substitute for police work carried out in compliance with the rules. Indeed, these powers open the door to miscarriage of justice and the significant likelihood of damaging the reputation of individual citizens...

Government Orders

If our police and intelligence authorities do not have the resources they need to investigate potential terrorist acts and to charge those responsible, then we should review their needs immediately.

We cannot consider the bill without considering the question of racial and religious profiling. Racial and religious profiling is a problem in terrorism related investigations and prosecutions. It is a reality for many Canadians, especially those in the Arab and Muslim communities, but also to other people in other racial minority groups.

The provisions of Bill S-3 do nothing to reduce such concerns or to protect Canadian citizens from such profiling. We have to struggle with the experience of Arab and Muslim communities in Canada in the post-September 11 period.

Imam Zijad Delic, the national executive director of the Canadian Islamic Congress, and formerly the Iman of the mosque in my community, brought some of the concerns of Canadian Muslims before the Senate committee. He noted their position that the Criminal Code could deal fully with terrorism-related crimes and that it best balanced security with human rights. He also noted that ensuring all Canadians participated fully in our society without having to be regarded with suspicion was very important. He said:

Education, engagement, participation and institutional integration through inclusion are far better alternatives....moving forward with good faith will create the atmosphere of trust, cooperation and engagement we need to make progress.

He also made a very direct plea at the committee when he said:

On policies and practices, profiling Canadian Muslims is an issue on which the Government of Canada and Canadian Muslims differ significantly. Muslims cannot accept that we are profiled as a security threat to our own country. If government policy is not engaged in profiling, its actual operational practices speak differently, as evidenced by many cases in Canada. Please do not give our law-and-order people more power without appropriate accountability....Canada does not need laws that will prevent its citizens from feeling accepted, embraced, safe and secure. Canada needs to rethink its approach toward this bill and to focus on bridge-building between government and the many communities and groups that make us the unique mosaic we are.

There is an important message in his statement. We must pay clear attention to the effect that legislation like Bill S-3 and its extraordinary provisions have in our communities, the effect that it will have on some law-abiding, honourable Canadians. If the legislation increases their insecurity, if it does not promote their safety, how can we believe that somehow it adds to the overall protection of Canadian society?

J.S. Woodsworth, the first leader of the CCF, once said, "What we desire for ourselves we wish for all". We would be well advised to struggle with the meaning of that in the context of developing anti-terrorism and security measures that are experienced positively by all those Canadians who seek peace and justice, respect the law, promote values of equality and oppose terrorism.

I should point out that the NDP has a proposal to address racial and religious profiling in Canada in Bill C-493, which I tabled in the House. The original version of this bill was tabled by the member for Vancouver East and after consultations with members of the Arab, Muslim, black, aboriginal and South Asian communities, it was revised and re-tabled as Bill C-493.

That bill states that enforcement officers from the RCMP, Canada Customs, Canada Revenue Agency, the immigration department,

Canada Border Security Agency, those operating under the Aeronautics Act or CSIS must not engage in racial or religious profiling. Those agencies must collect data to ensure this practice is not engaged and must put in place explicit policies and procedures to prevent it and to respond to complaints. They must also undertake an analysis of racism and how it functions in the context of the particular agency.

Racial and religious profiling is hugely detrimental to the stability and success of Canadian society. It must not be tolerated in any form. We must be explicit in our condemnation of it and ensure it is prohibited in law.

Denis Barrette also stated at the Senate hearings on Bill S-3:

These laws are used in emergencies, where fear and panic are at the forefront— somewhat like what happened at the time of September 11, 2001.

- (1015)

Fear is never a good adviser. It is rather in moments of peace and quiet that the importance of preserving rights and freedoms should be rationally assessed. It is obviously important to defend them in difficult times, but we must plan for how to protect them in difficult times.

It is easy to protect rights and freedoms in peaceful times. We must provide for the unpredictable and ensure that, in a moment of panic, legislation does not result in innocent victims because it was poorly conceived or because it was dangerous or useless.

I say clearly that I am opposed to Bill S-3 and the revisions it makes to the Anti-Terrorism Act, to reintroduce investigative hearings and preventive detention. We should instead let the Criminal Code of Canada do the job, a job it is fully capable of doing. We must also ensure that our police and intelligence authorities have the resources they need to carry out their investigations effectively and with respect for all Canadian citizens for human rights and for civil liberties.

- (1020)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for my colleague across the way.

What happens when an individual is a suspect and then ends up being found not guilty? What happens then? Does the bill provide for any compensation or anything else? What happens to that person who was labelled and whose reputation was tarnished by accusations that turned out to be untrue?

Could the member tell me, and everyone listening today, whether there are any provisions in this bill that provide something for those individuals who were suspected and turned out to be innocent?

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Siksay: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure the legislation provides anything in that regard, and this is a serious problem. The legislation opens the door to people being subjected to extreme penalties, like detention, like having severe limitations put on their everyday activities, based on allegations that have never been proven in a court of law. That is one of the most unjust things a society can do to anyone.

Government Orders

The fact one can have allegations that are never tested by our rules of evidence, that are never tested in a court of law and that this can determine whether a person is free to move in society is extremely unjust.

Yesterday during the debate, we heard one member talk about his experience in a standing committee. I believe a representative of CSIS brought in an example of the kinds of dossiers it had on some people who were of concern to it. The member described this as being a very significant document, which outlined many very serious concerns. He said that he found it very disturbing.

He said that he put a question to a representative from the Civil Liberties Organization. He asked if the person wanted to live next door to a person like that. He said that the answer was no, that the person did not want to next door. I would have to look at the context of that discussion and question.

However, if I were to answer that question, I would consider the document provided to be a large dossier of allegations and until the day it was proven beyond a reasonable doubt in a court of law, that person deserved to live in my neighbourhood, or anybody else's neighbourhood. When we begin to make judgments about our fellow citizens, based on unproven allegations, we have gone down a very slippery slope to a place where I think most Canadians would have very serious concerns about human rights and civil liberties in our country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the member for Burnaby—Douglas on his speech. I know that he is a parliamentarian who always prepares his speeches carefully.

This bill raises a number of concerns. In fact, it is giving grey hair to all the parliamentarians in this House who are concerned about human rights.

We are discussing provisions that the House did not vote for and that someone is trying to bring back to life. I would like our colleague to tell us how many objectionable provisions there are in this bill in terms of the major constitutional guarantees provided by the charter, for example, the presumption of innocence and the right to remain silent.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Siksay: Mr. Speaker, the member for Hochelaga is absolutely correct. Those of us who are concerned about civil liberties and human rights in Canada are very concerned about the legislation, and it causes significant worries for us. We have to be very clear.

The House did something proper, at the time the provisions were about to be sunsetted, in voting down an extension of these provisions. It is very clear that there has been no demonstrated need for them in Canada. We have good Criminal Code legislation that makes it very clear. Any of kinds of criminal activity associated with terrorism are of the most serious kinds of crime and they have some of the harshest penalties associated with them. The Criminal Code provides for processes of long-standing that balance the need to protect individual freedoms and the security and the needs of the state. There have been many years, centuries even, of jurisprudence to get us to that point in Canada, where we have a system that

balances those concerns. It is very important we show respect for that system.

I am not convinced extraordinary measures have been necessary. In fact, they have never been used when they existed in that five-year period. It does not seem they have been part of what has been necessary to protect us in the circumstances that exist in the world today. We have to be vigilant about these kinds of provisions that would take us to a different place, that would suspend some of the basic rights that we have.

I think if we told many Canadians that we currently had someone in jail in Canada for seven years who had never been charged or convicted of a crime, they would find it unbelievable and shocking and would want to know how that was possible in Canadian society. However, we already have this with the security certificate legislation and with the situation of Mr. Almrei, who is in the Kingston Immigration Holding Centre. This is a very draconian legislation and is currently being used in Canada.

Despite assurances that extraordinary measures are not to be used or are only to be used in very extreme or difficult circumstances, here we have someone who has been detained for that period of time without any possibility of being released. It looks very bleak in that sense right now, given the extension of the legislation.

We have to be very vigilant about our commitment to human rights and civil liberties, to the principles of the charter and to ensure we judge this legislation in that light before it comes to a vote in the House of Commons.

• (1025)

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the speaker is raising unnecessary concerns that these provisions will somehow be abused. In fact, there are many safeguards with respect to the recognizance conditions.

First, I should point out that the consent of the Attorney General of Canada or the attorney general or solicitor general for the province has to be obtained.

Second, it is only if the person refuses to enter into the recognizance that her or she can be incarcerated, and that is an important point. Also, the person who enters that recognizance has the right to apply to change or to vary the conditions under the recognizance order.

It seems to me that many of the concerns he has raised are unnecessarily raising fear among Canadians that this will somehow be abuse.

Would he respond to those comments?

Mr. Bill Siksay: Mr. Speaker, why would we put someone in jail who has never been convicted of a crime in Canada, which is what this provision would do? Why would we put extreme limitations on people's personal freedoms when it has never been proven that they have committed a crime or posed any threat to Canadian society?

Government Orders

The problem with the legislation is that it takes those kinds of cases out of our usual justice system and makes an exception. It basically says that allegations have been made against a person, even though nothing has been proven in a court of law that the person has actually done anything, and we need to restrict the person's freedom in order to protect society.

We already have the possibility of doing that under the Criminal Code. Conspiracy is a crime under the Criminal Code, as is plotting a criminal activity. We should use those provisions and subject the person to the rigours of the Criminal Code, and the state to the rigours of the Criminal Code in those instances as well.

I see no excuse for short-circuiting that process. No one has been able to show that this has been necessary in the five years since September 11. We have charged people with offences related to alleged terrorist activity but we did not use these kinds of provisions to do that.

I think it is very dangerous to have this kind of extraordinary sweeping provision on the books when we already have legislation in the Criminal Code that can deal effectively with any situation that might arise and also balances the need for security and respect for human rights and civil liberties in Canada.

● (1030)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga, BQ): Mr. Speaker, before I begin my speech, I would like to mention that yesterday marked the departure of the head of parliamentary interpretation, Monique Perrin D'Arloz, who worked at the House of Commons for 35 years. On behalf of all parliamentarians, I want to thank her for being our voice. I attended the reception in honour of her departure. I thank her for being so dedicated to all the members of this House.

It is rather troubling to talk about Bill S-3. To understand this bill, you have to start with the 2001 terrorist attacks, which showed us that there was a connection between civil societies and terrorism. There were many expressions of solidarity from Canada. In his memoirs, former Prime Minister Jean Chrétien talks at great length about the close historical relationship between Canada and the United States. President Kennedy once told John Diefenbaker, "Geography made us neighbours. History made us friends." We have a special relationship with the United States that sometimes has advantages and sometimes disadvantages.

All Quebecers and Canadians were shocked and saddened to see the twin towers collapse, because they felt for the people involved.

Nevertheless, a few months later, Anne McLellan, who would become the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, but was then the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Canada, acted with some haste. Certainly, those were troubling times. No one in this House wants to minimize the events of September 2001.

But now we have had time to look back on things. The Anti-terrorism Act that was introduced was studied, clause by clause, by a special legislative committee. If I remember correctly, our colleague from Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel and the current defence critic, the member for Saint-Jean, represented the Bloc Québécois on that committee.

There was a certain collective anxiety and very strong pressure from the Americans, who had passed the Patriot Act. I do not want to talk about that American legislation, which goes much further than the Canadian legislation, but there was a sort of collective psychosis that may have led us to ignore human rights and major civil liberties a little too easily.

That does not mean the Bloc Québécois is minimizing the risk terrorism presents to society. The Bloc Québécois has long been interested in the entire issue of organized crime. An entire generation representing this House followed the work of CIOC. I was eight when the work of CIOC began, but others will remember quite clearly the tainted meat scandal. Many Quebecers followed the CIOC proceedings. This was an opportunity to see that organized crime was not just a theory, but that it had taken root in the community.

Then there was a period of calm. In the 1990s, unfortunately, organized crime began to run rampant again, especially in large cities like Montreal. There was a fierce battle over the drug market. In my riding of Hochelaga—Maisonnette, this battle resulted in the car bomb attack that took the life of young Daniel Desrochers on August 9, 1995. This led us, and all parliamentarians in this House, to wonder how effective the measures in the Criminal Code were for dismantling major organized crime networks.

Today we are going a little further: we have to deal with terrorism.

● (1035)

Terrorism, in its contemporary form, attacks civil society through what are called undifferentiated attacks. It can be bombs in a subway, where groups, not individuals, are the target. When public buildings are attacked, no one in particular is targeted. Civil society is under threat. It is more serious and more difficult for law enforcement agencies to foil, investigate and dismantle terrorist networks that have a much broader scope than organized crime ever did.

I recently read a piece by Charles-Philippe David, the brother of the leader of Québec solidaire. He wrote that the driving force behind terrorism in the 21st century has largely, but not exclusively, been based on religious considerations. No country is safe from terrorism, but some countries are targeted more than others. In political science and history classes, we learned that the United States was the world's police officer. Their interventionist international policy obviously makes them a bigger target.

Government Orders

I do not want to leave out an important component of the historical background. Shortly after 2001, the Liberals introduced a bill that the Bloc Québécois did not support. There was a lot of pressure at that point in time. The Bloc Québécois did not support the bill because we questioned how effective it would be. We did not want to downplay the potential for a terrorist attack. We knew that it was a real possibility, and we wanted emergency measures and plans to be in place. I know that the civil protection people were working on this. However, we did not believe that the measures proposed at that time were the right ones.

For example, there was the possibility that people might be arrested without charges. And that goes against a fundamental principle of our justice system. When we want to bring people before the courts, we have a constitutional obligation to present evidence in order to charge them. If it is a serious matter, we proceed by way of indictment so that we can bring the entire justice system into play, with a defence lawyer and a crown prosecutor. We present the evidence. If it is a very serious matter, we proceed with a jury, and a trial will follow.

Former minister McLellan's bill twisted the administration of justice in two ways. When Anne McLellan's bill was introduced in the House, it contained a sunset clause. At the time, we were told that the provisions of the act would expire after a certain period of time, following which a parliamentary committee would study them and we, as parliamentarians, would decide whether it was appropriate to extend them. I would point out that the House did not consider it appropriate to extend provisions in the Criminal Code concerning sections 83.28, 83.29 and 83.3. Accordingly, we voted against it, and most members of the House decided to allow the provisions to expire. The feeling was unanimous among members of the Bloc Québécois and the NDP. If I remember correctly, the Liberals were divided and the government was unanimous.

What are we concerned about? First, we are concerned about the so-called investigative hearings. This is all based on allegations. No charges have been laid, nobody has been convicted; nobody has even been put on trial. The government is getting ahead of the justice system and once again, it wants us to support sections 83.28 and 83.29 of the Criminal Code. These are what they call investigative hearings.

• (1040)

Let me explain because this is somewhat technical and I would like our fellow citizens to understand what it is all about. A peace officer—a police officer to put it simply—may make an application to a provincial court judge—in Quebec, warrants are issued by provincial court judges—or a superior court judge with the prior consent of the Attorney General. It is correct to say, as our friend did earlier, that the consent of the Attorney General is required for an order for the gathering of information to be issued.

A peace officer or his agent may go before a superior court judge or a provincial court judge and explain that he would like to gather more information on a given individual because he has reasonable grounds to believe that the individual in question may have terrorist connections.

I remind the hon. members that we are talking about information in a context where no charges have been laid and no trial held, and

that such an approach is totally arbitrary. The individual is required to appear before a judge. Hopefully, he or she will be notified in writing. The individual would be ordered, for example, to report to the Montreal courthouse next Tuesday, at 10 a.m., for an examination and to face justice. We are talking about an examination before a judge, where the individual will be required to answer questions. He or she may not refuse to answer.

In addition, the general principle whereby one has the right not to incriminate oneself does not apply under sections 83.28 and 83.29. The only exception, of course, is a person who has privileged information, for instance someone working for Criminal Intelligence Service Canada. These people are never required to disclose privileged information, the same way that police officers are never required to divulge their sources.

So, the examination is held before a judge, and the individual is required to answer the questions. Naturally, one might want to trivialize this. I heard earlier a government member say that the Attorney General was certainly necessary and that the person has the right to counsel. But do members not realize that we are talking about a situation where no charges have been laid against the person, yet he or she had to undergo questioning before any formal judicial process has been initiated? That is worrisome.

I must remind the House that this is similar to what happened with security certificates. That is another issue, but it follows the same logic. The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration along with the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Canada can sign a certificate ordering that an individual be arrested, tried and convicted, without having any access to the evidence that led to his or her arrest.

At the time, it was my colleague, Michel Bellehumeur, member for Berthier—Montcalm, who is now a member of the judiciary, given his talent and experience, who had raised this issue. When we of the Bloc Québécois said this was somehow detrimental to justice and showed a lack of respect for fundamental freedoms, at the time, the Liberals refused to accept our arguments. The case went before the Supreme Court of Canada and, in January 2006 or 2007, the whole thing was of course declared unconstitutional. The government had to go back to the drawing board and introduce another bill. But we are not satisfied with that bill, because it designates a kind of *amicus curiae*, a friend of the court, who would have access to the evidence. Yet that friend of the court, who would be defending the accused, cannot share the evidence with his or her client.

Thus, we see some logic that is completely twisted and completely inexcusable with regard to some major constitutional guarantees. I would be willing to bet on this, even though I am generally quite cautious. I am not a man of great wealth, which is why I tend to be cautious. But I would be willing to bet that these provisions will find their way to the Supreme Court of Canada and that the government will lose again regarding the drafting of this bill.

• (1045)

It would be even more surprising given that sections 83.28 and 83.29 of the Criminal Code have never been invoked. Law enforcement organizations never used these sections once over a six or seven year period, that is from the time they were passed until the day of the failed vote to extend the sunset clause.

Government Orders

Why? Because there are other provisions already in the Criminal Code. As we learned in our law courses, pursuant to section 495 of the Criminal Code, a peace officer may arrest an individual and bring him before a justice of the peace if there are reasonable grounds to do so. Naturally, there must be some basis for this action. In fact, anyone can do this. For example, if I have reason to believe that my neighbour will rob a bank, I can go before a judge and lay the information. This person may be summoned to appear and may have to enter into a peace bond.

Naturally, these provisions apply to the issue of terrorist networks. We could not understand why we needed a new law when such provisions were already in place.

As for investigative hearings, they provide a means of obtaining information about individuals who have not even been charged. They may be brought before a judge and undergo an actual examination, even though they may have legal representation, without ever having been charged.

The second clause of Bill S-3, which seeks to bring back the two clauses which expired after the vote in the House, pertains to section 83.3 of the Criminal Code, which deals with recognizance and preventive arrest and detention.

The scenario is as follows. Again with the consent of the Attorney General, who is generally the Minister of Justice, a peace officer who believes that a terrorist act will be committed can require that a person sign a recognizance with conditions or ask that the person be arrested, if necessary, to prevent a terrorist act from being committed. This peace officer will lay an information before a provincial court judge. The judge will order the person to appear if the judge is convinced that this is necessary. According to the bill, the person will have 24 hours after the information is laid to appear. A show-cause hearing will then be held to determine whether or not the person should be arrested or whether conditions should be imposed on the person. Generally, these conditions pertain to the person's movements and contacts with certain people.

In short, the difference is that this person can be formally arrested.

It is true that the Criminal Code already contains section 810, which, if memory serves, was adopted when we studied the first anti-gang bill. The Bloc Québécois won that battle, which resulted in an anti-gang law. I clearly remember that at the time, senior officials wanted to bring down organized crime using the conspiracy provisions. They had a hard time understanding that we were facing a new situation where people were very well organized into networks and formed a veritable industry that terrorized big cities like Montreal, Vancouver and Toronto.

Consequently, there are already provisions whereby individuals can be required, preventively, to keep the peace or not have contact with certain people. For example, in cases of sexual assault, the person must not be allowed to have contact with victims. Here, though, we have a situation where people can be arrested preventively, without being charged or tried.

Clearly, this bill is rather disturbing. I do not believe that the Bloc Québécois can support this bill, and we invite all members to reject it.

● (1050)

I will close by saying, once again, that the Criminal Code contains everything needed to intervene; we do not need these provisions.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member from the Bloc for his intervention.

The concerns that we have had on this side have been about due process. We have heard from the government and others regarding due process, suggesting that all is well and that the Conservatives have the right balance somehow. They have taken a piece of legislation, which they believe was riddled with problems, but nonetheless, enough was done to repair the concerns.

I am particularly concerned about due process, the provision of evidence and what happens when someone does give a statement and what happens to that.

I would like the hon. member's take on the concerns he might have as a member of Parliament, as a legislator. Does he believe that the balance is right? We have certainly heard from his speech the concerns he has, but could he elaborate on that, particularly concerning evidence and due process?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, we do not believe this bill is balanced. First, as we have said, there are at least two constitutionally recognized rights being ignored in this bill, namely the right to remain silent and the right not to self-incriminate. When we start talking about preventive arrests, there is little room for those rights to be respected.

We also do not understand why these provisions are needed when sections 495 and 810 of the Criminal Code already include everything we need to lay charges when necessary.

This is not a balanced bill. It only addresses the allegation stage. There is no room for proof beyond a shadow of a doubt, which is generally the threshold in criminal law. There is reason to be worried about the potential adoption of these provisions.

Ms. Nicole Demers (Laval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague and I am very proud that he is taking an interest and trying to uphold the rights we have acquired over the years.

I know that my colleague is very young, so he likely does not remember that an entire society, Quebec's francophone society, was put on trial in October 1970. I was 20 years old, six and a half months pregnant, and I was a victim of and witness to the war measures unjustifiably instituted simply because a few people had misstepped and committed crimes. But an entire society was put on trial and things went too far. Hundreds of people were unjustly accused, without even being told what they were accused of.

Statements by Members

This experience traumatized me for a long time. Now, when I hear about provisions that could infringe on rights and muzzle me, I have to question whether they are appropriate or legitimate. I wonder if my colleague thinks the government wants to include these provisions in the bill so that it can move forward with its right-wing agenda, its right-wing ideology.

● (1055)

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her question. It is true that I was eight years old in 1970. I vaguely remember it. We can remember certain things, even from when we were eight. My parents also told me about the tanks on the streets of Montreal at that time. And they certainly remember the artists, the people who were targeted for arrest.

