



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 142 • NUMBER 087 • 2nd SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, May 2, 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, May 2, 2008

The House met at 10 a.m.

[English]

---

*Prayers*

---

• (1000)

[Translation]

## POINTS OF ORDER

BILL C-445—SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker:** I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised by the government House leader and minister for democratic reform on April 8, 2008 concerning the requirement for a royal recommendation for Bill C-445, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (tax credit for loss of retirement income) standing in the name of the member for Richmond-Arthabaska.

I would like to thank the hon. government House leader as well as the hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska for their contributions on this issue.

[English]

In his intervention, the hon. government House leader stated that refundable tax credits are direct benefits paid to individuals regardless of whether tax is owed or not and are paid out of the consolidated revenue fund. He argued that a legislative proposal creating such a tax credit therefore needed to be accompanied by a royal recommendation.

In support of his argument, he pointed to a Speaker's ruling of June 4, 2007, which did not select a report stage amendment to Bill C-52, the Budget Implementation Act, 2007, that sought to create a refundable tax credit because it required a royal recommendation. He also referred to a ruling of May 11, 2006 from the Speaker of the Senate that ruled out of order Bill S-212, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act (tax relief) on the basis that it increased a refundable tax credit.

[Translation]

In response, the hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska argued that legislation proposing a reduction in taxes has always been permitted under our parliamentary rules, even if this leads to reimbursements being made to taxpayers.

To support his arguments, he pointed to a ruling by Mr. Speaker Parent of October 16, 1995 regarding Bill S-9, An Act to amend the Canada-United States Tax Convention Act, 1984.

The Chair has carefully reviewed Bill C-445, the previous rulings that were cited as well as the comments from the hon. members and believes that the central issue in the present case is whether the creation of the tax credit found in Bill C-445 is strictly an alleviation of taxation or an authorization to spend for a new and distinct purpose. If it is the latter, the bill would need to be accompanied by a royal recommendation before the third reading motion can be proposed to the House.

[Translation]

The bill standing in the name of the hon. member of Richmond—Arthabaska seeks to amend the Income Tax Act by providing for a tax credit to a taxpayer in respect of whom an employer and the employees failed to make required registered pension plan contributions. Whether or not the tax credit is refundable or non-refundable is the key issue in determining the need for a royal recommendation.

• (1005)

[English]

Non-refundable credits are deducted from a person's tax payable rather than being calculated separately: they simply reduce the amount of tax payable by an individual. The amount of the credit is limited to the amount of the tax payable.

This is not the case for refundable tax credits, which are unique in the Income Tax Act: they provide for a taxpayer to receive an amount from the government due to a low amount of taxable income and tax payable. Such credits are calculated separately on an income tax return because they are not simply alleviations of taxes otherwise payable.

[Translation]

Bill C-445 is proposing a refundable tax credit. The Chair is of the opinion that the bill would not only alleviate taxation but also potentially allow monies to be disbursed from the consolidated revenue fund, in the event the taxpayer had taxable income for the year that yielded taxes less than the amount of the credit.

### *Government Orders*

The circumstances of Bill C-445 are quite different from those referred by the hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska in the ruling concerning Bill S-9. There, reimbursements were limited to tax payable. By making a tax credit refundable, Bill C-445 could lead to refunds that are greater than taxes paid. Such spending, for a new and distinct purpose, would need to be accompanied by a royal recommendation.

[*English*]

Accordingly, the Chair will decline to put the question on third reading of this bill in its present form unless a royal recommendation is received.

The debate, later today or on Monday, is currently on the motion for second reading and, as usual, this motion will be put to a vote at the close of the second reading debate.

I thank the hon. government House leader and the member for Richmond—Arthabaska for their comments on this matter.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### **CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT, 1999**

**Hon. Gerry Ritz (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC)** moved that Bill C-33, An Act to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the House what a pleasure and an honour it is to stand and speak to the third reading phase of Bill C-33.

As everyone knows, there has been quite a bit of controversy around this bill in the days leading up to this particular juncture in the passage of Bill C-33. And it will pass. I would like to thank my colleagues from the Liberal Party and the Bloc for taking this legislation under consideration and moving it ahead. It shows real leadership by a government that in the face of a lot of adverse media and so on moved ahead with the right thing at the right time. I give those members a lot of credit for that. Of course the fourth party is leading a different parade, and I welcome it to that, because that is what it does best.

This is a tremendous opportunity. It has been a long road to get here. No one thought when we brought it in that this type of bill would face this kind of adversity, because all of us aggressively campaigned on this issue throughout past elections. Elections come around more quickly in minority situations, but in 2004 and 2006 every party campaigned aggressively on a biofuel strategy. Since we are in government now, Canadians obviously judged our strategy to be the most practical.

The other parties, including the NDP, said they wanted 10% ethanol. We are at 5% ethanol and 2% biodiesel, and I think that in this time and place that is the right quantity. We are moving ahead fairly aggressively on this. Ethanol and biodiesel plants have come into being across the country. This is a great opportunity for farmers to move ahead and to have a different warehouse door to deliver to.

More than that, this is great for rural communities that are looking for some sort of renewal after many years of seeing urbanization across this country, whatever was driving it. However, I will not get into that today.

Addressing the environment is at the forefront of everybody's mind. As I said, all parties called for a renewable fuel mandate and based it on two things: ethanol is a clean-burning fuel and fossil fuels are not going to last forever. It is time to get serious, especially here in Canada, where we have the capacity to make these changes. It is time to get serious about moving to greener technology. It is all part of what is best for the environment as well.

This legislation is probably one of the best policies to come forward in the last decade. It is actually a bedrock principle: it is good for the Canadian economy, good for Canadian farmers, and of course it is great news for the environment.

There are a lot of studies at cross purposes out there. Most of them are based on a global model, which we are not talking about here today. We are talking about Canadian production and Canadian policy and that is what this government has to answer to. We cannot begin to analyze and ascertain the directions other countries are taking, but we have to speak to the Canadian electorate, the Canadian people, about why we are doing what we are doing.

There is good news out there. Due to the innovation and industriousness of Canadian agriculture and Canadian forestry, we have the capacity to do this and in no way affect our food lines.

A lot of people say that we cannot do both. They say we cannot grow food for energy and for consumption. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Anyone who has analyzed food production in this country knows that we are growing more, that it is better quality, and that it is safer. It is time that we started using that great renewable resource to create energy that is great for the environment and also starts to backstop a lot of what farmers were not able to get out of the food line fully to address their bank lines. This legislation is going to do that. We have already seen some effect of that positive side. Again, as I said, it is due to the innovation and so on that is out there.

Things are changing as we speak. Going to our 5% mandate, which is three billion litres of ethanol over the next few years, is the equivalent of taking a million cars off the road, which is a fantastic story in and of itself, but it also takes less than 5% of our capacity to grow these products.

*Government Orders*

Anyone who is familiar with farm production will tell us that in any given year the weather is a far bigger factor than 5%. There have been instances of floods or droughts, or it just plain does not rain at the right time, and that can cut a crop in half. That is 50%. That is another zero in there.

• (1010)

We are talking about 5% of our land mass being used for this production. With the industry and the innovation that we have out there, we can probably go further than the three billion litres on that type of land mass. We have new types and new varieties coming in with higher starch values in corn and wheat.

We are also spending a lot of money on moving ahead to the next generation of biofuels. For that next generation, the common phrase is cellulosic. What this entails is that we slip into the forestry side. We start to make use of logs and lumber not suitable for building. We start putting them into the ethanol system using a catalyst and using the innovation that is out there now.

A company called Iogen is actually using this. The member for Ottawa South is making muscles here, not very big ones, but he says that Iogen is in his riding and he is quite proud of it. I would imagine that he has had some great discussions with Jeff Passmore, the president of Iogen. Jeff is actually getting the final go-ahead to build a huge facility that will produce in the neighbourhood of 400 to 500 million litres of ethanol in my home province of Saskatchewan. The member for Ottawa South and I will have something in common, finally, and it will be Iogen.

We are looking forward to that. Iogen is going to use straw, wood chips from the Prince Albert pulp mill and different things like that to create that quantity of ethanol. That is a good news story. In the days to come, we will develop that technology, get it to a commercial status and move forward.

I had a discussion with Jeff Passmore a couple of weeks ago now. I ran into him at a function and we talked about it. He is very excited about the move to Saskatchewan. He is very excited about the potential and the capacity of Saskatchewan farmers to deliver the feedstocks to his plant.

So am I, because the majority of Canadians, some 74% or 75% in the latest poll, are very much behind this government in moving ahead on ethanol and biodiesel. Those are big numbers. What they are asking for, and there is no pun intended, is a homegrown solution to our energy situation, to our preponderance of fossil fuels, and they are asking for our exciting new developments to get hold of the environment and start turning things around. That is what they are driving for.

As I said, our mandate is 5% ethanol and 2% biodiesel, which is coming in the next years. The auto sector has taken up the challenge. That sector is now building vehicles that will burn up to 85% ethanol. That little conversion on the assembly lines means a one hundred dollar bill: that can almost be made back in the first month of driving that an average Canadian does. It will actually pay for that \$100 plus take charge of the environment.

For the life of me I cannot understand why certain parties and certain groups would not recognize the overall benefit this is going to create for Canadians and of course around the globe. They seem to

be stuck in their ideology and cannot get past it. What is required in times like these, when there is adversity and almost media hysteria, as we see in the headlines, is leadership. Leadership is what is required, from people who will forge ahead, who will continue to do the right thing at the right time for the right reasons and who will not bend to that kind of pressure coming from the ignorant masses and the people out there who do not understand the benefit of what this can do. I see a lot of head-shaking and nodding over there from the Liberal side, and they totally agree with me on that statement.

As a government we are concerned about poverty. We are concerned about hunger in the world. We had some great announcements the other day from my colleague, the minister in charge of CIDA. She made a great announcement that Canada continues to be number two in the world on getting those foodstuffs out globally to the poor and the hungry. We have tremendous domestic programs here that address this type of thing.

People from the United Nations are spearheading a lot of this. A lot of what they say I do not agree with, because it is not based on anything that I would call sound thinking, but they also say that there is enough food produced in the world to feed everybody. The problem is that we cannot get it to where we need it in a timely way, because it is all "best before" products. There is not the processing on the ground in some of these communities to make use of and keep fresh the wheat or meat that is delivered.

We have to be more thoughtful in our approach. I think the minister really batted it out of the park by untying our food aid. It has been talked about for a number of years. She finally got the job done. I am proud to stand with her in moving ahead on that issue.

That comes to grips with the timeliness of delivery. It comes to grips with the transportation costs to get that product there. In most instances, there is no port or infrastructure system capable of handling those boatloads of food aid when they arrive. A lot of it spoils on the dock, some of it because of infrastructure and some of it because of a governance system in the affected country that would trade that food for guns rather than distribute it to the people. People who are poor and hungry are much easier to lead when they are kept out there in the boondocks away from the real action where the changes can be made.

• (1015)

There is a lot work to be done to feed the poor, the hungry, and those in poverty situations in the world, but a lot of it comes as a result of good governance and infrastructure, as well as the delivery of that. I think that Canada has proven that we always punch above our weight on those issues.

When we did make the announcement of another \$50 million into that food aid program, a lot of people stood up, screamed and hollered that it was not enough. The UN was calling for a 26% increase from all of the contributing nations and we actually came in at 28%, plus we are giving money to the non-governmental organizations like the Foodgrains Bank. It does a tremendous amount of work around the world with donations from farmers. We pay the transportation as the government. There is some processing involved and they get it to where it should go.

*Government Orders*

We have the Mennonite system working around the world with their different relief programs, whether it is flood, famine, plague or pestilence, whatever happens. The Mennonites are there helping out.

Our tax system also builds in aid that is not considered under the UN envelope in the same way. We want a homegrown solution and we are a resource rich country. Nobody can deny that, whether we are talking about fresh water stocks, oil and gas or the tar sands in Alberta that are taking a bad rap right now, some of it justified, a lot of it not, but at the same time we have to start moving away from our dependence on fossil fuels. Even the big petroleum companies say that.

One of the largest ethanol producers in western Canada at this point is a company called Husky Oil. It is basically owned by a gentleman from Hong Kong, but he has a facility tied to the upgrader in my riding at Lloydminster that is producing several hundred million litres of ethanol. Husky Oil is having trouble getting product because farmers are growing what they can but the weather last year around the Lloydminster area did not let us get those crops off like we should have. That was more of a problem than it should have been. With technology and innovation we are starting to move to crops that are a little more easy to farm and will give farmers better results.

I know the Minister of Natural Resources was out to make an announcement in Minnedosa the other day, talking about our regulations and how that would help to start the blending of that product. Husky has bought a company called Mohawk. I remember as a young guy when gas was two bits, 30¢ and 40¢ a gallon, not a litre. That was before the former prime minister decided to make things metric. At those kind of prices per gallon it sounds really cheap but at the time I was making 90¢ an hour, so it is all relative.

They used to put an ethanol blend into their products some 25 or 30 years ago and I am giving away my age when I say that but that is the reality. This type of product has been around for a long time. It is finally coming to the fore, that with these regulations passed in Bill C-33 we will see, mixed right at the refinery and brought to the pump, that minimum 5% blend.

I have seen pumps, Mr. Speaker, in your home town when I was coming back the other day. I stopped in Kingston to have a great meal downtown on the waterfront. I asked how well you were doing. They all said they loved the guy but he should come home more. We also stopped for fuel. I note that the Liberals over there are saying, "Mr. Speaker, you should not go home because you might not get elected", but I am not sure about that one.

We fuelled up. I cannot remember the name of the station but it was a 10% blend. That is good news. Kingston is on the leading edge of ethanol and I praise you for that, Mr. Speaker. I know you have made that issue one of your own.

When we see the price of oil over that same timeframe jump from \$20 a barrel to approaching \$120 a barrel, it makes this type of economic activity more viable. We have a lot of work being done on new ways to produce ethanol. We have lots of work being done on biodiesel which is another huge success story. We as a government have taken on pilot projects to use rendered products from animals, the byproducts from restaurants, the leftover oils and greases and so

on that of course we do not want in our food anymore. We are running them back through biodiesel. It is a tremendous opportunity to build environmental products around that.

There are a number of situations that have arisen that have driven up the cost in the food chain and a lot of those can be based strictly on transportation because our product does not move from the farm right to the processor. It goes through middlemen. There are a lot of different things that go on and when we see increases in transportation costs that are doubling, tripling and so forth, because of fossil fuel and our addiction to it, the problems begin to arise where everyone takes a chunk of the pie. I will use round numbers.

● (1020)

When we see a \$3.00 loaf of bread, and I hear the bread processors saying they have to raise the price again because the cost of wheat is going up, it is ridiculous to the extreme because the farmer on that \$3.00 loaf of bread is getting 15¢. That is the cheapest part of that loaf of bread. The damn wrapper with the labelling on it is worth more; or the damn wrapper, sorry.

That is the reality. That is the situation that farmers have always faced. So, if the price of bread went to 20%, that is a 33% increase, if my math is still good. That is a huge increase for farmers. Is that nickel going to affect that \$3.00 loaf of bread? It should not. I would think it should not, but the costs of transportation of course are exaggerating the reality of what is going on out there. This is another good reason to move ahead with biofuels where we can start to have a renewable resource that is friendly to the environment and of course much easier to maintain the costs.

We should be looking at ways to make our agricultural processes even more innovative. We are doing that with a little thing called the removal of KVD in western Canada. Saskatchewan alone has 47 million acres of arable land. That is a big number. We run big operations and run big equipment to do it, and of course the overhead costs are all commensurate with the price, so we have seen the price of wheat going up.

We have also seen huge increases in fossil-based fertilizer fuel chemicals. All those types of things are also ramping up as well, so we are pushing a bubble where farmers are starting to make a little more money, but it is also costing a lot more money to make that, so we have to start addressing that and I think biofuels are a great way to do that.

There are opportunities out there now where people can buy a unit that they can actually put on their farms and make their own biodiesel. I talked to a neighbour of mine the other day and he was getting ready to start seeding, and then of course global warming kicked in and we got another 15 inches of snow. That slowed him down a little, but he had gone to town to fuel up his tractor because the roads were too muddy to have the truck come out, so he drove his tractor and it cost him \$1,000 to fill it up. The way we farm out there, that lasted about 12 hours, less than a day's shift.

*Government Orders*

When we look at the young fellow who seeds my ground now, who farms 24,000 acres, he will run 14 or 15 hard days like that with four and five outfits, so he has \$5,000 in fuel per day, plus the seed, plus the chemical, plus the fertilizer, plus the manpower, plus the overhead of the equipment and taxes on the land, and all that kind of stuff. Those are the economies of scale we are looking at.

Farmers start to look at the skid units that will actually produce biofuel out of their own canola. There are models like that out there now and it is a great opportunity for these guys to take some canola from their own production, run it through and create their own biofuel, but it does make more sense to do it on economies of scale at larger facilities.

I have always been a proponent of a number of smaller capacity units scattered throughout a province as opposed to one or two big ones. The problem with one or two big ones is the product has to move. The trucking beats up the road and it starts to defeat the whole process, so smaller and locally owned is the right way to go.

I am very fortunate to have in my riding, almost in the centre of my riding, a little town called Unity. There is a North West Terminal there that is owned by farmers. It is a huge success story. It is relatively new on the scene, but in the time that it has been around, some 10 or 15 years since the drawing board, it has doubled in capacity in the grain it has handled. It is now building a 25 million litre ethanol facility next door to the terminal, so as the grain is delivered in, it can slide some of it off to make ethanol right there.

As well there is another innovation. A fellow named Mervin Slater has been the push behind this, and I give a lot of credit to Jason Skinner and the crew out there at North West Terminal for their foresight and their vision, and the guys that were on that committee. Merv dropped in to see me when he was in Ottawa. He was on his way to Germany to look at technology that brings about 10% or 15% chaff in with the wheat.

Chaff cannot be hauled. It is like hauling potato chips or ping-pong balls. There is no weight and one cannot get enough on a truck, but when 10% or 15% chaff is brought in with the grain product, it virtually costs nothing. They are using that as the feed stock to fire the turbines to create the ethanol, then they recapture the heat and use it. It is a tremendously integrated system and I give them a lot of credit for that.

They have not put out a litre of ethanol. They are already looking at the potential and saying it is time to think about expanding the plant already, and that is great news for the farmers of Unity, great news for Canadians, and great news for the environment.

However, we have so many other potentials out there to make great quality ethanol. We have just a tremendous opportunity to show the world this can be done and not affect the food line. There are just any number of ways to point to this and say this is the right thing as we advance forward.

As I said in my speech, it is basic economics. There are so many things that we will gain from these different lines that will be created. There are offshoots from ethanol: the distiller's grain that goes back into livestock feed, the slurry, and the water. Everything that is used is captured and used as protein base for livestock feed.

● (1025)

It is not a zero sum gain. There are benefits from all the differing aspects of ethanol and biodiesel as it goes back into livestock feed. There is a loss of 20% or so but we will make that up. It will be good for the communities, good for the farmers, and good for the environment.

**Mr. Mario Silva (Davenport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to start by saying that I am not opposed to biofuel. I understood his remarks but there has been a growing concern, which maybe the minister could address. The concern raised by the public, both in relation to the higher food costs around the world that many have argued has to do with the demand for biofuels but also the incredible cost that it takes to make biofuel and diesel, deals in particular with the fact that biofuel needs fossil fuels in order to be produced. There is also a cost to the environment.

Like I said to the minister, I am not opposed to it and I certainly am in favour of the fact that we are proposing this amendment to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, but there are inefficiencies as well in our society that we have to deal with. The bigger issue may have to do with our high demand for energy consumption. Nothing is being put forward to address these concerns.

We have many products in our homes that are not very efficient. We have to look at other mechanisms to deal with the issues of energy within our homes, our society and our workplace. These things also need to be addressed so that consumption can be lowered. If we continue with the high demand for energy consumption, there is going to be more and more demand for energy and it will all have an impact on the environment and our lives.

I am not opposed to the issue of biofuel and I see that there is a need for it. I understand the increase to the 5% blend, but at the same time I have serious concerns and reservations which have been raised by a number of people and I would like to have the minister address those concerns.

● (1030)

**Hon. Gerry Ritz:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Davenport for his intervention and for seeking knowledge as to why this is the right thing at the right time. I give him credit for that. I will cover off a couple of things.

He talked about energy and our addiction to it, which I guess is the best way to describe it. I do not think we can push people away from having a light switch that flips on rather than lighting a coal oil lamp. We have lived through that and moved ahead, but there are new and innovative ways coming to the marketplace. There are new light bulbs available that will address energy consumption. Even turning our TVs off still takes power. There are new ways to do that and those will be driven by a different way.

*Government Orders*

We cannot combine all of our energy needs and the misuse of energy under the biofuels banner. A lot of people are using that as the lightning rod and we have to disconnect some of it. There is good news with biofuels but there are costs as well. He mentioned the point that it takes energy to create energy but that is typical of anything. Even if we go back to hydro, it still takes energy to build the dam, so we have to look at the downstream costs in a lot of cases.

I see comparisons now that say, "The cost of fossil fuel is \$1.20 at the pump for gas", and then, "Here is ethanol", but we still have to combine it and plant it. The downstream costs of that gas at the pump are not taken into consideration but they are for biofuels. That is not a true comparison. When comparing apples to apples in the studies that have been done, the real ones, there is a huge benefit to ethanol and a bigger benefit to biodiesel.

We have to start building better technology, there is no doubt about it. There is innovation out there that will let us grow the crop in a more fulsome and cheaper way with zero till, less fertilizer and all those types of things. As we develop new innovative varieties, we will get 80 bushels an acre on dryland farming, which is unheard of now, but we have not been able to do that because of kernel visual distinguishability in western Canada. That is gone. We will move ahead on that front as well. It is a major gain. There are several thrusts, not just biofuel. It becomes the lightning rod and the whipping boy.

When he talks about food costs, yes, we are all looking at that. In the latest study in Canada, Statistics Canada said the food basket in Canada actually dropped .2% in February. Our higher dollar is letting us buy better but it is also hurting our trade capacity.

