



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 147 • NUMBER 181 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, February 27, 2015

—

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, February 27, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

• (1000)
[English]

POINTS OF ORDER

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I hope you will indulge me for a few minutes. I would like to raise a point of order and seek your guidance on the absolutely outrageous actions of the Conservative majority on the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security yesterday evening. I am raising that first thing this morning, because I believe it is a question that has to be put to you for keen deliberation over the course of the weekend and to provide the House with some guidance on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, the bible on which our democratic practice and procedure that has evolved over a century and a half in the House comes from *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*. This is the bible, or the guide to the Speaker's deliberations, that guides all of our deliberations as members of the House of Commons.

In *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, on page 1057, is a very important regulation that guides our deliberations and guides the deliberations of committee structures in the House. It is a comment on the framing of the motion for the previous question. I will read for a moment how it is framed in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*.

The motion that "The question be now put" is known as the previous question. In the House, the previous question is a debatable motion. When the debate ends, the motion for the previous question is put to a vote. If the motion is carried, the initial motion under consideration is immediately put to the vote in the House.

At committee, and this is on page 1057 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, it says very clearly:

In committee, motions for the previous question are inadmissible.

That is black and white. There is no way of getting around what is a very clear regulation and very clear guidance that is given to committees. Motions for the previous question are inadmissible. I want to reference for a moment, as well, former Speaker Milliken's ruling on April 2, 2009, when he said:

...committees that overturn procedurally sound decisions by their chairs and choose to present procedurally unacceptable reports to the House will have them declared null and void.

Former Speaker Milliken was very clear that the guidelines, the procedure and practice rules we are governed by that are contained within *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, that clearly say that motions for the previous question in committee are inadmissible, are very clear direction to committees. Committees that then overturn procedurally sound decisions by their chairs and choose to present procedurally unacceptable reports will have them declared null and void.

Last night, at the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, exactly what I have just referenced happened. The Conservative majority on the committee threw out the rule book, threw out a century and a half of traditions that exist in our country and in this Parliament, and took matters into their own hands. The victims, of course, of this are all Canadians concerned about fundamental and sound principles of Canadian democracy and also the committee chair, who is the member for Prince Edward—Hastings.

Last night the majority on the committee simply told the chair that his intention to stick to the rule book was simply not going to be followed by the Conservative majority on the committee. They ignored the rules. They ignored the practice. They ignored all the precedents. They ignored the clear direction, and they overturned a procedurally sound ruling by the chair, showing profound disrespect to the member for Prince Edward—Hastings, even more profound disrespect to the rule book under which we are governed, and perhaps the greatest disrespect to Canadians as a whole. Conservatives threw out those democratic principles, and they threw out the rule book.

By ignoring the rules and forcing their majority will on the committee, the Conservatives have produced what is a real-life incarnation of the tyranny of the majority. The implications are pretty profound for our democracy. In the past, we have seen the government throw away the rule book. We have seen this with the Board of Internal Economy.

• (1005)

However, this was done in a public forum. I think it makes it even more outrageous that this took place in a public forum, in front of the public.

Points of Order

I am going to take a few minutes to recount what happened yesterday evening at the time the member for Northumberland—Quinte West stepped forward and moved a motion that was procedurally unacceptable.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, in the rule book, it is very clear that motions for the previous question are inadmissible. The member for Northumberland—Quinte West, perhaps because he was unaware of the rule book, perhaps because he had not read it, or perhaps because he does not think the rule book applied to him, moved that motion.

The chair, the member for Prince Edward—Hastings, made the following ruling. He said, “The chair cannot support this motion... due to the fact...that...we have other speakers on the list yet and our practice has been to continue the debate until the speakers are exhausted, and at the time then the motion would be brought forward”.

Very clearly, the member for Prince Edward—Hastings, as the chair of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, was following the rule book, and he clearly ruled it out of order.

The member for Northumberland—Quinte West then threw out the rule book and challenged the chair.

Now, at that point, the member for St. John's East stepped up and said, “I don't think that the overruling of the chair makes a motion” which was clearly inadmissible, “in order”. You know that when one moves a motion that is inadmissible, one simply cannot just overrule the chair. They cannot throw out the rule book.

At that point, the chair, following interventions from the Conservative majority, pushed ahead just the same.