Imagine that in 1970 we suspended habeas corpus, a provision of the law whereby people cannot be arrested without a warrant. The Charter did not exist then; there was only the Canadian Bill of Rights. As for all of the abuses described by my colleague, which were traumatic for both individuals and society, we were not protected because there were not enough legal rights.

Even though there are charters in Quebec City and Ottawa, they still want to regress in terms of ensuring human rights. My colleague is right in making this comparison, and yes, we should be worried.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud my colleague's eloquence. As a new member elected in 2006, I have looked to him as a model. I am inspired by his very clear way of explaining the issues surrounding such an important bill—a bill the Bloc Québécois will not support.

I am not an expert in legal matters, but what I would like to understand is, does this bill include a section or a clause that explains what happens to the individual, the man or woman, who is under suspicion, is taken in for questioning and who is thereafter stigmatized and labelled and suffers the consequences because the community knows about it, even though the suspicions or allegations against that person turn out to be unfounded? What does this bill say about that? I would like my colleague to explain that. What is there in this bill for an individual who was under suspicion and turned out not to be guilty?

Mr. Réal Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question.

In the case of preventive arrest, during the judge's questioning, an individual can find out on the basis of which allegations he or she has been brought before the judge. The member is right: this bill, combined with what we know about the security certificate process, means that individuals will not have access to the evidence or to the normal process that is supposed to be followed for a trial. The only way for an individual to find out what he or she is accused of is through questioning, through interaction with the judge who questions him or her.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

AMATEUR SPORTS

Mr. Gary Goodyear (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is that time of year when Canadians are enjoying the excitement of the NHL playoffs.

I would like to draw to the attention of the House a local hockey organization that is working to provide amateur athletic sports programs to persons with developmental disabilities.

The Cambridge Ice Hounds began in September 2006 and has grown to over 35 participants, making Cambridge the centre of one of the most successful special hockey programs in the province.

As well, congratulations go to the Galt Minor Hockey School for celebrating its 40th year of operation. Believed to be one of the oldest in Canada, it started in 1967 with an enrolment of 40 kids and has since grown to over 12,000 registrations.

Finally, congratulations to our local athletes of the year at their respective universities: Anthony Maggiacomo, Wilfrid Laurier; Carly Cermak, McMaster; and Lindsay Carson, University of Guelph.

Congratulations, Cambridge. Go, team.

* * *

● (1100)

PEACE IT TOGETHER

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House a non-government organization in my riding which, though small, does great work.

Peace it Together, as the organization is called, is run by an Israeli and a Palestinian. It began in 2004 as a summer camp, but its success is such that it now functions all year long bringing together Israeli, Palestinian and Canadian youth in a safe environment in B.C.

The youth interact, build bridges of understanding and learn the skills of conflict resolution. They confront the difficult problems they face back home in the Middle East as they forge common bonds and goals. The Canadian youth act as a buffer and they learn about the reality of hate and the solution of negotiation. The youth use film, multimedia and dialogue as their tools.

This group has no government funding. The group needs it urgently because there is a huge demand to expand the program. We all know that the youth of today can be the peacemakers of tomorrow given the right help, yet the government has refused to meet with this group. What a shame.

* * *

● (1105)

[Translation]

ROBBERT FORTIN

Ms. Meili Faille (Vaudreuil-Soulanges, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we were saddened to learn of the passing of poet Robbert Fortin on April 14, 2008.

This great Quebecker, poet, painter and engraver had a magnificent career—especially as a poet—which saw him earn the grand prize at the Salon du livre de Toronto in 1996 for his book *Peut-il rêver celui qui s'endort dans la gueule des chiens* and the award of excellence from the Société des écrivains in 1998 for his book entitled *Je vais à la convocation, à ma naissance*. In 2006, he published his tenth collection, *Les dès du chagrin*.

He was a member of the Union des écrivaines et écrivains québécois and senior editor, with the publishing house Éditions de l'Hexagone, of the poetry collection *L'appel des mots*, dedicated primarily to Quebec poetry.

On behalf of my Bloc Québécois colleagues, I would like to extend deepest condolences to the family, friends and colleagues of this great poet, Robbert Fortin.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN TAKEOVERS

Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since 1985, more than 12,000 Canadian firms, or the equivalent of over half our manufacturing sector, have become foreign owned. In Hamilton, steel giants Stelco and Dofasco were sold off, as were other Canadian icons, like Molson, Labatt and the Montreal Canadiens. When ownership leaves Canadian hands, jobs often follow.

But last week, we found out that it is possible to stand up for Canadian interests and stop these takeovers. We almost lost cutting edge space technology that was designed to protect our Arctic sovereignty and monitor climate change because the previous Liberal government privatized it, but pressure from NDP MPs and average Canadians blocked the corporate buyout that would have handed vital Canadian space technology to a U.S. weapons contractor.

The industry minister rejected the deal for not providing a net benefit to Canada. Unfortunately, this is the exception, not the rule. Since 1985, not a single foreign takeover had been rejected and 87% had been approved without even being reviewed.

It is time for real leadership. The minister has announced that he will consider a new national security test for takeovers, but why can he not enforce an economic security test as well? He owes it to hard-working Canadians to ensure that decent paying jobs are not put in jeopardy by foreign takeovers.

* * *

PROSTATE CANCER

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam, CPC): Mr. Speaker, governments can and should do more to fight prostate cancer, which is the most common cancer among Canadian men.

According to the Canadian Cancer Society, this year it is estimated that almost 25,000 Canadian men will be diagnosed with prostate cancer and 4,300 men will die of it. On average, 475 men are diagnosed with prostate cancer every week. On average, 83 men die of prostate cancer every week. That is 11 men a day.

Statements by Members

The Motorcycle Ride for Dad is Canada's biggest annual motorcycle event dedicated to fighting prostate cancer through research, education and awareness. In 19 cities across the country, from St. John's to Vancouver and all points in between, Canadians on motorbikes will raise money and awareness to help fight this terrible disease.

I encourage anyone who can to visit www.motorcycleridefordad.org and join me on this ride.

On behalf of Parliament, I want to thank all the volunteers, the donors and sponsors for making this event the incredible success it has become. We hope that 2008's ride will be the best yet.

* * *

[Translation]

LUCIEN AND ADRIEN BOSSÉ

Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that people have the good fortune to celebrate their 80th birthday together. But twins Lucien and Adrien Bossé from Saint-François-de-Madawaska, born April 12, 1928, are doing just that.

They each have their own way of sharing their memories. They both like to say that since they were identical twins, they confused more than one person. They would change places to fool their teacher and had fun playing tricks on people.

The twins grew up and took different paths, but always remained close. Lucien had many careers. He worked in construction, for example, at Nadeau & Nadeau and as a cabinetmaker. He also enjoys doing volunteer work in his community. As for Adrien, he enjoyed a long career as a barber and later worked for Nadeau & Nadeau. He is also involved in various activities in his community.

On this unique and joyous occasion, the citizens of Madawaska—Restigouche join with me in wishing both Lucien and Adrien Bossé a very happy 80th birthday.

* * *

[English]

PHILIPPINES

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Philippines faces serious human rights challenges, notably the ongoing extrajudicial killings and the apparent culture of impunity. Canada raised these concerns on April 11 during the Human Rights Council's universal periodic review of the Philippines.

Canada also encouraged the Philippines to ensure that its security forces are aware of human rights and their responsibility to protect human rights defenders.

Canada is encouraged that the Philippines has expressed its commitment to end extrajudicial killings through undertaking initiatives such as Task Force Usig, the Melo commission, and the visit of UN Special Rapporteur Philip Alston. We also commend the laudable role of the Supreme Court in the preservation of human rights and in the pursuit of justice.

Statements by Members

We encourage the Philippines to work at implementing the recommendations and to make progress on convictions. Canada supports the Philippines in implementing measures to promote and protect the human rights of all Filipinos.

* * *

[Translation]

SCIENCE FAIR

Mr. Richard Nadeau (Gatineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this year, for the first time, a record number of students will be representing the Outaouais region at the Science Fair's national finals to be held in Montreal from April 17 to 20.

Four of the eight projects selected at the Outaouais finals were presented by students from high schools located in my riding of Gatineau: Célyanne Couture, Milène Paquin, Talia Losier, Émilie Courchesne and Émina Alic from the Polyvalente Nicolas-Gatineau, and David Gagnon from the Polyvalente Le Carrefour.

The top prize went to Émina Alic, a grade 10 student enrolled in a math and science concentration, for her science popularization project entitled "The hidden face of cosmetics" dealing with the dangers associated with these products.

It is with great pride that the Bloc Québécois joins me in congratulating everyone of these students for their drive, creativity and contribution to this major event. They own the future.

* * *

[English]

HAROLD BUCHWALD

Mr. Steven Fletcher (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Canada lost a great Canadian, Harold Buchwald.

After completing his Masters of Law at the University of Manitoba, he went on to establish one of the pre-eminent law firms in the country. He became known in Manitoba as the "go to guy" for community organizations and often was their saviour.

Mr. Buchwald was chair of the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra and became its director emeritus. He was director of countless community organizations, including the Jewish Foundation of Manitoba.

He received an honorary doctorate degree from his beloved University of Manitoba and was honoured by the Hebrew University. Most recently, he was involved with the Canadian Human Rights Museum and initiatives to save the Upper Fort Garry gate. Mr. Buchwald was inducted into the Order of Canada in 1993.

He is survived by his wife Darlene, sons Jeffrey and Richard, daughter-in-law Tracy, and grandchildren Rachael, Serena and Adam.

Whenever a musical note is heard in Manitoba or a piece of art is appreciated, a part of Harold's soul is present.

ORGAN AND TISSUE DONATION

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to National Organ and Tissue Donation Awareness Week, which will begin April 20. Next week will help raise awareness of the vital importance of organ and tissue donations to help improve and extend the lives of so many.

I would also like to recognize my constituent, Emile Therien, for arranging a donation following the loss of his beautiful daughter, Sarah Beth.

In 2006 Sara Beth became a pioneer in Canadian organ donation. Prior to her actions, organs were not accepted from those who had died of heart related issues. Before becoming ill, Sarah Beth had signed an organ donation card and the Therien family worked with hospital staff to ensure that her generous and compassionate wish to help others was granted.

Filling out a donor registration form is not time consuming, but it can change so many lives. As medical technology increases, more transplants will become possible, but more donations are desperately needed.

I encourage all Canadians to sign their donor cards.

* * *

• (1110)

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Bruce Stanton (Simcoe North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, leadership means that when one makes a decision, one sticks to it. Leadership means having a vision and a plan of how to get there. Leadership means recognizing the truth from fiction. These are all things that the Liberal Party is sorely lacking.

The Liberals are out of touch with the issues that matter most to Canadians. They choose to focus on scandals that do not exist, and cheap smear jobs based purely on fantasy. They just do not get it.

Thankfully, our Conservative government does get it.

We recognize the issues that are important to regular citizens and we have taken concrete action. For example, continuing with our strengthening of justice legislation, just this past week we moved to toughen penalties for auto theft. We are making life more affordable for working families, and we are taking action to improve the health of Canadians.

While the opposition continues to demonstrate its lack of leadership, this government is getting the job done.

* * *

SPECIAL EVENTS

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to support the Friends of Ethiopia and join in its celebration of the Ethiopian millennium.

To mark this historic event, Friends of Ethiopia is sending some of the basic tools for self-sufficiency and independence to Ethiopia.

I attended the launch of its first event when it approached the City of Ottawa to donate an ambulance. Soon the ambulance will be sent to Ethiopia.

Statements by Members

I congratulate Friends of Ethiopia and its founder, Samuel Getachew. I wish the Friends of Ethiopia every success.

I wish to pay tribute as well to the Public Service Commission which is celebrating its first centenary this year. On behalf of my hon. colleagues, I extend best wishes to all of its employees who continue to help the Public Service Commission do its important work on behalf of Canadians.

I encourage everyone to visit the Library and Archives of Canada from April 29 to May 2, when the library will be hosting a special historical exhibit that highlights the Public Service Commission's achievements during the past 100 years.

* * *

EARTH DAY

Hon. Bryon Wilfert (Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the rest of the world celebrates Earth Day on April 22, Canadians will be left to wonder why the government has abandoned Canada's role as an environmental leader.

Earth Day 2005 was a high water mark for Canada's commitment to the environment. The leader of the official opposition was our environment minister. We announced the greenest budget in Canadian history. The world had asked Canada to chair the UN conference on climate change later that year.

How far we have fallen in the last two years. On Earth Day 2008, we will be left with an Environment Minister who cavorts with known climate change deniers. He advises the Prime Minister, caught funding ads through the University of Calgary, claiming that global warming does not exist.

The government's climate change plan has been denounced by every environmentalist, scientist and economist who has studied it.

On Earth Day 2008, we will have met the government's appalling lack of action on the environment. We also know that Canada has done and can do much better.

* * *

[Translation]

OLYMPIC HALL OF FAME

Mr. Robert Vincent (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on April 12, Danièle Sauvageau and Guillaume Leblanc were inducted into the Olympic Hall of Fame, both of whom have distinguished themselves as athletes in Quebec.

Initiated to Olympic race walking when he was merely 10 years old, Guillaume Leblanc already had the love for that sport in him. After winning a fourth place at his first Games, in 1984, he finally climbed on the second step of the podium in 1992, in Barcelona. This was the first time in 88 years that a Quebec athlete accomplished the feat of winning an Olympic medal in track and field.

In 2002, as head coach and managing director of the Canadian women's hockey team, Danièle Sauvageau led her team to victory and a gold medal at the Olympic Games in Salt Lake City. Never in the history of that sport had that happened before. She has been the

first female coach in Quebec's major junior hockey league and the first female hockey commentator on the CBC French network.

On behalf of all my colleagues from the Bloc Québécois, I want to congratulate today these truly exceptional Quebecers and to thank them for the inspiring example they set.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE SYSTEM

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, the Conservatives launched their stronger justice system week. On Tuesday and Wednesday, as part of the Conservatives' justice week, the RCMP raided their party headquarters.

The facts are clear. Elections Canada has ruled that the Conservatives broke Canada's election laws. The Conservatives have refused to cooperate fully with the Elections Canada investigation, which has led to the unprecedented RCMP raid on Conservative headquarters.

The Ontario Supreme Court issued a search warrant authorizing that raid. Canadians deserve to know what is in that Ontario Supreme Court warrant.

What are the Conservatives hiding? Why are the Conservatives so soft on Conservative crime?

* * *

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the Liberal Party for their continued support of our government.

In the past several months, the Liberal Party has opposed our budgets, our tackling crime packages, our environmental plans and our immigration proposals. While the Liberals have rabidly attacked these proposals, when push comes to shove and it is time to vote their convictions, the Liberals can be seen scurrying from the House, sitting on their hands and abstaining, actually voting to support our proposals, or just not showing up.

The Liberal leader has threatened an election monthly since becoming the leader of the party, only to retreat and retrench.

Is it any wonder Canadians have absolutely no idea where the Liberal Party stands on any issue?

While our government continues to improve the lives of Canadians by standing up for them, the Liberal Party continues to ride the pine collecting splinters.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTIONS**

• (1115)

*[English]***ELECTIONS CANADA**

Mr. Michael Ignatieff (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fundamental issue in the Conservatives' election spending scandal is relatively simple. They exceeded legal spending limits of the national campaign by over \$1 million. They violated the Canada Elections Act. They broke the law.

When will the government admit that was why there was a search warrant and why there was a police raid?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the fundamental issue at play is one of interpretation of the act. Our interpretation of the act is that it is entirely all right for Conservative candidates to talk about their national leader and their national party policies in running election campaigns.

The position of Elections Canada is that we cannot do that. That is the interpretation that is at stake and the interpretation that is at the core of the proposition that was put forward by the member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore.

We have gone to court to fight an interpretation. Why one needs a warrant to understand how to fight an interpretation, we do not know. We have provided every—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore.

Mr. Michael Ignatieff (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a smokescreen.

The Federal Court made it clear two months ago that the Conservatives were the only party guilty of wrongdoing in this matter.

The government must be aware that there are some very serious punishments which result from breaches of the Canada Elections Act. It must be aware of the possibility of jail time. It must be aware that it can even be stripped of its status as a political party.

Are those not the real reasons that it has tried so desperately to obstruct Elections Canada? The issue here is obstruction.

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore came here with high heights as a man who it was thought would be a saviour and set a new standard for discourse. He talks about obstruction. There has been not one iota.

We have produced every document that Elections Canada has asked for with regard to our lawsuit initiated on this issue.

We have been quite open about it. We do not understand why that search by Elections Canada was necessary, the same way we do not understand why Conservative Party candidates are treated entirely different from Liberal Party candidates in this matter.

[Translation]

Mr. Michael Ignatieff (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, they continue to put up a smokescreen. Yesterday, we

asked the Conservatives to table the search warrant in this House but we were told that the affidavit was still sealed. The warrant and the affidavit are two different documents and they know it as well as we do. It is the warrant that is important for the time being.

Therefore, will they table the search warrant here and now in this House?

[English]

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have made the same response before.

We have not seen the affidavit, so obviously I cannot table that. A party official saw the search warrant but we are not in possession of that either, so I am in no position to table that.

Those are things the member will need to ask Elections Canada for. From the questions the Liberals have posed, they seem to know a lot more about this than we do.

Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the government House leader refused to confirm where the Prime Minister was the morning of the RCMP raid at Conservative Party headquarters, so we will try again.

Was the Prime Minister at Conservative Party headquarters at any time on Tuesday morning, April 15, before or during the police raid?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, talk about the absurdity of the questions put forward by the Liberal Party. The member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, following in the footsteps of the member for Wascana, is laying out exactly that proposition.

The answer is no. The Prime Minister has not been to party headquarters in all of 2008. I do not believe he has been there in the past 12 months. However, that does not stop the member for Wascana from asserting it as if it were a fact.

The problem with members of the Liberal Party is that they stand up and say things in this House that have no basis in fact, for which they have no evidence, because the only thing they can grasp onto, absent a leader and policy, is smear and pretend scandal.

• (1120)

[Translation]

Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all he had to do was answer no yesterday.

Will the Prime Minister and Leader of the Conservative Party table a copy of the search warrant in the House and agree to make public the affidavits pertaining to the warrant?

[English]

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, apparently the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine did not hear my response to the member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore on that issue. I would invite her to review that.

Oral Questions

I would also invite her to review my comments yesterday and my questions about her in and out scheme, how she accepted money from the Liberal Party of Canada, spent it in her local campaign, gave an identical, exact to the penny, amount of money back to the Liberal Party, while claiming a rebate for her riding campaign.

That is what the Liberals say is wrong but that is what the member did. If it is okay for her, why is not okay for us? That is the core of why we took Elections Canada to court. Why is she—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Joliette.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, despite the facts provided by Elections Canada, the Prime Minister continues to repeat that the Conservatives' election practices are legal. That is exactly the same argument he used when Elections Canada challenged the treatment of registration fees collected at their March 2005 convention. Six months later, the Conservative Party was forced to admit that it had neglected to report several hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Chief Electoral Officer.

Rather than waiting until his back is up against the wall, will the Prime Minister just admit that, in the last election, the Conservatives broke the Elections Act, period?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we absolutely will not because we did not. We have followed the law on every aspect in this matter. We took Elections Canada to court because we think we should be treated the same as everyone else.

He mentions the convention fees issue, which is an interesting one. I was president of another party, the PC Party of Canada, back in the days when Elections Canada said that it was perfectly fine to make those registration fees fully eligible for contributions. As a result, when it changed its interpretation, somebody did not tell us. Guess what? We were the only ones it picked on.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives must stop treating Quebecers and Canadians like fools. If the Conservative Party offices were searched, it is because they are hiding information and documents from Elections Canada. The phoney excuses we have heard all week only serve to discredit the Conservatives day by day.

Before losing their remaining shred of credibility, will they admit that they broke the law and will they table the Elections Canada and RCMP search warrant in this House?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yet another member who has not been paying attention.

We did not break the law. We followed the law. We do not have the warrant in our possession, so we cannot be in a position to table it. We certainly, in this regard, have followed practices that every party has followed.

Our dispute is one with Elections Canada. We have produced every document Elections Canada has requested in this regard. We have not done anything the member has suggested. We have been totally forthcoming and have provided every document Elections Canada has sought. That is where we stand. We are always prepared to cooperate fully.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Leader of the Government said, and I quote, "We have offered every document to Elections Canada". But that is impossible. There was a search, and in order for there to be a search, Elections Canada would have had to prove to a judge that it could not obtain the information without a warrant. He should stop misleading the House.

What is the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons waiting for to table the warrant in the House right now?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the first thing I would have to wait for in order to table it would be to actually have it, so I am in no position to table it. Elections Canada would be the one to do that, and the member can go talk to it.

In terms of the question of our having to produce documents, we have produced every document sought.

Members should remember that we were the ones who initiated this case against Elections Canada. We have put the evidence on the table. We have been open every step of the way. The issue is one of interpretation. There has never been a question of availability of documents.

The issue is a legal interpretation of the law, where it says that our candidates cannot talk about their leader and their policy. It does not make sense to us. It does not make sense why the other parties are different.

• (1125)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, he should stop playing games. When the law states that the content of a warrant cannot be disclosed, it is to be fair to the party named in the search warrant. Nothing is stopping the Conservatives from simply telling us what the warrant said. They must know, since the police would have had to show it to the party officials before entering the building.

Why are they not telling us what the search warrant said if they have nothing to hide?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I said, we do not have the warrant. We have never seen the affidavit and insofar as the warrant is concerned, we understand it is about the issue that we have with Elections Canada, over which we have taken it to court. I will review for the benefit of the hon. member what that is.

Oral Questions

Elections Canada takes the position that Conservative Party candidates at the local level cannot advertise or promote their national leader, their national campaign policies and their national issues. We think that is absurd. We know that in the case of the Bloc Québécois, it had posters and banners all across the province in its local campaigns promoting its leader.

I can understand why perhaps the Liberal Party does not want to promote its leader in the next election. I can understand why it might not have any policies to put in its brochures, but we do and we are ready to do that in the next election, too.

* * *

CONSERVATIVE PARTY OF CANADA

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are fed up and appalled at the litany of scandals plaguing the Conservative government. None of them have been resolved. The Quebec adviser is under investigation. The Canadian Ambassador to the U.S. is under investigation. The chief of staff to the Prime Minister is under investigation. The Conservative election campaign is under investigation, complete with search warrants.