We are also seeing emerging countries, and I will list a couple, China, India, Brazil, Mexico, where there is a huge middle class starting to grow. They are moving away from a rice-based diet and saying, "We want meat and potatoes". We are seeing fast food chains moving there and so on. Whether it is good or bad, they are doing that because this middle class with money is asking for new and innovative foodstuffs. They are tired of a bland rice diet and they need protein, not starch.

I was in Cuba last week on a trade mission. People there are bemoaning the fact that rice has gone from \$400 a tonne to \$800 a tonne. Now it is approaching \$1,200 a tonne and it is still over in the Pacific Rim and has to be transported. I asked why they are not thinking outside the box. I said there are beans, potatoes and meat available in Canada for half those quantity prices and they should start re-jigging their diet to be more healthy. Therefore, there are a lot of changes in the food basket that just cannot be blamed on ethanol.

**Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to hear the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food speak again to this subject. The last time he spoke I asked him a question about the relative merits of what he was saying about the greenhouse gas reductions that are engaged with biofuels. He was talking about four megatonnes of reduction that would come from his 5% program in fuel with the \$2.2 billion investment.

A careful scientific analysis by the BIOCAP Canada Foundation shows that with corn ethanol we would get a 21% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which is what we would normally get with gasoline if it

were bought in Canada. If we buy it from U.S. producers we will have a negative greenhouse gas emissions reduction.

With the 21% Canadian, what would happen if we were to make all the corn in Canada and feed it into our ethanol system to produce the 5%? The vehicle fleet in Canada produces 100 megatonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions; 5% of 100 megatonnes is 5 megatonnes and 20% of 5 megatonnes is much less than 4 megatonnes.

Why does the minister keep using these figures when he obviously has the same kinds of studies that we are working from? If he has some study that shows that he is getting 4 megatonnes of reduction from his program, costing Canadian taxpayers \$2.2 billion, he should put it on the line.

The minister keeps referring to the idealistic opposition to not simply blindly moving ahead but carefully considering what we are doing with biofuels, that includes such idealistic lefties as Terence Corcoran, Don Martin and Gwyn Morgan who are all part of the NDP and are idealistic soulmates. How does the minister see these people as our idealistic compatriots?

● (1035)

**Hon. Gerry Ritz:** Mr. Speaker, for years I have listened to the NDP members rant on. They have two basic philosophies: the sky is falling or nobody moves, nobody gets hurt.

I really get tired of their intransigence on every issue. I guess that is why they always end up in the corner as the fourth party. They will never get any further than that. Provincially they are getting turfed out one by one because people are looking with an appetite to move forward and not to take the issues of the forties and fifties and try to somehow apply them to the future. It does not work.

I invite the member to join the 75% of Canadians who say that this is the right thing at the right time. I invite him to get on board with producers in rural Canada who say that this is the right thing for them to do. I invite him to get on board with up to date scientific studies from Environment Canada and Natural Resources Canada that show that biofuels are the right thing for Canadians.

I also welcome him to the debate on biofuels. Whether it is negative or not, it helps us prove our point.



*Government Orders*

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have a further question on why the NDP voted against Bill C-33 yesterday. It was the only party that voted against Bill C-33. It voted against Nahanni, against the Great Bear rain forest and against the \$9 billion environmental dollars.

I would ask the minister why members of the NDP are opposed to good environmental practices but on the other side they talk like they are green but in fact are climate change deniers. Why is that?

**Hon. Gerry Ritz:** Mr. Speaker, I think the parliamentary secretary raises a good point. I agree that there are times when the NDP members are green, green with envy that they will never get a chance to put any of their policies in place and we are moving ahead.

They voted against the cleanup of the Sydney tar ponds. We are getting the job done. They voted against the cleanup of Lake Simcoe. We are getting the job done. They voted against the cleanup of Lake Winnipeg in NDP central. We are getting the job done.

They have their agricultural propaganda arm, the NFU, going across Canada decrying biofuels and how terrible they are, which is absolutely ridiculous when we talk about a farm group basically dumping in their own nest. It is great for rural Canada. It is good producers. I wish they would get on board with the program.

**Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the minister's remarks this morning and I thank him for speaking extemporaneously without notes, which is good to hear. I will try to imitate his style and respond directly to some of the issues that he raised.

I do not think the minister should take too much comfort in the support that he received from this party yesterday in allowing Bill C-33 to proceed because we treat this bill merely as a technical amendment to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act which would allow the existing minister or any future minister to regulate the content of ethanol in fuels for consumption in Canada and for fuels to be exported abroad.

However, let me assure the minister and the government that there are very profound questions that they have not even begun to answer.

Chief among those questions is why, in the first instance, was this bill put to the House by the Minister of Agriculture when it is an Environment Canada bill? It is the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, separated and driven by the Minister of the Environment. I understand the government's intention here, which is to strategically place this as a farm receipts issue, which it, of course, partly is, but overarching the farm receipts issue, in fact overarching so many issues in Canadian society, are more profound issues and concerns about where we are going with our environmental policy. My remarks today will be cast with that chiefly in mind. How is the government proceeding here with this bill? How is it proceeding in the ethanol field when it comes to environmental perspectives?

However, I first want to talk about the very recent about-face taken by the NDP, which I will not descend to in terms of the remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture, but I do want to express my disappointment in the NDP in its attempts to politicize food prices, in its attempts to try to, in my view, frighten Canadians

with its food for fuel campaign. It is much more constructive if we actually pursue a rational debate about the drivers, the factors that are at play not just in Canada but globally. Factors, for example, like oil prices have jumped by nearly 100% over the past year; that in 2007 food prices increased by about 4% overall; that 80% of the cost of food today are food marketing costs. The marketing costs are the difference between the farm value and consumer spending for food at grocery stores and restaurants.

The price of rice is now up 77% since October. Rice is not used in the production of biofuels. As a whole, fish prices are up, not just in Canada but worldwide. Why? In part it is because we are seeing five of the six major oceans fisheries in a state of collapse today. We hear nothing from the government about that. Why is this important? It is important because the government's ethanol policy appears to be completely disconnected from its environmental policy. That is a shame because the two are inextricably linked. They need to be presented as such and they need to be defended as such.

I will turn for a moment to two amendments put forward by the NDP that the Canadian public is not aware of and that were ruled out of order by this House. This speaks volumes to the tone and the approach the NDP members are taking to this debate, which is simply not helpful. Two other amendments they have put to this House include the prohibition of the use of genetically modified organisms for biofuel production.

My understanding of this sector is that if we were to rule out the use of GMO crops, we might as well shut down the entire industry as we speak. For that matter, as an agricultural graduate, I can assure Canadians that most of the foods and the grains that we are eating are and have been improved through the use of science over the past decades.

Second, the NDP wanted to establish restrictions on the use of arable land. I put to the environment critic of the NDP some time ago whether the leader of the NDP would soon announce his intention to nationalize Canadian farms. We have seen that around the world and, as a person who has had the privilege of working around the world, I do not think there are any remaining jurisdictions that seriously believe that such nationalization will help us with our food production patterns.

● (1040)

I will now turn to some of the key issues around the bill. First, as we have said repeatedly, we are in favour of ethanol as a part of our energy mix now and into the future.

There is an industry that exists today. Ethanol is a transition fuel, one of the transition fuels to our carbon constrained future. Why is it a choice transition fuel right now, in the right amounts? It is partly because the infrastructure for ethanol distribution already exists. We have all of the sunk capital costs spent in the way in which we dispense gasoline and other fuels, and ethanol fits into that distribution system.

*Government Orders*

For example, when we talk about the eventual quantum leap, perhaps to a hydrogen based economy, our challenge will be how we distribute the hydrogen and safely. However, right now, as a transition fuel, ethanol can be used and blended. Every car on the road today with an owner's manual can burn up to 10% ethanol, as we speak.

As I say, it is a technical amendment bill and, in that sense, it is important. We need to give a minister the powers necessary to regulate fuel content.

However, more important, there remains a plethora of questions that the government has not even begun to address. Having just heard the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, I was waiting with anticipation to hear him speak to the connection between the Conservatives' fiscal policies on this issue, their agricultural policies on this issue and their environmental policies on this issue. Lo and behold, I waited too long because he never addressed them. He did not address the environmental implications of this issue at all, which is unfortunate.

We think it is important, as we agreed in committee when the bill was debated, that one year after the bill comes into full force and effect and becomes a law, it will go back to a parliamentary committee and then and there it will be the subject of a major detailed analysis.

The ethanol industry should be examined much more fulsomely. We need to address questions like energy inputs, chemical inputs and meaningful greenhouse gas reductions and whether we are achieving these. We need to address the impacts on food pricing, trade considerations, agricultural land use patterns both here and abroad, freshwater impacts, agricultural run-offs, farm receipts and soil impacts. The most precious resource that most farmers possess is the top three inches of their soil. There are so many other issues.

One year after the bill becomes law, we will hold the government to account and we will be asking for a detailed analysis.

The government has not developed the metrics necessary. In that sense, I commend the NDP for raising this issue, as well as the Bloc. The government has not developed the metrics necessary to tell Canadians clearly why we are choosing ethanol over other transition fuels or, for that matter, why one form of ethanol is more beneficial than others.

It is true that cellulosic ethanol allows us to make a quantum leap, to take us to a second or even third generation form of ethanol, which burns more cleanly and, for that matter, puts more marginal lands into production.

Thirty years ago, as a young agricultural student I remember surveying all of eastern Ontario for a potential project to plant all kinds of new varieties and species of poplar. Poplar, which grows very quickly, could be grown on very marginal lands and can be put into cellulosic ethanol form over time.

Now that we do have the engineering and the chemistry to produce the enzymes required to convert such feed stocks into cellulosic ethanol, we can have a very meaningful debate in a year's time in terms of more details.

Many factors are at play, and the minister has pointed to a few but has omitted others, to create this perfect global storm right now that is wreaking havoc in developing countries, emerging economies when it comes to food pricing and food access.

• (1045)

Yes, it is true that ethanol production in northern jurisdictions is having an impact. The question is, to what extent is it having an impact? So many other forces are at play, forces like decertification, climate change, weather patterns, energy costs, trade rules, subsidies. Forty per cent of the European Union's budget is the common agricultural policy to subsidize the production of agricultural products. This is a question that is affecting food prices.

Food distribution systems, corruption levels, the rule of law, the extent to which we are seeing rising Asian incomes and a propensity to consume more protein, the Australian drought, which is lingering as a result of climate change, all affect food prices.

I was quite shocked to hear the Minister of Agriculture make light of climate change, suggesting that cold weather recently in Saskatchewan clearly indicated that the planet was not warming, but must be cooling. This is tantamount to what we heard from the Minister of Public Safety, before he erased it from his website, when he made light of the fact that B.C.'s climate was warming so he was suggesting buying vast amounts of land in northern B.C. and flipping it for profit. That is not funny. It portrays the government's profound non-commitment to the climate change crisis facing Canada and the planet.

Many factors are at play, creating the perfect storm. Unfortunately now we are seeing nation states moving to nationalize and to hoard food stocks. This is very problematic. This is having a direct bearing on global food prices and global food distribution.

In short, when it comes to the question of where the government goes with its ethanol policy, we have a profound responsibility on this side of the House, as the official opposition, to hold the government to account, and we intend to do so. The government has announced it is spending \$2.2 billion in this field. We will watch closely as to how it invests this \$2.2 billion.

It is very strange also because the government's Minister of Finance stands up in public fora after public fora and announces to the world that he does not pick winners and losers. It is this neo-con, laissez-faire, "I don't care" voodoo economics that he professes to practice.

The government now is taking \$2.2 billion and ploughing it into a sector. This really raises questions about the government's commitment to this post-post-Conservative approach to economics that I have not seen another country in the world practice.

There are a number of important questions to raise about the science around ethanol and greenhouse gas reductions.

*Government Orders*

What is the net environmental impact of ethanol use? It depends very much on the raw materials used and the production process used. Has the government spoken to this? Not at all. Is it in the bill? Not at all. Have any studies been tabled? Nothing. Has any evidence been put forward to suggest that the government is meaningfully going to take us to second, third and fourth generation technologies? We have not seen it, but we will be watching for it. In a year, when we perform a detailed analysis on this question, we will be looking for answers to this question.

We hear a lot about corn ethanol. There are mixed studies. Berkley's studies find that corn ethanol reduces GHG emissions by about 13%. We are hearing contrary studies. Has the government actually reconciled the competing science, peer reviewed it and put it to the Canadian people? We have not seen it.

We see other studies that show that cellulosic ethanol would produce about 85% fewer greenhouse gases than gasoline. There are now emerging studies and emerging science. How much is the government investing in science? How much of it is evidence based? How much of it is ideologically based? We remain to be convinced. We are looking for that evidence.

It is true that new demand for corn to produce ethanol is inflating corn prices. There are distributive impacts that we have to be aware of not just in Canada, but throughout the United States, Mexico, Central America and beyond. The government has to address this question, and we will look for that question to be answered in due course.

Yet again, we know that even marginal increases in grain costs harm poor people the most. They could exacerbate world hunger. Again, I am disappointed in some of the tone, maybe even some of the histrionics coming from the NDP recently on this question. It is important to look at the oft-cited example of the price of tortillas in Mexico, which doubled in 2006, a year of record U.S. corn prices. We know we need to get off corn, because it is such an energy and water intensive, highly polluting crop. Plus, the minister knows the impact of mono-cropping of corn on soil friability on organic matter content. He knows the destructive nature of corn production.

• (1050)

Some are concerned that, for example, the use of E85, 85% ethanol as a motor fuel may lead to increased smog and health effects. Has this been addressed? No. We are waiting to see the analysis put by the government, and we will be holding it to account as it begins to allocate the \$2.2 billion into the field.

There is a fear that conversion of forests or wilderness to farmland will not only harm biodiversity, but may negatively affect the net greenhouse gas production because of the role that forests and wilderness play when it comes to sequestering carbon. The government, again, picked another winner. It does not pick winners and losers, but it picked another winner by investing over \$200 million in carbon capture and sequestration recently in the home riding of one of the government members, to be able to try to pilot through an important and promising technology. However, is it speaking about the role of nature in sequestering carbon? Not a peep. I do not believe the Conservatives take climate change seriously. I do not think they have reconciled their economic, agricultural and environmental policies.

Those are some of the questions that we want to see answered.

Here is another question. At the environmental centre of why nations first began using ethanol, it was to deal with the replacement of lead, as well as reducing the use of benzene, which is the number one petro-carcinogen. The government says that it has a national cancer strategy. We know that the number petro-carcinogen is benzene. If we Google benzene, here is what pops up, "No known safe level".

Then remember that some 400 million litres or 1% of gasoline is benzene. It is present with toluene and xylene, which are also dubious, according to Health Canada's anti-smoking group, and they are in there only for octane purposes. Ethanol has a 113 octane rating, the highest of any fuel. It could be used to replace at least the 1% benzene portion if oil refiners so desired. That is really important when the Canadian Cancer Society now predicts that one in two Canadians will get cancer. One in three Ontarians today will get cancer.

Is the government linking its three core policies together? We see no evidence of it, and we are looking for it.

Finally, I want to raise the question of the government's fiscal choice on April 1 of this year to repeal the excise tax exemption for biodiesel and ethanol fuels. This is at a time when the ethanol industry is just getting on its feet, and it is let down with the government deciding to remove the excise tax exemption for biodiesel and ethanol fuels. We know that on low level blends, the effect of the repeal on prices in the retail sector is minimum. It is about 0.5¢ per litre on E5 ethanol blends.

However, for higher blends, the additional burden is substantial, 2¢ a litre for E50 and 8.5¢ a litre for E85. How does this reconcile with the government's stated purpose to try to increase the ethanol industry in Canada? We have two or three stations in Canada against the 1,200 in the United States.

We will hold the government to account. I suggest the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Finance sit down and share a cup of coffee and actually try to bring their policies together.

I cannot understand for the life of me why the government is not placing this and connecting this to a national climate change response. The only thing I conclude, along with the seven objective and third party groups that have looked at the government's climate change plan, is that no one believes it. Nobody believes it will achieve what it sets out to. As a result, I think they are incapable of actually linking these together.

*Statements by Members*

•(1055)

**The Speaker:** When debate resumes after question period, there will be 10 minutes for questions and comments to the hon. member for Ottawa South, but we will now move to statements by members.

The hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### KODIAK IMPACT

**Mr. Richard Harris (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, congratulations are in order for the Kodiak Impact, a 17 and under boys volleyball team from Prince George, B.C., a champion boys volleyball team. The team rose as victors in the B.C. provincial championships, claiming gold in the process.

The Kodiak Impact is in Ottawa this weekend to compete in the national volleyball championships. My colleagues in the House and I would like to wish the players every success in their playoff quest this morning.

\* \* \*

•(1100)

### WORLD PRESS FREEDOM DAY

**Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is World Press Freedom Day, reminding us of the profound importance of freedom of expression, the lifeblood of a democracy and consecrated as a core freedom in constitutional and international human rights law.

Regrettably, the rights and safety of those who espouse it are increasingly at risk in many parts of the globe where journalists are harassed, kidnapped and even murdered with impunity. Some 95 have been killed in the last year alone.

Moreover, human rights defenders are having their free speech “criminalized”, as in the case of Bangladeshi journalist Shoaib Choudhury, who faces trumped up criminal charges carrying a death penalty for exercising this fundamental freedom.

Let us join together in marking World Press Freedom Day with the hope that freedom of expression will be a protected freedom and those who assault it will be held duly accountable.

On this day we recall the inspiring work of Spencer Moore, founder of the Canadian Committee for World Press Freedom, who, regrettably, passed away yesterday. On behalf of all parliamentarians, I offer our condolences to his family.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### ART EXHIBITION IN QUEBEC CITY

**Mr. Luc Malo (Verchères—Les Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, as part of Quebec City's 400th anniversary celebrations, an exhibition entitled “Le Louvre à Québec. Les arts et la vie” will be presented at the Musée national des beaux-arts du Québec.

After years of planning, negotiation and preparation ably undertaken by the museum team, a dream has finally become reality, especially for John R. Porter, the driving force behind this Quebec institution and the man who spearheaded this colossal project.

This exhibition is a fabulous opportunity for Quebec. No other place in the world has been lent this many works from the Louvre. They come from eight departments of the Parisian museum, and they will be presented in a single exhibition. As for finding all of these works at the same time in the French capital, do not even try; only in Quebec City will this be possible.

I urge all Quebecers to visit this exhibition. After all, it is not every day that we can admire works from the largest museum in the world.

\* \* \*

[English]

### VIETNAMESE CULTURAL DAY

**Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, as part of Asian Heritage Month, Ottawa will celebrate “Vietnamese Cultural Day” on Saturday. This year's celebration will include the launch of a book on Project 4000 titled, *Gift of Freedom: How Ottawa Welcomed the Vietnamese, Cambodian and Laotian Refugees*.

In the spring of 1979, citizens led by the mayor of Ottawa, Marion Dewar, opened their doors to refugees fleeing persecution and chaos in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. Project 4000 was launched. The faith community, businesses and neighbours came together to resettle thousands of newcomers.

*Gift of Freedom* is a must read for those who take pride in the spirit of our community. It tells the stories of a vibrant community and its members who arrived in Ottawa as refugees and soon became fully participating members of Canadian society.

I congratulate Ottawa's Vietnamese community, those who assisted in editing and producing this book and everyone who contributed to Project 4000. I wish them all the best in building the Vietnamese Boat People Museum in Ottawa.

\* \* \*

### HOCKEY

**Mr. Guy Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last year I stood in the House and told all Canadians how proud I was of the residents of Cornwall for their second place finish in the 2007 national Hockeyville contest.

Well, Cornwall is at it again. Our dynamic city is hosting a 2008 Royal Bank Cup. From May 3 to 11, the city of Cornwall and its exciting junior A hockey team, the Cornwall Colts, will be hosting the National Junior A Hockey Championship.

*Statements by Members*

The city of Cornwall and the riding of Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry have a long, rich history of producing great hockey players and championship hockey teams. Members of team Cornwall and the Chamber of Commerce have asked me to personally invite each and every Canadian to visit the wonderful city of Cornwall and watch the most exciting junior A hockey players in Canada compete for the prestigious RBC Cup.

It just does not get any better than watching the best junior hockey players compete in Canada's national sport, while visiting the most beautiful, safest, friendliest, progressive city in all of Canada. Welcome to Cornwall, Canada.

\* \* \*

**GASOLINE PRICES**

**Hon. Gurbax Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, consumers are being slammed by gas prices, which are expected to hit \$1.40 a litre this summer and could reach \$2.25 a litre by 2012.

High energy prices are especially hurting low income families, leaving little money for food and housing. Creative solutions are needed. That is why the Liberal Party has a plan to build a green economy, promote alternative energy sources and improve fuel efficiency.

Canadians are demanding action to help them cope with rising energy prices today and ensure that Canada is a leader in the green technology of the future.

Instead, what they have is a government that is like an exhaust pipe: all it puts out is a lot of hot air.

\* \* \*

● (1105)

[*Translation*]**DENISE BOUCHER**

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a Quebec author who broke down barriers with her feminist piece *The Fairies are Thirsty*.

This play was controversial when it was first put on in November 1978. It showed three stereotypical images of women: the virgin, the prostitute and the housewife. This play, banned by the church, was written by Denise Boucher, who opened my eyes to the roles of women.

Although we do not share the same ideals, politically or socially, we have something in common that no one can take away from us: a blood relation.

My dear godmother's experiences, fight for the equality of women, and passion for her culture are the legacies she has left me. This year marks the 30th anniversary of this extraordinary work. I commend the courage she had, Denise, to write this play and to demystify the role of women.

**SENIORS**

**Mr. Raymond Gravel (Repentigny, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, big oil companies are filling up on profits. During the first three months of 2008, Petro Canada socked away net profits of \$1.1 billion, an increase of \$590 million over this time last year. Moreover, the oil company is benefiting from tax measures that are allowing it to keep making even more money.

The price of gas has gone up spectacularly and may top \$2 per litre next year, which will affect all consumer products. Quebec seniors will suddenly see their buying power slashed when it comes to essential products, such as food. The poorest have nothing left to cut back on. They are already living below the poverty line, and now they will have even less, yet the Conservative government has the nerve to say that it is being generous toward them.