[*Translation*]

The member for Alfred-Pellan also intervened to request clarification. She asked the chair if there was no longer any right to debate the amendment to the amendment or the main motion between votes. The chair replied that that was indeed the case.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, what happened yesterday was that a clearly inadmissible motion, one that is clearly prohibited by the rule book, was ruled out of order, quite properly, by the chair, and the Conservative majority said, “The rules do not apply to us. We are just going to use our majority on this committee, and we are going to simply bulldoze through something that is clearly inadmissible, something that violates the principles, the democratic principles, under which we are governed and the rules that all of us, all members of Parliament, are supposed to follow”.

It is not just that they ruled what is inadmissible admissible, throwing out the rule book. They also eliminated any debate, as the member for Alfred-Pellan stated very clearly, after the Conservative majority tried to push through on this. It also eliminated any debate whatsoever on the amendment and on the main motion.

This is not some minor bill the Conservatives have brought forward. This is Bill C-51. This is a bill that has growing concern across the country about what it would mean to our democracy, what it would mean to democratic rights and freedoms. There have been

questions raised in this House repeatedly. No answers have been forthcoming from the government.

This is a bill that, in many people's minds, including former prime ministers and Supreme Court justices, would be a danger to Canadian fundamental precepts of Canadian democracy.

To throw out the rule book on the debate on Bill C-51 and the extent to which, actually, Canadians would be consulted on the bill at the committee stage is no minor matter. This is a fundamental principle of Canadian democracy.

On this side of the House, as New Democrats, we believe that Canadians are entitled to add their voices on Bill C-51 and that the experts are entitled to come forward and provide their recommendations on Bill C-51. We believe that this is a fundamental bill that could, in a very dangerous way, impact fundamental rights and freedoms in Canada, and we believe that Canadians have the right to be heard on the bill. That is what we believe on this side of the House.

● (1010)

This is an important study. The freedom of committees, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is circumscribed by our rule book, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, which is what all of us, as members of Parliament, are supposed to follow.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 116 says very clearly, as well:

In a standing, special or legislative committee, the Standing Orders shall apply so far as may be applicable, except the Standing Orders as to the election of a Speaker, seconding of motions, limiting the number of times of speaking and the length of speeches.

Since committees are regarded as creatures of the House, Standing Order 116 provides that the rules of the House have force in committees, so far as they are applicable. A member may speak on issues before a committee, and that is very clearly delineated in Standing Order 116.

However, it is also the precedents in the past. In the past, but perhaps not in events as outrageous as what we saw last night at the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, we have had issues with conduct in committees that have been brought to the House, and Speakers have made rulings on them. As well, for the guidance you will be giving us in the coming days, Mr. Speaker, I want to restate some of the Speakers' rulings and some of the comments previous Speakers have made on committee actions.

First, Speaker Milliken, on March 29, 2007, said the following:

At the present time, the chair occupants, like our counterparts in House committees, daily face the challenge of dealing with the pressures of a minority government, but neither the political realities of the moment nor the sheer force of numbers should force us to set aside the values inherent in the parliamentary conventions and procedures by which we govern our deliberations.

Hon. members are all aware of situations in committees of this Parliament where, because decisions of the chair are subject to appeal, decisions that were procedurally sound have been overturned by the majority on a committee

.....All the more reason then for the Chair to exercise its awesome responsibility carefully and to ensure that the House does not, in the heat of the moment, veer dangerously off course.

Speaker Milliken also, on March 14, 2008, said:

Government Orders

The Speaker must remain ever mindful of the first principles of our parliamentary tradition which Bourinot described thus: "To protect the minority and restrain the improvidence and tyranny of the majority, to secure the transaction of public business in a decent and orderly manner—"

As well, Speaker Milliken, on April 2, 2009, as I mentioned earlier, said:

As explained in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* at page 857, decisions of committee chairs may be appealed to the committee. However, as I noted in rulings on March 14, 2008 and May 15, 2008, committees that overturn procedurally sound decisions by their chairs and choose to present procedurally unacceptable reports to the House will have them declared null and void.

Finally, Speaker Fraser, on November 28, 1990, had this to say:

I have to say to hon. members and to the public that the workings of committees is very important to the working of the House of Commons. I do ask hon. colleagues to make every effort possible to come to whatever agreements and understandings among themselves which are necessary to make these committees work.

I do not want to state this too often, and I hope that I will not have to, but there is a general feeling across the country that somehow or other not only politicians, but maybe institutions, are letting down the country. This is why it is essential that everybody make an extra effort to try to make this system work.