When is the government going to release the results of the five ongoing investigations into Conservative misdeeds? When is it going to release those results?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have been quite clear on this issue. I thought it was only the Liberal Party that liked to pursue the imaginary scandals because it does not have a leader or any policies. The NDP actually has some policies. We think they are very misguided but we actually thought it had them.

I can say quite clearly, as we have in the past, that in the case of all these imaginary scandals, there really is nothing there other than a Liberal Party desperate to dredge up stuff to hide its own leadership problems and its own policy problems.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government House leader seems to have forgotten that in the last election the Conservatives falsely promised that the years of Liberal style corruption in government would end. They promised clean, accountable government where nothing would be hidden. Well, nothing has changed. There are insulting answers in the House, obstinate ministers, RCMP raids, investigations by Elections Canada, and now we get stonewalling.

I ask again. When can we expect the release of any of the five ongoing investigations into the Conservative misdeeds? When are we going to get to the truth? When will Canadians get the truth on these investigations?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what has happened in every case so far is that we have gotten to the point where we put the results on the table and we find out, for example, that after allegations that a cabinet minister did something inappropriate, no less than the OPP says absolutely nothing wrong was done and he is totally clear. That is what happens every single time on every single issue.

I could go through them all, but it turns out that, guess what, there is nothing there because this is a government that is cleaner than any government before and certainly cleaner than the government that right now has the legacy of having its executive director for Quebec arrested on charges of all that money that was taken from taxpayers for the sponsorship scandal.

* * *

ELECTIONS CANADA

Ms. Martha Hall Findlay (Willowdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government House leader continues to mislead the House. The Conservative overspending scandal was not initiated by the civil court case. The Chief Electoral Officer has determined that Conservatives blew the election spending cap, tried to hide it, and then tried to hide national party advertising expenses through 66 local campaigns.

Elections Canada has confirmed that the raid was not related to the civil lawsuit. Why does the Prime Minister insist on ordering his people to mislead Canadians? What did the search warrant say?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it relates to the exact same question. The question is how to interpret the Elections Act and whether it is appropriate and permissible for local candidates to talk about their national leader and their national policies in their campaigns.

Apparently, it is all right for the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, and so many other Liberals, to take that kind of approach. It is all right for all the candidates for the Liberal Party, for example, in New Brunswick to do group regional advertising, pool funds and get rebates, but it is only the Conservative Party that cannot do that. That is the unfair treatment that led us to bring this matter to court.

● (1130)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Martha Hall Findlay (Willowdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, they are not answering. We can only conclude that they have something to hide. And it starts with the Prime Minister.

What is in this search warrant that they are trying to hide from Canadians?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have the same curiosity that the hon. member has. We have not seen the affidavit in support of the search warrant and it is indeed a puzzle because we have produced every document, in this interpretation dispute, that Elections Canada has sought.

In fact, we find the whole investigation kind of suspicious, where it came from. But Liberal Senator Campbell said yesterday in the Senate that he knew where the investigation came from. The Liberal senator said, "We initiated the investigation; you initiated the lawsuit". That seems awfully clear to me what he thinks about where it came from.

Oral Questions

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative spending scandal is about one thing: national party spending limits. The Conservative Party of Canada broke the law. That is what Elections Canada is investigating with police raids and search warrants. The law puts a limit on how much any party can spend in total at the national level. The Conservatives broke that law and had to find somewhere to hide the illegal spending.

Will the minister now consent to any court proceeding today or next week on unsealing the affidavit supporting the search warrant?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we share the same curiosity because, as we said, we provided every document that Elections Canada has sought with regard to our dispute on how the election spending should be interpreted, and you know what, Mr. Speaker, Elections Canada does make unduly rigid interpretations.

I know that because the guy that the member for Wascana supported for the leadership, the member for Toronto Centre now, actually took Elections Canada to court too on an interpretation. Guess what? He won and he is \$50,000 richer as a result, so is his party leader, and so is the deputy leader from Etobicoke—Lakeshore.

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has a personal vendetta against Elections Canada. Back in 2001, he called Elections Canada officials “jackasses”, his words, not mine. Time and again Elections Canada has blown the whistle on his right-wing schemes to violate the rules that guarantee fair and honest elections in Canada. So when he came into office, he changed the people at Elections Canada. But guess what? Those new officials believe in the law. They are the ones who raided the Prime Minister's party office.

Why is the government trying to reduce Canadian election laws to tin pot standards?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, apparently, that member should look to his left, look to his right, because every single one of those frontbenchers who ran for the leadership of his party, other than him who never ran for the leadership of his party in the end, every single one of them benefited from the fact that they said Elections Canada does not know how to interpret the law. They took Elections Canada to court. I guess they do not respect that institution either. But you know what, Mr. Speaker, they won because Elections Canada makes mistakes sometimes.

* * *

[Translation]

JUSTICE

Ms. Nicole Demers (Laval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the National Assembly of Quebec unanimously passed the following motion:

That the National Assembly indicate to the Parliament of Canada that Bill C-484 should not be passed since it could give rise to significant uncertainty as regards the criminalization of abortion and the legal status of the fetus.

Will the government join with Quebec and defeat this completely unacceptable bill?

[English]

Mr. Rob Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we have stated many times in this House and as the Minister of Justice has stated, the government has no plan to reopen the debate on abortion.

[Translation]

Ms. Nicole Demers (Laval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when will the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Status of Women and Official Languages have the courage to stand up and defend women? The free vote argument is not good enough. We clearly see the Conservative Party's reform agenda: to criminalize abortion through the back door, as was the case in more than 30 states in the United States. The religious right is thrilled, and so are pro-life groups.

Unless it is intending to criminalize abortion, will the government ask its members to vote against this bill, yes or no?

• (1135)

[English]

Mr. Rob Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I just said, the government has no plan to reopen the debate on abortion.

While I am on my feet, I would like to ask the hon. member: When is her party going to start standing up for justice in Canada? When is her party going to stand in favour of our bill to reduce drug offences and crack down on crime, people who sell drugs to kids in schoolyards, crack down on identity theft, and crack down on auto theft? That is what Canadians are wondering.

* * *

[Translation]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have learned that not only was Quebec opposed to police intervention in January 2004 on Kanesatake Mohawk lands, but so was the RCMP. We now know that this federal government decision was strictly political—just one more reason for it to reimburse its share of the costs incurred as a result of this operation.

Will the federal government assume its responsibilities and reimburse the Quebec government for that operation?

[English]

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government will not tolerate mismanagement of Canadian taxpayers' money. Unlike the previous Liberal government, any allegation of mismanagement is a matter that our government takes seriously. That is why we launched a forensic audit and the Minister of Public Safety expects to receive the final report in the upcoming weeks.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives can hide behind an operation undertaken by the Liberals all they want, but by refusing to reimburse the Quebec government, they are in league with the Liberals and endorsing a bad decision.

Now that they have an opportunity to act, will they correct the situation and reimburse the Quebec government?

[English]

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, unlike the government under which the alleged mismanagement occurred, we will shed light on these allegations. The Minister of Public Safety does expect to receive a final report in the upcoming weeks and the minister will take an appropriate course of action once he has reviewed the independent report.

* * *

[Translation]

MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Brian Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Foreign Affairs is an embarrassment to Canadians. The minister has done nothing to help Brenda Martin, who is still in a Mexican prison. The minister has done nothing to ban cluster bombs. In the only matter in which the minister has decided to take action, Afghanistan, he created an international incident last week.

How can the Prime Minister still have confidence in this minister? When will he ask the minister to step down?

[English]

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government has full confidence in the Minister of Foreign Affairs. However, what I would like to ask the hon. member is: When will he ask his leader to resign because his leader is the one who said that he would invade Pakistan.

Mr. Brian Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week the minister embarrassed Canada, just like that last response did, and put the government of Afghanistan in an impossible position. If it removes the governor of Kandahar, it looks like it is caving into NATO pressure. If he stays, its ability to combat corruption has been seriously compromised.

How many mistakes of this magnitude will it take before the incompetent Minister of Foreign Affairs is finally fired for his incompetence? How long will it take?

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that Afghanistan is a sovereign state that makes its own decisions about government appointments. Why does the hon. member not ask his leader why he wanted to invade Pakistan, which is a sovereign country? Why would he want to invade it? He should go ahead and ask his leader that question.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a government member, who was once labelled a foreign political saboteur by CNN, has undermined Canada's ability to have constructive dialogue with China on human rights.

The member for Calgary West has compared the Beijing Olympics to Adolf Hitler's 1936 Berlin Games. He has even mused about an insurrection.

With his foreign affairs minister calling for the overthrow of the governor in Kandahar and a backbencher calling for riots in Beijing, when will the Prime Minister put some diplomacy in his foreign affairs policy?

● (1140)

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the comments made by the member for Calgary West are his own views and do not reflect the views of the Government of Canada.

Canada has no plans to boycott the Beijing Olympics. However, Canada has serious concerns about human rights and we will continue the dialogue with China on that issue.

However, let me say very clearly, the comments of the member for Calgary West were his own views and do not reflect the views of the Government of Canada.

Hon. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, maybe it is time to build a firewall around the government caucus members. This is not the first time the member for Calgary West has helped to put this Conservative government on the world stage.

He is also infamous for calling Nobel peace prize winner Nelson Mandela a communist and a terrorist. Just recently, the foreign affairs minister has trashed the governor of Kandahar with allegations of corruption.

When will the Prime Minister rein in his foreign relations wrecking crew—

The Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of this government is very clear. The Prime Minister has stated it on many occasions. We will stand for human rights. We will stand for the rule of law. We will stand for democracy. Those are the driving forces for the foreign policy of this country. That is what this government will run on. That is the record of this government.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Canada's Supreme Court rendered its decision in two cases dealing with the "two beer defence". This defence has been used for years as a way for drunk drivers to escape responsibility for their actions.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice tell the House how this decision interacts with Bill C-2, our Tackling Violent Crime Act, to safeguard Canadians against those who commit serious and violent crimes?

Mr. Rob Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his interest in justice issues and in making Canada a safer place for all Canadians.

Obviously our government welcomes this decision. I am pleased to say that the portion of the Tackling Violent Crime Act dealing with impaired driving will come into force on July 2, 2008. The new law will strengthen investigation, enforcement and prosecution in cases of alcohol or drug impaired driving.

We are taking a practical approach to criminal justice, one that is tough but fair. We are eliminating inappropriate technicalities and finally giving victims a voice.

* * *

GASOLINE PRICES

Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we all know that hard-working families are paying too much at the pump. It is not complex: the big oil and gas companies are gouging. The Competition Bureau claims it cannot figure it out even after countless investigations, yet gas prices spike just before a weekend and when the weather gets nicer.

There is a fairer way: appoint an ombudsman and hand that office the power to regulate and make sure the law has teeth. When will this government stop standing up for the oil companies and start standing up for consumers?

Hon. Gordon O'Connor (Minister of National Revenue, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this government has been standing up for Canadians ever since we got elected.

We have had three very successful budgets with over \$200 billion in tax cuts. The GST has gone down from 7% to 5%, corporate income tax is down, and personal income tax is down. We are doing a lot for Canadians.

Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough that Canadians are getting hosed at the pump, but now they are getting hosed by this government. Consumers are not looking for rhetoric. They are looking for help.

Last weekend I spoke to a hard-working Hamilton dad who was forced to pull his son from soccer because, even for one of the most affordable of sports, the out of town tournaments come with a hefty gas bill. That is not a choice any working family should have to make.

Why will this government not show real leadership and legislate an oil and gas ombudsman?

Hon. Gordon O'Connor (Minister of National Revenue, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have shown real leadership. We have a sports credit for parents who have their children playing sports.

Let me say that it is the height of hypocrisy for the NDP to be talking about the price of gasoline. The NDP stands for carbon taxes. It has advocated putting carbon taxes on top of our current price. If

the NDP policy and the policy of the official opposition were implemented, gas would go up another 25¢.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government's record of broken promises led to yesterday's launch of a second day of action by Canada's aboriginal people.

There are promises such as the one the Prime Minister made to former students of Île-à-la-Crosse, not once but twice, that they would be included in the residential schools agreement. There are promises such as the campaign commitment that the government would put the wheels back on the Kelowna Accord.

Why will the minister not live up to the promises his government has made? Or is it that the Conservatives just say anything to get a vote?

• (1145)

Mr. Rod Bruinooge (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from the member for Labrador. In fact, I have to commend him for his recent trip to take part in the sealing industry's hunt off the east coast. I must admit it is appreciated that there are some members over there who support that industry.

In relation to comments recently made in relation to the upcoming day of protest, I note that when the national chief was before committee this week he had a lot of good things to say about our government. I look forward to addressing that in my next question.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are more empty promises. Let us look at the promises to Labrador, which were broken not once but twice. Where are the military commitments to 5 Wing Goose Bay? Where are the 650 troops? Where is the UAV squadron?

Is the Conservative government going to meet even one of its commitments or, again, will it just say anything to get a vote?

Mr. Laurie Hawn (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this government has made more commitments to the Canadian Forces in the rebuilding of Canada's place in the world than any government in recent history, in decades.

We have set a lot of priorities. They include 5 Wing Goose Bay, as they include all parts of the Canadian Forces. In fact, our priorities are logical. They are being funded. It is going to take a long time to get over the decade of darkness, but we are doing it.

We have priorities to set, unlike the party opposite. It had more priorities than Disney had dalmatians.

*Oral Questions***ETHICS**

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative government believes that everyone is out to get it: Elections Canada, the Nuclear Safety Commission and the Canadian Wheat Board. There is even an audiotape of a senior Conservative admitting the party tried to bribe Chuck Cadman, so I guess the Prime Minister is out to get it too.

What did the Prime Minister mean when he said they offered to replace “financial considerations” that Chuck Cadman might lose due to an election?

Mr. James Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member gets zero points for originality and 100 points for consistency. I have answered that question a number of times.

The only offer that was made to Chuck Cadman was that of rejoining the Conservative Party, presenting himself as a candidate and getting re-elected as a Conservative member of Parliament. That was the only offer made to Chuck Cadman.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just to correct the parliamentary secretary, he has been asked this question over 150 times and not once has he provided an answer.

This Chuck Cadman affair has ruined the reputation of Doug Finley and ruined the reputation of Ian Brodie, and I am concerned about my friend the parliamentary secretary and how it is sacrificing his credibility in the House.

The Prime Minister is on tape. Dona Cadman is on record. Has the parliamentary secretary asked the Prime Minister directly to explain the tape?

Mr. James Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question and the concern from my friend from Cape Breton. He forgets that of course Dona Cadman has said she believes the Prime Minister and has said that he is telling the truth.

We have been clear about the only offer that was made to Chuck Cadman, which was the one that I just described. That is the simple fact of this case.

Of course I sleep well at night knowing that I am not sacrificing myself to anything but simply the truth.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL AID

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the World Bank is calling on all governments for emergency action to prevent the food crisis from plunging 100 million people in poor countries further into poverty. The president, Robert Zoellick, is calling on the international community to give the UN world food program the \$500 million in emergency aid it needs by the end of the month.

Will the government follow the example of France, which has just doubled its emergency aid to poor countries, and respond to this call to support these countries in great need?

[*English*]

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this government is very much concerned about the crisis in food aid and the rising cost of food. In fact, the Minister of International Cooperation has just had a meeting with her counterpart in Japan about how to address this issue. However, I would like to remind the member that Canada is the second largest contributor to the World Food Bank. Our country is doing that.

• (1150)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, speaking of the food crisis taking hold in many countries, we were told in this House that the government planned to discuss it during major conferences to be held in the coming months.

Will the minister responsible for the Sommet de la Francophonie take the initiative and suggest putting this very important matter on the agenda for the Sommet de la Francophonie?

[*English*]

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the member that this is a very important issue. It is already on the international agenda of this government. The Minister of International Cooperation talked about it in Japan with the G-8 development ministers. We will continue to work with our counterparts around the world on this crisis in food aid.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Hon. Raymond Simard (Saint Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when asked this week about his attempt to breach the Privacy Act, the Minister of Agriculture gave a ridiculous response. The fact is that he tried to break the law twice by writing letters to the president and CEO of the Canadian Wheat Board asking for the names and addresses of and specific commercial information about individual producers.

Why did the Minister of Agriculture put in a second request to receive personal information after being warned the first time that he would be breaking the law?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Secretary of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister was clear this week. He acted within his powers. Instead of creating diversions here, the member should follow the wishes of the farmers to bring changes to the Wheat Board, as we do as government, and he should stand up in the House and vote once in a while.

SPONSORSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today the RCMP arrested Benoît Corbeil, the former director-general of the Quebec wing of the Liberal Party of Canada. He will face charges including fraud, exercise of influence, and conspiracy to defraud as a result of the investigation into the Liberal sponsorship scandal.

Canadians rejected this kind of corruption by voting in the Conservative Party in the last election. Can the government tell us what it has done to clean up this kind of corruption?

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have introduced the toughest anti-corruption law in Canadian history. That anti-corruption law has brought in whistleblower protection, expanded access to information and banned big money from the political process.

Now I would like to take the opportunity to invite the Liberal House leader to stand in his place and issue a formal apology to all Canadians for the massive criminal conspiracy known as the Liberal sponsorship scandal.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, despite years of delay we are finally getting down to selecting a new border crossing in Windsor.

The government has three proposals on the table that involve crossing the Detroit River. One of those proposals will require bulldozing through a historic community called Olde Sandwich Towne, the oldest European settlement west of Montreal. Another proposal will also require bulldozing of forests next to the Spring Garden ANSI, which is of significance for the environment.

Will the minister reject those two proposals and support a crossing that protects Sandwich Towne and the environment?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I will do no such thing. As the hon. member knows, this process has been ongoing for a number of years now. An organization has been put in place. It has looked at different alternatives. It looked at a number of options.

As we know, and I will repeat this in the House, this is the most important border crossing between Canada and the United States. This government is committed to making sure that this gateway is maintained and continues to progress.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it will be a cabinet decision at the end of the day and the minister has the power to do the right thing. We are calling upon him from my community to protect the children, to protect the environment and to protect Sandwich Towne, which is an area of historic significance. We do not take it lightly.

This is an opportunity to do the right thing for the community. There has been a long history of bad mistakes on the border. It is time to clean it up and do it right. This minister has to take his

Oral Questions

responsibility seriously, show some leadership and make sure we do it right this time.

• (1155)

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this question from my colleague is somewhat premature. He knows full well that everything has been put in place, every action has been taken, every rule and regulation will be followed, and everybody's concerns will be met.

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the merit of the court challenges program has been proven once again with Ms. Paulin's victory in the Supreme Court. The ruling acknowledges that the RCMP maintains its status as a federal institution under the Official Languages Act and must ensure bilingual services in Canada.

Why does the government refuse to recognize that the court challenges program is a useful tool in defending the rights of linguistic minorities? Why does the Conservative federal government not want to respect the will of the linguistic communities?

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government strongly supports official language minority communities. We announced \$30 million in funding and that hon. member and his party voted against that measure.

* * *

[English]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when I go home to my riding I hear from my local farmers that our Conservative government is delivering real results for Canadian farmers.

I hear how we listened to industry and made changes to the advance payments program. I hear how we delivered \$50 million for the cull breeding swine program. I hear about how we delivered \$600 million for Kickstart.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food speak to some of the other accomplishments of this Conservative government?

Mr. Guy Lauzon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, finally, I have a question from a member who really cares about agriculture.

This past week the Minister of Agriculture received a standing ovation from over 250 farmers attending a dinner in my riding. The loudest ovation of the night came when the minister talked about the real results we had achieved for supply management.

Oral Questions

After 13 years of nothing but talk from the Liberals and the irrelevant Bloc, our Conservative government is providing real results for our farmers. Unlike the party opposite, Canadian farmers are standing up and cheering for our actions.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Bill Siksay (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Oceans Day is exactly 51 days, 16 hours and 4 minutes away. The Living Oceans Society, David Suzuki Foundation and the Sierra Club have called for action on a Pacific north coast integrated management plan by that time, an ecosystem-based management plan that is sustainable, protects the environment and provides for human well-being as needed.

First nations, the province and the federal government must be directly engaged in this development. Will the government commit today to launching a formal Pacific north coast integrated management plan process by Oceans Day?

Hon. John Baird (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the member for his genuine concern for the environment.

We are taking real action to try to address the challenges on the west coast. One of the first announcements we made, when I became Minister of the Environment, was the investment of \$30 million in the Great Bear Rainforest. It is one of the largest coastal temperate rainforests in the world, with the Haida Gwaii islands and the coast of British Columbia.

We are also working to stop the dumping of raw sewage in the Pacific Ocean in Victoria. This is something that has been endorsed by the former Liberal environment minister, who now sits within the Liberal caucus, and the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

Days of dumping raw sewage in the Pacific Ocean are over under this government.

* * *

TOURISM INDUSTRY

Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the snow is melting across Canada and the tourism season is upon us, one thing we do not see is real action by the government to enhance this vital industry.

The industry has put forward concrete steps that the Conservatives should act upon, like air access, the individual GST rebate and the approved destination status with China. Why do they not act? Why do they not care?

Hon. Diane Ablonczy (Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I guess the hon. member did not read our last budget, which has put millions into building tourism products along the St. Lawrence and Saguenay River, which will build a new port, which will help the cruise industry in Pangnirtung, Nunavut, which also will put money into our border crossings to ensure visitors will have a speedy entry into our country.

We spend \$400 million a year on tourism. That is in addition to what is spent by all the provinces and many municipalities. Tourism is doing very well in Canada.

● (1200)

[Translation]

BROADCASTING INDUSTRY

Mr. Luc Malo (Verchères—Les Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Paris and its francophone partners continue to disagree about the role of the multilateral channel, TV5 Monde. Belgium, like Switzerland yesterday, has threatened to withdraw if France continues with its plan to integrate the francophone television network into the proposed France Monde holding company and if TV5 is no longer a multilateral resource for francophone countries?

Does Canada concur with Switzerland and Belgium that, no matter what the governance of TV5 may be, it should not be controlled by France Monde?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada sent a letter on April 15, 2008, addressed to all the TV5 partners. It included the Canadian proposal and reiterated the importance of safeguarding the multilateral nature of the TV5 Monde project.

TV5 Monde is an important tool in the promotion of the culture and values of the international francophonie and must remain a shared project.