Promises do not put food on the table. The Bloc Québécois strongly condemns this ongoing situation that abandons seniors to unacceptable living conditions.

\* \* \*

[*English*]**AFGHANISTAN MISSION**

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Peterborough, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the efforts being made by 24-year-old Peterborough resident, Private Jonathan Bedford. The son of David and Brenda Bedford, Jonathan is a medic with the 1st Field Ambulance of the Princess Patricia's Light Infantry, stationed in Kandahar.

When asked by family what they could send him in Afghanistan, Private Bedford selflessly requested that they send him items that he could give to Afghan children to improve everyday aspects of their lives.

Rallying to his request, his parents approached Crayola Canada in Lindsay for support. The company acted immediately by donating a crate of Crayola children's products.

It is this type of effort that preserves our proud Canadian identity. Private Bedford is bringing joy and hope to the lives of the people of Afghanistan.

On behalf of a proud community and nation, I would like to thank Private Jonathan Bedford, and his parents, David and Brenda, for their great work and sacrifice. Private Jonathan Bedford is a truly great Canadian.

\* \* \*

**AFGHANISTAN MISSION**

**Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on March 26 the Iqaluit airport was full of family, friends and well-wishers to greet RCMP Constable Henry Coman upon his return from one year in Afghanistan.

Born in Pangnirtung and growing up in Iqaluit, Henry is a role model for Nunavut youth, as well as one of our respected Inuit RCMP officers.

*Statements by Members*

Henry volunteered for one year of service in Afghanistan where he helped train and advise the Afghan national police and Kandahar city fire department on basic first aid, vehicle maintenance and basic policing techniques.

RCMP Constable Henry Coman is now at home with his wife, Alison, and daughters, Cassandra and Victoria, and enjoying springtime in Nunavut.

I know his mother, Oolahnee, and sister, Heather, are very relieved he is home safely. Thanks to his family for supporting him. We welcome Henry home and thank him for his good work and dedication. Matna. He makes Nunavut proud.

\* \* \*

**ISRAEL**

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Nepean—Carleton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, next week on May 8 the state of Israel will celebrate its 60th birthday. I rise today to congratulate the Jewish state for what has been a miraculous achievement in the last six decades to create one of the world's most advanced democracies.

Unfortunately here at home, radical left-wing groups are targeting the Jewish state. Only two weeks ago the Canadian Union of Postal Workers passed a resolution calling for an international campaign of boycott, divestment and sanctions. Radical left-wing groups on campuses have been holding Israel apartheid weeks and intimidating Jewish students.

On November 8, 2007 at York University, Jewish students were swarmed by anti-Israel students shouting, "The Hezbollah is not a terrorist organization. The real terrorists are Zionists and the Americans". One faculty member is said to have shouted, "Gestapo" at the students themselves. In April 2008 at Carleton University, a student picked up a picture of a terrorist who had killed eight Israelis.

This kind of thing is unacceptable and cannot—

• (1110)

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek.

\* \* \*

**OMAR KHADR**

**Mr. Wayne Marston (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Omar Khadr left Canada as a dutiful son following his father, as any boy of 13 or 14 years of age would do; misguided yes, but as with most children, loyal to his father and with no real comprehension of the potential consequences of his actions.

Later, at the age of 15, this boy was apprehended following a firefight with American special forces. Khadr had been shot twice in the back while he was turned away from the fight. In fact, one American officer had to step in to prevent another from executing him on the spot with his pistol.

Omar was taken to a field hospital where, while he was still in a great deal of pain recovering from his wounds, he was exposed to the American style of enhanced interrogation, and after months of recuperation was transported to Guantanamo. By all definitions and particularly the one contained in the UN Optional Protocol to the

Convention on the Rights of the Child, a child combatant is anyone under the age of 18 years. In all senses of the word, Omar Khadr is a child combatant and our government must first accept this conclusion and then move to have him repatriated to Canada.

\* \* \*

**TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION**

**Ms. Tina Keeper (Churchill, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Justice Harry LaForme of the Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation. Justice LaForme was appointed as the chair of the Indian residential schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

This commission is part of the effort and commitment by the former Liberal government to develop a fair and lasting resolution process for the survivors of the Indian residential schools comprised of the common experience payment, the independent assessment process, commemoration activities, and an endowment to the Aboriginal Healing Foundation which the Conservatives cut by over \$200 million. Under the Liberals there was a commitment of an apology. The last component is the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

This is historic. I congratulate Justice LaForme on his appointment as the chair of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**RAIL SAFETY WEEK**

**Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to this year's Rail Safety Week, currently underway, from April 28 to May 4. It is important to increase awareness and educate the public in order to prevent tragic accidents and create a safe environment for people who live near railway facilities, people who use the services and workers who work in this industry.

In 2007, there were no less than 209 level-crossing collisions in Canada, resulting in 27 deaths and leaving 21 people injured, in addition to incidents involving 100 people on or near railroad tracks, causing 57 deaths and leaving 25 people seriously injured. That is far too many.

When we consider the number of accidents and near collisions on railway tracks, it is clear that this public awareness campaign is crucial. That is why the Bloc Québécois encourages everyone to participate.

*Oral Questions*

[English]

**COMMUNICATIONS VETTING POLICY**

**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is a disturbing trend about the Prime Minister and his Kremlinesque practice of producing enemies lists. The Prime Minister quite simply does not tolerate people who disagree with him: MPs who oppose him, kicked out; non-partisan organizations he does not like, funding cut; hard-working loyal public servants fired; parliamentary committees investigating him, shut down; anyone who challenges him, sued. Just ask Bernard Shapiro, Jean-Pierre Kingsley, Arthur Carty, Linda Keen, and Adrian Measner, to name just a few.

As of this week, the muzzle list now includes Elections Canada and the Auditor General. A directive was issued by the Prime Minister's Privy Council to the Auditor General and all hereto independent officers of Parliament that their communications are to be vetted by his office. No wonder even backbench Conservatives have taken to calling the Prime Minister's Office the Kremlin.

\* \* \*

**ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, thanks to our government, aboriginal Canadians are starting to see real results and measurable improvements in their quality of life.

For the first time ever, there is an Indian residential schools settlement agreement. For the first time ever, the Prime Minister will apologize to former students of residential schools. For the first time ever, there are tripartite agreements with provinces to improve education. For the first time ever, a government is moving to protect women and children on reserve when a relationship goes bad. For the first time ever, our government is moving to deliver real human rights on reserve. We are not into aspirational documents. We want the real thing. For the first time ever, specific claims are going to be resolved fairly and quickly for aboriginal people and all Canadians. For the first time ever, there is real action to clean up the drinking water.

Thanks to our Conservative government, we are making real improvements in the lives of aboriginal people. No more promises in a news release. This is the real deal.

---

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

●(1115)

[English]

**ELECTIONS CANADA**

**Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the scandal involving the in and out scheme just keeps getting worse for the government. Now we learn the data crime unit of the RCMP is analyzing computer records seized during the raid on Conservative Party headquarters.

The latest Conservative attempt is to dodge investigators and this time they are claiming solicitor-client privilege. That will not wash.

The Conservative lawyer, Paul Lepsoe, was himself a key designer of the in and out scheme and may be subject to prosecution.

If the government still thinks the scheme is legal, why does it refuse to cooperate with the RCMP and Elections Canada?

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has what we call no shame. He has spent an entire term in Parliament so far inventing imaginary scandals. He continues with that pattern today and has the nerve to write, which appeared in the newspapers today on his blog, sad words about the lack of decorum in Parliament and how members do not talk about policy anymore. He said:

A new policy isn't half as good as a scandal or the whiff of one...I am worried that politics is being boiled down to irrelevance—to splashy conflicts and salacious juice.

He is the father of that trend.

**Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this was not an imaginary raid. It is time for answers from the government.

It is one thing to cite solicitor-client privilege when the Conservatives are under police investigation for fraud and then hire a lawyer, but when the lawyer is actually one of the kingpins that helps structure the fraud, privilege goes out the window.

First they tried to threaten Elections Canada, then they sued it. When that did not work, they smeared it. Now, since the courts have ruled their arguments irrelevant, they try this new ploy.

No more excuses. No more stonewalling. When will the government cooperate with the RCMP and Elections Canada? How many more police raids will it take before we get some answers?

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Conservative candidates spent Conservative funds on Conservative ads. They got financial assistance from the national party to do so. Elections Canada found out about it. How? Because we told them, and why would we not? After all, it is legal and all parties do it.

It singled us out, so we took it to court. One day before it was to face questioning, it interrupted the court case, breaking its own rules, barging into our office and bringing Liberal cameramen along.

**Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me quote a December 15, 2005, email released with the search warrant, written by Michael Donison, national executive director and the House leader's top adviser:

### Oral Questions

I have been speaking with Paul Lepsoe...there are contiguous ridings that we could include on the list...None of those campaigns can or will spend very much, and could make their caps available.

Use space in ridings, overspend nationally, break the rules, try to steal an election; that is this lawyer's advice. Before the next police raid, will the government simply stop the lame spin and cooperate?

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the member would target his former Liberal deputy prime minister with those kinds of smears. After the 2004 election, the director-general of the Liberal Party, a candidate in Alberta, wrote to local Liberal campaigns saying:

During the past election campaign, the Liberal Party of Canada in Alberta transferred funds and/or paid for services in kind directly to the candidate—

This was for an ad that ran in the *Edmonton Journal* for which the local campaigns had no approval. Perhaps there is no evidence that they even had advance knowledge of the ad running. Why does the member, the doctor-detective of the House of Commons, not find answers to that?

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservative government refused to provide Elections Canada with the documents required for its investigation of the in and out scheme. This forced Elections Canada to ask the RCMP to search the Conservative Party offices. And that is not all. We have learned that the RCMP's integrated technological crime unit is reviewing the files on the Conservatives' computers.

Can the government assure us that there will be absolutely no interference with the RCMP investigation?

• (1120)

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it should not be forgotten that Elections Canada is aware of our practices precisely because we informed them of the transfers, which are completely legal.

We will continue to co-operate with everyone because all our procedures and all our actions have been completely legal and ethical.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, those with a clear conscience have nothing to hide, but that is not the case for them. The Conservatives' lawyer, Paul Lepsoe, is one of the architects of the in and out scheme. In an email dated December 15, 2005, the national director of the Conservative Party said that it was Mr. Lepsoe who had the idea of inflating expenses in certain ridings by using the in and out scheme.

Does the Conservative government believe that being a member of the bar is a licence to commit fraud?

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Conservative candidates spent Conservative money on Conservative advertising with the help of transfers from the national party.

[English]

Elections Canada found out about all of this because we told it. Why would we not? After all, these practices are legal and normally

undertaken by all parties. Elections Canada singled us out so we took it to court. One day before it was to be questioned, it barged into our office with media and a Liberal camera in hand.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party is claiming to be the victim of arbitrary treatment by the Chief Electoral Officer, and it has even gone so far as to question his credibility and impartiality. But it is not just the Chief Electoral Officer who has doubts about the Conservative Party's integrity. The Commissioner of Canada Elections and the judge who issued the search warrant were convinced that there were enough disturbing facts to warrant an RCMP raid on the party's headquarters.

Does the government realize that it is not the credibility of Elections Canada that is at stake, but the integrity of the Conservative Party?

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, allow me to quote from the April 4, 2003 issue of *La Presse*:

Considered legal but not in keeping with the spirit of the Elections Act, the technique known as in and out has been used by the Bloc Québécois, as has recently come to light. The leader of the PQ, Bernard Landry, admitted yesterday that his party had also used this technique.

That is why the leader of the Bloc is the father of in and out.

**Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, all the Bloc members and candidates have been reimbursed; the Conservatives cannot say the same. The RCMP has never raided the Bloc Québécois headquarters; the Conservatives cannot say the same.

The parliamentary secretary does not seem to realize the seriousness of the accusations being made against the Conservative Party. A sworn statement filed in court alleges that his party forged documents, pressured its own candidates to break the law, obstructed the work of investigators, gagged its candidates and devised a scheme to circumvent the law.

He should be much less arrogant in the face of such accusations.

[English]

**Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the invoice the hon. member refers to was an invoice originally and mistakenly bundled by the advertising firm. As a result, the Conservative office simply divided it up, and gave it to the candidates who owed the amounts in question and added the GST. That is very clear. The changes to add the GST were made in handwriting. I cannot imagine why anyone trying to cover up changes would make them in handwriting.

[Translation]

The Bloc invented the in and out scheme. That is why the Bloc leader is the father of in and out.



### HYDROELECTRICITY

**Ms. Meili Faille (Vaudreuil-Soulanges, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Conservative government is considering financing hydroelectric development in Newfoundland and Ontario, to help set up an electricity distribution line that would even have to cross Quebec.

Does the Prime Minister promise that he will not interfere in this issue, and that Quebec would have final say over whether this distribution line crosses its territory?

• (1125)

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that is not true. The Government of Canada is very diligent about respecting the provinces' areas of jurisdiction. I can assure the member; the Government of Canada will continue to work with the provinces when necessary.

**Ms. Meili Faille (Vaudreuil-Soulanges, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Quebec developed its vast hydroelectricity network on its own, without financial assistance from Ottawa. Quebec taxpayers financed this network.

Can the Prime Minister guarantee that he does not plan on holding talks about federal financing for an east-west electricity distribution network, and that he will never prevent the Government of Quebec from selling its electricity as it sees fit?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that the Bloc Québécois recognizes the extraordinary work of Robert Bourassa—a great Canadian federalist—who made such a significant contribution to developing energy in the north.

\* \* \*

[English]

### AFGHANISTAN

**Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, *La Presse* is reporting today that the overall cost of the war in Afghanistan will be at least \$5 billion, already half a billion more than budgeted.

As the situation in Afghanistan becomes more volatile and more equipment, munitions and troops are needed, we cannot trust the government to balance the books. The costs of this war are spiralling out of control. The air force and navy are already in a budget crunch.

What will the Conservatives cut to keep the fighting going in this unbalanced war in Afghanistan?

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the NDP has never believed in supporting our armed forces, but we on this side of the House view things very differently. We want to ensure that our fighting men and women in the field in Afghanistan, who are doing great work in assisting the Afghan people, have the resources they need.

This House of Commons authorized a resolution, supported by the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party. It put in place conditions for certain equipment that we need to provide to our troops in order for them to continue their activity to support the democratically

### Oral Questions

elected Afghan government. We will continue to provide them with the resources they need.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### THE ECONOMY

**Ms. Denise Savoie (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the middle class earns only one dollar more a week than the last generation. Despite strong growth in the past 20 years, it is harder and harder for families to manage. Women, youth and immigrants are affected the most because of unstable and minimum-wage jobs. They simply cannot make ends meet.

Knowing that a recession is on its way, will the government finally choose the real world over big companies?

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we have provided considerable assistance to people living on limited means and all Canadians. We reduced the GST, benefiting all Canadians, particularly those who do not pay income tax, which is one-third of the population. We reduced the personal income tax rate for the lowest earners. We added new tax credits, such as the Canada employment credit and the child tax credit. We have done plenty to help Canadian taxpayers and their families get ahead.

\* \* \*

### CANADA POST CORPORATION

**Hon. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservative government is conducting a strategic review of Canada Post's services. What that really means is that the government basically wants to deregulate and privatize. We have reason to be concerned because the Conservatives are launching a direct attack on the universality of this crown corporation.

Can the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, who is responsible for Canada Post, explain to Canadians why he could not care less about them?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to reassure my colleague: Canada Post will remain a crown corporation, and we have no intention of privatizing it.

The purpose of the independent review will be to ensure that Canada Post has the tools it needs not only to fulfill its obligations in the coming years, but also to adjust to changes in the communications sector, particularly with respect to the Internet and other information sources—to figure out how to adapt.

• (1130)

**Hon. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister is well aware that deregulation will have a direct impact on universality. That is unavoidable. There will be job losses, the price of stamps will rise dramatically, and service quality in rural areas will differ significantly from that in larger centres.

*Oral Questions*

At the Empire Club in Toronto, Canada Post's president could not say enough about the merits of deregulation, so how are we supposed to believe the minister when he says that the crown corporation will not be privatized and will remain a crown corporation?

**Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Because, Mr. Speaker, we have just given our word on that right here in this House.

\* \* \*

[English]

**ETHICS**

**Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the finance minister's judgment and actions on several issues have created the perception that he has an ethical blind spot. Now we learn that a private institution, in which he has a direct financial interest, may benefit from a targeted tax decision made by the minister.

To avoid any appearance of conflict, did the minister recuse himself from this decision? Did he consult the Ethics Commissioner specifically on this decision before the decision was made?

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this is another baseless smear and character assassination by a Liberal Party that has no other play in its play book.

The commitment to make scholarships tax free was a commitment that we made in the last election and it is, as are all the commitments we make, one we delivered upon.

The school for the developmentally disabled that the Minister of Finance supports does not give scholarships.

It is a wholly manufactured issue by the Liberals. They do not care that it does not give scholarships. They do not care because they have a chance to try to smear a Tory. It does not matter. They are happy to take—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Kings—Hants.

**Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Ethics Commissioner writes a letter to every member of Parliament. The letter clearly states:

...should there be any matters before the House...that may potentially conflict with your private interests...you consult with my Office in order that we may advise you of what measures...may be required...to satisfy the requirements of the Code.

Did the minister respect the rules clearly stated by the Ethics Commissioner and consult her on his decision?

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, of course he respected the rules. The accusation is ridiculous. He lent money to a school for the disabled. It does not give scholarships.

However, that does not stop the Liberals from trying to score a hit and hurt the disabled and hurt students.

Why is it that the Liberals are willing to attack a program that is giving funding to the disabled and scholarships to help disabled

students? It is because they think they can get a good quick political hit. It is shameful what that Liberal Party will do.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Thierry St-Cyr (Jeanne-Le Ber, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that there are a number of applicants for permanent residence for humanitarian reasons who have been assigned the same case officer for their file assessment as for their pre-removal risk assessment. Department of Citizenship and Immigration officials have told me that this is standard procedure.

Can the minister tell us if these are in fact her department's instructions?

**Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians want an immigration system that supports and helps genuine, legitimate immigrants. That is what we are trying to do. Every application is assessed based on its unique circumstances and under fair conditions.

**Mr. Thierry St-Cyr (Jeanne-Le Ber, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, an officer who must make a decision based on humanitarian grounds must do so by looking at all the evidence and without prejudice. However, if the officer has already rendered an unfavourable decision during the risk assessment, he or she obviously cannot be, or appear to be, an impartial decision maker in that case.

Does the minister intend to issue the necessary directives to put an end to such situations, which would never be tolerated if they were applied to Canadian citizens?

• (1135)

**Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our department has more than 4,000 people working around the globe. We always try to ensure justice and fairness.

[English]

We try to have checks and balances to ensure every application gets the attention it deserves in a fair and just manner.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**OMAR KHADR**

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Omar Khadr's military lawyer told the Subcommittee on International Human Rights that all western countries had successfully negotiated the repatriation of their nationals and that Great Britain had promised to lay charges, on condition that they were warranted under British law. No one in Great Britain has been tried.

Should the government not follow Great Britain's example and request Omar Khadr's repatriation so that he can receive a fair and just trial?

*Oral Questions*

[English]

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Khadr faces some serious charges. The Government of Canada has sought and received assurances that Mr. Khadr is being treated humanely. Department officials have carried out several welfare visits with Mr. Khadr and we will continue to do so.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister often tells us that he is closely monitoring Mr. Khadr's trial in the United States. But according to Mr. Khadr's military lawyer, the commissions were set up in Cuba precisely because they would not be allowed in the United States.

Does the minister realize that by refusing to act to repatriate Mr. Khadr, he is complicit with the Bush administration in violating the rule of law?

[English]

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as I stated, Mr. Khadr faces serious charges. We will continue providing cultural assistance where we can, but any questions on whether Canada plans to ask for the release of Mr. Omar Khadr from Guantanamo are premature and speculative as the legal process and appeals are going on.

\* \* \*

#### HEALTH

**Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today the international scientific community slammed the Conservative government for a serious breach of international scientific standards and political interference in Vancouver's safe injection site's research calling it a "political horror story".

Australia's Dr. Wodak said that it "ignored science, due process, and public opinion while also risking harm to the country's international standing".

Ideology over evidence harms people and the government does not care. How can the Minister of Health defend his irresponsible actions?

**Mr. Steven Fletcher (Parliamentary Secretary for Health, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the allegation is obviously false.

I would like to draw to the member's attention a statement made by the chair of the independent expert advisory panel. It says that the version of the report concerning the estimated number of HIV cases that may have been prevented was in error from the earlier draft and was deleted and amended at the request of the chair of the AEC after consultation with the other committee members.

I wish the member would get the facts straight.

**Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister ignored 22 reports proving the effectiveness of Insite. He refused to commit support. He is running out of excuses for leaving Canada's harm reduction programs in the lurch.

This is a severe indictment on Canada's international reputation and blatant disregard for the health and safety of its citizens.

When will the minister finally acknowledge the scientific evidence on Insite and remove his research moratorium so other communities can benefit from the proven strategy?

**Mr. Steven Fletcher (Parliamentary Secretary for Health, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, in fact, the minister did extend the exemption for the Insite program until June 30 in order to gather more scientific information.

It would be more helpful if the opposition party would support our programs for helping victims and for stopping drug pushers and other people who prey on the most vulnerable. It should help support government policies rather than just fearmonger and do nothing.

**Hon. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is no scientific evidence to support the minister's opposition to the Insite program. In fact, the government offered money for additional research but only if the investigators would not release the evidence until after the exemption for the Insite program expired.

Dr. Evan Wood, with the B.C. Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS, has called this, "muzzling researchers". The University of British Columbia has called the minister's conditions "ethically unacceptable".

When will the minister stop embarrassing Canada and choose evidence over his ideology?

● (1140)

**Mr. Steven Fletcher (Parliamentary Secretary for Health, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, again the member is ill-informed. The minister has extended the exemption on two occasions in order to gather more information. No decision has been made on what the government intends to do because we are taking a close look at the research.

Will the member please support the government and do what is best for Canadians? Will she stand up for Canadians rather than sitting down all the time?

**Hon. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health is now a harm reduction denier. He does not care what the experts say.

The medical officer of health for British Columbia knows that the Insite program works. Health Canada, in 2006, decided that the program was working and recommended the program be extended.