I am not happy with this situation, obviously. But, I am also bound by rules here and if I am to intervene in committees, it has to be in a very severe and outrageous situation indeed.

I would submit that this is an absolutely outrageous situation, that the rules under which we are governed were clearly violated yesterday, and that the chair made a procedurally sound decision, based on the fact that motions for the previous question are inadmissible.

• (1015)

Even more so, motions for the previous question eliminate all questions at once. With a sleight of hand, it simply eliminates any ability for opposition members of Parliament to speak on that issue at all.

What could be next? If the tyranny of the majority means that at any time a procedurally sound decision made by a chair of a committee can be overturned by a Conservative majority, what is to stop Conservatives from saying that opposition members have no right to speak at all, or that opposition members have no right to appear at committee? At what point are they going to stop this tyranny of the majority?

There is absolutely no doubt that what happened last night was a travesty. It ripped up the rule book on a fundamental piece of law that Canadians are becoming increasingly concerned about. I have no doubt that the government does not want debate on this bill. The more there is debate, the more Canadians are calling into question how this bill was put together and the vague language and loopholes that can lead to dangerous precedents in our country. There is no doubt about that. However, they do not have the right to completely shut down debate. They do not have the right to move procedurally wrong motions, to overrule the chair when the chair is ruling, having followed the rule book in the interest of Canadian democracy, and they do not have the right to simply shut down debate.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for guidance from you in the coming days. The House has an objective referee, and so should committees. When committee chairs make procedurally sound rulings following the rule book, they should be respected. Rules are there for a reason. The implications of allowing a wild west in committees in the final

11 weeks of Parliament are simply too serious to even contemplate at this point.

I ask for the Speaker's guidance on what was an outrageous action by the Conservative majority last night at the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, and, as a member of the opposition, I also ask for his guidance as a Canadian. What happened last night was a travesty. It was outrageous, and it should not be permitted. We ask for the Speaker's wisdom and guidance so that these kinds of instances do not occur again.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government House leader will respond to this issue right after question period.

• (1020)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that there is a great deal of merit in much of what the NDP House leader has put on the record. It is a very serious issue.

We anticipate that we will get some clarification from the Speaker, given the gravity of not only what took place last night, but also given the importance of the issue and the behaviour that was witnessed yesterday.

The leader of the Liberal Party stood in this place just last week and talked about how important it is from the Liberals' perspective that amendments be presented, such as parliamentary oversight, which has been a critical piece for the Liberal Party. As we present these amendments, we are going to be very cognizant of the behaviour of the majority Conservative membership on the committee. We have to be very cautious when we reflect on the behaviour of the Conservative majority that was witnessed yesterday. That behaviour is questionable at best, and it is important that the government House leader reflect on that behaviour and understand that it was inappropriate.

As we move through the committee process, specifically on Bill C-51, we ask that the government be more sensitive to the reasons that the rules exist to allow for a proper functioning of the committee, and, hopefully, as members indicated during second reading, they will be sympathetic to the amendments that will be put forward. I hope this is not something we are going to be witnessing throughout the committee stage, as there are some critically important amendments that have to be introduced.

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair will obviously take this under advisement and wait until we have heard a response from the government side, recognizing that there is some urgency, but also recognizing that there is still sufficient time for a decision from the Chair. Again, we will wait to hear a response from the government.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

RESPECT FOR COMMUNITIES ACT

The House resumed from December 1, 2014 consideration of Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Government Orders

Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today to support the proposed legislation, the respect for communities act, otherwise known as Bill C-2. I do not think that anyone can deny the enormous public health harms associated with illicit drug use. In some way, we have all seen the damage that illicit drug use can cause, not only to the health of the user, but to families, friends, and communities.

The Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, the CDSA for short, is the federal legislation that controls substances that can alter mental processes and may produce harm to health and society when diverted or misused. The CDSA has the dual purpose of protecting public health and maintaining public safety.

The substances covered by the CDSA have a risk of abuse and pose serious risks to individuals when they are misused or abused. Those risks are significant. They increase when the controlled substance is unregulated, untested, and obtained from illegal sources. That is an important point that often gets lost in this debate. The drugs that would be used at any proposed supervised injection drug site are bought on the black market. We are not talking about drugs that are prescribed by a doctor and have the needed medical oversight. These drugs are purchased on the street and then used by people suffering with addictions.