* * *

[English]

ETHICS

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the financial considerations, the offer the Prime Minister spoke of in the tape, were simply to secure Mr. Cadman's candidacy and not to buy his vote, how many meetings did Mr. Finley and Mr. Flanagan have with Mr. Cadman after that crucial vote to continue efforts to secure his candidacy?

Mr. James Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there was just the one meeting on May 19, 2005. That is the only meeting that took place on this matter.

It is good to see that the member for Kings—Hants is in the House of Commons today. It saves me a trip to the Clerk to ask her a question as to whether we have a vote in the House of Commons tonight. Now that I know he is here, I know we do not have any votes.

The Speaker: I am sure the parliamentary secretary knows that votes on Fridays are deferred to Monday in any event. It is just for fun.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development in support to the Minister of Industry of Canada's decision concerning RADARSAT-2.

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fourth report of the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development with respect to RADARSAT-2.

[English]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Lloyd St. Amand (Brant, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources in relation to the RADARSAT-2 satellite.

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Patricia Davidson (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women in relation to gender budgets.

* * *

PETITIONS

PENSIONS

Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table another petition today that arises out of my national campaign to fight for fairness for ordinary Canadians and, in particular, for seniors, who were shortchanged by their government as a result of an error in calculating the rate of inflation. The government has acknowledged the mistake made by Statistics Canada, but has refused to take any remedial action.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to take full responsibility for this error, which negatively impacted their incomes from 2001 to 2006, and to take the required steps to repay every Canadian who has been shortchanged by a government program because of the miscalculation of the CPI.

Routine Proceedings

The petitions are signed by hundreds of people from Duncan, Ladysmith, Vancouver, Gravenhurst, Bracebridge, Huntsville, Burk's Falls, Hamilton, Thessalon, Sault Ste. Marie, Whitby, Toronto, Sackville and Bedford. All the petitioners are asking for is a bit of fairness from their government.

It is a privilege to present this petition on their behalf.

● (1205)

DARFUR

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by almost 75 of my constituents from towns in my riding in Alberta, including Camrose, Armena, Kingman and Hay Lakes. There are also other petitioners who come from Bow Island and Brooks, Tisdale, Saskatchewan, and really across Alberta and Saskatchewan.

The petitioners share our government's concern about the violence in Darfur, Sudan and the displacement of millions of people. They call on our government to increase humanitarian aid and ensure access for its safe arrival. They also call on the government to treat the situation in Darfur as a genocide.

I have received representation from many people in my riding in the past year concerning this matter, both from high schools and from Augustana University. I am very proud of my constituents for taking action to express their views.

I am pleased today to present this petition on their behalf.

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present today.

The first petition is signed by hundreds of citizens who ask the government to do the right thing and to locate the national portrait gallery in the appropriate place, and that is here in the national capital region. They note that other nations have their national portrait gallery in their capital cities. They also note that keeping the portrait gallery in Ottawa would save the federal government \$2.5 million a year.

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition from citizens who want the federal government to restore support to and stop the funding cuts to the operating budget of the Status of Women of Canada.

NAHANNI NATIONAL PARK

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, finally, I have a petition from citizens who want to see the government protect the Nahanni National Park and the entire south Nahanni watershed. The petition is signed by people from Ottawa as well as people from outside the Ottawa region.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the following question will be answered today: No. 221.

Government Business

[English]

Question No. 221—**Mr. Dennis Bevington:**

With regard to the Northern Residents Tax Deduction: (a) what is the rationale for changing the way the travel portion of the deduction is calculated; (b) how will this change affect the amount of money paid out through this deduction; (c) what is the estimated difference between what will be paid out following this change compared to what would have been paid out if this change had not been made; (d) what is the estimated amount that would have been paid out had this change not been made; and (e) what is the estimated number of tax filers who are affected by this change?

Hon. Jim Flaherty (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the northern residents deduction, NRD, consists of two income tax deductions that are available to residents of the north who live in the prescribed northern zone or intermediate zone: a travel deduction and a residence deduction.

The travel deduction allows taxpayers to deduct the value of up to two employer-paid vacation or family related trips per year and an unlimited number of employer-paid medical trips, the benefit of which is included in income for tax purposes, from their income for income tax purposes. Since the deduction is based on the cost of travel, any inflationary increases are effectively accommodated for under this deduction. Accordingly, since the introduction of the NRD in 1987, no changes have been made to the travel component. The budget presented in the House of Commons on February 26, 2008, proposed a 10 percent increase to the residency component in support of a comprehensive northern strategy to help the north realize its full social and economic potential. The increase in the residency component is designed to further assist in drawing skilled labour to northern and isolated communities. This measure will be effective as of January 1, 2008.

In particular, the maximum daily residency deduction will be increased from \$15 to \$16.50. This increase will bring the maximum annual amount of the residency deduction to \$6,022.50, \$16.50 multiplied by 365 days, from \$5,475, \$15 multiplied by 365 days, for residents of the northern zone and to \$3,011.25 from \$2,737.50 for residents of the intermediate zone.

When combined with the basic personal amount of \$9,600 and the Canada employment credit of \$1,019, a single resident of the north will be able to earn up to \$16,600 tax free in 2008. For that same year, it is estimated that about 189,000 individuals will benefit from the increase. Including this increase of \$10 million in additional tax relief per year, it is estimated that the NRD will reduce federal revenues by \$150 million in 2008-09 and by \$155 million in 2009-10.

Widespread support for this important Government of Canada initiative has been noted from northern leaders. For instance, Yellowknife Mayor Gord Van Tighem noted it was, "something we've been asking for a significant period of time... (it) will mean more spending into local economies and further reduce the cost of living".

In addition to increasing the generosity of the residency component of the NRD, the budget presented in the House of Commons on February 26, 2008 also announces new measures that will protect and secure Canada's sovereignty and create more economic opportunities in the north, including: \$34 million over two

years for geological mapping to support economic development; extension of the mineral exploration tax credit for an additional year; and \$8 million over the next two years for a commercial harbour in Pangnirtung, Nunavut.

Since 2006, the government has made important investments in the north, including investments to advance social and economic development in the territories through a \$300 million northern housing trust and \$195 million between 2006-07 and 2008-09 in increased territorial formula financing payments.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 218 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[English]

Question No. 218—**Mr. Bill Casey:**

With respect to acts of torture committed in the private sphere in Canada: (a) how many Canadian organizations and individuals have written to the Minister of Justice over the past five years requesting to make these acts illegal in Canada and to make Canada a designated torture free zone; (b) what official discussions or conferences have taken place within Justice Canada in regards to this request; (c) why is non-state actor torture not named or listed as a specific crime in the Criminal Code; (d) does the government intend to make changes to the Criminal Code to correct this omission; (e) what official discussions or decisions have been made by the Minister of Justice or officials of Justice Canada on the designation of Canada as a torture-free zone; (f) has Justice Canada studied the laws of other jurisdictions or countries on the specific issue of defining non-state actor torture as a crime; (g) what official discussions or decisions have occurred within Justice Canada, involving the Minister of Justice, to recognize that there are various forms of non-state actor torture in Canada; and (h) what services, programs or policies does Justice Canada use to support Canadians who have been victims of non-state actor torture?

(Return tabled)

[English]

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

[Translation]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill S-3, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (investigative hearing and recognizance with conditions), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Government Business

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak on behalf of the Bloc Québécois about Bill S-3, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (investigative hearing and recognizance with conditions).

People listening to us need to understand that the Bloc Québécois opposes the principle underlying Bill S-3. The Bloc Québécois has taken a responsible approach to analyzing this issue. All legislative measures concerning terrorism must strike a balance between safety and respect for other basic rights.

That was the principle guiding the Bloc Québécois in its involvement in the review of the Anti-terrorism Act and its application, a review called for in the act itself. Between December 2004 and March 2007, the Bloc Québécois heard witnesses, read briefings, and interviewed specialists, civil society representatives and law enforcement agencies.

During the Subcommittee on the Review of the Anti-terrorism Act's specific study of the two provisions in Bill S-3, the Bloc Québécois made its position on investigative hearings and recognizance with conditions clear. The Bloc Québécois felt that the investigative process needed to be better defined.

In our opinion, it is clear that "this exceptional measure should be used only in specific cases in which it is necessary to prohibit activities where there is imminent peril of serious damage, and not in the case of misdeeds already committed".

We were also firmly opposed to section 83.3, dealing with preventive arrest and recognizance with conditions. Not only do we feel that this measure is of little, if any, use in the fight against terrorism but, more importantly, there is a very real danger of its being used against honest citizens.

The Bloc Québécois finds that a terrorist activity deemed dangerous can be disrupted just as effectively, and in fact more effectively, by the regular application of the Criminal Code, without the harmful consequences that a preventive arrest can trigger.

Therefore, we recommended abolishing this approach, and we won our point on February 27, 2007. Today, our position has not changed.

The investigative process should only be reinstated if major changes are made to it, which Bill S-3 does not do. Moreover, preventive arrests have no place in the Canadian justice system, given their possible consequences and the fact that other provisions which are already in place are just as effective.

Bill S-3, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (investigative hearing and recognizance with conditions) was introduced and read for the first time on October 23, 2007. This bill seeks to reinstate two provisions of the Anti-terrorism Act that were abolished when their sunset clause was allowed to expire. The vote on the sunset clause took place on February 27, 2007.

I was a member of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities in 2001, when we passed the Anti-Terrorism Act, which provided for a five-year review. It is during that five-year review that the vote on the sunset clause was held,

again on February 27, 2007, and that is when Parliament decided not to extend that clause.

Sections 83.28 and 83.29 of the Criminal Code, which were abolished following the vote on the sunset clause, dealt with investigative hearings. Under these provisions, a peace officer could, after obtaining the attorney general's prior consent, ask a provincial court judge, or a superior court judge, to make an order for the gathering of information.

If granted, the order required the person named therein to appear before a judge, to be questioned and to produce everything in his or her possession. The person named in the order had the right to retain a lawyer, and was supposed to answer questions put to him or her, but could refuse if answering a question would disclose information protected by any law relating to non-disclosure of information or to privilege. The presiding judge was to rule on any refusal to answer. The person was not to be excused from answering questions or producing things on the ground that it might incriminate him or her. Essentially, individuals were to be deprived of their right to remain silent.

However, no information or statement obtained during an investigative hearing could subsequently be used directly or indirectly in any other criminal proceedings, other than a prosecution for perjury or giving contrary evidence. Investigative hearings were not useful. They were never even used, thus proving that section 83.28 was not necessary.

● (1210)

Moreover, as part of a regular investigation, the police can already question witnesses and carry out search warrants to obtain documents.

Bill S-3 seeks to reintroduce this mechanism, section 83.28, which was abolished by the vote against the sunset clause, in a nearly identical form.

With respect to recognizance, arrest and detention, section 83.3 of the Criminal Code addressed recognizance with conditions, with the prior consent of the Attorney General. A peace officer who believed that a terrorist activity was about to be carried out and who suspected that the imposition of a recognizance with conditions on a person, or the arrest of a person, was necessary to prevent the carrying out of the terrorist activity, could lay an information before a provincial court judge. The judge could order the person to appear before him or her. A peace officer could arrest the person without a warrant if the arrest was deemed necessary to prevent the terrorist activity from being carried out.

The person detained was to appear before a provincial court judge within 24 hours or as soon as possible thereafter. Then a show-cause hearing was to take place to determine whether the person should be released or further detained. The hearing could not be delayed longer than 48 hours.

Government Business

If the judge determined that it was not necessary to have the person sign a recognizance, the person was to be released. If, however, the judge determined that the person did have to sign a recognizance, then the person was required to keep the peace and comply with the other conditions that had been imposed for up to 12 months. If the person refused to sign the recognizance, the judge could order that the person be incarcerated for up to 12 months.

This provision was never used. Section 83.3 was added to the Criminal Code but, five years later, when it was abolished, it had never been used.

That is not surprising, because police officers could and still can use other Criminal Code provisions to arrest someone about to commit an indictable offence.

Section 495 of the Criminal Code states:

(1) A peace officer may arrest without warrant

(a) a person...who, on reasonable grounds, he believes...is about to commit an indictable offence;

Section 495 already existed. There is a good reason why the police never made use of the new provisions in section 83.3, which is why it was allowed to expire in 2007.

The dissenting opinion in the report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security gives the following explanation with regard to section 495 of the Criminal Code:

The arrested person must then be brought before a judge, who may impose the same conditions as those imposable under the Anti-terrorism Act. The judge may even refuse bail if he believes that the person's release might jeopardize public safety.

Section 495 already enables the police to make preventive arrests. There was therefore no need for section 83.3.

The dissenting opinion goes on about section 495 of the current Criminal Code:

If police officers believe that a person is about to commit an act of terrorism, then they have knowledge of a plot. They probably know, based on wiretap or surveillance information, that an indictable offence is about to be committed. Therefore, they have proof of a plot or attempt and need only lay a charge in order to arrest the person in question.

There will eventually be a trial, at which time the arrested person will have the opportunity to a full answer and defence. The person will be acquitted if the suspicions are not justified or if there is insufficient proof to support a conviction.

It seems obvious to us that the terrorist act thus apprehended would have been disrupted just as easily as it would have been had section 83.3 been used.

However, it is this provision that is most likely to give rise to abuses.

It may be used to brand someone a terrorist on grounds of proof that are not sufficient to condemn him but against which he will never be able to fully defend himself. This will prevent him from travelling by plane, crossing the border into the United States and probably from entering many other countries. It is very likely that he will lose his job and be unable to find another.

One could compare this situation to that of Maher Arar upon his return from Syria before he was exonerated by Justice O'Connor...If this new and temporary provision of the Criminal Code were used, it would be a judicial decision to impose conditions because of apprehended terrorist activity. The general public would see that person as almost certainly, if not definitely, a terrorist.

Terrorist movements often spring from and are nourished by profound feelings of injustice...The fight against these injustices is often conducted in parallel by those who want to correct the injustices through democratic means—

The former made a positive contribution to the transformation of the societies in which we live today. They are often the source of many of the rights that we enjoy.

●(1215)

It is inevitable that political activity will bring the first and second groups together. Very often, the former will not even be aware that the latter are involved in terrorism. The planning of terrorist activity is by its nature secret.

...

In order to determine whether a person is part of a terrorist network, security officers make use of electronic surveillance, but, as we saw in the Arar case, they also monitor the contacts of someone—

Now, to be able to order incarceration and, subsequently, the imposition of conditions of release, it is sufficient that the judge be convinced "that the detention is necessary in order to maintain confidence in the administration of justice, having regard to all the circumstances, including the apparent strength of the peace officer's grounds...and the gravity of any terrorist activity that may be carried out."

In other words, the apprehension of serious terrorist activity and grounds that appear founded will suffice—

It should also be noted that the person arrested need not be the one that is thought likely to commit a terrorist act, but only and simply a person whose arrest "is necessary to prevent the carrying out of the terrorist activity."

There is an important nuance there that is both astonishing and disturbing. It can include innocent people who are unaware of the reasons for which terrorists are soliciting their aid in a planned activity while concealing the real reasons they are asking for aid.

Some see in the reference to section 810 of the Criminal Code an indication that our criminal law already uses a procedure similar to that set out in section 83.3. While there is a similarity in the procedure followed, there is a very big difference in the consequences of applying these two sections.

Under the current section 810, a person can be summoned before a judge, but not arrested. The judge can order that person to enter into a recognizance to keep the peace.

The judge cannot commit that person to a prison term unless the person refuses to sign the recognizance, after listening to all the parties and being satisfied by the evidence adduced that there are reasonable grounds for the fears.

If the person signs the recognizance and respects the conditions, he or she remains at liberty, will not be sentenced and will thus have no criminal record.

...

This provision and section 83.3 that we [rejected] are very different in nature and have radically different consequences.

There is also no comparison between the impact that the use of section 83.3 and section 810 would have on someone's reputation.

When the decision is made to depart from the fundamental principles underlying our system of criminal law, there is always a risk that these measures will later be applied in a manner totally different from those foreseen. That was the case with the imposition of the war measures act in 1970, which saw the incarceration, among others, of a great poet, a pop singer, numerous relatives of people charged with terrorist activities and almost all the candidates of a municipal political party.

In light of this analysis, we have decided not to support the extension of these provisions. First, it is of little, if any, use. These two sections went unused during the five years they were in effect. Second, there is a very real danger that this provision might be used against honest citizens.

A terrorist activity deemed dangerous can be disrupted just as effectively, and in fact more effectively, by the regular application of the Criminal Code.

That is why I have taken the time to explain sections 83.28 and 83.3 of the Criminal Code: Bill S-3 is practically identical to the two measures that were eliminated, namely investigative hearing—sections 83.28 and 83.29 of the Criminal Code—and recognizance with conditions, which is similar to section 83.3 which was eliminated. If we count technical amendments, such as minor clarifications, there are still only three substantial amendments.

They amended the investigative procedure in order to standardize it. The previous investigative procedure depended on whether or not the terrorism offence had already been or would be committed. If the terrorism offence had not yet been committed, the judge had to be convinced—along with other criteria—“that reasonable attempts have been made to obtain the information” outside of the investigative procedure. This was not required for offences that had already been committed.

Bill S-3 standardizes the procedure and requires “that reasonable attempts have been made to obtain the information by other means” through investigative hearings in both cases.

The second minor amendment concerns the limit on detention. Bill S-3 adds a limit on detention when someone who is under investigation is being detained because there is a risk that they will evade service of the order or because they did not attend the examination.

● (1220)

An examination of the review in committee led to the following. Aside from the fact that the Attorney General of Canada and, in the case of section 83.3, the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, must include in their annual report on the use of the two provisions their opinion on whether the provisions should be extended, the most important amendment is to ensure that the provisions will be subject to a comprehensive review, before the sunset clause expires, either by a Senate committee, a House committee or a joint committee that Parliament or one of its houses will have designated or created for this purpose. Within one year after the committee starts the review, it must submit its report to Parliament, along with recommendations on whether the provisions should be extended.

In short, not only were the comments of the Bloc Québécois not taken into account, but neither were the numerous recommendations by the two committees, both House and the Senate, who seriously examined the issue. The Conservative government prefers to do whatever it likes, forgetting that in a democratic and free society, there must be a real balance between ensuring safety and respecting other fundamental rights.

The Bloc Québécois has been acting in this responsible manner since 2001. I was on the Standing Committee on Transport when the Anti-terrorism Act was passed and we were the ones who presented the famous sunset clause to ensure that there would be a five-year review. In 2007, Parliament decided to abolish these provisions because they were never used. Again, the Conservatives do not care about the different committees and recommendations from all the experts and they decide to restore measures that had been abolished by this Parliament in 2007.

Perhaps I should read from the Bloc Québécois dissenting opinion.

The Anti-terrorism Act, a measure adopted rather quickly following the events of September 11, 2001, required its provisions to be reviewed three years after the bill became law.

The Subcommittee on the Review of the Anti-terrorism Act was responsible for reviewing the legislation, as a five-year review was required. In October 2006, the subcommittee of the Standing

Government Business

Committee on Public Safety and National Security tabled an interim report specifically on the two measures contained in Bill S-3. Although the Bloc Québécois agreed with some of the subcommittee's findings, it felt that the two provisions should not be kept as they were worded then.

The Bloc Québécois explained its reasoning by signing a dissenting opinion, which I will now read.

From the outset, it must be understood that this is a preliminary report that addresses only two sets of provisions in the Anti-terrorism Act; namely, those pertaining to investigations and preventive arrests as provided for in sections 83.28, 83.29 and 83.3 of the Criminal Code, as amended by section 4 of the Anti-Terrorist Act.

We concur with the description of the specific historical context that led to the adoption of the Anti-terrorism Act.

We also agree with most of the recommendations made in the majority report of the Committee, which aim to provide better guidelines for the investigation process. This exceptional measure should be used only in specific cases in which it is necessary to prohibit activities where there is imminent peril of serious damage, and not in the case of misdeeds already committed.

We, like other members of the Committee are also of the opinion that another review of the provisions ten years after their coming into force is needed and would make it possible to better assess whether the provisions should be extended or allowed to expire.

We would have preferred a three-year period; however, we are willing to support the opinion of the majority...

However, we do not agree with the Committee members' opinion regarding the preventive arrests provided for in section 83.3 of the Criminal Code, as introduced in the Anti-terrorism Act. Our reasons are as follows.

Terrorism cannot be fought with legislation; it must be fought through the efforts of intelligence services combined with appropriate police action.

There is no act of terrorism that is not already a criminal offence punishable by the most stringent penalties under the Criminal Code. This is obviously the case for premeditated, cold-blooded murders; however, it is also true of the destruction of major infrastructures.

Moreover, when judges exercise their discretion during sentencing, they will consider the terrorists' motive as an aggravating factor. They will find that the potential for rehabilitation is very low, that the risk of recidivism is very high... This is what they have always done in the past and there is no reason to think they will do differently in the future.

Thus, given this representation by our members on the subcommittee, it is important that Parliament understand that the Bloc Québécois will vote against Bill S-3, which seeks to reintroduce measures abolished by the House in 2007. The Bloc Québécois continues to have an advantage over the other parties in this House. We are always responsible and true to ourselves.

● (1225)

[English]

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with the closing remark of my colleague from Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel. He always comes to the House well prepared. He made a very informative and well-researched speech on the concerns he has with Bill S-3. We have many of the same apprehensions about the bill. I was particularly interested in two points my colleague raised on which I would like him to comment.

Government Business

One is the lack of respect shown to the will of Parliament and to the voice of committees. In fact Parliament and the standing committee at the five year review rejected the implementation of these terms and conditions and wanted them to cease. We believe that the voice of Parliament should have primacy. The government of the day should have listened, taken note and acted accordingly, not to reintroduce these same measures through an unelected chamber like the Senate.

There is a second thing on which I would like the member to comment. I believe that one of the basic fundamental tenets of our judicial system is the right to remain silent when accused, or in a hearing, or in a courtroom setting. We only suspend the right to remain silent with very robust corresponding measures, such as, in the case of a parliamentary committee, there is no right to remain silent, but the information gleaned at that committee cannot be used against the person in any subsequent proceeding.

That does not seem to be the case in Bill S-3. There is no right to remain silent and the information given cannot be used directly against the person, but it may be used as derivative testimony, or derivative evidence in some further proceeding.

Would my colleague agree this has to be addressed? The right to remain silent cannot be compromised unless there are corresponding protections introduced.

• (1230)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his two questions.