When will the minister take off his ideological blinders, face the fact that harm reduction works and extend the Insite program? Or, would he prefer to just stick to his present program of harm maximization?

**Mr. Steven Fletcher (Parliamentary Secretary for Health, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the minister is doing what is best for Canadians. He is looking at the research and we have extended the exemption in order to do this.

*Oral Questions*

What is causing harm are Liberal policies, Liberal inaction, lack of Liberal leadership and lack of Liberal vision. I think Canadians have decided that the best thing for harm reduction is to stop voting for the Liberal Party.

**Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last week, the government took real action after years of Liberal inaction to protect the health of Canadian babies and young children.

Our government is the first in the world to ban bisphenol A from baby bottles and has proposed to list it as toxic.

Would the Minister of Environment tell the House about the impact of this important decision and how Canada is demonstrating real international leadership?

**Hon. John Baird (Minister of the Environment, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate this member on his interest, particularly in children's health. He is absolutely right. Once again Canada is taking real leadership with the strong efforts of the Minister of Health and the many scientists at Environment Canada and Health Canada. Canada is providing real leadership.

We were excited to see, south of the border, Senator Hillary Clinton announce that she would co-sponsor a bill to follow up the action of the Conservative government here in Canada. We are excited about this initiative and are looking forward to continuing to get the job done.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, last week, it was reinforced just what an environmental disaster the tar sands are. At least 500 ducks were killed when they landed in the toxic sludge of a Syncrude tailing pond.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister said that he would look into the killing of these ducks. More study was the answer people along the Athabasca-Mackenzie watershed heard from the Liberals. Action to deal with all the environmental damage caused by the tar sands is needed now.

When will the Conservative government take action to prevent more damage from the out of control development of the tar sands?

**Hon. John Baird (Minister of the Environment, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we are tremendously concerned about the effect on wildlife and the incident that took place outside of Fort McMurray.

Environment Canada officials and enforcement officers, together with the representatives from the Canadian Wildlife Service, are on the scene and are conducting an investigation. If charges are to be laid they will lay them.

We will bring those responsible for environmental crimes to justice. That is why we got such a big increase in the budget for environmental enforcement, an increase, I would remind the member, that he voted against.

**Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, we are not just talking about the death of 100 ducks, but the damage being done to the water, air and earth of northern Alberta,

Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories from this out of control development.

Thousands of people, many aboriginal, who call this part of Canada home are suffering because of the environmental damage of the tar sands. The welfare of aboriginal people and transboundary pollution are federal responsibilities.

The government's plan has been to let the companies police themselves, a plan for disaster if I have ever heard of one.

When will the Conservatives shoulder their responsibility—

• (1145)

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of the Environment.

**Hon. John Baird (Minister of the Environment, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I do know that the member supports the Mackenzie Valley pipeline, which is very interesting given his comments, to help flow petroleum products to market.

We reject the Liberal approach, which is nothing on air quality in the oil sands and nothing on global warming. The only thing the previous government did for the oil sands is give them a big fat tax break.

When this government wanted to rescind it, that member of the NDP voted against it. I say shame on him and shame on the Liberal Party.

\* \* \*

**AFGHANISTAN**

**Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there are reports that Canadian military personnel are engaged in talks with the Taliban. The government, however, denies this. Yet, Afghan government officials, including the head of the Kandahar provincial council, contradict Canadian ministers. They praise this initiative, even characterizing it as a Canadian decision.

Will the government, in the interests of transparency and principle, account for its denial in the face of Afghan confirmation, not just media reports, of the Canadian military having discussion with the Taliban?

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the decision to engage the Taliban was made by the government of Afghanistan. Canada does not interfere with what the government of Afghanistan does.

We will support the government of Afghanistan in any kind of reconciliation effort that can bring peace to the region and that will renounce the violence. Therefore, we will continue to support the government of Afghanistan.

[Translation]

**Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that is not an answer. The head of the Kandahar provincial council, Ahmed Wali Karzai, yesterday confirmed the Canadian government's decision to talk with the Taliban. He said, "I support the Canadian decision. I believe it is a good approach."

The ministers of Canada's government are saying that there are no talks, but the Afghans confirm that there are. What is the truth?

*Oral Questions*

[English]

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Minister of International Cooperation, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, for any decision made in engaging with anybody, it is the Government of Canada that will make the decision. However, as I have said, and I will repeat it again, it is the responsibility and the prerogative of the Afghan government to negotiate with its citizens, including the members of the Taliban. For any reconciliation process that will bring peace to the region, they can count on Canada's support.

\* \* \*

**CANADA BORDER SERVICES AGENCY**

**Mr. Brian Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, small cities across the country are experiencing serious customs staffing shortages at local airports. Penticton, Fredericton, Prince George, Moncton, Regina, Terrace and Mont-Tremblant are losing out because the public safety minister cannot be trusted to make sound airport staffing policy. He seems to be in a daze.

The minister's reaction is symptomatic of Conservative blindness to the economic needs of smaller cities. Can the minister explain why his customs policy does not give our smaller cities even a chance?

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, CBSA officials have been tasked with advancing the file on addressing the issue. They have conducted a core services review to establish a service delivery approach that is fair, transparent and flexible. Options are currently being discussed.

**Mr. Brian Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, Lib.):** What is transparent, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no plan to distribute budgeted money fairly to airports across the country. But fairness is not the government's strong suit. It has cherry-picked some small airports to be open 24 hours. Meanwhile, others are losing out on contracts with air carriers that need to operate beyond the nine to five hours set out by the empire of CBSA.

Why is the minister determined to separate the A cities from the B cities?

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as I previously noted, we recognize the importance of this issue in terms of national security as well as economic prosperity.

CBSA has conducted its review of core services at the request of the minister and options are being developed. Decisions to provide CBSA services take into account security, service to the public and the government's fiscal responsibilities.

\* \* \*

• (1150)

[Translation]

**AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD**

**Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the federal government's inaction when it comes to setting reciprocal standards for specified risk materials, SRMs, with the

United States, has forced another slaughterhouse to close its doors, this time in Ontario.

Is the minister's goal to force the closure of every slaughterhouse in eastern Canada, or will he resolve this situation before he single-handedly provokes another crisis for beef producers?

**Hon. Christian Paradis (Secretary of State (Agriculture), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely false. It is grandstanding.

My colleague knows full well that the minister is working on this. The Canadian Food Inspection Agency has been directed to harmonize the SRM policies with U.S. regulations. Progress has already been made. Policies on the buildings and on the water used for cleaning have already been harmonized. If the hon. member was unaware of this, then he is learning it from me. These are significant gains for the industry.

**Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Levinoff-Colbex slaughterhouse in Saint-Cyrille-de-Wendover, Québec, is the only major slaughterhouse in eastern Canada.

The federal government refused to give producers money in 2006 to help them get organized. Will the government finally acknowledge that it made a mistake and help Colbex absorb the costs of the new rules on SRMs, or will it simply allow that slaughterhouse to close as well?

**Hon. Christian Paradis (Secretary of State (Agriculture), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, in the Levinoff matter, it is very interesting to see that the producers want to reinvest in it.

What is even more interesting, and what I would like to say to my colleague, is that the last budget included an additional \$3.3 billion in funding for people in the livestock industry. That money is now in circulation to help people, in addition to the \$50 million for hog producers who are in crisis.

What are they doing? Not only have they been absent, but they voted against the budget. Let them tell the producers that and see how they feel about it.

\* \* \*

[English]

**CANADA-U.S. RELATIONS**

**Hon. Navdeep Bains (Mississauga—Brampton South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government is mired in controversy. Let me remind the government that it has been eight weeks since the Prime Minister promised Canadians that he would get to the bottom of the NAFTA-gate leaks, leaks that implicate his inner circle.

It has been eight weeks and counting. Where is the report? My question is very simple: why does it take the Prime Minister eight weeks to ask Ian Brodie what he said?

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware from previous questions asked in the House, the matter has been taken up by the Clerk of the Privy Council to undertake an investigation. It is not being run by the Prime Minister but by the Clerk of the Privy Council to ensure that it is fully independent and thorough.

### Oral Questions

We will await his response on it, because it is important that we have positive relations with the United States. It is important that our trading partnership remain strong. It has been very beneficial for Canada and it has been very beneficial for the United States as well. We will continue to stand up for the benefits it represents for both countries.

\* \* \*

#### NEW BRUNSWICK FLOODING

**Mr. Gary Goodyear (Cambridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, over the last several days New Brunswickers living along the Saint John River have been under siege by the rising flood waters. Also, Canadians know that the tax filing date is April 30. Some of these folks living along this river in New Brunswick may have been unable to file their taxes in time because of flood preparations and safety precautions.

I would like to know if the government has any plans to help these people who have been affected by the flooding.

**Mr. Rob Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our government has been monitoring the situation very closely. In fact, the Prime Minister will be in New Brunswick this afternoon to meet with residents and view the flood damage.

Further, the Minister of National Revenue has instructed the CRA to apply taxpayer relief provisions for New Brunswickers who may have missed the tax filing deadline. Our government understands the stress and fears those affected by the flood are experiencing while they are dealing with the evacuation of their families, businesses and communities.

We will stand with New Brunswickers in their time of need.

\* \* \*

#### FIREFIGHTERS MEMORIAL

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, all men and women are created equal, and then some become firefighters. The day a person becomes a firefighter, he or she becomes a hero in my books.

Today the leader of the NDP is speaking to Toronto's firefighters, but he has the sad duty to report to them that despite a vote in the House of Commons over a year ago to approve a firefighters memorial, the government has failed to erect this memorial to Canada's heroes.

I ask the government: when will the firefighters memorial finally be built as specifically instructed by the House of Commons? A grateful nation wants to honour its heroes.

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this is a government that very strongly supports our emergency first responders: our police, our firefighters, our EMS workers. We have done a number of things to ensure their roles are respected by the government.

We have done it in areas such as law enforcement, where we have brought in very important legislative changes involving the Tackling Violent Crime Act to back up our police. We have also been looking

very seriously at the question of how we can support and assist our firefighters more.

We appreciate the commitments that we make, we respect the commitments that we make, and of course we are deeply saddened, as is every member of Parliament, when a firefighter is lost in service.

\* \* \*

● (1155)

#### GASOLINE PRICES

**Mr. Wayne Marston (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, gas prices in Hamilton hit a record high this week while Petro-Canada was announcing a \$1.1 billion first quarter profit for 2008. What a slap in the face for consumers.

Lower income families in Hamilton are falling farther and farther behind. How will seniors pay for gas, eat healthily and afford their expensive prescriptions?

The Conservatives and the Liberals before them continually supported big corporations, banks and the oil companies. When will the government start truly supporting working families in their time of crisis?

**Mr. David Anderson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there are two ways to deal with this issue.

One is to slap on carbon taxes, raise income taxes and raise the GST to put it back where it was or raise it an additional point. That is what the NDP and the Liberals in the House would do.

Another way of dealing with it is to lower taxes: to lower the GST, to lower income taxes, to raise personal exemptions and let Canadians keep their money. We have done that. Canadians support us because that is what they want to happen in this country.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### TQS

**Mr. Massimo Pacetti (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, everyone in Quebec agrees that the information services provided by TQS are essential to regional news and diversity. Everyone, except the minister, who does not seem in the least interested in the future of TQS, its workers and the information they provide.

Why is the minister refusing to send a clear message in support of TQS and its regional newscasts?

[English]

**Hon. Jim Abbott (Parliamentary Secretary for Canadian Heritage, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like the member and all members to know that our minister is following this situation very closely. She has sent a letter to the CRTC chairman asking him for the details of the process he intends to follow.

As a matter of fact, last Friday the CRTC announced that it is going to have public hearings on this issue commencing on June 2. Our minister is fully aware of this and is fully engaged with this issue.

## AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

**Mr. Jeff Watson (Essex, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives' biofuels plan will actually help fight world hunger. Biofuels are helping our economy, giving us more revenue to help the rest of the world.

NDP members, in their usual weather vane way, have now broken their promise to farmers on biofuels. Shame on them for doing that. The Bloc and the Liberals, or should I say the powerless and the power hungry, are stumbling and contradicting themselves on biofuels.

Can the Secretary of State for Agriculture tell us how the Conservatives' biofuels plan will help us fight world hunger?

[Translation]

**Hon. Christian Paradis (Secretary of State (Agriculture), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our plan for biofuels permits us to counter the world food shortage. When we reach our biofuel targets, 95% of Canada's arable land will continue to produce food. Biofuels stimulate the economy and they will provide the means to do more for the planet.

Canada is one of the two most important donors to the world food program. This is no small matter.

Therefore, the NDP is wrong, the Bloc has no power and, as for the Liberals, as usual we cannot believe them.

\* \* \*

[English]

## KAMLOOPS AIRPORT

**Ms. Denise Savoie (Victoria, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the conservative government is getting a bad reputation for promising one thing and delivering another. We just need to ask the people in Kamloops. City officials there were told the new airport was approved. Even though the government committed \$6.6 million, one city councillor put it best by saying that the government is really just tap dancing now.

Will the minister stop trying to shuffle the blame onto Kamloops local officials and tell working families in Kamloops when the promised money is coming and that no administration fees will be charged?

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the community economic development initiative is investing more than \$33 million to strengthen and diversify the economies of B.C.'s forestry dependent communities. It will enable communities such as Kamloops not only to survive but thrive in the global economy over the long term.

That community economic development initiative is of course part of the federal \$200 million mountain pine beetle program that our government launched in 2007. Already that program is doing much to help control the spread of the pine beetle, recover as much economic value as possible for the timber destroyed by the beetle, and protect forests and communities from the risk of wild fire.

## Oral Questions

It is just one example of how we are standing up for resource based communities. We are doing our part to help out communities like Kamloops.

\* \* \*

• (1200)

## ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Indian Affairs was at the United Nations yesterday attacking the United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. In full damage control mode, he shut aboriginal Canadians out of the media conference.

However, he cannot hide from the fact that more than 100 legal experts signed a letter refuting the government's rationale for voting against the declaration. Will the minister admit that his bogus excuses are a complete betrayal of Canada's aboriginal peoples?

**Hon. John Baird (Minister of the Environment, CPC):** Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. Canada voted no because the declaration is flawed. It lacks clear, practical guidance for states. It contains provisions that are incompatible with Canada's constitutional framework.

This government is working to get the job done for first nations by improving the quality of their drinking water, by finally settling the residential schools dispute, and by building more housing for first nations. This government is delivering more for first nations and Inuit than the Liberal government did in 13 long years.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## STATUS OF WOMEN

**Ms. Nicole Demers (Laval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the executive director of the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women, Lise Martin, had to leave her job when her operating budget was cut in half after the government withdrew its support for Status of Women Canada's research and advocacy mandate.

Can the Minister of Status of Women explain why Status of Women Canada does not have a line item in its budget for organizations that do research on women and its researchers?

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Status of Women, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House that our government increased the budget for the women's program by \$20 million this year, an increase of 76%, the highest increase ever. We are also helping all organizations and women in Canada, unlike the Bloc, which will never be able to do anything here in 113 years.

[English]

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Ottawa South is rising on a point of order.

*Routine Proceedings***POINTS OF ORDER**

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in a response given by the Minister of the Environment to a question put to him, I think he referred to the pipeline through the Northwest Territories, the Mackenzie Valley pipeline, as a pipeline that would transport petroleum.

Just for the record and for his own information, it does not actually transport petroleum. It will be transporting natural gas.

**Hon. John Baird (Minister of the Environment, CPC):** Petroleum products, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank the member for Ottawa South for supporting this Conservative government. Everywhere I go over the next six months I will be sure to give credit to the Liberal Party of Canada, and specifically the member for Ottawa South, for keeping the Prime Minister and this government in office.

**The Speaker:** I do not think either sounded like a point of order to me.

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[English]

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## STATUS OF WOMEN

**Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 10th report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women in relation to the main estimates.

\* \* \*

**PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions between the parties, and I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion.

I move:

That, in the opinion of the House, the government should ratify the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons With Disabilities, signed by Canada on March 30, 2007, following requisite consultations and procedures with provincial and territorial authorities, and that Parliament and the Government of Canada take appropriate measures within their competence to ensure Canada's full compliance with the convention.

• (1205)

**The Speaker:** Does the hon. member for Winnipeg North have the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

**PETITIONS**

## STATUS OF WOMEN

**Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table petitions from my riding collected by student volunteer, Marissa Caucci, from Villa Maria High School.

The petitioners call upon the government to redouble its efforts to protect women's rights, including in particular: to enact pay equity legislation; to initiate gender budgeting policy; to reinstate the court challenges program; to combat the disturbing incidence of poverty among women, and combat violence against women, particularly trafficking; to initiate a comprehensive child care and affordable housing strategy; and to address gender disparities in matters of social and economic rights while protecting aboriginal women.

In conclusion, the petitioners remind the government to heed the clarion call of the Vienna convention that, "Women's rights are human rights and there are no human rights which do not include the rights of women".

## SRI LANKA

**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I would like to present a petition signed by 660 students from York University and from my riding of Etobicoke Centre.

Last year the designated peace negotiator of the Tamil side in the Sri Lankan conflict, Mr. Thamilselvan, was killed by a targeted Sri Lankan air force strike. Soon afterwards, the Sri Lankan government withdrew support for the peace process, leading to descent into even greater violence, and now all out civil war.

The petitioners urge the Prime Minister to show leadership by engaging in multilateral diplomatic efforts to help secure a ceasefire and bringing about hope for war ravaged Sri Lanka by pushing for renewed peace negotiations.

Canada has the capacity to be a leader in advancing the cause of peace in this war-torn region.

## ABORIGINAL CHILDREN

**Ms. Tina Keeper (Churchill, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table a petition that is signed by people from Brochet, Manitoba and Edmonton, Alberta to implement Jordan's principle.

They say that it is the right of all Canadian children to access universal health care. Canada is a signatory to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and first nations children residing on reserve do not have the same access to health care services as all other Canadian children.

They are calling on the government to follow through on Jordan's principle so that all first nations children residing on reserve receive the same health care services as other Canadian children.

## UN DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

**Ms. Tina Keeper (Churchill, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would also like to table a second petition signed by people from Akwesasne and from St. Albert, Alberta.

They are calling on the government to adopt the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.



## SECURITY AND PROSPERITY PARTNERSHIP

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present yet another petition signed by people from Winnipeg, Manitoba regarding the security and prosperity partnership which is an agreement being worked on in relative secrecy between three governments, Canada, the United States and Mexico, and in collaboration with the big corporate sectors trying to ensure that there is an agenda in many areas around health, the environment and the economy that reduces our standards in Canada and the role of our government here. The petitioners call on our government to bring this debate into the open. They call for a full, open and democratic debate to seek a mandate from the people of this country. They call on the government to ensure that the sovereignty of this nation is respected at all costs.

\* \* \*

## 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 questions will be answered today: Nos. 216 and 229.

[Text]

Question No. 216—**Mr. Derek Lee :**

Does the government intend to be guided by Bill C-81, An Act to establish the National Security Committee of Parliamentarians, which was introduced during the first session of the 38th Parliament, and introduce a bill which would provide for a form of parliamentary scrutiny or review of security and intelligence matters and for the protection of classified information made available for that purpose and, if so, when will the government do so?

**Hon. Stockwell Day (Minister of Public Safety, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is committed to pursuing a more direct role for Parliament in the review of national security issues as part of a plan to build a more robust, accountable, independent national security review framework for Canada.

There have been a number of calls for enhanced review, including Justice O'Connor's reports, the Report of the Task Force on Governance and Cultural Change in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Senate Special Committee on the Anti-Terrorism Act, ATA, and the House of Commons Subcommittee on the Review of the ATA, all of which made specific recommendations to the government.

The government is working diligently to determine the most effective and efficient review model for Canada's national security activities.

Question No. 229—**Mr. Dennis Bevington:**

With regards to the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board: (a) what was the rationale for choosing Mr. Richard Edjericon as the new board chair; and (b) what was the rationale for not choosing Ms. Gabrielle Mackenzie Scott to continue as the board's chair?

**Hon. Chuck Strahl (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, in response to a) The Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board indicated to the minister that the board approved the nominations of both Ms. Gabrielle Mackenzie-Scott and Mr. Richard Edjericon as potential chair for the minister's consideration. They further clarified that if neither

## Government Orders

candidate is considered to be acceptable, the board would be pleased to submit additional names and would do so expeditiously.

As per section 12 of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act, which states that "...the Chairperson of a board shall be appointed by the federal minister from persons nominated by a majority of the members", the minister considered the nominations and, after evaluation, appointed Mr. Richard Edjericon to a 3-year term as chair on March 29, 2008.

Mr. Richard Edjericon has all the required qualifications to provide leadership and participation to the board, and will contribute to the success of the important work that lies ahead.

In response to b) Ms. Gabrielle Mackenzie-Scott's term expired on March 28, 2008, after serving a 3-year term as Chair.

[English]

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

**The Speaker:** The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Is it agreed the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT, 1999

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-33, An Act to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999, be read the third time and passed.

**The Speaker:** Before question period, the hon. member for Ottawa South had the floor and had concluded the time allotted for his remarks, but there are 10 minutes for questions and comments consequent on his speech. I therefore call for questions and comments.

There being none, resuming debate, the hon. member for Western Arctic.

● (1210)

**Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to talk about biofuels because, unlike what has been projected about the New Democratic position, we support a properly managed biofuel programs in this country. What we are trying to do in the House of Commons is to get to a point where we have policies that we can present to the Canadian public and that industry can understand where we are going. We want to be assured that what we are doing is correct and is working in the best interests of Canadians on all the fronts that have been purported to be useful in terms of the development of a biofuel industry in Canada.

*Government Orders*

The comments of the Liberals and Conservatives today and yesterday about our participation in this debate remind me of the old saying: A half truth is like half a brick; one can throw it twice as far and it hurts just as much. That is what they are doing. They are presenting half-truths again. That is not what we want in Parliament. We want to have an honest and structured debate about the relative merits of what we are doing as a Parliament. That is what we are after. That is what we are focused on.