Our government takes safety very seriously, and we have a number of controls in place when it comes to prescribed drugs. In fact, this House recently passed Vanessa's law in order to strengthen the safety of prescription drugs. Given this, I think it is only appropriate that we give all Canadians an opportunity to comment on the measures which could be needed to protect health when a site is proposed to allow the injection of illegal street drugs.

Our government believes that exemptions from the CDSA for activities involving illegal substances at supervised consumption sites should only be granted once rigorous and relevant criteria have been addressed by the applicant. The criteria that are outlined in the bill stem directly from the five factors laid out in the 2011 Supreme Court of Canada decision on *Insite*. The court's decision requires the Minister of Health to consider the following five factors when assessing an exemption application for a supervised consumption site: evidence, if any, on the impact of such a site on crime rates; local conditions indicating a need for such a site; the regulatory structure in place to support the site; resources available to support its maintenance; and, expressions of community support or opposition.

All of the criteria proposed in Bill C-2 relate to one of these factors that I just referred to. Much like the dual purpose of the CDSA, which is to protect public health and maintain public safety, the criteria in this bill balance both the public health and public safety considerations of the operation of a supervised consumption site. The criteria included in this bill are relevant to matters of public health or public safety, and some of the criteria address both.

Today I would like to focus on some of the public health criteria in the bill and discuss how each one relates to the factors set out by the Supreme Court of Canada. One criteria requires that an applicant provide a letter from the provincial minister responsible for health in the province in which the site would be located, which outlines his or her opinion on the proposed activities at the site and describes how

those activities are integrated within the provincial health care system. I can guarantee that the health minister in my province of Alberta would want to be consulted on proposals for a site like this. It is only appropriate that provincial ministers be afforded an opportunity to have their views heard. This relates to the Supreme Court factor that requires that community expressions of support or opposition be considered.

These criteria allow the professional opinion of the respective provincial minister of health to be a part of what the federal minister would consider when assessing or assigning an application. Moreover, information about access to drug treatment services, if any, could help to understand how drug users would be supported within the provincial health care system.

Other public health-related criteria fulfill the court's directive to look at evidence, if any, on local conditions indicating a need for such a site. These criteria are asking for relevant information on things like the number of people who consume illicit substances or have infectious diseases in relation to illicit drug use in the area of the proposed site.

- (1025)

Another requirement for applicants which contributes to the minister's understanding of the local conditions is official reports, if any, that are relevant to the establishment of a supervised consumption site, including any coroners' reports. These reports, including those from a coroner, could be used to support evidence of illicit drug problems in the area, indicate important drug use patterns, and identify the demographic of the individuals who could benefit from the services provided by a supervised consumption site.

We all know that the best laid plans can sometimes run into local circumstances that present unexpected challenges to a plan, so it is critically important that the bill require that the facts on the ground be considered when any proposed site is being looked at.

Additionally, following an initial exemption, if an applicant wishes to continue activities at a supervised consumption site, subsequent exemption applications would have to inform the Minister of Health of evidence, if any, of any impacts of the site's activities on public health during the period that the site had been operating.

This information provides the minister with an understanding of public health impacts that the site has had and would potentially continue to experience with a future exemption. This criterion builds on the Supreme Court factor requiring the minister to consider local conditions in the area where a site would be located.

In its decision, the Supreme Court affirmed the discretion of the Minister of Health to grant or deny exemption applications and to request information for this purpose.

This proposed legislation clearly identifies information to be addressed in an exemption application to assist the minister in considering the information relevant to the Supreme Court factors. Her decision must balance the protection of public health and maintenance of public safety in accordance with the charter.

Government Orders

Moreover, the criteria serve to add clarity and transparency to the exemption application process. With this legislation, all persons wishing to open a supervised consumption site would know exactly what is expected as part of their application.

While the focus of my speech today has been related to public health, it is important to note that the proposed legislation balances both public health and public safety. Indeed, Bill C-2 would amend the CDSA to create a more robust legislative structure to balance protection of public health and maintenance of public safety with respect to supervised consumption sites.

It is imperative that there be strong controls around activities with these dangerous drugs, and I urge all members to vote in favour of the bill.

• (1030)

Mr. Jamie Nicholls (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the member's speech, and if he and his party are so concerned with public health, the HIV West Yellowhead is holding seminars into harm reduction in March.

My first question would be whether he will attend these meetings and actually consult with HIV West Yellowhead to see what its members think about the bill. After that consultation, if an organization like HIV West Yellowhead has problems with the bill, will he bring forward amendments to the government bill?