With respect to the first question, the Conservatives are obviously acting in bad faith. The Anti-terrorism Act adopted at the time provided for a review of the act. Why? And why were we such staunch supporters of this issue? It was because we did not want there to be abuses. At the time, it was pointed out that the Criminal Code contained provisions that could do the job. Five years later, the clause had never been invoked. That fact was so clearly presented that Parliament decided, on February 27, 2007, to allow these clauses to expire. The two provisions were simply abolished.

Now the Conservative party has decided to reintroduce these provisions by way of the Senate. Once again, the Conservative way of governing is quite simply disrespectful. They say, "We are right; everyone else is wrong." That is very harmful to a society. This brings me to the member's second question, the right to remain silent.

The measures in the Criminal Code were adopted by those who came before us and who gave us the opportunity, today, to take our place in this House. It is a model of society recognized throughout the world and one that Quebec would choose if it were a country. Thus, we are able to guarantee to all individuals that they will not be found guilty for acts they have not committed and that they have the right to remain silent if they deem that the questions asked would be incriminating.

Yet decisions are being taken to change this way of doing things on which our society is founded because, once again, the Conservatives have decided that there have been terrorist threats. Five years, six years or seven years later, these clauses have never

been invoked. Therefore, the Bloc Québécois does not understand why, today, these provisions are being reintroduced after already being abolished by Parliament because they were never used.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to ask my colleague some questions following his heartfelt presentation. I was under the impression that he too was a member of the parliamentary committee in 2002, along with our defence colleague, if memory serves.

Clearly, the Bloc Québécois has been concerned about this bill since 2002, when Anne McLellan was the minister of public safety and emergency preparedness. First of all, the bill violated certain constitutional guarantees.

I have three questions for my colleague. Can he please refresh our memories regarding what constitutional guarantees are violated? He already mentioned the right to remain silent, but does he not think the presumption of innocence and the right not to self-incriminate are also jeopardized by this bill?

Second, can he please describe for us the Criminal Code provisions that already exist on this matter? Of course, I am referring to section 810 in particular. Can he please confirm that the existing legislation already contains every preventive measure necessary to counter terrorist threats?

Furthermore, can he please explain how the Conservatives have shown a lack of respect in this House? I cannot imagine that all ministers could have supported such a denial of democracy by failing to respect the House's vote. Does my colleague think there is one minister in particular who is less democratic than the others?

• (1235)

Mr. Mario Laframboise: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Hochelaga for his question. He is doing an excellent job as justice critic for the Bloc Québécois. He works very efficiently, is a thorough researcher and gets to the bottom of things. He is not like the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities who is often unprepared when he rises in this House. That, however, is his problem. I am very pleased that my colleague from Hochelaga is doing such great work.

It must be noted that our police forces have never used the sections we are discussing here or the provisions in the Anti-terrorism Act, precisely because sections 810 and 495 already exist in the Criminal Code. So one must wonder why the Conservatives insist on trying to reintroduce measures that were abolished in 2007 by this Parliament. Why would they do this, besides the fact that they think they are right and want everyone to think the same way?

The problem with the Conservative Party is that it is in the minority in this House. If an election were called, it would no longer form the government.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague from Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel on his excellent presentation.

I have a quick question for him. I have been listening to the debates all morning, and I am hoping that he can explain what is between the lines in this bill.

Government Business

Why are the Conservatives doing everything they can to reintroduce this bill? What is the hidden agenda that would push this party to disrespect the will of the House?

I am really wondering, and I am certain that my colleague can answer my question.

Mr. Mario Laframboise: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question.

It is mostly likely the fact that the Constitution protects certain rights, such as the right to remain silent and the right to fair and full defence. That is what the Conservative Party wants to take away in order to control not only politics, but also people's lives.

This reformist way of continually reintroducing right-wing values is really starting to grate on Quebeckers and, as we now see, Canadians as well. They truly understand that the only way to protect their interests is to elect social democrats, such as the Bloc Québécois, to the House, people who believe in protecting citizens' interests from those who would take them away.

[*English*]

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak to Bill S-3 again, because I have spoken previously on it.

I would like to spend a few minutes retracing where this bill came from. I was a member of Parliament when this bill came forward in its first incarnation. It was Bill C-36, the anti-terrorism legislation. It came forward after the attack on the World Trade Center towers on September 11, 2001. It went through the House very quickly.

I remember at that time getting up to speak to the legislation. In fact, the NDP caucus opposed the legislation. We believed that the path being taken by the then Liberal government in this massive new venture of anti-terrorism legislation was not warranted.

We had grave concerns at that time about the impact it would have on life and civil liberties, particularly on Canadians who were originally from the Middle East, who were part of the Canadian Arab or Muslim communities, because after September 11, there was a shift in what was taking place in our society. Many things changed, one of which was the legislation that came forward.

The debate was not that long. In fact, one of the concerns the NDP had back in 2001 was how quickly the legislation was being pushed through Parliament. This was very serious legislation that made very significant departures from the process of law that we understand in this country. We said that the two clauses we are dealing with today, seven years later, were particularly offensive.

Because there was so much debate about those two clauses, which happened to deal with investigative hearings and preventive detention, it was agreed by the government, finally, that those clauses could be sunsetted. They would come under a review so that Parliament would have to examine the legislation and those specific clauses again.

The Anti-terrorism Act passed very quickly. The Bloc at that time may have opposed it as well, I am not sure, but it was basically the NDP and maybe the Bloc who voted against it. The Conservatives and the Liberals voted for it. We knew it would come back for debate

and of course that happened. We had that debate a short while ago, because we knew those two clauses would become null and void unless they were somehow continued or reintroduced by March 1, 2007.

On February 27, 2007 there was a vote on those two clauses and, interestingly, they were defeated. It was a very important moment in the House of Commons to see that after a full debate in the House by all political parties, the NDP, the Bloc and some members of the Liberal Party defeated those amendments.

The government has reintroduced, with virtually no changes or very small changes, the same two amendments dealing with investigative hearings and preventive detention. The NDP is standing for the third time to speak out against this legislation.

These clauses have actually never been used. They are an affront to a democratic society. They create a path and a process that we do not want in this country.

Whenever I have spoken at community meetings or public hearings about security issues, more often than not, people voice their very significant concerns about the kind of legislative initiatives that are being undertaken as a result of September 11, and about how much has changed in our society in terms of security. Many people have been targeted, particularly visible minorities.

● (1240)

I want to pay tribute and respect to the organizations that have never given up in speaking against this kind of legislation, and this legislation in particular, whether it is at parliamentary hearings or at hearings that have been organized in the community. There are people in this country who have remained vigilant even in the face of sometimes a public appetite to have greater security measures. There have always been organizations like the B.C. Civil Liberties Association, the Canadian Bar Association, the Canadian Arab Federation, the Muslim Association of Canada and many others who have always come forward to warn and alert parliamentarians about the dangers of this legislation.

It is very important that we remember that. Sometimes in the furor and frenzy of when things happen, people feel threatened and insecure, and it is very easy for governments to play a very opportunistic role, to play on those fears and to bring in the kind of draconian legislation that we have seen with the Anti-terrorism Act.

We have come to see over the passage of a number of years now that that legislation was not needed. Therefore, it is somewhat concerning and surprising that yet again we are debating this bill, that we are debating these two particular clauses. The Conservative government, with the support of the Liberals, is prepared to re-enact these amendments that have already been voted down by the Canadian Parliament.

When I speak to my constituents, they are very concerned about what is taking place in this country. For example, this weekend is the fourth annual summit of the security and prosperity partnership. It is taking place in New Orleans. Our trade critic, the member for Burnaby—New Westminster, is one of the members who will be participating in a very broad people's summit, as opposed to the leaders' summit in New Orleans that is going to be discussing what is called the SPP.

Government Business

The Council of Canadians, the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada, CEP, the United Steelworkers, and many other organizations will be heading to New Orleans, probably today, to participate in the SPP people's summit. Just as we saw at Montebello at the leaders' summit, where the Prime Minister of Canada, the President of the U.S. and the President of Mexico met behind closed doors to discuss security and trade issues, that will take place in New Orleans.

I am very glad that those members of civil society, and there are 30 organizations that are hosting the people's summit in New Orleans, will be there to push for and demand accountability from these leaders, who are trying to further this incredible agenda, the economic, political, cultural and security agenda between our three countries, and the integration of Canadian society politically, economically and culturally into the United States.

Many people are hugely concerned about this. I wanted to raise this today as we are debating this bill because I think that they are very much related. We have seen so many different processes that we are not even barely aware of. Sometimes we get leaked information. Sometimes we find out about what is going on, but all of these processes are taking place behind closed doors.

There are some people who have access. Business elites have access to this process. In fact they have their own forum for raising these issues and bringing them to government. In terms of the Canadian Parliament, people generally, or organizations or the labour movements, civil society, have no access to this process. A lot of this process, in terms of the security and prosperity partnership has to do with security measures in developing a common front of security measures, a merging of the American system with the Canadian system.

We know that anytime we cross the border. There are many of my constituents who, for no apparent reason, have experienced terrible interrogation and investigation at the border, and sometimes have been refused, all under the guise of security.

•(1245)

It really comes back to the broadness of the bill and what it represents. Although the bill has very specific measures in it, to me, former Bill C-36 and Bill S-3, the one we are debating today, exemplify this environment of heightened security, of control by the state, of the clampdown on civil society, the clampdown on individual rights and liberties. This is something that we should really stand up against.

I am very proud that in the NDP we have done that historically. Whether it is the War Measures Act in Quebec, whether it is the internment of Japanese Canadians during the second world war, there are these moments in our community's history where we have to make a decision as to whether or not what is being laid down has a basis and merit, or whether it is actually, in the long run, undermining the fundamental principles of a democratic society. We in the NDP believe that the anti-terrorism legislation did just that. It fundamentally changed Canadian society.

There was a feeling at the time that this really would not affect many people. It was somehow those people; it created an environment of them and us. It is a very dangerous situation when

we identify a group of people as being a threat. That is precisely what this legislation does. We have to take the attitude that when civil liberties of any minority, whether it be religious, ethnic, sexual orientation, gender or whatever it might be, any discrimination, any singling out is not only a threat to that group, but it is a threat to all people.

Even if we do not feel immediately threatened or if we do not feel that we are the ones who are being targeted, we have a responsibility to speak out in defence of civil rights and civil liberties for all people. In my community there are people who feel very strongly about that. They are very concerned about the direction that we have taken in the last seven years.

It was actually because of the anti-terrorism legislation that a few years ago I introduced a bill to eliminate racial profiling in Canada. It was a very interesting experience to introduce that bill. When I introduced it, I held a number of hearings across the country, and I was quite taken aback by the response I got in different cities from people who came forward with personal experiences about having been targeted. It has always taken place.

Racial minorities in this country have always been targeted, but it escalated and went off the charts after September 11. I heard from people that it was both random and systemic. The chances of being held up at the border, particularly at airports but also at ground crossings, greatly increased if one looked like a member of a certain community, if one was Muslim, or wore the hijab, or was a member of a minority from the Middle East. That became very clear in talking with people and hearing about people's experiences.

The bill that we introduced to eliminate racial profiling is very important. I am very pleased that the bill has been reintroduced by my colleague from Burnaby—Douglas and it is now Bill C-493. We hope it will come forward for debate in the House one day because I think there is very strong support for that bill.

We also know the experience of Maher Arar and the horrendous situation that that one individual faced in terms of a complete denial of his basic human rights. He was sent to the U.S. with Canadian complicity and then to Syria, where he remained in jail for so long. He was tortured. It was only because of the work of his wife, Monia Mazigh, his family, his community and broader civil society that the issue finally came forward and there was a public hearing.

•(1250)

It is again one of those moments in Canadian history where people feel that a grave injustice was done, although it is good to know that because of the public pressure, there was a public hearing and finally an apology made.

However, what that family went through is something that probably none of us will understand or be able to relate to because it was so deep, so grievous and so harmful. We must learn from that experience.

In light of all of those things that have happened, here we are in 2008 debating whether or not two clauses in the bill should continue. We have already voted once that they should be defeated, that they should be left null and void as a result of the date the sunset clauses came into effect.

Government Business

I would hope that we in the House could abide by that. We have had a vote. It was taken in February 2007. The clauses were defeated by 159 to 124 members. I am hoping that might happen again this time. The Conservative government has reintroduced these clauses and is hoping they will go through.

I am hoping very much that there is enough expression, will and solidarity in the House from the NDP, the Bloc and maybe some members of the official opposition that we can again defeat these amendments as unnecessary.

We look at our global community and Canada's part in that, and read about what is taking place in the world today. People do not want to see this kind of legislation. This legislation will not do anything to stop food riots, to improve food security, whether in Canada or around the globe. It will not do anything to improve the health of developing nations, eliminate starvation or help the millions of children and families who are suffering needlessly because of the incredible inequities in resource development and wealth distribution on our planet.

This legislation does not address those issues at all. In fact, it exacerbates a global system that is based on U.S. domination in terms of foreign policy and the war in Iraq, and certainly Canada's involvement in the war in Afghanistan. All of these things are connected.

Yet, if we talk to people and ask them what they are worried about and what they want to see us, as parliamentarians, focus on, people will tell us that they want to look at legislation, programs and policies that actually improve equality and social justice in our world. They want to see us focus on those priorities and to deal with those terrible inequities that exist.

I am coming to the conclusion of my comments today and I am glad that I was able to speak to the bill, as I have before. I will speak whenever it is necessary, as will my colleagues in the NDP, because we believe that we play a very important role in the House of standing up.

We take our role very seriously. We come here to vote. We do not sit on our hands. We challenge the government's agenda and we speak for a majority of Canadians who, if they had a direct vote in this, would not be supporting this legislation, Bill S-3, today.

I hope that when we get to the vote, there will be enough members of the House to defeat this, as we did before, and to recognize that these amendments are not necessary. They have not been used. They are not needed. We should focus our attention and our priorities on the issues Canadians really want us to in terms of building healthy, safe communities, respecting our environment, and promoting social justice in our world.

●(1255)

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to most of the hon. member's comments with regard to the proposed legislation. I do not have time to hit on every point she raised, but there is one thing I would like to mention, and it has to do with our responsibility in the House and the issue of human rights.

People have a right to go to bed at night knowing there are laws in place to protect them from people who would come into our country, or are already in the country, and who want to do them harm through terrorist acts.

One of the reasons the legislation has been brought before the House is because there were concerns with regard to human rights. We went to the one body in the country, other than the House, that deals with these issues day in and day out, and that was the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has addressed these issues and the legislation conforms to the court's concerns.

We have talked about people being inconvenienced, while travelling, by some of the heightened regard we have for terrorism. We do not mind having the odd bottle of hairspray thrown in the garbage at the airport because we know it is being done to protect us. An organized terror group in another part of the world planned on blowing up aircraft by concealing these types of things. That is why we are being inconvenienced. The vast majority of us do not necessarily like it, but we understand why it is necessary.

That is why we do not necessarily like this type of law, but we know it is necessary to protect us so we can continue to be a country that is respected around the world for our human rights and how we take care of our citizens.

The hon. member mentioned Maher Arar. That incident happened under the previous Liberal regime. We are making all the changes that Justice O'Connor recommended. We did that almost immediately upon receipt of those recommendations, and that has been the hallmark of this government.

We will continue to defend Canadians against people who would do them harm, and the legislation does absolutely that.

●(1300)

Ms. Libby Davies: Mr. Speaker, the member and I have different perspectives on the legislation.

This bill is overkill. No one here is disputing the fact that Canadians want to experience safety, that they want to go to bed at night and not worry about a number of things. There is no evidence that anything in the bill would make us safer. On the contrary. We could make some strong arguments that the purview of the bill and what it represents would create a global community so focused on incredible security measures that it fosters greater destabilization.

What is security? Security is being safe. Security is about having enough food to eat every day. Security is having a roof over one's head. These are also basic forms of security.

Where I depart from the member is the Conservative government has an obsession with legislation that is focused on a law and order approach, that everything will be solved by some new little boutique bill or a big bill such as Bill C-26 on mandatory minimum sentences for drug crimes and that this somehow will answer all the problems in our society.

There is a fundamental difference in what I am speaking about and what the member is speaking about, but I certainly respect his opinion.

Government Business

With respect to Maher Arar, I do not care whether it was the previous government or the Conservative government, but it happened in our country and we all bear responsibility for what happened to him. I am glad there finally was an apology. However, if we do not understand what happened and if we are unable to link it back to this bill and how we have dismissed the liberties of people and have taken away the due process of law, then what have we learned? That is the question I put forward.

This is why NDP members cannot support the legislation.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from across the way on her speech. She defends her arguments and her party's position passionately and with conviction. Further, she knows very well that the Bloc Québécois and the NDP will vote against Bill S-3

This makes me think about how each time I see a woman rise in this House, I am reminded of how few of us there are. I would like to take this opportunity to urge the parties to recruit more women so they can speak out in this House. Perhaps then the debates would be more informed and they would be different. I think members know what I mean. We would like more women in this House, and I urge the parties to recruit more for the next election, so we can have equal representation by men and women.

That said, I would like to ask my colleague what bothers her the most about this bill. What bothers her and affects her the most? What does she think is hiding behind this bill? I would like to know.

[*English*]

Ms. Libby Davies: Mr. Speaker, I think that is just about the best question and comment I have heard all day. I would concur with the hon. member.

I think if we had a majority of progressive women in this House, and I am sure she would agree with that qualification, it would be a very different place. Think of the things that would be different. We would have child care at the top of the agenda, housing, food security and the environment. We would not be going to war. I very much appreciate the comments of the member from the Bloc. I am very happy that the Bloc will not be supporting this bill. I think we certainly stand together on that question.

The hon. member asked a very good question. What is behind this bill? What is behind this bill is a political climate of fear that is created for ideological reasons. We have seen it in the United States, whether it is on drugs or security, and we are seeing it now in our own country. It began with the former government and it is now being continued at a very rapid rate by the Conservative government.

It is all the more important then that we stand up as a voice of reason and in effect blow the whistle on this kind of legislation, and point out that it is not necessary. It is overkill. Most importantly, we respect our democratic society, respect people's human rights, and respect the due process of law. I am glad that we will be voting against this legislation along with the Bloc.

• (1305)

Mr. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to see the NDP and the Bloc pat each other on the back for not protecting Canadians. I am actually appalled. I listened very

carefully to the speech from the member for Vancouver East. I know she said that the way to address terrorism is by having a roof over one's head and having food on the table.

Quite frankly, if she looks at the Air India disaster, the people who were accused and convicted in the tragedy, having a roof over their heads and having food in their belly was not an issue. It was a matter of religious and political extremism.

I want to ask her, in light of the Air India disaster and the inquiry that followed, how can she still justify not supporting some reasonable anti-terrorism measures that our Supreme Court of Canada has already provided us guidelines for and we are complying with those guidelines?

Ms. Libby Davies: Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting at all that where there are acts of terrorism that we should not act in a very forthright and strong way as a state. Certainly, we have seen those instances. When the member uses the Air India bombing as the example, I think it begs the question.

Clearly, legislation is already in place to deal with that. It comes back to the question: Why are we debating this legislation. Why is it necessary? It is overkill. It is not needed. There are more than adequate provisions within our existing laws and Criminal Code to deal with acts of terrorism.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to this debate on Bill S-3. I will start by saying that the Bloc Québécois is opposed in principle to Bill S-3.

The Bloc Québécois has a responsible approach to analyzing such bills, because we believe that any anti-terrorism legislation must strike a balance between maintaining safety, which is very important, and respecting the other fundamental rights.

With this in mind, the Bloc Québécois became very involved in the review process of the Anti-terrorism Act and its application, a review which is provided for in the act itself. From December 2004 to March 2007, the Bloc Québécois listened to witnesses, read submissions and interviewed specialists, members of civil society and law enforcement officials. As usual, the Bloc Québécois was passionate, professional and thorough in its work.

During the specific review of the two provisions in Bill S-3 by the Subcommittee on the Review of the Anti-terrorism Act, the Bloc Québécois clearly stated its position on the investigative hearings and on recognizance with conditions. The Bloc Québécois thought better guidelines for the investigative process were needed.

It is clear to us that this exceptional measure should be used only in specific cases in which it is necessary to prohibit activities where there is imminent peril of serious damage, and not in the case of misdeeds already committed.

Government Business

The Bloc Québécois also firmly opposed section 83.3 dealing with preventive arrest and recognizance with conditions. Not only does this mechanism appear to us to be of little, if any, use in the fight against terrorism, but also, we believe that there is a very real danger of this provision being used against honest citizens.

The Bloc Québécois believes that terrorist activity deemed dangerous can be disrupted just as effectively, and in fact more effectively, by the regular application of the Criminal Code, and without the potentially harmful consequences of preventive arrest.

As a result, we recommended the abolition of this mechanism and we won on February 27, 2007. Today, as always, the Bloc is consistent, and our position on the issue has not changed.

I would add that the investigation process should not be reinstated unless major changes are made to it, which Bill S-3 does not do. Moreover, preventive arrests have no place in Canada's justice system because of the potential consequences and the fact that other, equally effective, provisions are already in place.

As we all know, Bill S-3, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (investigative hearing and recognizance with conditions), was read for the first time in the Senate on October 23, 2007. The purpose of the bill is to reinstate two provisions of the Anti-terrorism Act that were abolished when the sunset clause was allowed to expire. The vote on the sunset clause was held on February 27, and parliamentarians did not extend the provisions. That was the will of the House as voted.

I am surprised that the government is bringing back in this bill two clauses that have already been debated and defeated in a vote right here in the House of Commons.

●(1310)

Perhaps we could look at what section 83.28 of the Criminal Code, on investigative hearings, was all about. Under this provision, a peace officer could, with the prior consent of the Attorney General, apply to a provincial court or superior court judge for an order for the gathering of information. The order, if made, required the named person to appear before a judge for examination and to bring any thing in his or her possession.

The person named in the order had the right to counsel and was required to answer questions, but could refuse to do so in order to avoid disclosing information protected by any law relating to privilege or disclosure. The presiding judge was to rule on any refusal. The person was not excused from answering a question or producing a thing on the ground that that could incriminate him or her. In fact, the person simply lost the right to remain silent. However, no information or testimony obtained during an investigative hearing could subsequently be used directly or indirectly in other proceedings, other than a prosecution for perjury or contradictory evidence.