This is not an ideological debate. The Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food claimed in his speech that somehow the ideological forces of the left were driving this debate on biofuels, creating opposition to the Conservatives' implementation of a program in exactly the way they want through a bill that has no conditions attached to it, much as what was indicated by my colleague from Ottawa South. After he got over the need to bash away at us, he spoke quite eloquently about all the things that we have been bringing forward in Parliament, all the issues that have not been resolved around biofuels.

When we talk about an ideological bent, we can refer to all the different people who have spoken lately of their concerns about the direction biofuels are taking not only in Canada but around the world. And yes, we do have what we might call a fellow traveller in the Prime Minister of Great Britain whose government over many years promoted biofuels, but who has now said, "We have to go back and look at what we are doing".

New Democrats are always willing to examine what we have proposed to see the merits within it. If we have policies that are not perfect, we adjust them. I can see that too with the Conservatives. They had a policy which was clearly articulated by the Prime Minister during the election. He said that the Conservatives were not going to touch income trusts. What did he do when he came to the realization, that we already supported, that these were hurting the economy? He changed his position. We saw the result.

This is a forum. The government must be flexible. We must look at the situation in front of us and do the very best possible for Canadians. The New Democrats are standing up again trying to ensure that the debate is useful and relevant and that we get the consideration we want of the bills in front of us.

The biofuels bill is an empty box which the Conservatives can fill with goodies for their friends. They can fill it with policies that will help large corporations. They can fill it with policies that will bring products from other countries that are going to compete with our Canadian farmers. This will create more dislocation and will not give us the kind of environmental return we could get from our own farmers. New Democrats do not trust the Conservative government to do the right thing.

• (1215)

In committee, we were consistent. We brought up conditions that we wanted to see in the bill that would ensure we did the right thing with biofuels. Those were opposed by both the Liberals and the Conservatives. They did, however, give the NDP an amendment to have a review on a two year basis. It is a good idea and it is almost all we needed, but not quite.

A two year review will already assume that the industry is up and running, that it is investing, that farmers are changing their production of different types of agriculture products to match up to the legislation in place. This was not quite enough. With this empty box, we needed to have a review of what the Conservatives would fill the box with before it went out to the public. How is this opposing biofuels?

This is giving some surety to Canadians that where the economy is going is correct. How can this be interpreted except in terms of this half truth? Once again, one can throw it further to try to hurt the others just as much. That is the truth of what has gone on in Parliament to date.

When I heard the member for Ottawa South talk eloquently about the problems with the biofuel policy in front of us, when he mentioned all the studies that had not been done, when he mentioned all the things that were not in place, why was he then so insistent that we flash forward with this policy when he had all those unanswered questions? Did it have anything to do with the investment that would go to his riding from the \$2.2 billion, which are on the table right now as part of the public funds that will be invested in the biofuels industry? I ask the member for Ottawa South to look into his heart and see whether this is part of his motivation.

Right now across northern Canada, and it is not just in the Northwest Territories, it is in Yukon, Nunavut, northern Quebec, Labrador, we are experiencing a massive increase in heating costs and costs of generation with fossil fuels, fuel oil. Fuel oil prices affect hundreds of thousands of people across northern Canada and many rural people in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba. It affects rural people in Ontario, the Maritimes and Quebec who are not attached to a natural gas distribution system and use fuel oil. These costs are going through the roof.

Are there any solutions? There are solutions and we are putting those solutions to work in Yellowknife right now. We are buying biomass products from Alberta and running our larger buildings and many homes on wood pellets. It is easily transportable, cellulosic material that is simply pelletized and provides that opportunity.

This can spread right across northern Canada. This could have been available to everybody in the country if there had been one thing, and that was parity in the bioenergy market where the greenhouse gas reductions were compared with biofuels and bioenergy, where values and incentives were based on how much we could return to the different types of objectives that were set into the policy. If that were the case, we could do so much more to reduce the cost of living for people across country who are not attached to a natural gas delivery system.

Personally, as a northern resident, although I use biomass myself, I have full sympathy for us in building our bioenergy industry across the country. Yet there is no parity and no discussion of this. Nor is there any discussion of the way to use different forms of energy. We are on a biofuel path that may or may not be appropriate. This does not mean we should preclude the other forms of bioenergy available to us.

●(1220)

We are investing \$500 million in a cellulosic ethanol pilot plant. The BIOCAP study prepared by REAP-Canada, which was presented in the agriculture committee, speaks to cellulosic ethanol quite well. Cellulosic product that could easily be used in thermal capacities has a 39% efficiency in conversion of that energy. In other words, when the bioenergy product is converted into biofuel in a cellulosic ethanol plant, 60% of the energy is lost off the top. Huge capital costs are attached to this as well.

A typical commercial cellulosic plant, as the one proposed in Idaho, would have an estimated cost of \$250 million U.S. to process approximately 68 million litres of cellulosic ethanol each year. That works out to about \$175 a gigajoule in investment to return one gigajoule of energy. When we look at other forms of using cellulosic product, for instance, in replacing thermal energy in people's homes, in power generation, we are looking at about \$5 a gigajoule investment in the plant. We are creating an industry that stretches right across the country and works for everyone.

These are the types of examples we need to talk about in Parliament. We need legislation that will create a level playing field for bioenergy and biofuels and will ensure that we are putting money into the best things possible for Canadians.

I am not trying to be a Luddite. I am speaking to the real concerns of Canadians. We are running out of natural gas in our country. National Energy Board projections indicate that we will be a net importer of natural gas by 2020 with all supplies in. This is a crisis, and one perhaps not well articulated by the government because it does not want to go in that direction. It wants us to purchase liquefied natural gas from other countries at exorbitant prices, with no particular economic benefit to our whole economy.

The opportunities for bioenergy everywhere are great and for biofuel equally great. We need to move ahead with policy that works. I do not see that here. The legislation does not address the issues in front of us. It does not provide significant return to Canadians in terms of greenhouse gas reductions. We invest \$2.2 billion to get a couple of megatonnes of reduction. That is \$1 billion a megatonne.

Where is the comparative analysis that should have taken place about the kinds of investments the government should make in different forms of subsidies that would go to different things and provide better analysis? These analyses are available. BIOCAP Canada did a complete assessment of that.

The greenhouse gas reduction cost for corn ethanol is some \$375 per kilogram. Using biomass in pelletized form for either heating or for electrical generation would be a \$50 a kilogram cost reduction.

The numbers are just staggering when we think of what we are doing. Why are we doing it? Because a number of people in the

### *Government Orders*

other parties have specific interests in the ridings. They see this as an investment to be made right away so they can move this forward in a way that really does not make good policy. It may make good sense in the next election for these people, but in the long term is it really the sense of what we want to do as a responsible member of the international community? I do not think so.

●(1225)

Having recognized the inadequacies of the legislation, as solidly supported by my Liberal colleagues in their speeches, I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "That", and replacing them with the following:

Bill C-33, An Act to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999, be not now read a third time, but referred back to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food for the purpose of reconsidering clause 2 with a view to making sure that both economic and environmental effects of introducing these regulations do not cause a negative impact on the environment or unduly influence commodity markets.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** I find the amendment acceptable.

The hon. government House leader on a point of order.

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Mr. Speaker, motions of this type are generally in order at third reading, however, there is a caveat to that. A motion of this type, other than the obvious transparent effort to obstruct and delay, in which we know members are engaging, is not in order if it is a motion that has the impact of providing instructions to the committee on how it should deal with the matter. It is one thing to refer a matter such as this back to the committee for reconsideration, however, the motion goes far beyond that because it says, "to making sure that both economic and environmental effects of introducing these regulations do not cause a negative impact on the environment or unduly influence commodity markets".

I would argue that, in so doing, members have overstepped the bounds of what can be done in a motion of this type by providing instructions to the committee on how it should dispose of a bill. That is beyond the scope of what the House can do at this stage.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** I thank the hon. government House leader for his advice and it will be taken into consideration. For the moment, we will resume debate.

[*Translation*]

Although the member for Richmond—Arthabaska probably has a question or comment to make, I will first go to questions and comments addressed to the member for Western Arctic.

The member for Burlington.

*Government Orders*

[English]

**Mr. Mike Wallace (Burlington, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from the New Democrats. I absolutely disagree with his speech, however, and his approach to the legislation, which is much needed. I am the member for the riding of Burlington, a completely urban area, and I am very much in support of what we are doing, for a couple of reasons.

This program will be part of the whole process that is required for our country to meet its obligations to reduce greenhouse gases. As a member of the auto caucus, over and over again, companies that produce vehicles in our country tell us there needs to be a mix, alternative fuel vehicles, hybrids, bio-diesel, to make it happen.

Ford, for example, in St. Thomas makes a vehicle that is E85 compatible, and there is a number of vehicles around the Hill that are E85, and 85% ethanol is coming to town. In Woodstock in the next week an E85 pump at an independent gas station will bring that to the marketplace. It is going to happen in Burlington. It is going to happen in all urban areas across the country. We need to be on board to be able to produce ethanol domestically to meet the demand of consumers who will want to be more environmentally sensitive in their automobile choices.

Does the member not think the NDP's approach on this bill is like putting its head in the sand and not dealing with the issue? The use of biofuels is coming. We can either be a part of it and make a difference and take advantage of it as a Canadian economy, or we can let some other country get ahead of us and do it. Why are the NDP members not embracing the biofuel approach, which the bill would enhance?

● (1230)

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** Mr. Speaker, the question really fits very well with what I have been proposing. I wanted to see conditions that would have linked themselves to greenhouse gas emissions for the development of the biofuels industry.

In other words, we would have some condition that would give a priority to those biofuel production lines, those uses of biological energy, to produce fuel so that the incentives would be tailored to the greenhouse gas reductions.

To move to 5% ethanol in our gasoline we are going to have to grow about 4.5 million tonnes of corn or else we are going to buy it from the United States. The studies that are done by BIOCAP Canada, a very respectable study, suggest that corn ethanol from the United States or corn products from the United States actually have a negative greenhouse gas life cycle production. In Canada it is slightly better at 21%.

Biodiesel on the other hand from canola is probably the most attractive option when we are talking about the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions through the use of a particular product. So when we talk about canola, we are talking about a product that actually does have some of the characteristics that we are looking for in a product. We can see a net offset of CO<sub>2</sub> of 57%. That is reasonable but it is still not as good as perhaps using bioenergy simply as a heating product where we are going to get a greenhouse gas reduction closer to 90% to 95%. Those are good numbers. Those are really solid numbers.

Therefore, when we think of the bioenergy industry, yes, we should think of it in terms of greenhouse gas reductions and we should be very careful about what we are doing with it so that we do achieve the goals that we have, and we do move ourselves toward Kyoto compliance.

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know that a point of order was raised just a few minutes ago by the government House leader. You said that you would take it under consideration and make a ruling. So before you do, I would like to make a comment on that same point of order.

I think if you look at the amendment that has been proposed, the motion that is before us, it is quite clear that what is being instructed here from the House is not mandatory. It is a permissive motion for the purpose of reconsidering one clause of the bill, clause 2. It quite clearly says in our motion "with a view". It is something that would be considered and reviewed by the committee. It is permissive; it is not mandatory. Therefore, I believe that this amendment is in order and would urge you to take that into consideration before you make a ruling.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** I thank the hon. member for Vancouver East for her point of order.

Is the hon. government House leader rising again on the same point?

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to add a little to that because of course I only received this at 12:24 p.m. by email which would have been just a moment or two before the motion was made, so I did not obviously have time to prepare a response.

However, in that short time I have been able to avail myself of *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms* which at section 733 states that on amendments at third reading there are limitations on the type of amendments that can be moved and one of those limitations is that they should not seek to give a mandatory instruction to a committee. Similarly, Marleau and Montpetit at page 673 indicates the same. It states:

—an amendment to recommit a bill should not seek to give a mandatory instruction to a committee.

This amendment does have such an instruction to a committee. It instructs it to amend it with regard to certain substantive questions. In that regard, it is absolutely an amendment that is beyond the scope permitted at this stage.

● (1235)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** I do not wish to entertain a debate, but I will hear the hon. member for Vancouver East one more time.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Mr. Speaker, very briefly, maybe the government House leader has not had an opportunity to read the amendment carefully, but it is quite clear that it is not mandatory. The wording clearly says "for the purpose of reconsidering clause 2 with a view". This is not something that is mandatory. It leaves it open to the committee. I think it is well within the rules of the House to allow this amendment to stand.

*Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** It appears to me that the hon. member for Vancouver East is repeating a point that she has already made. I am afraid that if I recognize the hon. government House leader, he is also going to repeat something he has already said. Therefore, I will hear him one more time but I am looking forward to new information.

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Mr. Speaker, the member for Vancouver East said “with a view to” and then she did not bother to read the next words, which are, “making sure that”, and then there are the instructions on what the committee is supposed to substantively achieve. That is a mandatory instruction. The phrase “a view to” is optional but “making sure” is quite mandatory in anybody's understanding of the English language.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** I now thank both hon. members for their points of order. All hon. members have heard me before commend them for their courtesy to each other. I would hope that this kind of commendation will inspire more courtesy, including advance notice of motions. As a chair occupant, I certainly do not like to be ambushed. I would like to make sure that all members are aware of what is to be expected before it happens.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Ottawa South.

**Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, how much time is left in this 10 minute session?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** The clock did stop while we were dealing with this issue and there is now five minutes remaining.

**Mr. David McGuinty:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the member and thank him for his remarks, but I want to respond directly to this issue of basically delaying the empowering of the Minister of the Environment and any subsequent minister of the environment to be able to regulate fuel content.

I want to point out to Canadians that, yes, it is true that the member has raised some important points. I would say, however, that he is overstating the analysis. He certainly is overstating the evidentiary analysis he is putting forward. I am glad to see that he was quoting from a research program that the previous government set up, but I do not think it is as conclusive as he put it and that troubles me.

Second, I want to understand whether he intends to continue to drive the NDP view that we should be prohibiting the use of genetically modified organisms for biofuel production and also whether he intends to lobby for the establishment of restrictions on the use of arable land. I guess flowing from that, is he now telling us that the NDP is moving toward the notion of perhaps even fettering the rights of farmers or maybe, even worse, nationalizing their lands? I do not quite understand what kind of conditionality the NDP wants to oppose because it is not authorized to do so on farm growers.

Finally, I do not understand his position because the urgency of climate change compels us to act and the onus is on the government within a year, and we will hold it to account, to tell us exactly what is the state of the industry.

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member over there and the Liberal Party for doing the work with BIOCAP because it is a very respected organization. Unfortunately, its funding is not going to continue.

Having said that, the numbers are far apart. If the numbers were closer together, if there was some kind of fudge factor in the numbers, we could say they were at least close, but these numbers put the greenhouse gas emission reductions way different. They put the cost per kilogram of CO<sub>2</sub> reduction to the government at very different levels. Some of them are at factors of 10.

When I talk about scientific studies that show factors of 10 on the scale and when we are talking about what is logically good for the economy, I do not think I have to worry so much about the veracity of the precise numbers. These are very large differences.

When we talk about agricultural issues, I defer to the agricultural committee. These were raised in the agricultural committee. They were raised on very important issues that talk about what kind of land is used. Are we going to deforest land to increase the yield of agricultural production in order to make this change?

We see what has happened in the United States where the increased corn production has led to less soy bean production which has led to increased soy bean production in third world countries where the environmental conditions are not very good, where there is a lot of displacement of people off the land. We see the interconnection between land and the resources as the changes are made.

I am not an agricultural specialist. I come from a place in this country where there is not much agricultural activity. My grandfather was a farmer but I do not have that practical experience on the land. I defer to, in terms of what should happen with land, to the agricultural committee. I would expect that the committee members have reams of studies that suggest what should be done with land in Canada. If they do not, if they are just making this up as they go along, that is wrong.

• (1240)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** Questions and comments. The hon. member for Ottawa Centre will want to have a very short question. There is one minute left. That will include both the question and the answer.

**Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP):** Duly noted, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask my colleague from Western Arctic if he could explain why we need to have the amendment he just put forward embraced by the House and what the benefits of the amendment would be in terms of this legislation?

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** Mr. Speaker, really and truly the report that we received from the agricultural committee was that the bill moved along much too fast. It did not take into consideration all the types of things that needed to be looked at. The purpose of the motion is to get a stronger scientific policy position from the agriculture committee and—

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

[*Translation*]

I thank the member for Richmond—Arthabaska for his patience and courtesy. He now has the floor.

**Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand. Things like that can happen in the House; it is called democracy. I was waiting patiently.

*Government Orders*

I am pleased to participate once again in the debate on Bill C-33, An Act to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999. I have already made two or three speeches on this subject. To avoid repeating what I have said, I will focus in this speech on the need to reduce our dependency on oil, which obviously also has to do with the use of biofuels.

The bill itself does not contain any standards. It authorizes the government to adopt regulations, which is basically how biofuels would be monitored, with respect to standards and their impact. In the medium term, this bill can help us reduce our dependency on oil and significantly decrease greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles, depending on the type of biofuel used and, of course, the type of transportation used with these biofuels.

The vast majority of greenhouse gas emissions are produced when petroleum products are burned. To reduce these emissions and fight climate change, naturally, we also have to reduce our oil consumption.

Of course, Bill C-33 is not a binding instrument for reducing greenhouse gas emissions; it is a measure to promote the development of alternative fuels. The best instrument for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and the only binding one, is the Kyoto protocol, which the Conservative government unfortunately rejected out of hand. Instead, this government is helping the oil companies, which have responded with a price at the pump that is close to \$1.40 in the Montreal area. The other day, I saw \$1.37. A litre of regular gasoline is selling for nearly \$1.50.

In Canada, the oil companies, which recently again announced profits in the billions of dollars, pay less tax than in Texas. When we see that, we wonder what this government's real intentions and real priorities are.

Between 1970 and 2000, the hydrocarbon industry received \$66 billion in direct subsidies from the federal government. For your information, Quebec developed hydroelectricity all on its own, without the federal government's help.

The Bloc Québécois suggests that the government stop giving special treatment to the oil industry, which has no need of government tax breaks. It is not a matter of shutting down the oil industry. We all understand that we need oil, but the idea behind this sort of policy or concern is to stop giving tax breaks to companies that do not need them in the least.

I have a few figures that prove this. Petro-Canada's net profit for the first quarter of this year was \$1.1 billion, an 82% increase over the same period last year. This is no laughing matter. In 2007, Shell, the second-largest oil company in the world, had a net profit of over \$30 billion. A net profit of more than \$30 billion for a single oil company, even one that operates all over the world, is quite something.

Instead of helping the oil industry, the federal government needs to levy a surtax on oil extraction and production industry profits. The revenues from this surtax should go toward measures to promote reduced consumption of petroleum products. This would be a smart policy if we really want to reduce our oil use.

One of the ways we could be less dependent on oil is by improving energy efficiency and using cleaner modes of transportation to move goods. Take trains and ships for example—these two types of transportation account for 8% of oil consumption, compared to trucks, which account for 92%. This is an absolutely incredible difference.

● (1245)

The benefits of increasing our use of trains and ships include reducing our consumption of oil products and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, which we will come back to. What is more, when we take greater advantage of our seaways and rail system, we scale down traffic by reducing the number of trucks. We have all been stuck in traffic. I am not saying that the problem will be fixed immediately, but cutting down on the use of trucks will certainly improve the situation.

We must also move away from fuel oil and favour cleaner energy sources, for individuals as well as businesses. We have been looking at all kinds of alternative fuels and alternative energy sources. Now we must promote the use of these products in order to keep reducing our use of fuel oil, a serious pollutant.

In Parliament, the Bloc Québécois is actively trying to minimize the impact of the rising price of gasoline. This is not the first time we have done so. We are once again on the attack. For instance, this week, we moved forward with deliberations at second reading of Bill C-454, introduced by my colleague from Montcalm. The bill made its way to second reading this week and was the topic of debate. The bill aims to give greater powers to the Competition Bureau.

I would also like to touch briefly on the objective of Bill C-454. It is absolutely crucial that the government strengthen the Competition Act in order to better combat the exorbitant increases in gas prices that average Canadians must face every time they fill up. To achieve this, the government must give greater powers to the Competition Bureau so that it may conduct a real investigation, particularly of the refining sector.

At present, the Competition Bureau does not have the power to launch an investigation on its own initiative. The legislation must therefore be changed. When it does conduct a review, its mandate does not allow it to discipline the industry, but simply to determine how it generally operates. Furthermore, it cannot force the disclosure of documents or protect witnesses during such a review. Thus, clearly, it is very broad and above all very fluid. This does not impose many restrictions.

In short, the Competition Bureau has its hands tied and is in no position to fight the oil companies, which are unscrupulously fleecing consumers. I have more examples. Profit margins in refining can reach 20¢ per litre of gas, which represents \$10 for an average fill-up of 50 litres. And 50 litres is exactly the capacity of my car's gas tank. That is definitely excessive—not my gas tank, but the profit margins in refining as high as 20¢ per litre of gas. I would like to reiterate that this means as much as \$10 for the average fill-up.

*Government Orders*

Generally, it is businesses, taxi drivers, farmers—since we are talking about the bill studied by the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food—and consumers who pay the price. Oil companies already benefit from preferential tax treatment.

Obviously, in light of all this, oil company executives are laughing merrily. In fact, the Competition Bureau does not have the tools to ensure that prices are not artificially inflated. When a very few companies almost completely control a market as large as the gasoline market, someone has to keep an eye on them. You see the same signs when travelling through cities, villages, or almost anywhere. There are only so many oil companies. We are referring primarily to the major oil companies that control the market.

Oil refining comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government. Thus, it is up to the House of Commons to ensure that the Bloc Québécois' Bill C-454 is passed as quickly as possible in order for the Commissioner of Competition to take the necessary steps to prevent excessive gas price increases and oil company practices that are contrary to the public interest.

With the approach of summer it is possible that consumers will once again suffer because of the inordinate price of gas. Our bill must proceed quickly and unimpeded if we want it to be in force before the summer holidays. Not that we are in a hurry for them to arrive—but they are coming. We know that gas prices escalate suddenly and mysteriously in the summer.

Our dependence on oil is also a contributing factor to Quebec's trade deficit. Between 2003 and 2007, Quebec exports rose from \$64 billion to \$70 billion compared to imports, which rose from \$64 billion to \$81 billion. We therefore have a trade deficit of \$11 billion.