Mr. Jim Eglinski: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of this conference, but if I get an invitation, I will attend, and I will give my opinions based on what I learn from that.

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize that the hon. member has had a long career in law enforcement and working with communities to resolve safety issues.

I wonder if he could express his opinion, from his own life experience, on why local communities ought to have a say if someone is considering having what is called a safe injection site with illegal drugs, perhaps in a residential neighbourhood, and why law enforcement officials, municipal leaders, and others in the area might need to have a say on a site opening up in their neighbourhood.

Mr. Jim Eglinski: Mr. Speaker, it is a very good question. As a former police officer, serving 35 years in the force, I know how important it is to get that information from within the community to the appropriate officials. As a former police officer, I would want the Minister of Health to know exactly what my officers know on the street level. We would want to pass on information from our town council, which knows what is going on. We would want to pass that information from the community, from the people who run the businesses on the streets to the local residents. In particular, the residents of that community would have to pass this on.

It is imperative that this information is part of the whole focus that the minister can look at to make a decision whether to grant or deny the site.

Mr. Jamie Nicholls: Mr. Speaker, this is a supplementary question to what was mentioned before. I just want to elaborate on the consultation that is happening.

There are dates in March in Edson, Hinton and Whitecourt. The member could be proactive and not wait for an invitation to consult

with people involved in harm reduction in West Yellowhead. He could register right now, today.

Will the member register for this conference and find out what the community is dealing with in terms of addiction and harm reduction? You can do it right now. You can register right now, online.

• (1035)

The Deputy Speaker: I would draw to the attention of the member that his comments are to be directed to the Chair, not to individual members of Parliament. I assume that was not an invitation for the Chair to attend.

The hon. member for Yellowhead.

Mr. Jim Eglinski: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I will not do that right now because I am in the House. I will do it after I leave the House. I will look into it and ensure that it does not conflict with my other responsibilities within my riding. However, I would really enjoy going to one of those meetings. I will endeavour to attend in one of my communities, because it is being observed in several of them, as I understand from my hon. friend. I will endeavour to be there.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise once again to debate Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, which was introduced by the Conservative government.

So much has been said about this bill on supervised injection sites. As a member of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, I was quite surprised to see that the government chose to send this bill to that committee even though the better part of the bill is directly related to health. It should have gone directly to the Standing Committee on Health. It is sad. I suspect that this is for partisan and political reasons, so I felt I needed to speak up about it.

We did study the bill, but not in quite as much detail as we would have liked. I will say more about that in my speech. After the speedy study that the Conservative majority forced the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security to do, we have no choice but to oppose Bill C-2 as written.

That being said, I would like to congratulate my colleague from Vancouver East for her excellent work on Bill C-2 and supervised injection sites in general. She represents the riding that is home to Insite, the supervised injection site that people often refer to in connection with this bill and that has the support of the majority of the community. I will say more about that later.

For the people watching at home right now, I will explain what Bill C-2 is all about. The bill, in fact, is a thinly veiled attempt by the Conservative majority to stop safe injection sites from operating, simply for partisan, political reasons. It runs directly counter to a ruling handed down by the Supreme Court of Canada regarding these sites.

Government Orders

We know that the Conservatives do not necessarily worry too much about abiding by Supreme Court decisions, but I consider the court an essential body when it comes to these decisions. We should not go against decisions made by the highest court in the land.

Bill C-2 sets out a lengthy and arduous list of criteria that supervised injection sites would need to meet before the minister would grant them an exemption under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. The exemption already exists, but the bill makes the list of criteria extremely complicated. In addition, the bill puts discretionary powers directly into the hands of the minister. This is unacceptable when it comes to an issue as important as supervised injection sites and drug addiction in general.

The minister could therefore prevent a supervised injection site from opening its doors, even if all the criteria are met. This is just another arbitrary, partisan decision. We must not take this matter lightly and turn it into a partisan issue. That is what the Conservatives are doing with Bill C-2. Under the new criteria, it will be even more difficult for organizations to open supervised injection sites in Canada. City officials and the public have been increasingly calling for these kinds of supervised injection sites.

I am saying that the Conservative Party is making this a partisan issue because it had a major fundraising campaign called "keep heroin out of our backyards". This bill will make it virtually impossible to open supervised injection sites. Furthermore, several addiction and legal experts told the committee that this bill would have the complete opposite effect and that it could make drugs even more accessible in neighbourhoods.