In our opinion, investigative hearings were not useful. Moreover, they were never used. In the normal course of an investigation, the police can already question witnesses and conduct searches to obtain documents. This is possible under the current law, which means that, in a way, Bill S-3 is seeking to reintroduce almost exactly the same provisions we refused to extend.

If we look more carefully at recognizances, arrests and preventive detentions, section 83.3 of the Criminal Code dealt with recognizance with conditions. A peace officer who believed that a terrorist activity was going to be carried out and who suspected that the imposition of a recognizance with conditions or the arrest of a person was necessary to prevent the terrorist activity could, with the prior consent of the Attorney General, lay an information before a provincial court judge. That judge could order that the person appear before him or her. A peace officer could arrest the person named in the information without a warrant if the arrest was necessary in order to prevent a terrorist activity from being committed.

The person detained in custody had to be taken before a provincial court judge within 24 hours or as soon as feasible. A hearing known as a show-cause hearing was then to be held to determine whether the person should be released or held longer. This hearing could not be adjourned for more than 48 hours.

If the judge determined that there was no need for the person to enter into a recognizance, the person had to be released. If the judge determined that the person should enter into a recognizance, the person was bound to keep the peace and respect other conditions for up to 12 months. If the person refused to enter into such a recognizance, the judge could order that person to be imprisoned for up to 12 months.

I will repeat, this provision had never been invoked before it was abolished. That is not surprising because police officers could, and still do, use the other provisions of the Criminal Code to arrest someone about to commit an offence.

●(1315)

Section 495 of the Criminal Code states:

(1) A peace officer may arrest without warrant

(a) a person ... who, on reasonable grounds, he believes ... is about to commit an indictable offence;

The person arrested must then be brought before a judge who can impose the same conditions as those in the Anti-terrorism Act. The judge can even refuse bail if he believes that the person's release would endanger public safety.

If the police believe that an individual is about to commit a terrorist act, it is because they are aware of a plot. They probably know, based on wiretap or other surveillance information, that a criminal act is about to be committed. Therefore, they have proof of a plot or attempt, and need only lay a charge in order to arrest the person in question.

They will eventually go to trial, at which time that person will have the opportunity to present a full answer and defence. The person will be acquitted if the suspicions are not justified or if there is insufficient proof to support a conviction.

Government Business

It seems obvious to us that the apprehended terrorist activity would have been disrupted just as easily as if section 83.3 had been used. However, it is this provision that is most likely to give rise to abuse and this concerns the Bloc Québécois greatly.

It may be used to brand someone a terrorist on grounds of proof that are not sufficient to actually accuse him but against which he will never be able to fully defend himself. This will prevent him from travelling by plane, crossing the border into the United States and probably entering many other countries. It is very likely that he will lose his job and be unable to find another. These are serious consequences for the person affected by this provision.

One could compare this situation to that of Maher Arar upon his return from Syria, before he was exonerated by Justice O'Connor. If this new, temporary provision of the Criminal Code had been used, a judicial decision could have imposed conditions because of apprehended terrorist activity. The general public would see that person as almost certainly, if not definitely, a terrorist.

Terrorist movements often spring from and are nourished by profound feelings of injustice. A parallel fight against these injustices is often conducted by those who want to correct them through democratic means. Such people have made a positive contribution to the transformation of the societies in which we live today. They have often been the source of many of the rights that we enjoy.

It is inevitable that political activity will bring terrorists and non terrorists together. Very often, the latter will not even be aware that the former are involved in terrorism. The planning of terrorist activity is by its nature secret, of course. In order to determine whether a person is part of a terrorist network, as we saw in the Arar case, security organizations will monitor a person's contacts. For a judge to be able to order incarceration and, subsequently, the imposition of bail conditions, it is sufficient that the judge be convinced, and I quote, "that the detention is necessary in order to maintain confidence in the administration of justice, having regard to all the circumstances, including the apparent strength of the peace officer's grounds and the gravity of any terrorist activity that may be carried out".

● (1320)

In other words, the apprehension of serious terrorist activity and grounds that appear founded will suffice.

It should also be noted that the person arrested need not be the one that is thought likely to commit a terrorist act, but only and simply a person whose arrest "is necessary to prevent the carrying out of the terrorist activity".

There is an important nuance there that is both astonishing and disturbing. It can include innocent people who are unaware of the reasons for which terrorists are soliciting their aid in a planned activity while concealing the real reasons they are asking for aid.

Some see in the reference to section 810 of the Criminal Code an indication that our criminal law already uses a procedure similar to that set out in section 83.3. While there is a similarity in the procedure followed in these two sections, there is a very big difference in the consequences of applying these two sections.

Section 810 states that a person can be summoned, not arrested, before a judge, who can order that person to be of good behaviour.

After listening to all the parties and being satisfied by the evidence adduced that there are reasonable grounds for the fears, the judge cannot commit that person to a prison term unless the person refuses to sign the recognizance.

If the person signs the recognizance and respects the conditions, he or she remains at liberty, will not be sentenced and will thus have no criminal record.

This provision and section 83.3 that we rejected are very different in nature and have radically different consequences. There is also no comparison between the impact that the use of section 83.3 and section 810 would have on someone's reputation.

When the decision is made to depart from the fundamental principles underlying our system of criminal law, there is always a risk that these measures will later be applied in a manner totally different from those foreseen. That was the case with the imposition of the War Measures Act in 1970, which saw the incarceration, among others, of a great poet, a pop singer, numerous relatives of people charged with terrorist activities and almost all the candidates of a municipal political party.

In light of this analysis, we decided not to support the extension of this measure. For one thing, it is of little, if any, use in the fight against terrorism, and second, there is a very real danger of its being used against honest citizens. In addition, a terrorist activity deemed dangerous can be disrupted just as effectively, and in fact more effectively, by the regular application of the Criminal Code.

As we mentioned on several occasions, Bill S-3 is virtually identical to the two measures that were abolished, namely the investigative hearing, under sections 83.28 and 83.29 of the Criminal Code, and the recognizance with conditions, under section 83.3 of the Criminal Code. Except for a number of technical amendments, such as the rewriting of some parts to make minor clarifications, there are only three substantive changes.

Let us take the change made to the investigative procedure. As regards the standardization of that procedure, the "old" investigative process made a distinction based on whether the terrorism offence had already been committed, or was going to be committed.

● (1325)

In a case where the terrorism offence had not yet been committed, the judge had to be convinced—in addition to meeting other criteria—that "reasonable attempts have been made to obtain the information"—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): It is with regret that I must interrupt the hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry.

The hon. member for Vancouver East is rising on a point of order.

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt the member in the last moment of her speech but keeping my eye on the clock, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, between noon and 2 p.m. on Monday, April 28, the Chair shall not receive any quorum calls, dilatory motions or requests for unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

• (1330)

[Translation]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill S-3, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (investigative hearing and

Private Members' Business

recognizance with conditions), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): 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.

When we return to the study of Bill S-3, the hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry will have 10 minutes left for questions and comments.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SURPLUS TRANSFER ACT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau): The hon. member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue is not present to move the order as announced in today's notice paper. Accordingly, the bill will be dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper.

[English]

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

(The House adjourned at 1:30 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

HON. BILL BLAIKIE

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. ROYAL GALIPEAU

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. ANDREW SCHEER

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. PETER MILLIKEN

MS. LIBBY DAVIES

MR. MICHEL GUIMOND

HON. JAY HILL

MR. MICHAEL IGNATIEFF

MR. JAMES MOORE

MR. JOE PRESTON

HON. KAREN REDMAN

HON. PETER VAN LOAN

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Thirty-Ninth Parliament

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Boshcoff, Ken	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Bouchard, Robert	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Québec	BQ
Boucher, Sylvie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Status of Women	Beauport—Limoilou	Québec	CPC
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	Québec	BQ
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Saskatchewan	CPC
Brisson, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Ontario	Lib.
Brown, Gord	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	Ontario	CPC
Bruinooog, Rod, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	CPC
Brunelle, Paule	Trois-Rivières	Québec	BQ
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CPC
Cannan, Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	British Columbia	CPC
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Cannon, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Pontiac	Québec	CPC
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Québec	BQ
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Carrier, Robert	Alfred-Pellan	Québec	BQ
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley	Nova Scotia	Ind.
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	CPC
Chan, Hon. Raymond	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
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 Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Ontario	CPC
Coderre, Hon. Denis	Bourassa	Québec	Lib.
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—Tecumseh	Ontario	NDP
Comuzzi, Hon. Joe	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Ontario	CPC
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Québec	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup	Québec	BQ
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	NDP
Cullen, Hon. Roy	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta—Richmond East	British Columbia	CPC
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
D'Amours, Jean-Claude	Madawaska—Restigouche	New Brunswick	Lib.
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	Ontario	CPC
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
Day, Hon. Stockwell, Minister of Public Safety	Okanagan—Coquihalla	British Columbia	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
DeBellefeuille, Claude	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Québec	BQ
Del Mastro, Dean	Peterborough	Ontario	CPC
Demers, Nicole	Laval	Québec	BQ
Deschamps, Johanne	Laurentides—Labelle	Québec	BQ
Devolin, Barry	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes— Brock	Ontario	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	NDP
Dhaliwal, Sukh	Newton—North Delta	British Columbia	Lib.
Dhalla, Ruby	Brampton—Springdale	Ontario	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, Leader of the Opposition	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Québec	Lib.
Dosanjh, Hon. Ujjal	Vancouver South	British Columbia	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland and Labrador	CPC
Dryden, Hon. Ken	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Québec	BQ
Dykstra, Rick	St. Catharines	Ontario	CPC
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Emerson, Hon. David, Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	CPC
Epp, Ken	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	Alberta	CPC
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Faille, Meili	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Québec	BQ
Fast, Ed	Abbotsford	British Columbia	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Haldimand—Norfolk	Ontario	CPC
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Fletcher, Steven, Parliamentary Secretary for Health	Charleswood—St. James— Assiniboia	Manitoba	CPC
Folco, Raymonde	Laval—Les Îles	Québec	Lib.
Freeman, Carole	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	Québec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Québec	BQ
Galipeau, Royal, The Acting Speaker	Ottawa—Orléans	Ontario	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing— Pembroke	Ontario	CPC
Gaudet, Roger	Montcalm	Québec	BQ
Godfrey, Hon. John	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Wascana	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Goodyear, Gary	Cambridge	Ontario	CPC
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la- Chaudière	Québec	CPC
Gravel, Raymond	Repentigny	Québec	BQ
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, Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport)	Simcoe—Grey	Ontario	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Guimond, Michel	Montmorency—Charlevoix— Haute-Côte-Nord	Québec	BQ
Hall Findlay, Martha	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CPC
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	CPC
Harris, Richard	Cariboo—Prince George	British Columbia	CPC
Harvey, Luc	Louis-Hébert	Québec	CPC
Hawn, Laurie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Edmonton Centre	Alberta	CPC
Hearn, Hon. Loyola, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	Newfoundland and Labrador	CPC
Hiebert, Russ, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Inter-governmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	South Surrey—White Rock— Cloverdale	British Columbia	CPC
Hill, Hon. Jay, Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip	Prince George—Peace River	British Columbia	CPC
Hinton, Betty, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Kamloops—Thompson— Cariboo	British Columbia	CPC
Holland, Mark	Ajax—Pickering	Ontario	Lib.
Hubbard, Hon. Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ignatieff, Michael	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	Alberta	CPC
Jean, Brian, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Fort McMurray—Athabasca	Alberta	CPC
Jennings, Hon. Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce— Lachine	Québec	Lib.
Julian, Peter	Burnaby—New Westminster	British Columbia	NDP
Kadis, Susan	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge— Mission	British Columbia	CPC
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Nunavut	Lib.
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and to the Minister of International Trade	South Shore—St. Margaret's	Nova Scotia	CPC
Keeper, Tina	Churchill	Manitoba	Lib.
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism and Canadian Identity)	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CPC
Khan, Wajid	Mississauga—Streetsville	Ontario	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	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
Lake, Mike	Edmonton—Mill Woods— Beaumont	Alberta	CPC
Lalonde, Francine	La Pointe-de-l'Île	Québec	BQ
Lauzon, Guy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengary	Ontario	CPC
Lavallée, Carole	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Québec	BQ
Layton, Hon. Jack	Toronto—Danforth	Ontario	NDP
Lebel, Denis	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	Québec	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour	New Brunswick	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lemay, Marc	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	Québec	BQ
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Ontario	CPC
Lessard, Yves	Chambly—Borduas	Québec	BQ
Lévesque, Yvon	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik —Eeyou	Québec	BQ
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	CPC
Lunn, Hon. Gary, Minister of Natural Resources	Saanich—Gulf Islands	British Columbia	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	British Columbia	CPC
Lussier, Marcel	Brossard—La Prairie	Québec	BQ
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of National Defence and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	Central Nova	Nova Scotia	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety	Oxford	Ontario	CPC
Malhi, Hon. Gurbax	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Ontario	Lib.
Malo, Luc	Verchères—Les Patriotes	Québec	BQ
Maloney, John	Welland	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Fabian	Avalon	Newfoundland and Labrador	CPC
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River— Marquette	Manitoba	CPC
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Marston, Wayne	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek	Ontario	NDP
Martin, Hon. Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Lib.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Martin, Right Hon. Paul	LaSalle—Émard	Québec	Lib.
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	NDP
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	Ontario	NDP
Mathysen, Irene	London—Fanshawe	Ontario	NDP
Matthews, Bill	Random—Burin—St. George's	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	British Columbia	CPC
McCallum, Hon. John	Markham—Unionville	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuinty, David	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
McGuire, Hon. Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John	Scarborough—Guildwood	Ontario	Lib.
McTeague, Hon. Dan	Pickering—Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga	Québec	BQ
Ménard, Serge	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	Québec	BQ
Menzies, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Macleod	Alberta	CPC
Merrifield, Rob	Yellowhead	Alberta	CPC
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Ontario	CPC
Milliken, Hon. Peter, Speaker	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	CPC
Minna, Hon. Maria	Beaches—East York	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Moore, James, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics.....	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	CPC
Moore, Rob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Fundy Royal	New Brunswick.....	CPC
Mourani, Maria.....	Ahuntsic	Québec	BQ
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
Nash, Peggy	Parkdale—High Park	Ontario	NDP
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 National Revenue	Carleton—Mississippi Mills....	Ontario	CPC
Obhrai, Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation	Calgary East.....	Alberta	CPC
Oda, Hon. Bev, Minister of International Cooperation	Durham	Ontario	CPC
Ouellet, Christian.....	Brome—Missisquoi.....	Québec	BQ
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel ..	Québec	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	Manitoba	CPC
Paquette, Pierre.....	Joliette	Québec	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Secretary of State (Agriculture)	Mégantic—L'Érable.....	Québec	CPC
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Québec	Lib.
Pearson, Glen.....	London North Centre.....	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.....	Québec	BQ
Petit, Daniel	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles.....	Québec	CPC
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Québec	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	Québec	BQ
Poilievre, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Nepean—Carleton	Ontario	CPC
Prentice, Hon. Jim, Minister of Industry	Calgary Centre-North.....	Alberta	CPC
Preston, Joe.....	Elgin—Middlesex—London ..	Ontario	CPC
Priddy, Penny.....	Surrey North	British Columbia	NDP
Proulx, Marcel.....	Hull—Aylmer	Québec	Lib.
Rae, Hon. Bob	Toronto Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc.....	Alberta	CPC
Ratansi, Yasmin	Don Valley East.....	Ontario	Lib.
Redman, Hon. Karen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Regan, Hon. Geoff.....	Halifax West	Nova Scotia.....	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Ontario	CPC
Richardson, Lee	Calgary Centre	Alberta	CPC
Ritz, 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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Roy, Jean-Yves	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis— Matane—Matapédia	Québec	BQ
Russell, Todd	Labrador	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Savage, Michael	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Savoie, Denise	Victoria	British Columbia	NDP
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Québec	Lib.
Scheer, Andrew, The Acting Speaker	Regina—Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	CPC
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	Ontario	CPC
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shiple, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Ontario	CPC
Siksay, Bill	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Silva, Mario	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Simard, Hon. Raymond	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Skelton, Hon. Carol	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	Saskatchewan	CPC
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	Manitoba	CPC
Solberg, Hon. Monte, Minister of Human Resources and Social Development	Medicine Hat	Alberta	CPC
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	Alberta	CPC
St-Cyr, Thierry	Jeanne-Le Ber	Québec	BQ
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	Québec	BQ
St. Amand, Lloyd	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin— Kapuskasing	Ontario	Lib.
Stanton, Bruce	Simcoe North	Ontario	CPC
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	Alberta	CPC
Strahl, Hon. Chuck, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	British Columbia	CPC
Stronach, Hon. Belinda	Newmarket—Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas— Flamborough—Westdale	Ontario	CPC
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Hon. Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Temelkovski, Lui	Oak Ridges—Markham	Ontario	Lib.
Thi Lac, Ève-Mary Thai	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	Québec	BQ
Thibault, Louise	Rimouski-Neigette— Témiscouata—Les Basques	Québec	Ind.
Thibault, Hon. Robert	West Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Thompson, Hon. Greg, Minister of Veterans Affairs	New Brunswick Southwest	New Brunswick	CPC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	CPC
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	Ontario	CPC
Toews, Hon. Vic, President of the Treasury Board	Provencher	Manitoba	CPC
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Ontario	Lib.
Trost, Bradley	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Saskatchewan	CPC
Turner, Hon. Garth	Halton	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Tweed, Mervin	Brandon—Souris	Manitoba	CPC
Valley, Roger	Kenora	Ontario	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	Ontario	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform	York—Simcoe	Ontario	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	CPC
Verner, Hon. Josée, Minister of Canadian Heritage, Status of Women and Official Languages	Louis-Saint-Laurent	Québec	CPC
Vincent, Robert	Shefford	Québec	BQ
Volpe, Hon. Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	Ontario	CPC
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Warawa, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Langley	British Columbia	CPC
Warkentin, Chris	Peace River	Alberta	CPC
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North	Manitoba	NDP
Watson, Jeff	Essex	Ontario	CPC
Wilfert, Hon. Bryon	Richmond Hill	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John	Edmonton—St. Albert	Alberta	CPC
Wilson, Blair	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	British Columbia	Ind.
Wrzesnewskyj, Borys	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Yelich, Lynne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CPC
Zed, Paul	Saint John	New Brunswick	Lib.
VACANCY	Saint-Lambert	Québec	
VACANCY	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Québec	
VACANCY	Guelph	Ontario	

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session—Thirty-Ninth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (28)		
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane, Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism)	Calgary—Nose Hill	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	CPC
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	CPC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	CPC
Epp, Ken	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	CPC
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	CPC
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	CPC
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister	Calgary Southwest	CPC
Hawn, Laurie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Edmonton Centre	CPC
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	CPC
Jean, Brian, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Fort McMurray—Athabasca	CPC
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism and Canadian Identity) ...	Calgary Southeast	CPC
Lake, Mike	Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont	CPC
Menzies, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	Macleod	CPC
Merrifield, Rob	Yellowhead	CPC
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	CPC
Obhrai, Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation	Calgary East	CPC
Prentice, Hon. Jim, Minister of Industry	Calgary Centre-North	CPC
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	CPC
Richardson, Lee	Calgary Centre	CPC
Solberg, Hon. Monte, Minister of Human Resources and Social Development	Medicine Hat	CPC
Sorenson, Kevin	Crowfoot	CPC
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	CPC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	CPC
Warkentin, Chris	Peace River	CPC
Williams, John	Edmonton—St. Albert	CPC
BRITISH COLUMBIA (36)		
Abbott, Hon. Jim, Parliamentary Secretary for Canadian Heritage	Kootenay—Columbia	CPC
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	NDP
Bell, Catherine	Vancouver Island North	NDP
Bell, Don	North Vancouver	Lib.
Black, Dawn	New Westminster—Coquitlam	NDP
Cannan, Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	CPC
Chan, Hon. Raymond	Richmond	Lib.
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	NDP
Cummins, John	Delta—Richmond East	CPC
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Day, Hon. Stockwell, Minister of Public Safety	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CPC
Dhaliwal, Sukh	Newton—North Delta	Lib.
Dosanjh, Hon. Ujjal	Vancouver South	Lib.
Emerson, Hon. David, Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics	Vancouver Kingsway	CPC
Fast, Ed.	Abbotsford	CPC
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Grewal, Nina	Fleetwood—Port Kells	CPC
Harris, Richard	Cariboo—Prince George	CPC
Hiebert, Russ, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale	CPC
Hill, Hon. Jay, Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip	Prince George—Peace River	CPC
Hinton, Betty, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo	CPC
Julian, Peter	Burnaby—New Westminster	NDP
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission	CPC
Lunn, Hon. Gary, Minister of Natural Resources	Saanich—Gulf Islands	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CPC
Martin, Hon. Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	Lib.
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	CPC
Moore, James, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	CPC
Murray, Joyce	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Priddy, Penny	Surrey North	NDP
Savoie, Denise	Victoria	NDP
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
Wilson, Blair	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	Ind.
MANITOBA (14)		
Bezan, James	Selkirk—Interlake	CPC
Blaikie, Hon. Bill, The Deputy Speaker	Elmwood—Transcona	NDP
Bruinooge, Rod, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Winnipeg South	CPC
Fletcher, Steven, Parliamentary Secretary for Health	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	CPC
Keeper, Tina	Churchill	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	CPC
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Neville, Hon. Anita	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Pallister, Brian	Portage—Lisgar	CPC
Simard, Hon. Raymond	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	CPC
Toews, Hon. Vic, President of the Treasury Board	Provencher	CPC
Tweed, Mervin	Brandon—Souris	CPC
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	CPC
D'Amours, Jean-Claude	Madawaska—Restigouche	Lib.
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Hubbard, Hon. Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour	Lib.
Moore, Rob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Fundy Royal	CPC
Murphy, Brian	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Hon. Greg, Minister of Veterans Affairs	New Brunswick Southwest	CPC
Zed, Paul	Saint John	Lib.
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (7)		
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	CPC
Hearn, Hon. Loyola, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	CPC
Manning, Fabian	Avalon	CPC
Matthews, Bill	Random—Burin—St. George's	Lib.
Russell, Todd	Labrador	Lib.
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)		
Bevington, Dennis	Western Arctic	NDP
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brison, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley	Ind.
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and to the Minister of International Trade	South Shore—St. Margaret's	CPC
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of National Defence and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	Central Nova	CPC
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West	Lib.
Savage, Michael	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	NDP
Thibault, Hon. Robert	West Nova	Lib.
NUNAVUT (1)		
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
ONTARIO (105)		
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	CPC
Alghabra, Omar	Mississauga—Erindale	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	CPC
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	NDP
Bains, Hon. Navdeep	Mississauga—Brampton South	Lib.
Baird, Hon. John, Minister of the Environment	Ottawa West—Nepean	CPC
Barnes, Hon. Sue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West	Lib.
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Hon. Maurizio	Vaughan	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Boshcoff, Ken	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.
Brown, Gord	Leeds—Grenville	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	CPC
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Oshawa	CPC
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 Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario	Parry Sound—Muskoka	CPC
Comartin, Joe	Windsor—Tecumseh	NDP
Comuzzi, Hon. Joe	Thunder Bay—Superior North	CPC
Cullen, Hon. Roy	Etobicoke North	Lib.
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	CPC
Del Mastro, Dean	Peterborough	CPC
Devolin, Barry	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	NDP
Dhalla, Ruby	Brampton—Springdale	Lib.
Dryden, Hon. Ken	York Centre	Lib.
Dykstra, Rick	St. Catharines	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Haldimand—Norfolk	CPC
Flaherty, Hon. Jim, Minister of Finance	Whitby—Oshawa	CPC
Galipeau, Royal, The Acting Speaker	Ottawa—Orléans	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CPC
Godfrey, Hon. John	Don Valley West	Lib.
Goodyear, Gary	Cambridge	CPC
Guarnieri, Hon. Albina	Mississauga East—Cooksville	Lib.
Guergis, Hon. Helena, Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport)	Simcoe—Grey	CPC
Hall Findlay, Martha	Willowdale	Lib.
Holland, Mark	Ajax—Pickering	Lib.
Ignatieff, Michael	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Kadis, Susan	Thornhill	Lib.
Karygiannis, Hon. Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Khan, Wajid	Mississauga—Streetsville	CPC
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	CPC
Lauzon, Guy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Layton, Hon. Jack	Toronto—Danforth	NDP
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety	Oxford	CPC
Malhi, Hon. Gurbax	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Welland	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane	Sudbury	Lib.
Marston, Wayne	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek	NDP
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste. Marie	NDP
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	NDP
Mathyssen, Irene	London—Fanshawe	NDP
McCallum, Hon. John	Markham—Unionville	Lib.
McGuinty, David	Ottawa South	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John	Scarborough—Guildwood	Lib.
McTeague, Hon. Dan	Pickering—Scarborough East	Lib.
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	CPC
Milliken, Hon. Peter, Speaker	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Minna, Hon. Maria	Beaches—East York	Lib.
Nash, Peggy	Parkdale—High Park	NDP
Nicholson, Hon. Rob, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Niagara Falls	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon, Minister of National Revenue	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	CPC
Oda, Hon. Bev, Minister of International Cooperation	Durham	CPC
Pearson, Glen	London North Centre	Lib.
Poillievre, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Nepean—Carleton	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	CPC
Rae, Hon. Bob	Toronto Centre	Lib.
Ratansi, Yasmin	Don Valley East	Lib.
Redman, Hon. Karen	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	CPC
Rota, Anthony	Nipissing—Timiskaming	Lib.
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	CPC
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Lib.
Shiple, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	CPC
Silva, Mario	Davenport	Lib.
St. Amand, Lloyd	Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing	Lib.
Stanton, Bruce	Simcoe North	CPC
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Lib.
Stronach, Hon. Belinda	Newmarket—Aurora	Lib.
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale	CPC
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Hon. Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Lib.
Temelkovski, Lui	Oak Ridges—Markham	Lib.
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	CPC
Tonks, Alan	York South—Weston	Lib.
Turner, Hon. Garth	Halton	Lib.
Valley, Roger	Kenora	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform	York—Simcoe	CPC
Volpe, Hon. Joseph	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	CPC
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Watson, Jeff	Essex	CPC
Wilfert, Hon. Bryon	Richmond Hill	Lib.
Wrzesnewskyj, Borys	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
VACANCY	Guelph	