• (1250)

What is Quebec's largest import? Of course, it is oil. In 1998, Quebec imported \$2.5 billion worth of oil and last year it imported \$14 billion worth, which is an increase of 457%. The price per barrel of oil explains the astronomical increase. Last year, in 2007, not long ago, the price per barrel was roughly \$70 and now it is over \$100. It was \$119 last time I checked. Unfortunately the price goes up more often than it goes down.

Quebec has a policy goal that all fuel sold will include 5% ethanol by 2012. It has already invested \$6.5 million in building two cellulosic ethanol production plants in the Eastern Townships, one in Westbury and the other in Sherbrooke. That is not so far from my riding. Cellulosic ethanol is the way of the future. I have already talked about this, as have a number of my colleagues in this House. The process promotes the use of agricultural residues, such as straw, and forestry residues, such as wood chips, along with trees and fast growing grasses, such as switchgrass. Bill C-33 will allow the emergence of this new generation of biofuels.

Biodiesel is another type of preferred biofuels. There is a biodiesel plant in Sainte-Catherine, Quebec.

Beef producers currently have to dispose of their specified risk materials. That is a Canadian standard beef producers have to comply with. We are not against it, but we would like to see reciprocity with U.S. standards. But that is for another debate. One thing is certain for now, producers have to get rid of these materials,

which end up in the landfill. Often, unfortunately, producers have to pay out of their own pockets to get rid of these animal materials that can no longer be used, not even to make feed for other animals.

If we gave these materials added value by turning them into biodiesel, we could kill two birds with one stone. We could turn these materials into fuel. That is what sustainable development is all about. Instead of throwing out the material, burying it or paying to have it removed, we could pay for it once it has value and turn it into biodiesel. The technology already exists and this is already being done. Biodiesel is currently being made out of animal fats.

The Fédération des producteurs de bovins du Québec has studied the feasibility of setting up a plant to process animal carcasses and slaughterhouse byproducts into biofuel. Strategic partnerships and help from the government are needed to get that kind of project off the ground.

We have Bill C-33, but we will have to go much farther than that in developing a policy to promote biofuels that have few negative environmental impacts, or at least far fewer than petroleum and fewer than the foods we could use to make biofuels.

According to the Fédération des producteurs de bovins du Québec, we have to ensure that the life cycle of renewable fuels offers true environmental and energy benefits compared to oil products. That is why we should support the federation's project.

I have also talked about the training and recycling centre, CFER, in Victoriaville in my riding. In cooperation with 10 restaurants, this organization recycles used oil, the kind used for french fries, among other things. They are recycling it to make fuel. A pharmacy in Victoriaville even uses this kind of fuel in its delivery vehicle. Here in the House, I joked about how when one is driving behind the delivery vehicle, one does not necessarily get a smell of french fries.

Obviously, that is an important way to use it, a way that will not necessarily consume more energy in transportation. If the vehicle that collects this used oil goes to each of the restaurants and runs on used oil, itself, and if they manage to sell that oil at the pumps one day, that will be a huge energy gain. They are not yet at that point. It is still experimental, but the vehicle works very well.

Let us take this one step further. For example, sludge from sewage treatment plants can also be transformed into ethanol. Quebec's national scientific research institute came—once again—to Victoriaville.

*Government Orders*

•(1255)

I do not know if they did a very exhaustive study, but one thing is sure: the institute said that sludge from the Victoriaville sewage treatment plant could be transformed into ethanol. This is the kind of project we should be encouraging if we really want to reduce our oil dependency.

[*English*]

**Mr. Wayne Marston (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, earlier today we heard a comprehensive speech from the member for Ottawa Centre, another one from the member for Western Arctic and now we have the addition of our good friend from the Bloc with his comments around Bill C-33. A common thread that appears to be travelling through the remarks I am hearing in the House today is that we should err on the side of caution.

I would refer back to a quote I have here:

Biofuels have many advantages, but we have to look at all our options and make sure we make the best choices to ensure a more sustainable future.

...attempting to save the planet by wholesale switching to biofuels like ethanol and biodiesel may unintentionally have the opposite effect.

That quote was from David Suzuki. In this country we all know that he is very highly regarded when it comes to environmental matters.

I would add one thing. Yesterday, in the *Toronto Star*, there was an editorial which read:

And while biofuels may be doing little for the environment, they are doing the world a great deal of harm by diverting food from hungry people to the feeding of automobiles.

In the final closing remark, it states:

Parliament should heed NDP Leader...and take more time to consider the implications of Bill C-33 before passing it.

Some of these folks are non-traditional supporters of the NDP, I would go so far as to say, but would the Bloc not agree that we should err on the side of caution and take our time to ensure that when we set this up that we do it properly?

•(1300)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Bellavance:** Mr. Speaker, that is why in committee we introduced amendments to make sure there are environmental studies, or studies on the environmental impacts as well as the social impacts related to the use of biofuels.

It is important to note that there are many kinds of biofuels. That is why I focused on biofuels made from cellulosic ethanol. There is biodiesel made from canola, which the NDP member for Western Arctic spoke about earlier, but as I was saying, there are also animal oils, animal carcasses and other waste materials that can be used to produce biodiesel.

We have a simple choice to make. We can continue to use oil and deal with steeply rising oil prices. Many people, for example those in the agricultural sector and those affected by the food crisis, will suffer huge consequences. We can keep going as we are and hope that one day oil prices will drop. Except that oil is a non-renewable resource.

Do we decide to develop new fuel sources made from renewable materials—and I agree with the member here—materials that will not be worse than oil in their effects on the environment? It is clear. One day, we will have to get with the times and find an alternative to decrease our dependence on oil.

[*English*]

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this is a concern that I raised yesterday in the report stage debate in the sense that too often when we debate these kinds of issues here in the House it becomes very polarized. Again today we heard the statement about a wholesale change to biofuels.

The government is not proposing a wholesale change to biofuel. We are talking about a very minimal biofuel content in our fuel. We also recognize that only about 5% of our land is used to produce crops that will be used for biofuel.

Does my hon. colleague think that, as our minister pointed out not too long ago, the weather pattern changes can actually have a greater impact than just the 5% of land use that is used for ethanol production?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Bellavance:** Mr. Speaker, in fact, to answer my colleague's question, the Government of Quebec has established a policy on the use of biofuels. It is quite similar, since Quebec hopes to increase the use of ethanol in fuel to 5% by 2012. Once again, Quebec has made a choice. The government, and probably a vast majority of the population, decided that this ethanol should be cellulosic ethanol.

There are pilot plants, as I mentioned earlier. We must therefore encourage the development of this new ethanol production. If we simply say that this is how it is, that it is in the works, nothing will get done. I therefore hope that the Conservative government, which has established its own policy for the use of ethanol in fuel, will allocate the funds needed to ensure that these new alternatives can be developed and that it does not simply say that it will change the crops in our fields, as is the case in some countries, to make fuel. That is where the danger lies.

The current food crisis was not brought about exclusively by the use of biofuels, or agrofuels as some people are now calling them, for there are many other factors involved. Consider the stock market speculation concerning food, the droughts there have been, especially in Australia, which is a major wheat producer and has been suffering drought conditions for years, which cause productivity problems. Consider also China and India, where there are more and more people who now have the means to feed themselves a little better.

Another thing that concerns me is the rising price of food products. We cannot blame biofuels alone, given that rice is the product that has risen the most in cost in recent months. It has gone up nearly 100%. To my knowledge, there is not a single grain of rice fueling any vehicles. The price of milk has also gone up rather outrageously and I am pretty sure that no one is putting milk in their gas tanks.



I am not saying that biofuels have no impact. They do. We must be extremely vigilant about this, but many other factors are also at play.

• (1305)

[English]

**Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak to the bill and to the amendments that our party has put forward.

I will begin by assuring those who are concerned about our party's position on biofuels in general that this is something that needs to be part of the mix to deal with the catastrophic climate change that is in front of us. However, we also need to be cautious. The do no harm principle should be invoked, the precautionary principle, which is why our party has taken the stand it has.

As we have noted recently, both in the House and in the debate that has occurred in Canadian society and, indeed, globally on the issue, if we look at the advantages of ethanol and biofuels, ethanol being part of the biofuel mix, we have to ascertain what the cost benefits are.

When we take a look at ethanol as an example, which seems to be the one that is the most popular, and certainly the supports are fairly strong within the government, we need to look at the costs in terms of the production of the corn for the ethanol as part of the mix for gas.

I recall years ago, when ethanol first became an option, that many said that we should be careful in what we were doing and that we should look at it both in terms of the cost of transporting the goods to production, in other words, the corn from the farmer's field that goes to the plant to mix the ethanol, and the effects on the environment there. We were also told to drill down deeper and look at the actual costs in terms of the production costs.

It has emerged, if we use ethanol as an example because that is the one that has the most production, focus and support, that there is a huge amount of investment in fertilizer, for instance.

There is an important aspect to fertilizer that we should be dealing with. Fertilizer, as we know, comes from natural gas. If we are disproportionately using things like fertilizer, which is a fuel and one that is not renewable, and we are using that to help with the production of corn for ethanol, it should be part of the cost benefit analysis.

I would also add that when we are looking at the other resources that are required for growing corn, certainly for ethanol purposes, there is a fairly substantive use of water as a resource. Again, if we look at the whole mix and what is required in the recipe for ethanol, that is something that should be taken into account.

The use of fertilizer is not something that has been fully analyzed, in other words, the degree to which it will be using the fuel that is required to make fertilizer. Many have pointed to this as a concern, notwithstanding the use of water.

When we look at the tar sands as an example and the science around the tar sands, what was contemplated first in the science that was pushed was how to get oil out of the sands. That is fair enough

### *Government Orders*

and innovative. Some work was done on that. What I do not think was contemplated was what happens with the waste.

We have seen this not just with the tar sands but also with nuclear energy. What I think most of us want to see is a very genuine, thorough analysis of the effects and costs in the production of any new energy source.

In the case of the tar sands, Alberta is about to become a have not province, not in terms of fiscal capacity but in water capacity. Australia was mentioned earlier regarding some of the problems it is having with drought. Water is a resource we take for granted but we should be very careful in how we use it, especially in relation to agricultural production.

• (1310)

We have new technologies such as ethanol. I mentioned nuclear power. We still have not figured out what to do with spent nuclear waste in a safe way into which everyone can buy. I mentioned the tar sands. However, when we deal with ethanol, we have to ensure we have done the proper analysis and due diligence. That is the thrust of our amendments and our concerns about the bill.

A member of Liberal Party, in statements to the press, was trying to convince his colleagues to slow down on the bill and not support it to the degree that we see with the official opposition, and that perhaps it would make sense to amend the bill with some of the amendments we brought forward, to have the oversight and to send it back to committee to do the cost benefit analysis, as I just made. He said that we should admit that things have changed, that since we made assumptions when we looked to ethanol as the way to deal with catastrophic climate change, new evidence had appeared. I suggest that would be the right notion and probably good advice for his caucus colleagues.

I do not assume the governing party will change its direction. It has been noted for going ahead regardless. However, I would plead with the opposition, and certainly with the Bloc, to take a reasoned and sensible analysis of the bill and the concerns we have with it.

The question is, why rush into it? Why not have amendments put forward, as we have done, to do due diligence? If we find 10 years hence that we have in fact gone in the wrong direction, the question will be, why were we in a rush to do this?

It will be difficult for government members and other members of Parliament to get a satisfactory answer when we put amendments forward at committee to have due diligence done. We put forward amendments at report stage. We put forward an amendment today to ensure we were careful with this and due diligence was done. That is important to note.

As my colleagues have said, we are not talking about an ideological view. We are talking about scientists saying that we should be very careful in how we go forward with our biofuel policy. Many have suggested that this is the wrong way to go without the proper oversight, as I mentioned.

*Government Orders*

I find it interesting that in his comments this morning, the minister suggested that this was not about the global map right now, that we were only talking about Canada. That is fair enough. We are in the Parliament of Canada and we are discussing the Government of Canada's policy on biofuels.

The problem with that statement or that analysis by the minister is it denies we are in a global economy. I find it intriguing that I am making this statement for members of the party who suggest that they are the ones who understand the global economy. What we do with our biofuels policy matters to the rest of the world, as does our policy on the tar sands. I share that with the House because if the minister's suggestion is that our policy on biofuels in Canada does not affect the global economy or that we do not have a role to play, I would fundamentally disagree with him on that.

At one point, he said that we needed to deal with an issue because of climate change. He then mentioned that recently there was snow in his province and that the farmers were in the fields. He made a passing remark about it being global warming. It suggests to me that the Conservatives do not have a consensus yet in their caucus about whether global warming exists. I hope that is not the case. This has been a long learning curve for the governing party. I know at one point it denied climate change and the science of it. I hope it was a lightened remark as opposed to an unlightened analysis.

● (1315)

It is about good policy, and the policy we form here does affect the global view and what happens in the world. The government has been very clear about Canada's role. I think the Prime Minister coined the phrase that he wanted Canada to be an energy superpower. If we are going to be, on the one hand, an energy superpower and, on the other hand, making policy on biofuels and suggesting this is only for Canada and it does not really affect the rest of the world, there is incongruity. What he is saying is that what we do here will not affect what happens around the world, and I could not disagree with him more.

Let us look at the analyses and studies that have been brought forward. The chief economist for the U.S. agriculture department is very critical of what is happening with biofuel policy. Gwyn Morgan, no close cousin of the NDP, has said that this is not the way to go. People have genuine questions about what the effects of this policy will be and we need to listen to them.

All our party is asking for is some reason, due diligence and to ensure when we are formulate our policy, we do not do it in a hurry or be too hasty. If we do that, there are unintended consequences and, some would say, irreversible effects that will occur. Once we build into our mix of energy supply, put in certain supports and have legislative underpinnings to it, it is very difficult to undo.

What that means for not only the environment but our economy is that we will then have our eggs distributed in the wrong basket. I will not say they would all be in one basket with this legislation, but it gives the nod to the economy and says, "This is where you should be investing".

It was noted by the minister in his comments this morning that perhaps weather could have more of an effect on the supply of fuel, the cost of fuel, et cetera. Granted, I would concur with him on that.

However, the same can be said about the supply, in terms of ethanol, that will be built in if there is a bad crop. What happens if there is a drought? What will happen then is we might have to look far afield, pardon the pun, to supply the mix that has been built into the system.

I would like to see the analysis on that. What is the last decade's analysis for the supply of some of these crops that we will be dependent upon, even with the minimum that we have established presently? Those kinds of things need to be understood.

The other thing I find interesting is the people who are lobbying for ethanol in particular. We know the person at the top of the association, who was running the lobby effort for this, was lobbying one day for the industry and the next day was working for the government. I find it that interesting.

We need to be absolutely clear as to the premise for which these policies are brought in. Is it the best direction for our country in terms of the economy, climate change and to ensure we have the right mix? Many people would be surprised that someone who lobbied for this policy one day, ended up the next day in the Conservative government, directing where that policy would go. Again, that is important to note.

If we look at what the legislation purports to do, and certainly the government will say it will do, and look at some of the concerns brought forward by scientists, there is no clarity. There is not enough clarity for my party and I think opposition members, because we have heard from some who are concerned about their party's position, to say that we should rush ahead and do this.

● (1320)

There has not been sufficient argument to say that we cannot hold back, that we have to go ahead immediately because the sky will fall. When we look at some of the arguments that have been made about concerns of bringing this policy forward, we can still slow down, take a look at the cost benefit and have this kind of policy put in place. It is a false premise for those who say we have to rush this through now. Those who have taken a look at the direction of ethanol and biofuels mix have argued the opposite, that we can still go in the right direction on this, but it is important we get the balance right.

We do not take this lightly. We have seen what happens once we start down this direction. We see the concerns in the United States. As I referenced, the chief economist for the Department of Agriculture in the United States has thrown up the cautionary flag and said that they have a problem, that have done too much in one area and that it is undermining the capacity for the United States in terms of agriculture. I do not want to be put a corner like the Americans.

As my colleague from Hamilton said, this is something we should rethink and be cautious about. It was interesting to note the editorial he referenced from *The Toronto Star* the other day. It states:

But in their rush to biofuels, the politicians have overlooked the drawbacks of turning food into fuel.

*Private Members' Business*

Although biofuels do emit less greenhouse gas than regular gasoline, environmentalists point out that this comparison does not take into account the emissions coming from the farm machinery and fertilizer required to “grow” these new fuels and the trucks for transporting them.

This is a reasonable question, and it should be put back to the committee to answer it. What is unreasonable about that question? If we are to do due diligence, if in fact this whole policy is to deal with the catastrophic climate change that is in front of us, then why would we not do our homework on this? Why would we not look at an impact, not just of when the fuel comes out the tailpipe, but look at the production of that fuel? We can do that. In fact scientists have done this, working with farmers.

There is a suggestion that if we are critical of this policy, that somehow we do not support farmers. It is unfortunate that some are using this argument to create a wedge between society in general, which wants to deal with that catastrophic climate change, and the challenges that confront farmers. Our party has been clear for decades about the way to support farmers. We believe in the Wheat Board and other institutions that have been built by farmers. We are not going to undermine them. I think this is something where the government is trying to create a wedge. I have talked to farmers locally and they do not buy that. They are as concerned as the rest of us on this rush to put in legislation that would tip the hat one way in terms of where agricultural direction is going.

I hope that reason will carry the day, that the government will take a second look at this and that the opposition will support our amendments. I hope we can look back 10 years from now and say that we did the right thing, that we did due diligence and we made sure that we did not rush into something that we had not thought through thoroughly.

• (1325)

**Hon. Jay Hill (Secretary of State and Chief Government Whip, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I hardly know where to begin after listening to that, but let me start with a phrase that I heard the NDP member use repeatedly throughout his dissertation: why rush into this?

I do not know how long the NDP would like to study this issue, but as a former farmer and someone who is proud to represent a large rural riding with a large agricultural component, which is unlike the riding the member represents, I have to tell him that a lot of farmers have been waiting a long, long time already for this type of option. They have been waiting for this option to see it impact favourably on commodity prices, even in a small way, so they can receive a better return from the marketplace, as opposed to taxpayers being forced to assist them in order to keep them afloat.

They are looking forward to this. I hope they are watching this debate today. I hope they are watching the NDP members stand in their places and vote against giving farmers this option, this alternative for which they already have been waiting years. They have been waiting for years for governments to catch up to the technology that farmers have known was out there.

What do we see now? Farmers are looking forward to this legislation. They would argue strenuously with the hon. member and would say that we are not rushing into this at all. They have already waited some time for this.

Never mind the environmental benefits, this change in policy could be of great advantage to the struggling forestry sector in my riding and the riding of my colleague from Cariboo—Prince George. We could start utilizing more of the wood waste from trees to produce biofuel. Never mind that advantage. Never mind the environmental advantage in reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which the member himself admitted.

These are all positive things, yet the NDP wants to vote against this legislation. They want to kill it. They want to stop. They want to wait for another 5, 10, 15 or 20 years while they study this some more. Rather than taking a positive step and moving forward, those members want to send the bill back to committee.

I want that member to stand up and express why he believes that farmers should not view the NDP as being against them when it wants to kill this bill that will help them so much.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** I would like to advise the hon. member for Ottawa Centre that there are seven minutes left in the period for questions and comments, but only one of those minutes is today.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Mr. Speaker, there is no coincidence between the member's comments and the time remaining for my response. That is an old parlour trick, I suppose.

I will simply note for the member that there is farmland in my riding. He should know that very well. In fact, I am very proud to have the Experimental Farm in my riding, and it does research for farmers. He should know that it is part of where we are finding that there are concerns.

I will simply say that the member is actually helping me with my argument when he is trying to establish that there is a wedge between farmers and other Canadians. It is unfortunate that he is trying to drive a wedge between farmers on the one hand and everyday Canadians on the other. I do not think most Canadians would put up with that. I am happy that they will see through this as just wedge politics, not really about caring for farmers—

• (1330)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** I regret that I must interrupt the hon. member for Ottawa Centre. 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 C-33, there will be six minutes left for the hon. member for Ottawa Centre for questions and comments.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

### INCOME TAX ACT

**Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ)** moved that Bill C-445, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (tax credit for loss of retirement income), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

*Private Members' Business*

He said: Mr. Speaker, I hope that you do not get the feeling that I am always talking, since I just spoke during another debate. I want to say that this bill is particularly close to my heart and that I am moved today as I speak to this issue, not only because this is my bill, but because a number of people worked on this bill. These people deserve our consideration, and that is why we drafted such a measure.

I will briefly explain Bill C-445, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (tax credit for loss of retirement income). This enactment amends the Income Tax Act to provide a refundable tax credit to a taxpayer in respect of whom an employer and the employees failed to make the contributions required to be made to a registered pension plan. It was introduced at first reading on May 17, 2007. Today, nearly one year later, we are ready to debate it at second reading. It is making good progress. We hope that the bill will move quickly through Parliament so that the people affected get what is coming to them.

I will give a brief account of how this bill came to be. In my riding, the Jeffrey mine, a chrysotile mine, went bankrupt, throwing many people out of work. Unfortunately, their retirement fund also disappeared like snow in the sun because there was a loophole when the company went bankrupt. People lost a great deal of money in all this. For years, Jeffrey mine retirees used every possible means to obtain some compensation. The Government of Quebec gave a certain amount of money at a given point, but it was a one-time contribution that did not cover their losses.

What could be done? These people came to see me to determine what could be done. At the same time, retirees from Atlas Steels, in Sorel, also went to see their MP, who will speak in a few moments. We worked together, along with the member for Chambly—Borduas who worked very effectively on this file, to see what could be done at the federal level to help these people.

Mr. Gaston Fréchette, chair of the Jeffrey Mine retirees subcommittee in Asbestos, in my riding, represents more than 1,000 retirees who worked at the mine. There are about 1,200 in all. In addition, Mr. Pierre Saint-Michel is the chair of the Atlas Steels retirees group, which has just under 300 members. These people and their supporters—there are many—truly worked with us. Mr. Fréchette came up with the idea of a tax credit. We met with them here and we held press conferences in Asbestos and in the riding of the member for Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, who also participated in these discussions. Together, we came up with the basis for Bill C-445.