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Hon. Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Murphy, Hon. Shawn	Charlottetown	Lib.

QUÉBEC (73)

André, Guy	Berthier—Maskinongé	BQ
Arthur, André	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier	Ind.
Asselin, Gérard	Manicouagan	BQ
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Barbot, Vivian	Papineau	BQ
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	BQ
Bernier, Hon. Maxime, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Beauce	CPC
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie	BQ
Blackburn, Hon. Jean-Pierre, Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Jonquière—Alma	CPC
Blais, Raynald	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	BQ
Blaney, Steven	Lévis—Bellechasse	CPC
Bonsant, France	Compton—Stanstead	BQ
Bouchard, Robert	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	BQ
Boucher, Sylvie, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Status of Women	Beauport—Limoilou	CPC
Bourgeois, Diane	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Brunelle, Paule	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Cannon, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Pontiac	CPC
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	BQ
Carrier, Robert	Alfred-Pellan	BQ
Coderre, Hon. Denis	Bourassa	Lib.
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup	BQ
DeBellefeuille, Claude	Beauharnois—Salaberry	BQ
Demers, Nicole	Laval	BQ
Deschamps, Johanne	Laurentides—Labelle	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, Leader of the Opposition	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Faille, Meili	Vaudreuil-Soulanges	BQ
Folco, Raymonde	Laval—Les Îles	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Freeman, Carole	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	BQ
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gaudet, Roger	Montcalm	BQ
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	CPC
Gravel, Raymond	Repentigny	BQ
Guay, Monique	Rivière-du-Nord	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord	BQ
Harvey, Luc	Louis-Hébert	CPC
Jennings, Hon. Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
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, Denis	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	CPC
Lemay, Marc	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	BQ
Lessard, Yves	Chambly—Borduas	BQ
Lévesque, Yvon	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	BQ
Lussier, Marcel	Brossard—La Prairie	BQ
Malo, Luc	Verchères—Les Patriotes	BQ
Martin, Right Hon. Paul	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga	BQ
Ménard, Serge	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	BQ
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	BQ
Mulcair, Thomas	Outremont	NDP
Nadeau, Richard	Gatineau	BQ
Ouellet, Christian	Brome—Missisquoi	BQ
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Paquette, Pierre	Joliette	BQ
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Secretary of State (Agriculture)	Mégantic—L'Érable	CPC
Patry, Bernard	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	BQ
Petit, Daniel	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	CPC
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Proulx, Marcel	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Rodriguez, Pablo	Honoré-Mercier	Lib.
Roy, Jean-Yves	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia	BQ
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
St-Cyr, Thierry	Jeanne-Le Ber	BQ
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	BQ
Thi Lac, Ève-Mary Thai	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Thibault, Louise	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	Ind.
Verner, Hon. Josée, Minister of Canadian Heritage, Status of Women and Official Languages	Louis-Saint-Laurent	CPC
Vincent, Robert	Shefford	BQ
VACANCY	Saint-Lambert	

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
VACANCY	Westmount—Ville-Marie	
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CPC
Batters, Dave.....	Palliser	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CPC
Clarke, Rob	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River	CPC
Fitzpatrick, Brian	Prince Albert	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph, Wascana.....	Wascana	Lib.
Komarnicki, Ed, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Souris—Moose Mountain	CPC
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.....	CPC
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board.....	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CPC
Scheer, Andrew, The Acting Speaker	Regina—Qu'Appelle	CPC
Skelton, Hon. Carol	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar.....	CPC
Trost, Bradley.....	Saskatoon—Humboldt	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin.....	CPC
Yelich, Lynne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development	Blackstrap	CPC
YUKON (1)		
Bagnell, Hon. Larry	Yukon.....	Lib.

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of April 18, 2008 — 2nd Session, 39th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Barry Devolin

Vice-Chairs:

Jean Crowder
Nancy Karetak-Lindell

Harold Albrecht
Rod Bruinooge
Rob Clarke

Tina Keeper
Marc Lemay

Yvon Lévesque
Anita Neville

Todd Russell
Chris Warkentin

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Gérard Asselin
Larry Bagnell
Dave Batters
Catherine Bell
Leon Benoit
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Olivia Chow
Joe Comuzzi

Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Tony Martin
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister

Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

Chair:

Paul Szabo

Vice-Chairs:Pat Martin
David TilsonDave Batters
Sukh Dhaliwal
Russ HiebertCharles Hubbard
Carole LavalléeRichard Nadeau
Glen PearsonDave Van Kesteren
Mike Wallace

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi
Paul Crête
John Cummins

Patricia Davidson
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Monique Guay
Michel Guimond
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit

Pauline Picard
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Penny Priddy
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Maurice Vellacott
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair: James Bezan

Vice-Chairs: André Bellavance
Paul Steckle

Alex Atamanenko
Ken Boshcoff
Wayne Easter

Guy Lauzon
Larry Miller

Carol Skelton
Lloyd St. Amand

Brian Storseth
Ève-Mary Thaï Thi Lac

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Guy André
Charlie Angus
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Serge Cardin
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi

John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Charles Hubbard
Rahim Jaffer

Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Tony Martin
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister

Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair: Gary Schellenberger

Vice-Chairs: Maria Mourani
Andy Scott

Jim Abbott
Michael Chong
Denis Coderre

Dean Del Mastro
Ed Fast

Hedy Fry
Luc Malo

Francis Scarpaleggia
Bill Siksay

(12)

Associate Members

Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Alex Atamanenko
Vivian Barbot
Colleen Beaumier
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
David Christopherson
Rob Clarke
Joe Comuzzi
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson

Libby Davies
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Tina Keeper
Wajid Khan

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Wayne Marston
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Richard Nadeau
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Glen Pearson
Daniel Petit

Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Pablo Rodriguez
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Norman Doyle

Vice-Chairs: Thierry St-Cyr
Andrew Telegdi

Dave Batters
Colleen Beaumier
Maurizio Bevilacqua

Robert Carrier
Olivia Chow

Nina Grewal
Jim Karygiannis

Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Vivian Barbot
Don Bell
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Dawn Black
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Rob Clarke
Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins

Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Dean Del Mastro
Johanne Deschamps
Barry Devolin
Sukh Dhaliwal
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Daryl Kramp

Mike Lake
Francine Lalonde
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Brian Masse
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Penny Priddy

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Lui Temelkovski
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Blair Wilson
Lynne Yelich

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Bob Mills

Vice-Chairs:
Bernard Bigras
Geoff ReganNathan Cullen
John Godfrey
Luc HarveyMarcel Lussier
David McGuintyFrancis Scarpaleggia
Maurice VellacottMark Warawa
Jeff Watson

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Paule Brunelle
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi
Jean Crowder
John Cummins
Patricia DavidsonClaude DeBellefeuille
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Martha Hall Findlay
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Susan Kadis
Randy Kamp
Jim Karygiannis
Gerald KeddyWajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
James Moore
Rob Moore
Thomas Mulcair
Joyce Murray
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Christian Ouellet
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre PoilievreJoe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Anthony Rota
Denise Savoie
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Lloyd St. Amand
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Chris Warkentin
John Williams
Blair Wilson
Lynne Yelich

FINANCE**Chair:** Rob Merrifield**Vice-Chairs:**Paul Crête
Massimo PacettiDean Del Mastro
Rick Dykstra
Jean-Yves LaforestJohn McCallum
John McKayTed Menzies
Thomas MulcairGarth Turner
Mike Wallace

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Navdeep Bains
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Robert Bouchard
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Rob Clarke
Joe Comuzzi
Jean Crowder
John CumminsPatricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Barry Devolin
Sukh Dhaliwal
Norman Doyle
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
John Godfrey
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Martha Hall Findlay
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald KeddyWajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Gurbax Malhi
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Joyce Murray
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James RajotteScott Reid
Lee Richardson
Anthony Rota
Michael Savage
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Lui Temelkovski
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Blair Wilson
Lynne Yelich

FISHERIES AND OCEANS**Chair:**

Fabian Manning

Vice-Chairs:Raynald Blais
Bill MatthewsMike Allen
Gerry Byrne
Blaine CalkinsRandy Kamp
Gerald KeddyYvon Lévesque
Lawrence MacAulayScott Simms
Peter Stoffer

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Catherine Bell
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Robert Carrier
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe Comuzzi
Paul Crête
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen
John CumminsRodger Cuzner
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Wayne Easter
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Wajid KhanEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mario Laframboise
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott ReidLee Richardson
Todd Russell
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Paul Steckle
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Roger Valley
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Kevin Sorenson	Vice-Chairs:	Vivian Barbot Bernard Patry	
Raymond Chan Johanne Deschamps Paul Dewar	Peter Goldring Wajid Khan	Denis Lebel Keith Martin	Deepak Obhrai Bob Rae	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Patricia Davidson	Ed Komarnicki	Joe Preston
Harold Albrecht	Dean Del Mastro	Daryl Kramp	James Rajotte
Mike Allen	Barry Devolin	Mike Lake	Scott Reid
Dean Allison	Sukh Dhaliwal	Francine Lalonde	Lee Richardson
Rob Anders	Norman Doyle	Guy Lauzon	Anthony Rota
David Anderson	Rick Dykstra	Jack Layton	Michael Savage
Claude Bachand	Ken Epp	Pierre Lemieux	Gary Schellenberger
Larry Bagnell	Mark Eyking	Tom Lukiwski	Bev Shipley
Navdeep Bains	Meili Faille	James Lunney	Bill Siksay
Dave Batters	Ed Fast	Dave MacKenzie	Mario Silva
Colleen Beaumier	Brian Fitzpatrick	Gurbax Malhi	Raymond Simard
Leon Benoit	Steven Fletcher	Fabian Manning	Carol Skelton
James Bezan	Raymonde Folco	Inky Mark	Joy Smith
Dawn Black	Cheryl Gallant	Wayne Marston	Thierry St-Cyr
Steven Blaney	John Godfrey	Brian Masse	Caroline St-Hilaire
Sylvie Boucher	Gary Goodyear	Colin Mayes	Bruce Stanton
Diane Bourgeois	Jacques Gourde	Alexa McDonough	Brian Storseth
Garry Breitkreuz	Nina Grewal	John McKay	David Sweet
Bonnie Brown	Art Hanger	Ted Menzies	Myron Thompson
Gord Brown	Richard Harris	Rob Merrifield	David Tilson
Patrick Brown	Luc Harvey	Larry Miller	Alan Tonks
Rod Bruinooge	Laurie Hawn	Bob Mills	Bradley Trost
Blaine Calkins	Russ Hiebert	Maria Minna	Mervin Tweed
Ron Cannan	Betty Hinton	James Moore	Dave Van Kesteren
Serge Cardin	Michael Ignatieff	Rob Moore	Maurice Vellacott
Colin Carrie	Rahim Jaffer	Richard Nadeau	Mike Wallace
Rick Casson	Brian Jean	Anita Neville	Mark Warawa
Michael Chong	Peter Julian	Rick Norlock	Chris Warkentin
Rob Clarke	Randy Kamp	Brian Pallister	Jeff Watson
Joe Comartin	Jim Karygiannis	Glen Pearson	John Williams
Joe Comuzzi	Gerald Keddy	Daniel Petit	Borys Wrzesnewskyj
Irwin Cotler	Jason Kenney	Pierre Poilievre	Lynne Yelich
John Cummins			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Scott Reid	Vice-Chairs:	Mario Silva Caroline St-Hilaire	
Irwin Cotler	Jason Kenney	Wayne Marston	David Sweet	(7)

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:

Diane Marleau

Vice-Chairs:Charlie Angus
Daryl KrampHarold Albrecht
Diane Bourgeois
Patrick BrownMeili Faille
Raymonde FolcoMark Holland
James MooreMario Silva
Chris Warkentin

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Rob Clarke
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle

Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Jean-Yves Laforest
Mike Lake

Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Marcel Lussier
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
Rob Moore
Thomas Mulcair
Richard Nadeau
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Massimo Pacetti
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Geoff Regan
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Denise Savoie
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Judy Wasylycia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HEALTH**Chair:**

Joy Smith

Vice-Chairs:Christiane Gagnon
Lui TemelkovskiCarolyn Bennett
Patrick Brown
Patricia DavidsonSteven Fletcher
Susan KadisLuc Malo
Robert ThibaultDavid Tilson
Judy Wasylcia-Leis

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Bill Blaikie
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe Comuzzi
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Rodger Cuzner
Dean Del MastroBarry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Raymond Gravel
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Tina Keeper
Wajid KhanEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
John Maloney
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Brian Masse
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
Maria Minna
James Moore
Rob Moore
Brian Murphy
Rick Norlock
Deepak ObhraiBrian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Penny Priddy
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

HUMAN RESOURCES, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chair:

Dean Allison

Vice-Chairs:
Yves Lessard
Michael SavageFrance Bonsant
Gord Brown
Rodger CuznerRuby Dhalla
Jacques GourdeMike Lake
Tony MartinJudy Sgro
Lynne Yelich

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Carolyn Bennett
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitreuz
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
Olivia Chow
David Christopherson
Rob Clarke
Joe Comuzzi
Jean Crowder
Nathan Cullen
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Dean Del MastroBarry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Raymonde Folco
Hedy Fry
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Raymond Gravel
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gerald Keddy
Wajid KhanEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Guy Lauzon
Carole Lavallée
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
Maria Minna
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Christian Ouellet
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe PrestonJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Todd Russell
Denise Savoie
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Scott Simms
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Thierry St-Cyr
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair: James Rajotte

Vice-Chairs:

Paule Brunelle
Dan McTeague

André Arthur
Scott Brison
Colin Carrie

Mark Eyking
Peggy Nash

Raymond Simard
Bruce Stanton

Dave Van Kesteren
Robert Vincent

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rona Ambrose
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Gérard Asselin
Dave Batters
Catherine Bell
Don Bell
Leon Benoit
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Ken Boshcoff
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Gerry Byrne
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Serge Cardin
Robert Carrier
Rick Casson
Raymond Chan
Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Rob Clarke

Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi
Jean Crowder
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Claude DeBellefeuille
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Hedy Fry
Cheryl Gallant
Yvon Godin
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean

Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Jean-Yves Laforest
Mario Laframboise
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Dominic LeBlanc
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Tony Martin
Brian Masse
Colin Mayes
John McCallum
Joe McGuire
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Brian Murphy
Rick Norlock

Deepak Obhrai
Massimo Pacetti
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Geoff Regan
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Anthony Rota
Jean-Yves Roy
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Bill Siksay
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair:

Lee Richardson

Vice-Chairs:
Serge Cardin
John MaloneyDean Allison
Guy André
Navdeep BainsRon Cannan
Sukh DhaliwalPeter Julian
Gerald KeddyLarry Miller
Joyce Murray

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
 Harold Albrecht
 Mike Allen
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Vivian Barbot
 Dave Batters
 Don Bell
 Leon Benoit
 James Bezan
 Steven Blaney
 Sylvie Boucher
 Garry Breitzkreuz
 Gord Brown
 Patrick Brown
 Rod Bruinooge
 Paule Brunelle
 Blaine Calkins
 Colin Carrie
 Rick Casson
 Raymond Chan
 Michael Chong
 Rob Clarke
 Joe Comuzzi
 John Cummins
 Patricia Davidson
 Dean Del Mastro

Barry Devolin
 Paul Dewar
 Norman Doyle
 Rick Dykstra
 Wayne Easter
 Ken Epp
 Meili Faille
 Ed Fast
 Brian Fitzpatrick
 Steven Fletcher
 Cheryl Gallant
 Peter Goldring
 Gary Goodyear
 Jacques Gourde
 Nina Grewal
 Art Hanger
 Richard Harris
 Luc Harvey
 Laurie Hawn
 Russ Hiebert
 Betty Hinton
 Rahim Jaffer
 Brian Jean
 Randy Kamp
 Wajid Khan
 Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp
 Mike Lake
 Francine Lalonde
 Guy Lauzon
 Denis Lebel
 Dominic LeBlanc
 Pierre Lemieux
 Tom Lukiwski
 James Lunney
 Dave MacKenzie
 Fabian Manning
 Inky Mark
 Colin Mayes
 John McCallum
 Alexa McDonough
 Ted Menzies
 Rob Merrifield
 Bob Mills
 James Moore
 Rob Moore
 Thomas Mulcair
 Peggy Nash
 Rick Norlock
 Deepak Obhrai
 Daniel Petit
 Pierre Poilievre

Joe Preston
 James Rajotte
 Geoff Regan
 Scott Reid
 Gary Schellenberger
 Bev Shipley
 Raymond Simard
 Carol Skelton
 Joy Smith
 Kevin Sorenson
 Bruce Stanton
 Brian Storseth
 David Sweet
 Myron Thompson
 David Tilson
 Bradley Trost
 Mervin Tweed
 Dave Van Kesteren
 Maurice Vellacott
 Robert Vincent
 Mike Wallace
 Mark Warawa
 Chris Warkentin
 Jeff Watson
 John Williams
 Lynne Yelich

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair:	Art Hanger	Vice-Chairs:	Réal Ménard Brian Murphy	
Larry Bagnell Blaine Calkins Joe Comartin	Rick Dykstra Carole Freeman	Dominic LeBlanc Derek Lee	Rob Moore Daniel Petit	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Libby Davies	Daryl Kramp	Penny Priddy
Harold Albrecht	Dean Del Mastro	Mike Lake	James Rajotte
Mike Allen	Barry Devolin	Guy Lauzon	Scott Reid
Dean Allison	Sukh Dhaliwal	Carole Lavallée	Lee Richardson
Rob Anders	Norman Doyle	Denis Lebel	Gary Schellenberger
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Pierre Lemieux	Bev Shipley
Sue Barnes	Meili Faille	Tom Lukiwski	Bill Siksay
Dave Batters	Ed Fast	James Lunney	Carol Skelton
Leon Benoit	Brian Fitzpatrick	Dave MacKenzie	Joy Smith
James Bezan	Steven Fletcher	John Maloney	Kevin Sorenson
Bill Blaikie	Cheryl Gallant	Fabian Manning	Lloyd St. Amand
Steven Blaney	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Bruce Stanton
Sylvie Boucher	Gary Goodyear	Wayne Marston	Brian Storseth
Garry Breitzkreuz	Jacques Gourde	Colin Mayes	David Sweet
Bonnie Brown	Nina Grewal	John McKay	Myron Thompson
Gord Brown	Richard Harris	Serge Ménard	David Tilson
Patrick Brown	Luc Harvey	Ted Menzies	Bradley Trost
Rod Bruinooge	Laurie Hawn	Rob Merrifield	Mervin Tweed
Ron Cannan	Russ Hiebert	Larry Miller	Dave Van Kesteren
Colin Carrie	Betty Hinton	Bob Mills	Maurice Vellacott
Rick Casson	Rahim Jaffer	James Moore	Mike Wallace
Michael Chong	Brian Jean	Anita Neville	Mark Warawa
Rob Clarke	Marlene Jennings	Rick Norlock	Chris Warkentin
Joe Comuzzi	Randy Kamp	Deepak Obhrai	Jeff Watson
Irwin Cotler	Gerald Keddy	Brian Pallister	John Williams
John Cummins	Wajid Khan	Pierre Poilievre	Lynne Yelich
Patricia Davidson	Ed Komarnicki	Joe Preston	

LIAISON

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:	Yasmin Ratansi	
Rob Anders	Barry Devolin	Rob Merrifield	Gary Schellenberger	(27)
Leon Benoit	Norman Doyle	Bob Mills	Andy Scott	
James Bezan	Art Hanger	Shawn Murphy	Joy Smith	
Steven Blaney	Derek Lee	Joe Preston	Kevin Sorenson	
Garry Breitzkreuz	Fabian Manning	James Rajotte	Paul Szabo	
Blaine Calkins	Diane Marleau	Lee Richardson	Mervin Tweed	
Rick Casson				

Associate Members

Charlie Angus	Paul Crête	John Maloney	Pablo Rodriguez
Claude Bachand	Jean Crowder	Pat Martin	Michael Savage
Vivian Barbot	Roy Cullen	Irene Mathysen	Thierry St-Cyr
Catherine Bell	Patricia Davidson	Bill Matthews	Lloyd St. Amand
André Bellavance	Ken Epp	Dan McTeague	Brent St. Denis
Carolyn Bennett	Christiane Gagnon	Réal Ménard	Paul Steckle
Bernard Bigras	Yvon Godin	Maria Mourani	Peter Stoffer
Raynald Blais	Michel Guimond	Brian Murphy	David Sweet
Paule Brunelle	Nancy Karetak-Lindell	Massimo Pacetti	Andrew Telegdi
John Cannis	Daryl Kramp	Penny Priddy	Lui Temelkovski
Serge Cardin	Jean-Yves Laforest	Marcel Proulx	David Tilson
David Christopherson	Mario Laframboise	Geoff Regan	Joseph Volpe
Rob Clarke	Yves Lessard		

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:	Yasmin Ratansi	
Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Paul Szabo	Mervin Tweed	(7)
Diane Marleau				

NATIONAL DEFENCE**Chair:**

Rick Casson

Vice-Chairs:Claude Bachand
John CannisDawn Black
Steven Blaney
Robert BouchardCheryl Gallant
Laurie HawnJames Lunney
Joe McGuireAnthony Rota
Bryon Wilfert

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Larry Bagnell
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Colleen Beaumier
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Bernard Bigras
Bill Blaikie
Sylvie Boucher
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Robert Carrier
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe Comuzzi
John CumminsPatricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Johanne Deschamps
Barry Devolin
Ujjal Dosanjh
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed KomarnickiDaryl Kramp
Mario Laframboise
Mike Lake
Francine Lalonde
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Dominic LeBlanc
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Gilles-A. Perron
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe PrestonJames Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Scott Simms
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Alan Tonks
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Borys Wrzesnewskyj
Lynne Yelich

NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:

Leon Benoit

Vice-Chairs:
Catherine Bell
Lloyd St. AmandOmar Alghabra
Mike Allen
David AndersonKen Boshcoff
Claude DeBellefeuilleRichard Harris
Christian OuelletAlan Tonks
Bradley Trost

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
 Harold Albrecht
 Dean Allison
 Rob Anders
 Dave Batters
 Dennis Bevington
 James Bezan
 Bernard Bigras
 Steven Blaney
 Sylvie Boucher
 Garry Breitreuz
 Gord Brown
 Patrick Brown
 Rod Bruinooge
 Blaine Calkins
 Ron Cannan
 Colin Carrie
 Rick Casson
 Michael Chong
 Rob Clarke
 Joe Comuzzi
 Paul Crête
 Jean Crowder
 Nathan Cullen
 John Cummins
 Patricia Davidson

Dean Del Mastro
 Barry Devolin
 Norman Doyle
 Rick Dykstra
 Ken Epp
 Meili Faille
 Ed Fast
 Brian Fitzpatrick
 Steven Fletcher
 Cheryl Gallant
 Yvon Godin
 Peter Goldring
 Gary Goodyear
 Jacques Gourde
 Nina Grewal
 Art Hanger
 Luc Harvey
 Laurie Hawn
 Russ Hiebert
 Betty Hinton
 Rahim Jaffer
 Brian Jean
 Randy Kamp
 Gerald Keddy
 Wajid Khan

Ed Komarnicki
 Daryl Kramp
 Mike Lake
 Guy Lauzon
 Denis Lebel
 Pierre Lemieux
 Tom Lukiwski
 James Lunney
 Marcel Lussier
 Dave MacKenzie
 Fabian Manning
 Inky Mark
 Colin Mayes
 Ted Menzies
 Rob Merrifield
 Larry Miller
 Bob Mills
 James Moore
 Rob Moore
 Rick Norlock
 Deepak Obhrai
 Brian Pallister
 Daniel Petit
 Pierre Poilievre
 Joe Preston

James Rajotte
 Scott Reid
 Lee Richardson
 Gary Schellenberger
 Bev Shipley
 Scott Simms
 Carol Skelton
 Joy Smith
 Kevin Sorenson
 Bruce Stanton
 Brian Storseth
 David Sweet
 Myron Thompson
 David Tilson
 Mervin Tweed
 Roger Valley
 Dave Van Kesteren
 Maurice Vellacott
 Robert Vincent
 Mike Wallace
 Mark Warawa
 Chris Warkentin
 Jeff Watson
 John Williams
 Lynne Yelich

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**Chair:** Steven Blaney**Vice-Chairs:**Yvon Godin
Pablo RodriguezMichael Chong
Denis Coderre
Jean-Claude D'AmoursRaymond Gravel
Denis LebelPierre Lemieux
Richard NadeauDaniel Petit
Brent St. Denis

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Alex Atamanenko
Vivian Barbot
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Rob Clarke
Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del MastroBarry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed KomarnickiMaka Kotto
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Maria Mourani
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
James RajotteGeoff Regan
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Denise Savoie
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:		Vice-Chairs:	Michel Guimond Marcel Proulx	
Yvon Godin Gary Goodyear Marlene Jennings	Dominic LeBlanc Pierre Lemieux Tom Lukiwski	Pauline Picard Joe Preston	Karen Redman Scott Reid	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott Harold Albrecht Mike Allen Dean Allison Rob Anders David Anderson Charlie Angus G�rard Asselin Dave Batters Leon Benoit James Bezan Bill Blaikie Steven Blaney Sylvie Boucher Gary Breitzkreuz Gord Brown Patrick Brown Rod Bruinooge Blaine Calkins Ron Cannan Colin Carrie Rick Casson Chris Charlton Michael Chong Rob Clarke Joe Comartin	Joe Comuzzi John Cummins Patricia Davidson Libby Davies Dean Del Mastro Barry Devolin Norman Doyle Rick Dykstra Ken Epp Ed Fast Brian Fitzpatrick Steven Fletcher Cheryl Gallant Peter Goldring Jacques Gourde Nina Grewal Monique Guay Art Hanger Richard Harris Luc Harvey Laurie Hawn Russ Hiebert Betty Hinton Rahim Jaffer Brian Jean Randy Kamp	Gerald Keddy Wajid Khan Ed Komarnicki Daryl Kramp Mike Lake Guy Lauzon Denis Lebel Derek Lee James Lunney Dave MacKenzie Fabian Manning Inky Mark Colin Mayes R�al M�nard Ted Menzies Rob Merrifield Larry Miller Bob Mills James Moore Rob Moore Brian Murphy Shawn Murphy Rick Norlock Deepak Obhrai Brian Pallister Pierre Paquette	Daniel Petit Pierre Poilievre James Rajotte Lee Richardson Gary Schellenberger Bev Shipley Raymond Simard Carol Skelton Joy Smith Kevin Sorenson Bruce Stanton Brian Storseth David Sweet Paul Szabo Myron Thompson David Tilson Bradley Trost Mervin Tweed Dave Van Kesteren Maurice Vellacott Mike Wallace Mark Warawa Chris Warkentin Jeff Watson John Williams Lynne Yelich	
---	--	---	--	--

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Chair:	Scott Reid	Vice-Chair:		
Chris Charlton	Gary Goodyear	Dominic LeBlanc	Pauline Picard	(5)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Joe Preston	Vice-Chair:		
Chris Charlton	Derek Lee	Pauline Picard	Scott Reid	(5)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:**

Shawn Murphy

Vice-Chairs:Jean-Yves Laforest
David SweetMauril Bélanger
David Christopherson
Brian FitzpatrickMark Holland
Mike LakeMarcel Lussier
Pierre PoilievreJohn Williams
Borys Wrzesnewskyj

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Omar Alghabra
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Ken Boshcoff
Sylvie Boucher
Diane Bourgeois
Garry Breitreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe ComuzziJohn Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald KeddyWajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Thomas Mulcair
Richard Nadeau
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian PallisterDaniel Petit
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
Lynne Yelich

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:

Garry Breitkreuz

Vice-Chairs:Roy Cullen
Penny PriddySue Barnes
Bonnie Brown
Gord BrownUjjal Dosanjh
Dave MacKenzieColin Mayes
Serge MénardRick Norlock
Ève-Mary Thāi Thi Lac

(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Omar Alghabra
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
France Bonsant
Sylvie Boucher
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Raymond Chan
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe Comartin
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson

Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Carole Freeman
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Derek Lee
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Wayne Marston
Alexa McDonough
Réal Ménard
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Bev Oda
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Robert Vincent
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Borys Wrzesnewskyj
Lynne Yelich

STATUS OF WOMEN**Chair:** Yasmin Ratansi**Vice-Chairs:**Patricia Davidson
Irene MathysenSylvie Boucher
Nicole Demers
Johanne DeschampsNina Grewal
Inky MarkMaria Minna
Anita NevilleGlen Pearson
Bruce Stanton

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Catherine Bell
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Dawn Black
Steven Blaney
France Bonsant
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Chris Charlton
Michael Chong
Olivia Chow
Rob Clarke
Joe ComuzziJean Crowder
John Cummins
Libby Davies
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Meili Faille
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Nancy Karetak-LindellGerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Jack Layton
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Colin Mayes
Alexa McDonough
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Peggy Nash
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel PetitPierre Poilievre
Joe Preston
Penny Priddy
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chair:	Rob Anders	Vice-Chairs:	Brent St. Denis Peter Stoffer	
Ron Cannan Roger Gaudet Albina Guarnieri	Betty Hinton Gilles-A. Perron	Todd Russell Bev Shipley	David Sweet Roger Valley	(12)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott	Dean Del Mastro	Wajid Khan	Daniel Petit
Harold Albrecht	Barry Devolin	Ed Komarnicki	Pierre Poilievre
Mike Allen	Norman Doyle	Daryl Kramp	Joe Preston
Dean Allison	Rick Dykstra	Mike Lake	James Rajotte
David Anderson	Ken Epp	Guy Lauzon	Scott Reid
Claude Bachand	Ed Fast	Denis Lebel	Lee Richardson
Dave Batters	Brian Fitzpatrick	Pierre Lemieux	Gary Schellenberger
Leon Benoit	Steven Fletcher	Tom Lukiwski	Carol Skelton
James Bezan	Christiane Gagnon	James Lunney	Joy Smith
Dawn Black	Cheryl Gallant	Dave MacKenzie	Kevin Sorenson
Bill Blaikie	Yvon Godin	Fabian Manning	Bruce Stanton
Steven Blaney	Peter Goldring	Inky Mark	Brian Storseth
Sylvie Boucher	Gary Goodyear	Tony Martin	Myron Thompson
Garry Breitzkreuz	Jacques Gourde	Colin Mayes	David Tilson
Gord Brown	Raymond Gravel	Alexa McDonough	Bradley Trost
Patrick Brown	Nina Grewal	Ted Menzies	Mervin Tweed
Rod Bruinooge	Art Hanger	Rob Merrifield	Dave Van Kesteren
Blaine Calkins	Richard Harris	Larry Miller	Maurice Vellacott
Colin Carrie	Luc Harvey	Bob Mills	Mike Wallace
Rick Casson	Laurie Hawn	James Moore	Mark Warawa
Michael Chong	Russ Hiebert	Rob Moore	Chris Warkentin
Rob Clarke	Rahim Jaffer	Rick Norlock	Jeff Watson
Joe Comuzzi	Brian Jean	Deepak Obhrai	John Williams
John Cummins	Randy Kamp	Brian Pallister	Lynne Yelich
Patricia Davidson	Gerald Keddy	Glen Pearson	

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CANADIAN MISSION IN AFGHANISTAN

Chair:	Pierre Lemieux	Vice-Chairs:	Vivian Barbot Dawn Black Bryon Wilfert	
Claude Bachand Sylvie Boucher Ujjal Dosanjh	Laurie Hawn Gerald Keddy	Dave MacKenzie Deepak Obhrai	Bernard Patry Bob Rae	(13)

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs: Blaine Calkins
Marilyn Trenholme Counsell

Joint Vice-Chair: Carolyn Bennett

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Jean Lapointe
Lowell Murray

Donald Oliver
William Rompkey

Mike Allen
G rard Asselin
Gerry Byrne
Ken Dryden
Cheryl Gallant

Peter Goldring
Gurbax Malhi
Fabian Manning
Louis Plamondon
Denise Savoie

(17)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins
Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin

Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ken Epp
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Luc Harvey
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Rahim Jaffer
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki
Maka Kotto
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake

Guy Lauzon
Denis Lebel
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Maria Mourani
Richard Nadeau
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Glen Pearson
Daniel Petit
Pierre Poilievre
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: J. Eyton
Derek Lee

Joint Vice-Chairs: David Christopherson
Ken Epp

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Lise Bacon
Michel Biron
John Bryden
Mac Harb

Wilfred Moore
Pierre Claude Nolin
Gerry St. Germain

Sue Barnes
Carole Freeman
Monique Guay
Luc Harvey
Rahim Jaffer

Rick Norlock
Pierre Poilievre
Paul Szabo
Tom Wappel

(20)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Dave Batters
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Steven Blaney
Sylvie Boucher
Garry Breitreuz
Gord Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Rick Casson
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joe Comuzzi
John Cummins

Patricia Davidson
Dean Del Mastro
Barry Devolin
Norman Doyle
Rick Dykstra
Ed Fast
Brian Fitzpatrick
Steven Fletcher
Cheryl Gallant
Peter Goldring
Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Art Hanger
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Betty Hinton
Brian Jean
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Wajid Khan
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp
Mario Laframboise
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Fabian Manning
Inky Mark
Colin Mayes
Réal Ménard
Serge Ménard
Ted Menzies
Rob Merrifield
Larry Miller
Bob Mills
James Moore
Rob Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Brian Pallister
Daniel Petit
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Lee Richardson
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Carol Skelton
Joy Smith
Kevin Sorenson
Bruce Stanton
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
Myron Thompson
David Tilson
Bradley Trost
Mervin Tweed
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Williams
Lynne Yelich

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

BILL C-20

Chair: Albina Guarnieri

Vice-Chair:

Charlie Angus
Raymonde Folco
Hedy Fry

Gary Goodyear
Jacques Gourde
Jay Hill

John Maloney
Rob Moore
Brian Murphy

Pierre Paquette
Pauline Picard
Scott Reid

(13)

Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

HON. BILL BLAIKIE

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. ROYAL GALIPEAU

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. ANDREW SCHEER

MS. DAWN BLACK

MR. KEN EPP

HON. ALBINA GUARNIERI

HON. JUDY SGRO

MR. PAUL ZED

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Stephen Harper	Prime Minister
Hon. Rob Nicholson	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. David Emerson	Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics
Hon. Jean-Pierre Blackburn	Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Hon. Greg Thompson	Minister of Veterans Affairs
Hon. Marjory LeBreton	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Secretary of State (Seniors)
Hon. Monte Solberg	Minister of Human Resources and Social Development
Hon. Chuck Strahl	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Hon. Gary Lunn	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. Peter MacKay	Minister of National Defence and Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
Hon. Loyola Hearn	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Stockwell Day	Minister of Public Safety
Hon. Vic Toews	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Rona Ambrose	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
Hon. Diane Finley	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Gordon O'Connor	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Bev Oda	Minister of International Cooperation
Hon. Jim Prentice	Minister of Industry
Hon. John Baird	Minister of the Environment
Hon. Maxime Bernier	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Lawrence Cannon	Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Hon. Tony Clement	Minister of Health and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario
Hon. Jim Flaherty	Minister of Finance
Hon. Josée Verner	Minister of Canadian Heritage, Status of Women and Official Languages
Hon. Michael Fortier	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Hon. Peter Van Loan	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform
Hon. Gerry Ritz	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board
Hon. Jay Hill	Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip
Hon. Jason Kenney	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism and Canadian Identity)
Hon. Helena Guergis	Secretary of State (Foreign Affairs and International Trade) (Sport)
Hon. Christian Paradis	Secretary of State (Agriculture)
Hon. Diane Ablonczy	Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher	to the Prime Minister and for Status of Women
Mr. Rob Moore	to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Mr. James Moore	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics
Mr. Jacques Gourde	to the Minister of Labour and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Mrs. Betty Hinton	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mrs. Lynne Yelich	to the Minister of Human Resources and Social Development
Mr. Rod Bruinooge	to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians
Mr. David Anderson	to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board
Mr. Laurie Hawn	to the Minister of National Defence
Mr. Gerald Keddy	to the Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and to the Minister of International Trade
Mr. Randy Kamp	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Dave MacKenzie	to the Minister of Public Safety
Mr. Pierre Poilievre	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. Russ Hiebert	to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
Mr. Ed Komarnicki	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Colin Carrie	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Mark Warawa	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Deepak Obhrai	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation
Mr. Brian Jean	to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Mr. Steven Fletcher	for Health
Mr. Guy Lauzon	to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario
Mr. Ted Menzies	to the Minister of Finance
Hon. Jim Abbott	for Canadian Heritage
Mr. Pierre Lemieux	for Official Languages
Mr. Tom Lukiwski	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform

CONTENTS

Friday, April 18, 2008

<p>Point of Order</p> <p>Comments by Member for Hochelaga</p> <p>Mr. Ménard (Hochelaga)..... 5099</p>	<p>Liberal Party of Canada</p> <p>Mr. Tweed..... 5109</p>
GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
<p>Criminal Code</p> <p>Bill S-3. Second reading..... 5099</p> <p>Mr. Siksay..... 5099</p> <p>Mrs. DeBellefeuille..... 5101</p> <p>Mr. Ménard (Hochelaga)..... 5102</p> <p>Mr. Albrecht..... 5102</p> <p>Mr. Ménard (Hochelaga)..... 5103</p> <p>Mr. Dewar..... 5105</p> <p>Ms. Demers..... 5105</p> <p>Mrs. DeBellefeuille..... 5106</p>	<p>ORAL QUESTIONS</p> <p>Elections Canada</p> <p>Mr. Ignatieff..... 5110</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5110</p> <p>Mr. Ignatieff..... 5110</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5110</p> <p>Mr. Ignatieff..... 5110</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5110</p> <p>Mrs. Jennings..... 5110</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5110</p> <p>Mrs. Jennings..... 5110</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5110</p> <p>Mr. Paquette..... 5111</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5111</p> <p>Mr. Paquette..... 5111</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5111</p> <p>Ms. Picard..... 5111</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5111</p> <p>Ms. Picard..... 5111</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5111</p>
STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS	
<p>Amateur Sports</p> <p>Mr. Goodyear..... 5106</p> <p>Peace it Together</p> <p>Ms. Fry..... 5106</p> <p>Robbert Fortin</p> <p>Ms. Faille..... 5106</p> <p>Foreign Takeovers</p> <p>Ms. Charlton..... 5107</p> <p>Prostate Cancer</p> <p>Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)..... 5107</p> <p>Lucien and Adrien Bossé</p> <p>Mr. D'Amours..... 5107</p> <p>Philippines</p> <p>Mr. Obhrai..... 5107</p> <p>Science Fair</p> <p>Mr. Nadeau..... 5108</p> <p>Harold Buchwald</p> <p>Mr. Fletcher..... 5108</p> <p>Organ and Tissue Donation</p> <p>Mr. McGuinty..... 5108</p> <p>Liberal Party of Canada</p> <p>Mr. Stanton..... 5108</p> <p>Special Events</p> <p>Mr. Dewar..... 5108</p> <p>Earth Day</p> <p>Mr. Wilfert..... 5109</p> <p>Olympic Hall of Fame</p> <p>Mr. Vincent..... 5109</p> <p>Justice System</p> <p>Mr. Brison..... 5109</p>	<p>Conservative Party of Canada</p> <p>Ms. Davies..... 5112</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5112</p> <p>Ms. Davies..... 5112</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5112</p> <p>Elections Canada</p> <p>Ms. Hall Findlay..... 5112</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5112</p> <p>Ms. Hall Findlay..... 5112</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5112</p> <p>Mr. Goodale..... 5113</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5113</p> <p>Mr. Goodale..... 5113</p> <p>Mr. Van Loan..... 5113</p> <p>Justice</p> <p>Ms. Demers..... 5113</p> <p>Mr. Moore (Fundy Royal)..... 5113</p> <p>Ms. Demers..... 5113</p> <p>Mr. Moore (Fundy Royal)..... 5113</p> <p>Public Safety</p> <p>Mr. Ménard (Hochelaga)..... 5113</p> <p>Mr. MacKenzie..... 5113</p> <p>Mr. Ménard (Hochelaga)..... 5114</p> <p>Mr. MacKenzie..... 5114</p> <p>Minister of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)..... 5114</p> <p>Mr. Obhrai..... 5114</p> <p>Mr. Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)..... 5114</p>

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

APPENDIX

Employment Insurance Surplus Transfer Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau)	5131
---	------

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 case de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante :**
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

**Additional copies may be obtained from Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: (613) 941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: (613) 954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@pwgsc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>**

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

**On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires ou la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : (613) 941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : (613) 954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>**