When I said that this was an issue close to my heart and that I was moved speaking about the bill, it is because I saw these people wrack their brains, approach us and ask what we could do to help them. And then they worked on the bill with us so that we could introduce it. I would therefore like to thank not only Mr. Fréchette and Mr. Saint-Michel but all those individuals and retirees who helped out. I would like to extend a very warm thank you to the members for Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour and Chambly—Borduas because, without them, there would not be a bill.

I would like to briefly explain what this bill will do once it comes into force. As I was saying, it would create a refundable tax credit for loss of retirement income. Many retirees have seen their income drop

because their retirement fund was running a deficit when their company ceased operations. That is what happened to people who retired from Atlas Stainless Steels, which belongs to Ontario's Slater Steel, and from the Jeffrey mine in Asbestos, closer to home. To help retirees caught in this situation, we propose creating a refundable tax credit for loss of retirement income.

This refundable tax credit, which would amount to 22% of lost income, would not affect retirees' income, whether or not they pay income tax. The credit would also be transferrable to a surviving spouse and would apply to both money purchase and defined benefit plans. Accordingly, a retiree whose income drops from \$30,000 to \$20,000 would receive 22% of the \$8,000 lost, which would be a non-taxable amount of \$1,760.

● (1335)

We do not believe that retirees should have trouble making ends meet because they are not receiving the retirement income they contributed to for years. That is what happened to retirees from Atlas Stainless Steels in Sorel-Tracy, whose income has dropped between 28% and 58% since July 1, 2005, and is still dropping.

Passing this bill will make it possible for all retirees caught in this kind of situation to recover part of the money lost. Take, for example, retirees from the Jeffrey mine. Since 2003, they have lost \$55 million from their pension fund and \$30 million in benefits.

Of course, this bill would not be retroactive. My colleagues should understand that when it comes into force, this bill will apply to the previous tax year. We will not be able to go any farther back than that.

Retirees whose complementary pension fund is smaller than it should have been will be compensated, as will surviving spouses, when they are entitled to part of the income.

The tax credit is 22%. Some may wonder where we came up with that figure. It corresponds to the federal marginal tax rate that applies to the middle class. For people whose income is between \$36,000 and \$72,000, the tax rate is 22%. That is where we came up with that percentage.

The tax credit is refundable so that everyone can take advantage of it, even those whose incomes are very low and who do not pay taxes. It is a matter of social justice for us. We thought about this. I know that this morning, a ruling was unfortunately made concerning royal assent. From what I understand, if the tax credit had not been refundable, the decision would have been different. We are bound by the royal assent, but I hope that the government will listen to reason.

We made this choice thinking of the poorest members of society. We knew that some people had lost their retirement income, and that some of them had even less money than others. A non-refundable tax credit would have benefited only those with more money. Some people would have been eligible, but I think, unfortunately, that most of our retirees would not have been able to take advantage of the tax credit. That might have been a step in the right direction, but I think it would have been unfair to do it that way. That is why we went with the idea of a refundable tax credit in the bill.

I just explained that low-income people would have essentially been left out. The elected members, at least these three members, as well as the people from the two retiree committees I mentioned earlier, felt that the bill should apply to everyone, especially the least well off. I would like to congratulate the members of the retiree committees who were also thinking of their less fortunate colleagues.

We have to determine how many people this will affect in Quebec. I have heard rumours that the government thinks this measure would take a big chunk out of the consolidated revenue fund. I can say that in Quebec, we have found only two cases where the bill would help now-retired victims of business closures. I am referring to the two cases we have been talking about since the beginning of this debate — Atlas Steels in Sorel and the Jeffrey mine in Asbestos. These are victims of very exceptional cases—I do not know if we can call them very exceptional, but exceptional at the very least—that should never happen again.

Take Quebec for example, again. The Quebec government changed its legislation to require improved capitalization of money purchase benefit plans. And there should not be many cases that come up in Canada either. In Ontario, there is a government fund set up to replenish the pension plans of employees who find themselves in a similar situation. Luckily, governments have made adjustments so that there will not be any more situations like those that the retirees in Asbestos and Sorel have had to deal with.

We are now seeing measures like this in a number of provinces. Perhaps there are former workers from the St. Anne Nackawic Pulp Company Limited in New Brunswick who might be eligible—our research service looked into this. We could study the file in committee, since we have not been able to determine if this is the case or not. More examples like this could come up, but it would not involve many workers.

But even though this may not affect many people, we cannot simply wash our hands of it and stop worrying. Quite the opposite. One thing is certain: we are talking about very few cases and about exceptional situations. The fact that they are exceptional does not mean that they are any less important for the people involved.

• (1340)

We are talking about people who contributed to their employer's pension fund their entire lives only to end up with almost nothing once they retire.

The intention of Bill C-445 is not to hand out a lump sum payment, but to provide an annual payment equivalent to 22% of the loss. If we take the actuarial deficit of the two retirement funds for the people we are talking about, we expect this to cost roughly \$1.7 million in the first year for Quebec. Obviously, that amount will

### *Private Members' Business*

decrease over the years as the number of former employees decreases. For all of Canada this measure is estimated to cost between \$3 million and \$5 million, again if we take the example of the retirees I am referring to. More may be discovered with the current provincial measures, and if we look back, but note that this measure is not retroactive. In cases such as Singer and others, retirees have been compensated. At first we thought about including those cases in our bill, but they are different cases. This exception really only concerns two industries, two companies in Quebec and maybe one in New Brunswick.

Why does this issue concern the federal government? The federal government has a constitutional right to legislate while respecting the supremacy of provincial and Quebec legislation, of course, with respect to old age pensions and additional benefits, including survivor benefits and disability benefits, regardless of age. That is one of the reasons. The compensation set out in Bill C-445—and I wish to emphasize this—is provided as a tax credit. It has no impact on other government program benefits, does not interfere in any way in provincial social programs and is therefore very respectful of the division of powers. The Bloc Québécois would never show up with a bill calling on the federal government to interfere in provincial jurisdictions. That is why I wanted to emphasize this, in case that was what anyone was thinking, but that would surprise me. Most parties here understand what I am saying. The government has a say in this type of procedure.

There are other reasons as well. With a monetary policy that produces recurring deficits and a fiscal policy that does not allow the government to build up a surplus in good years, Ottawa is also responsible for providing relief for retirees who have to pay the price. These are good reasons why the federal government has a role to play in this issue.

I should mention that the coverage by the local press has been very interesting, and I want to thank the local media that have taken an interest in the cause. I will give just one example, because I want to give my colleague from Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour a chance to make his speech. The local media in my riding have covered the story of the Jeffrey mine retirees for a long time. They are involved in an ongoing legal battle, but that is something quite apart from what we are discussing today. This is an issue that regularly makes the news.

I want to read from the May 26, 2007 issue of *Les Actualités*, the Asbestos newspaper, which refers to this issue and gives a good summary of the situation. I am reading from the front page:

The 1,200 Jeffrey mine retirees who have been fighting for four years to obtain redress after losing their group insurance are beginning to see the light at the end of the tunnel. A bill that would create a refundable tax credit for the loss of retirement income has just been introduced in the House of Commons.

This was very good news.

*Private Members' Business*

In conclusion, I want to extend my warmest thanks to Gaston Fréchette, the chair of the Jeffrey mine retirees subcommittee, for raising awareness in this House. He decided to send letters—signed also by the president of the Sorel retirees—to all the members to make them aware of this issue. Mr. Fréchette, who is one of the retirees, also called all the members from Quebec, regardless of their party, to ask them to support this bill. That is what I am also doing today. I am calling on my colleagues to do justice to these people and support Bill C-445.

• (1345)

[English]

**Mr. Mike Wallace (Burlington, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member opposite for presenting his bill today. It gives us an opportunity to discuss it. I recognize the concern of the Bloc members on the issue of helping seniors, which is also important to us.

The government has been doing a number of things for seniors. For the first time in history, we provided pension splitting for seniors. There is an increase in the budget of the new horizons for seniors program of \$10 million to raise awareness of elder abuse and other issues they face, including fraud. We are giving older workers the choice to stay in the labour market by permitting phased-in retirement. We are doubling the amount of pension income eligibility for the pension income credit, which benefits nearly 2.7 million pensioners.

In his speech, I heard the member talk about the costs of the two, possibly three, locations that he was referring to, and it is not retroactive. I did not hear any long term projections of what this may cost the Government of Canada over the years. If it applies now, would it not apply in the future? Does he have any sense of what the financial issues might be for the Government of Canada in the future?

I find it interesting that he did try to make a distinction between provincial and federal jurisdictions. When the Bloc members want something from the federal government, it is always very easy for them to justify that it is a federal jurisdiction, but when the federal government tries to do something to help Quebecers, there is often a push back from that party that it is a provincial jurisdiction and that the federal government should stay out of it.

From a finance point of view, I would like to know, has he studied the long term financial issues in presenting this bill?

[Translation]

**Mr. André Bellavance:** Mr. Speaker, I was very clear in my speech. I gave figures. When it comes to pension benefits, some people do not get the same as others. We estimate that the entire cost would only be \$5 million for the two industries, the two we know about. We did not find others, but there may be a third.

We have to understand that it is a question of retirees who will sooner or later be able to use the tax credit once the bill is passed. Some of them will pass away. In some cases, like in Sorel, retired employees who were unfortunately shortchanged when the businesses closed are no longer there. Spouses who are entitled to a pension could also use a portion of this tax credit.

In total, the entire cost of this measure would not exceed much more than \$5 million.

That is my answer to the member's question. In all fairness, this is the type of proposal or bill that everyone in this House should make sure gets passed.

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my hon. colleague on his fine speech. He summarized the problem very well and explained the solution we are proposing for the former workers of Atlas Steels and the Jeffrey mine.

I would like to come back to the previous remarks by the Conservative member who expressed some concerns. Those same concerns regarding costs have been expressed to me and the hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska. People are wondering if there will be many cases like those. When people say that, they are forgetting that there cannot be others, because the provinces now have legislation to prevent a deficit in such funds.

As a result, we have seen a number of plant closures over the past year, but no other employees have been left in the same situation as those two groups of citizens.

It really is a unique case and one we hope to rectify with this bill. Does the hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska agree?

• (1350)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** The hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska has 15 seconds to answer.

**Mr. André Bellavance:** Mr. Speaker, with 15 seconds, here is my answer: I agree entirely.

To allay the members' fears, we can provide all the necessary information, if they agree to send the bill to committee. That would obviously be the best solution.

[English]

**Mr. Ted Menzies (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill C-445, a proposal for a refundable tax credit for shortfalls in pension income, which has been introduced by my good friend, the member for Richmond—Arthabaska.

The intention of the member's proposal is somewhat laudable. It seeks to assist Canadians who have seen their retirement incomes negatively impacted by a failed business. Unfortunately, it is fundamentally flawed to such a degree that we cannot support it.

The biggest problem with Bill C-445 is its annual cost, as was referred to previously by my colleague in a question, which is estimated to be approximately \$10 billion. Clearly, were Bill C-445 to be enacted, it would have a negative impact on Canada's fiscal position.

This proposal also raises serious concerns with respect to pension and tax policy, while also failing to take into account the multitude of prudent ways we are improving Canada's retirement income system. Again, as previously mentioned, Bill C-445 relates to the tax treatment of pensions and savings, an area that this Conservative government has recognized as a key priority, an important element for economic growth as well as an improvement for living standards.

As I am sure the House is well aware, our Conservative government has implemented an ambitious and aggressive agenda to reduce the tax burden on Canadians by cutting corporate taxes and personal income taxes, cutting the GST and many more. Tax cuts have prompted Canada's competitiveness and improved our standard of living, but tax cuts also spur investment while creating jobs, encouraging economic growth and allowing the freedom for Canadians to save.

Personal savings provide Canadians a means to invest in their own future and improve their standard of living. Savings also bring the peace of mind that comes with the knowledge that funds will be available in the event of an emergency or for future endeavours like starting a small business, purchasing a home, or a child's education.

Our Conservative government has taken major steps to improve incentives for Canadians to save. Most significantly I would point to the introduction in budget 2008 of the tax-free savings account, commonly known in the House as TFSA, whose introduction has been heralded in nearly all corners as an exceedingly positive initiative, perhaps the single most important personal savings vehicle since the introduction of RRSPs in 1957.

Indeed McGill University Professor William Watson praised it as a "great step forward for the country...almost all Canadians will now be able to shelter all their savings from tax".

TFSA will be a flexible, registered, general purpose account that will allow Canadians to earn tax-free investment income. As the TFSA matures over the next 20 years it will permit over 90% of Canadians to hold all of their financial assets in tax efficient savings vehicles in combination with existing registered plans. In 20 years, relative to the size of today's economy, the tax relief provided by the TFSA will grow to over \$3 billion annually.

In addition to the landmark TFSA, our Conservative government has introduced a number of tax measures to improve the pension and RRSP system, such as: doubling the amount of eligible income that can be claimed under the pension income tax credit to \$2,000, the first increase since 1975; increasing the maximum age to 71 by which Canadians must convert their RRSPs to registered retirement income funds and begin receiving pension payments; permitting employers to offer more flexible phased retirement programs in order to retain older, experienced workers and ease succession planning pressures; increasing the age credit amount; and permitting pension income splitting. The cumulative effect of these important measures represents nearly \$1.6 billion in tax relief every year for pensioners and seniors.

• (1355)

Clearly, this Conservative government has worked to improve the tax treatment of pensions and RRSPs and to make our retirement income system even more effective in meeting the needs of

### *Private Members' Business*

Canadians, and we will do more. However, we must make certain that policies are prudent and consistent with sound pension and tax policy principles.

Regrettably, Bill C-445's proposal to introduce a refundable tax credit for pension shortfalls is neither the most prudent nor the best way to promote the security of pension benefits. It would create undesirable economic incentives for pension plan sponsors and would be an improper use of the tax system. As well, it would be exceedingly costly and unfair in its application.

I will now expand on the points to which I have just alluded.

Bill C-445 would go far beyond its proposed intent. It would not provide a refundable tax credit in respect of shortfalls in pension income but would instead effectively provide a refundable credit on the full amount of pension benefits received by most retirees.

This is because, as drafted, the proposed credit would be based on the difference between the pension benefits payable to an individual from a registered pension plan and the amount of benefits received by the individual from a retirement compensation arrangement. As a result, the proposed credit would be extremely costly. In fact, it would cost about \$10 billion annually. I am assuming that this is why the Speaker ruled earlier today that this private member's bill does require a royal recommendation. I would concur with his decision.

Such a costly measure clearly would not be supportable. Let us make no mistake: it would put Canada into deficit and would put at risk the fiscal health of future generations of Canadians. Regardless of whether Bill C-445 has been drafted properly, its underlying objective is to provide a government-backed guarantee for pension benefits. This would not be good tax or economic policy and would not be fair to the taxpayers of the country.

The tax system is not intended to ensure or compensate individuals for the loss of pension benefits due to the underfunding of pension plans. Indeed, the proposed refundable credit would set a significant precedent for government compensation of shortfalls in expected retirement income in other situations.

Let us consider the example of an RRSP saver or an individual in a defined contribution pension plan who does not achieve the pension income he or she expects because of poor investment performance. Bill C-445 would mean he or she could request that a similar credit or other compensation be provided to help offset such shortfalls.

There are a number of other significant concerns with the proposal. For example, it would effectively mean that the federal government would provide compensation for shortfalls in pension income for provincially regulated plans. Moreover, providing a government-backed guarantee is not the best way to protect pension benefits.

*Private Members' Business*

The best way of ensuring that promised pension benefits are secure is to have healthy plans with good supervision. Providing any kind of guarantee or compensation for pension benefits, whether through the tax system or otherwise, is potentially costly for taxpayers. In addition, it raises issues of fairness, given that the costs would be borne by all taxpayers while the benefits would accrue only to a minority of those participating in pension plans.

Therefore, I urge members not to support this fundamentally flawed proposal.

• (1400)

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join this debate. I cannot help but make the comparison between what our Conservative government is doing and the same approach that the American Republicans have taken with their interventions abroad. With the \$10 billion price tag on this piece of legislation, I think the government wants to “shock and awe” my Bloc colleague into pulling the bill out of the House. I do not think that is going to work in this House.

This is a very important issue. Certainly it is important to make sure that seniors, Canadians who have worked their entire lives, are able to retire with some degree of health, support and dignity. I want to commend my colleague from Richmond—Arthabaska for bringing this legislation forward.

As has been brought up in previous interventions and in the parliamentary secretary's speech, there are aspects of the bill that are of much concern. Certainly, our finance critic is not comfortable with a couple of areas of the bill, and I would like to bring them forward later on in my address. Finance officials also have concerns with how the bill reads and if it is as focused as it should be.

Nonetheless, I want to state on the record that I think it is important to bring this bill forward to committee so that these issues are addressed in committee. That is where we will be able to have a full hearing. That is where we will be able to tap into the advice and recommendations from expert witnesses. We think that is where the bill belongs. We will be supporting that.

As I understand it, the bill deals with defined benefit pensions. When seniors retire, they anticipate that the defined package is going to be there for them, but let us say that they are not able to have the income they anticipated, for whatever reason. That certainly would have an impact on lifestyle and on people's ability to provide for themselves and their families.

The bill provides for a 22% tax credit for any lost income. If a person thought he or she was going to be drawing \$35,000 and was only able to draw \$30,000, then that 22% tax credit would be applied to the \$5,000 difference, for about \$1,100.

I think this bill deserves to be brought forward and looked at in committee. The member for Burlington made his intervention and talked about all the great tax room that has been given by the government since it came to power, but I will give the government just a little reminder.

I will use this opportunity in debate to remind the government of one tax increase, and that would be the tax increase on income trusts. We all remember income trusts. We remember the Prime Minister,

through the 2005 election campaign, looking into the eyes of Canadians and promising outright that there would be no increase in the tax applied on income trusts. Therefore, Canadians felt confident and very comfortable in putting their money into those income trusts, but we know what happened.

On Halloween 2006, the Conservatives pulled the plug. They put the tax on the income trusts. Within two days, \$25 billion of money earned by and invested by Canadians was lost from the markets.

Probably thousands of people were directly impacted by this broken promise, by this intervention of a 37.5% tax placed on income trusts. Thousands of Canadians were impacted, and probably millions indirectly, because most pension plans were invested in income trusts. Certainly CPP, which impacts or will impact every Canadian, was heavily invested in income trusts, so it did have an impact on all Canadians. We want to remind the government of that tax increase and the broken promise.

• (1405)

The Saskatoon *StarPhoenix* summed it up for me with regard to the reality of the income trust tax when it stated: “It's a huge impact for seniors. If you worked 40 years to create that nest egg and in a short time you lose one-quarter of that wealth, it's like going back to work for 10 more years”.

That is what was said: “like going back to work for 10 more years”. I know seniors, the people who contributed to this country, the people who paid taxes all the way through, the people who are looking to retire with a little dignity. They deserve better. They deserve more.

Here we are talking about Canadians who have pension plans or who have had the opportunity to contribute to RRSPs and prepare a little for their retirement, but I want to remind the government about something else, too, because its members go to great lengths about some of the steps they have taken to help seniors.

The Minister of Human Resources was at committee the other day and he almost separated his shoulder from patting himself on the back. He talked about increasing the amount for someone who receives the guaranteed income supplement. He talked about raising the ceiling as to how much he or she can earn. He thought this would be good for the labour market.

It may have a minimal impact on the labour market, but he talked about how great it is for seniors. How many people who receive the guaranteed income supplement will that have an impact on? Some 4% of Canadians who receive the guaranteed income supplement are able to go to work. So really what the government has done is fail the 96% of Canadians who receive the guaranteed income supplement. They will receive no benefit whatsoever from that intervention.

What really scares me and my colleagues on this side of the House is the rise in food prices and the rise in gasoline prices. We see the cost of living going up, but we do not see any action on the other side to help those seniors who are most vulnerable. We have seen that this measure fails 96% of the seniors receiving GIS.



*Private Members' Business*

Mr. Speaker, this coming fall—and mark my words, you will go back and refer to this in *Hansard*—we are going to have seniors in this country who will be up against it. We are going to see seniors who will have to decide if they will fill their fuel tank, fill their cupboards or fill their prescriptions. It is going to become that stark. The government has to do something.

Certainly I believe we will be able to bring these issues forward when the bill goes to committee for study. We do have some concerns. We will see what the bill looks like coming out of committee.

There are concerns that were shared with me by the critic and members on this side. We want to know if through this bill the government will guarantee all pension funds. Will this act as a disincentive for employers or employees to properly and fully contribute to and manage their funds? That is an important question. Hopefully the expert witnesses will be able to shed some light on that.

For Canadians who do not have a defined benefit package or pension plan, we want to ask if it is fair for them to subsidize this. This is a question that has to be asked.

We want to find out if the bill is worded properly. Does it ensure that it targets only retirees with these pensions?

We do not know if this bill is a proper solution, but it does merit further consideration. We have every confidence that the standing committee will bring forward the appropriate witnesses. We will get answers to these questions and hopefully from those answers we will find out whether or not the bill deserves further support.

**Mr. Wayne Marston (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-445, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, specifically to provide a tax credit, which we have been hearing about in this debate, for the loss of retirement income. It was introduced by the member for Richmond—Arthabaska and I appreciate that member's concern for the workers of his province and how this bill may help all workers across our country.

However, before I get into my remarks, recently in this debate we heard from the Conservatives a list of all of the things that they have done for seniors. I have one more thing for them to put on their list and that is the \$1 billion they owe seniors from the CPI mistake that was made a number of years ago. Each and every senior who is owed that \$500 for each year should be addressed by the government and should receive the money. If they owed the government money, they certainly would have somebody knocking on their doors.

Back to Bill C-445, it would grant a refundable tax credit equal to 22% of the reduction in pension benefits experienced by beneficiaries, other than trusts, of registered pension plans who suffer a loss of pension benefits, normally when their pension plan is wound up in whole or in part. It applies to both defined benefit and defined combination plans. This bill certainly will catch the ear of Stelco workers in Hamilton who went through the CCAA bankruptcy protection recently. They saw the sale by their employer of their company and all the insecurity about their pension and benefits. They had to deal with this stress for two years.

Seniors who have already retired and those who are about to retire have worked hard. They have played by the rules all of their lives

and now they need their pension plans. They need their income to retire in dignity and respect. They too often find their retirement benefits reduced through no fault of their own.

I will not suggest this bill would address fully the problems they will face but it offers some modest fairness for retirees.

In addition to Bill C-445, we in the NDP call on the federal government to explore other options to help retirees which should be based on the premises: that all workers deserve decent pension coverage, that all workers deserve to get the pension they have earned, that we show respect for today's and tomorrow's retirees, that retirement investments must work for and not against workers, and that the government has a national job strategy so that dignified retirement is possible.

A recent polling of Canadians found that 73% are worried about not having enough money to live on after retiring. Canadian workers worry about the solvency of their private pensions. They worry about the adequacy of both CPP and public income supports.

They know, for instance, that inflation does far more damage to retirees than any other group of Canadians. Over 250,000 seniors today live under the poverty line, under that cutoff point. Too many retirees are living in poverty. It is the responsibility of the government to protect seniors and not leave them hung out to dry.

A particularly alarming statistic is that one-third of seniors, most of whom are women, have little income outside of OAS and GIS, and have an average annual income of around \$12,000. How are these seniors expected to live in dignity on barely \$1,000 a month?

How are they expected to afford to stay in their family homes or expensive senior retirement residences or afford the cost of living and utility bills, not to mention the high price of gasoline for those who can still afford a car?

How are they expected to afford the medications each month, especially since the government will not provide a national pharmacare program? How are seniors expected, after all of those expenses, to meet the high cost of food?

Since the middle 1990s, according to the National Advisory Council on Aging, seniors' income levels have reached a ceiling and are no longer keeping pace with the rest of Canadians. In fact, the mean income of seniors rose only \$4,100 compared to other Canadian households, which rose \$9,000 between 1997 and 2003. Thirty per cent of families today have no private pension assets at all.

*Private Members' Business*

In this age of insecurity and tremendous job loss in our manufacturing sector, as well as the pulp and paper sector, the federal government must look beyond today and beyond the next election cycle. It is time for some long range planning in conjunction with our defined pension plans as to how to support workers in their retirement years.

• (1410)

In my riding of Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, I hear repeatedly about the moneys owed to seniors that I spoke about before. Regarding the error in the cost of living, we should imagine what a \$500 per year repayment would do for somebody with an income of \$12,000 per year and what it would mean to them.

The Conservative government has handed corporate Canada \$14 billion in tax breaks each and every year, and only a pittance to seniors. When seniors owe tax to the government, they have to pay or they are charged interest that compounds daily. However, when the government owes money to seniors, it simply dismisses those seniors and tells them that they do not matter.

The Conservatives tout their two point cut to the GST and the \$60 billion they took out of the fiscal capacity of the Government of Canada to respond in a reasonable way to the plight of seniors. Seniors across Canada have to choose between buying medication and eating. That is disgraceful and the government should be ashamed.

The government should cancel the corporate tax cuts and use the money to give seniors a reasonable raise in their CPP benefits. The Conservatives should follow the lead of the NDP and start a national prescription drug program for all Canadians.

The Conservatives should follow through on the promises they already made to seniors and implement the seniors charter, created by my colleague from Hamilton Mountain.

In June 2006, nearly two years ago, the House passed the NDP's seniors charter, which called for the government to work with the provinces to rectify decades of underfunding of seniors programs. The seniors charter called for the recognition of older Canadians as creative, active and valued members of our society.

The charter would have enshrined the right of every senior living in Canada to the following: income security, through protected pensions and indexed public income support that provides a reasonable state of economic welfare; housing, through secure, accessible and affordable housing; wellness, through health promotion and preventive care; health care, through secure, public, accessible, universal health care, including primary care, dental care, home care, palliative care, geriatric care and pharmacare; self development, through lifelong access to affordable recreation, education and training; government services, through timely access to all federal government programs and services, including family reunification.

It would create a seniors advocate to: conduct public education and awareness initiatives on the rights of seniors; ensure that all new and revised policies and programs affecting seniors receive public input from older persons; require that all new policies and programs affecting seniors are announced with specific timelines for implementation; act as an ombudsman for seniors with respect to

all government services and programs in making recommendations as appropriate that assist seniors; and that would advocate and report annually to Parliament on government policies and programs affecting seniors, including the effectiveness of federal funding related to the needs of older persons.

I wonder how many members present have had to eat cat food. I read an article on how seniors choose cat food because of its low price in order to get some protein because they simply cannot afford to purchase groceries. That is one of the great shames in this country. We have to do better. The government has to do better for our seniors and this is a national disgrace that can no longer be ignored.

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is also a pleasure for me to speak at second reading to Bill C-445, which was introduced by my colleague for Richmond—Arthabaska and which I was honoured to second. I would first like to thank him for all the work he has done with me to prepare this bill. I would also like to thank the member for Chambly—Borduas, the Bloc Québécois researchers and the officers of the House of Commons who advised us on the legal aspects and the drafting of the bill.

I would like to congratulate the member for Richmond—Arthabaska because he expressed in his speech the very thoughts of the former employees of Atlas Steels and the Jeffrey mine. These people were treated unfairly and they were victims. This request is not based on a whim. They want to redress a wrong. He explained the financial blow dealt to these individuals who had already retired in the belief that their pensions were guaranteed for the rest of their lives.

I would like to thank the NDP member who spoke just before me. He definitely extended the debate to the complex issues faced by seniors, including health. From the outset, he said he was prepared, together with his party, to support the bill. I thank him. As for the few questions he may have, we will attempt to reassure him when we study the bill in committee.

I would also like to thank the Liberal Party critic whose speech was very clear. From the start, he said that this bill deserved to be referred to committee. He said he had questions, and I understand that. He is entitled to have questions. But I think that he did not completely understand the purpose behind this bill.

The member for Richmond—Arthabaska, the member for Chambly—Borduas and I would be very happy to answer his questions and to appear before the committee. The former employees are also prepared to come and work with us, including Mr. Saint-Michel and the Jeffrey mine retirees' representative, Mr. Fréchette. They will come to explain the situation and I do not think they will have any problem answering the Liberal critic's questions. I thank him for supporting this bill. These two pledges of support, along with the support of all the Bloc members, ensure that this bill will be sent to committee so that it can move to the next stage.

*Private Members' Business*

However, the Conservative member's statement surprised me. I did tell several Conservative members from Quebec about this bill. I am not judging them, but it seems they may have forgotten to inform the parliamentary secretary, who spoke earlier. Talking about \$10 billion shows that either he is trying to get people worked up about this or he has gone crazy. Imagine: \$10 billion! We are talking about some 260 workers in one place and about 900 in another. The total per year would be \$1.7 million. These people are not going to live forever. Every now and then, some of them die. They are not young, and a few years from now, this will not cost the government anything. Yet he was saying that it would cost \$10 billion. Where did he get that number from?

Perhaps his speech was influenced by the combined deficit of all public and private retirement funds in Canada. If all of those people lost their jobs and were covered by this bill, it would cost \$10 billion. What kind of logic is that? It does not make sense. This is a matter of a few million dollars, and we are asking the government to fix an injustice. As I said earlier, it is not as though these workers acted on a whim. We have to demonstrate compassion for workers who have been deprived of income to which they had a legal right.

• (1420)

These people, like all workers, including the members of this House, paid contributions out of their income. The employer also paid, of course. Those contributions went into a fund and, all of a sudden, one third of the money was taken away without giving the retirees a say in the matter.

However, this fund was supposed to be guaranteed. If hon. members who retire were suddenly told, a year later, that their pension was being cut by one third, I think the reaction would be violent or at least very noisy. An injustice has been done and we want to correct it. The people suffering this injustice worked hard for many years. They have managed to build up a strong claim and a bill was born out of this claim.

Like my colleague from Richmond—Arthabaska before me, I would like to pay tribute to Pierre Saint-Michel and Gaston Fréchette and their two teams. They looked for a legal way to provide the workers with partial compensation for their losses. Today, after consulting experts, legislative drafters and House experts, they have finally found a solution to recover some of the loss. They will get that solution if every member of this House sets partisanship aside and understands the need to be compassionate and provide these people with social justice. This gesture, which would cost the government barely a few million dollars in the early years, would allow these people to obtain some compensation for their losses.

Today, I am calling on the Conservative members from Quebec to influence their government. I have chosen to sit as a sovereignist MP with a vision of Quebec sovereignty. They have chosen to sit within a party in power that claims to better defend the interests of Quebec. Well, ladies and gentlemen, now you have the opportunity to prove it.

I am calling on the members for Lévis—Bellechasse, Beauport—Limoilou, Pontiac, Beauce, Jonquière—Alma, Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, Louis-Hébert, Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean, Mégantic—L'Érable, Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles and Louis-Saint-

Laurent. They have said they might have some influence. Perhaps the critic and parliamentary secretary who spoke earlier might change his mind when the second hour of debate takes place in early June.

I hope this bill will be referred to committee by a unanimous vote. I ask them to use their influence. It is time for these members to prove they do have some influence and to act to change the parliamentary secretary's speech and their party's vision.

The Liberal members have agreed to refer this bill to committee, and I thank them. The NDP members have also agreed, and I thank them. Of course, the Bloc Québécois will support this private member's bill, and I ask the Conservative members to do the same.

I repeat, this is not a partisan gesture, but an act of human compassion and social justice. I therefore ask that all members support this bill and that, during the next hour of debate in early June, there be only speeches in support of this bill in this House so that we can act to reassure these people following the injustice they suffered a few years ago.

• (1425)

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** The hon. member for Kitchener—Conestoga has the floor for 10 minutes but he has advance notice that it will only be for 2 minutes today.

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps once you hear the beginning of my speech, you will want to extend the time to allow me to get in my entire speech.

Bill C-445, which is sponsored by the member for Richmond—Arthabaska, is a proposal for a refundable tax credit to deal with shortfalls in pension income. From the onset, I will state that we do not support this proposal as it is fundamentally flawed.

First and foremost, the largest issue with Bill C-445 is cost, which the Department of Finance estimated to be approximately \$10 billion. Clearly, supporting a proposal with a cost of this magnitude would be fiscally irresponsible and it would threaten Canada's fiscal health.

Furthermore, the proposal also raises serious issues with respect to pension and tax policy and ignores the present state of Canada's retirement income system. Bill C-445 touches on a matter of importance to all workers, the security of their pensions.

This government recognizes that the security of workers' pension benefits is a key element in ensuring the effectiveness of Canada's retirement income system. It has been recognized that Canada has a diversified retirement income system based on a mix of public and private pensions. The old age security and guaranteed income supplement programs, along with the Canada and Quebec pension plans, are considered to be the pillars of that system, ensuring a minimum level of income in retirement for Canadian seniors.

*Private Members' Business*

•(1430)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Royal Galipeau):** The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper. When we next return to the study of Bill C-445, there will be eight minutes left for the hon. member for Kitchener—Conestoga.

[*Translation*]

It being 2:30 p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

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

---





**APPENDIX**

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

**CHAIR OCCUPANTS**

**The Speaker**

HON. 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
Bruinooge, Rod, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	CPC
Brunelle, Paule	Trois-Rivières	Québec	BQ
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CPC
Cannan, Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	British Columbia	CPC
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Cannon, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities	Pontiac	Québec	CPC
Cardin, Serge	Sherbrooke	Québec	BQ
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Carrier, Robert	Alfred-Pellan	Québec	BQ
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester— Musquodoboit Valley	Nova Scotia	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.
Shipley, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Ontario	CPC
Siksay, Bill	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Silva, Mario	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Simard, Hon. Raymond	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Skelton, Hon. Carol	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
<b>ALBERTA (28)</b>		
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
<b>BRITISH COLUMBIA (36)</b>		
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.
<b>MANITOBA (14)</b>		
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
<b>NEW BRUNSWICK (10)</b>		
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.
<b>NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (7)</b>		
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.
<b>NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)</b>		
Bevington, Dennis.....	Western Arctic .....	NDP
<b>NOVA SCOTIA (11)</b>		
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.
<b>NUNAVUT (1)</b>		
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy .....	Nunavut.....	Lib.
<b>ONTARIO (105)</b>		
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 .....	
<b>SASKATCHEWAN (14)</b>		
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
<b>YUKON (1)</b>		
Bagnell, Hon. Larry .....	Yukon.....	Lib.



## LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of May 2, 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 Breitreuz  
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 Davidson

Claude 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 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  
 James Moore  
 Rob Moore  
 Thomas Mulcair  
 Joyce Murray  
 Rick Norlock  
 Deepak Obhrai  
 Christian Ouellet  
 Brian Pallister  
 Daniel Petit  
 Pierre Poilievre

Joe 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 Members**Jim 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 Members

Jim Abbott  
Harold Albrecht  
Dean Allison  
Rob Anders  
David Anderson  
Dave Batters  
Catherine Bell  
Leon Benoit  
James Bezan  
Steven Blaney  
Sylvie Boucher  
Garry Breitreuz  
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

<b>Chair:</b>	Kevin Sorenson	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	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

<b>Chair:</b>	Scott Reid	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	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 Wasylcyia-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 Members**Jim 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 Wasylycia-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 MastroBarry 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 KomarnickiDaryl 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 PoilievreJoe 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

<b>Chair:</b>	Art Hanger	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	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**

<b>Chair:</b>	Dean Allison	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	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**

<b>Chair:</b>	Dean Allison	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>	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 Members**Jim 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**

<b>Chair:</b>	Steven Blaney	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Yvon Godin Pablo Rodriguez	
Michael Chong Denis Coderre Jean-Claude D'Amours	Raymond Gravel Denis Lebel	Pierre Lemieux Richard Nadeau	Daniel Petit Brent St. Denis	(12)

**Associate Members**

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

---

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

<b>Chair:</b>		<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	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

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

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Chair:</b>	Joe Preston	<b>Vice-Chair:</b>		
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 Members**Jim 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 Thaï 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 Members**Jim 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

## TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

**Chair:**

Mervin Tweed

**Vice-Chairs:**Mario Laframboise  
Joseph VolpeDon Bell  
Robert Carrier  
Ed FastMartha Hall Findlay  
Brian JeanBrian Masse  
Bev ShipleyJeff Watson  
Paul Zed

(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  
Blaine Calkins  
Ron Cannan  
Colin Carrie  
Rick Casson  
Michael Chong  
Olivia Chow  
Rob Clarke  
Joe Comartin  
Joe Comuzzi  
Paul Crête

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

Geoff Regan  
Scott Reid  
Lee Richardson  
Todd Russell  
Denise Savoie  
Gary Schellenberger  
Carol Skelton  
Joy Smith  
Kevin Sorenson  
Bruce Stanton  
Peter Stoffer  
Brian Storseth  
David Sweet  
Myron Thompson  
David Tilson  
Alan Tonks  
Bradley Trost  
Dave Van Kesteren  
Maurice Vellacott  
Robert Vincent  
Mike Wallace  
Mark Warawa  
Chris Warkentin  
John Williams  
Lynne Yelich



## VETERANS AFFAIRS

<b>Chair:</b>	Rob Anders	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	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

<b>Chair:</b>	Pierre Lemieux	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	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 Breitzkreuz  
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, May 2, 2008

## Points of Order

### Bill C-445—Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker ..... 5381

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999

Mr. Ritz ..... 5382  
 Bill C-33. Third reading ..... 5382  
 Mr. Silva ..... 5385  
 Mr. Bevington ..... 5386  
 Mr. Warawa ..... 5387  
 Mr. McGuinty ..... 5387

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Kodiak Impact

Mr. Harris ..... 5390

### World Press Freedom Day

Mr. Cotler ..... 5390

### Art Exhibition in Quebec City

Mr. Malo ..... 5390

### Vietnamese Cultural Day

Mr. Dewar ..... 5390

### Hockey

Mr. Lauzon ..... 5390

### Gasoline Prices

Mr. Malhi ..... 5391

### Denise Boucher

Mrs. Boucher ..... 5391

### Seniors

Mr. Gravel ..... 5391

### Afghanistan Mission

Mr. Del Mastro ..... 5391

### Afghanistan Mission

Ms. Karetak-Lindell ..... 5391

### Israel

Mr. Poilievre ..... 5392

### Omar Khadr

Mr. Marston ..... 5392

### Truth and Reconciliation Commission

Ms. Keeper ..... 5392

### Rail Safety Week

Mr. Laframboise ..... 5392

### Communications Vetting Policy

Mr. Wrzesnewskyj ..... 5393

### Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Albrecht ..... 5393

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Elections Canada

Mr. Holland ..... 5393  
 Mr. Van Loan ..... 5393  
 Mr. Holland ..... 5393  
 Mr. Poilievre ..... 5393  
 Mr. Holland ..... 5393  
 Mr. Poilievre ..... 5394  
 Mr. Rodriguez ..... 5394  
 Mr. Poilievre ..... 5394  
 Mr. Rodriguez ..... 5394  
 Mr. Poilievre ..... 5394  
 Mr. Paquette ..... 5394  
 Mr. Poilievre ..... 5394  
 Mr. Paquette ..... 5394  
 Mr. Poilievre ..... 5394

### Hydroelectricity

Ms. Faille ..... 5395  
 Mr. Cannon ..... 5395  
 Ms. Faille ..... 5395  
 Mr. Cannon ..... 5395

### Afghanistan

Mr. Dewar ..... 5395  
 Mr. Van Loan ..... 5395

### The Economy

Ms. Savoie ..... 5395  
 Mr. Van Loan ..... 5395

### Canada Post Corporation

Mr. Coderre ..... 5395  
 Mr. Cannon ..... 5395  
 Mr. Coderre ..... 5395  
 Mr. Cannon ..... 5396

### Ethics

Mr. Brison ..... 5396  
 Mr. Van Loan ..... 5396  
 Mr. Brison ..... 5396  
 Mr. Van Loan ..... 5396

### Immigration

Mr. St-Cyr ..... 5396  
 Ms. Finley ..... 5396  
 Mr. St-Cyr ..... 5396  
 Ms. Finley ..... 5396

### Omar Khadr

Ms. Bourgeois ..... 5396  
 Mr. Obhrai ..... 5397  
 Ms. Bourgeois ..... 5397  
 Mr. Obhrai ..... 5397

### Health

Ms. Fry ..... 5397

Mr. Fletcher .....	5397	<b>Status of Women</b>	
Ms. Fry .....	5397	Ms. Demers .....	5401
Mr. Fletcher .....	5397	Mrs. Boucher .....	5401
Ms. Bennett .....	5397	<b>Points of Order</b>	
Mr. Fletcher .....	5397	<b>Oral Questions</b>	
Ms. Bennett .....	5397	Mr. McGuinty .....	5402
Mr. Fletcher .....	5397	Mr. Baird .....	5402
Mr. Sweet .....	5398		
Mr. Baird .....	5398		
<b>The Environment</b>			
Mr. Bevington .....	5398		
Mr. Baird .....	5398		
Mr. Bevington .....	5398		
Mr. Baird .....	5398		
<b>Afghanistan</b>			
Mr. Cotler .....	5398		
Mr. Obhrai .....	5398		
Mr. Cotler .....	5398		
Mr. Obhrai .....	5399		
<b>Canada Border Services Agency</b>			
Mr. Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe) .....	5399		
Mr. MacKenzie .....	5399		
Mr. Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe) .....	5399		
Mr. MacKenzie .....	5399		
<b>Agriculture and Agri-Food</b>			
Mr. Bellavance .....	5399		
Mr. Paradis .....	5399		
Mr. Bellavance .....	5399		
Mr. Paradis .....	5399		
<b>Canada-U.S. Relations</b>			
Mr. Bains .....	5399		
Mr. Van Loan .....	5399		
<b>New Brunswick Flooding</b>			
Mr. Goodyear .....	5400		
Mr. Moore (Fundy Royal) .....	5400		
<b>Firefighters Memorial</b>			
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) .....	5400		
Mr. Van Loan .....	5400		
<b>Gasoline Prices</b>			
Mr. Marston .....	5400		
Mr. Anderson .....	5400		
<b>TQS</b>			
Mr. Pacetti .....	5400		
Mr. Abbott .....	5400		
<b>Agriculture and Agri-Food</b>			
Mr. Watson .....	5401		
Mr. Paradis .....	5401		
<b>Kamloops Airport</b>			
Ms. Savoie .....	5401		
Mr. Van Loan .....	5401		
<b>Aboriginal Affairs</b>			
Mr. Boshcoff .....	5401		
Mr. Baird .....	5401		
		<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>	
		<b>Committees of the House</b>	
		<b>Status of Women</b>	
		Ms. Ratansi .....	5402
		<b>Persons With Disabilities</b>	
		Ms. Wasylycia-Leis .....	5402
		Motion .....	5402
		(Motion agreed to) .....	5402
		<b>Petitions</b>	
		<b>Status of Women</b>	
		Mr. Cotler .....	5402
		<b>Sri Lanka</b>	
		Mr. Wrzesnewskyj .....	5402
		<b>Aboriginal Children</b>	
		Ms. Keeper .....	5402
		<b>UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples</b>	
		Ms. Keeper .....	5402
		<b>Security and Prosperity Partnership</b>	
		Ms. Wasylycia-Leis .....	5403
		<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
		Mr. Lukiwski .....	5403
		<b>GOVERNMENT ORDERS</b>	
		<b>Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999</b>	
		Bill C-33. Third reading .....	5403
		Mr. Bevington .....	5403
		Amendment .....	5405
		Mr. Wallace .....	5406
		Ms. Davies .....	5406
		Mr. Van Loan .....	5406
		Mr. McGuinty .....	5407
		Mr. Dewar .....	5407
		Mr. Bellavance .....	5407
		Mr. Marston .....	5410
		Mr. Albrecht .....	5410
		Mr. Dewar .....	5411
		Mr. Hill .....	5413
		<b>PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS</b>	
		<b>Income tax Act</b>	
		Mr. Bellavance .....	5413
		Bill C-445. Second reading .....	5413
		Mr. Wallace .....	5416
		Mr. Plamondon .....	5416
		Mr. Menzies .....	5416
		Mr. Cuzner .....	5418
		Mr. Marston .....	5419



Mr. Plamondon.....	5420
Mr. Albrecht.....	5421

**APPENDIX**

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**1782711  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*  
Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En 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](mailto:publications@pwgsc.gc.ca)  
<http://publications.gc.ca>**

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

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