● (1040)

Instead of basing policies on an ideology that has nothing to do with the real facts associated with this problem, the NDP believes that policies must be based on evidence rather than ideology. Furthermore, we believe that harm reduction programs, including in this case supervised injection sites, must be exempt based on proof of their ability to improve the health of a community and to save human lives, and not on ideology.

The Conservatives have been trying to close supervised injection sites for years. They do not hide this and everyone knows it. They have spent tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars on court proceedings that have come to the same conclusion. InSite and similar supervised injection sites must be allowed to provide services in Canada.

As I mentioned, the Supreme Court ruled in favour of supervised injection sites like InSite, but the Conservatives have decided that they will not listen to reason and will continue to defend their personal ideology in a bid to raise more money for their next campaign. That is utterly disappointing in this type of debate.

We examined this bill in committee. I was a member of the committee, along with my colleague from Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca. We were also fortunate enough to have our wonderful colleague from Vancouver East help us examine this bill. Five committee meetings were held to study this massive bill. I want to point that out because over the past few days at meetings of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, we have been

having a lot of discussions about the importance of bringing in a large number of witnesses to talk about various bills.

We had two four-hour meetings to hear from witnesses and discuss Bill C-2, which addresses such an important issue. Only two meetings were scheduled to hear from witnesses. That is not very many since a much larger number of meetings have been held to hear from witnesses on other bills. In this case, the Conservatives told us that they thought two meetings were enough to examine Bill C-2, even though we were against the idea of hearing from so few witnesses.

I can give my colleagues opposite an example. When they were not in government, a study was conducted of the same-sex marriage bill. A total of 32 meetings were held. Hearings on this important bill were held across the country. According to the Conservatives at the time, 32 meetings were not enough, so I hope they will not tell me that they really think that two meetings to hear from witnesses were enough to examine such an important bill.

It is often difficult to explain exactly how committees work. It can seem relatively complex if a person does not attend committee meetings regularly. I completely understand that. The fact is that the Conservatives limited debate on every part of the study of this bill in committee. For example, we were given a maximum amount of time to examine the bill clause by clause, propose amendments and discuss them. Once again, the Conservatives were trying to limit debate as much as possible in committee.

Sixty-two amendments were proposed by all the opposition parties. The official opposition, the NDP, and the Liberals proposed more than 20 each, while the Green Party proposed a dozen or so amendments. The Conservatives not only ignored the expert testimony, they also rejected the 62 amendments. That is sad. I will close my remarks on that. I would have liked to go into more detail. I hope my colleagues will ask questions about this.

Montreal is currently trying to open supervised injection sites. The city consulted the public, police services, communities and addiction experts in order to develop something like what Vancouver has right now. Everyone said that it was extremely important for Montreal to have a supervised injection site like InSite, to have our own, similar model to address the addiction problem. Unfortunately, Bill C-2 will delay the efforts of the Montreal community to achieve such a result. I find the Conservative approach with Bill C-2 regrettable, and that is why the official opposition will vote against the bill.

Government Orders

•(1045)

[English]

Mr. David Wilks (Kootenay—Columbia, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member mentioned a couple of things that I took note of. One point that I would like to bring to light is that there is not one point of heroin that is ever purchased legally anywhere in Canada, yet that illegal purchase of heroin is taken to a site where the person can inject it without prosecution. Insite provides services that can be obtained in other parts of the Lower Mainland as well. The fact of the matter is that Insite provides a safe place for someone to inject an illegal drug. When we talk about fighting addictions, the fact of the matter with Insite is that it is an enabler, because we are not trying to get the users off the drug. We are actually allowing them to come in with the illegal drug and inject it. That is extremely problematic.

Insite allows for an illegal drug to be administered, basically legally, within its confines without prosecution. Is the NDP looking for a place where people can purchase an illegal drug and then administer it without prosecution?

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, I find it sad that members on the other side of the House do not truly understand what a complex issue drug addiction is.

We do not support anyone engaging in illegal activities. However, I do not think that the best solution is to put on blinders, believe that the problem does not exist and shut down supervised injection sites, which help drug addicts recover. All this does is hide the problem and undermine the existing solutions that have proven their worth.

I would like to share some facts about Insite with my colleague on the other side of the House.

A 2006 study conducted by Tyndall et al. revealed that over the course of a year, 2,171 Insite users had been referred to drug addiction counselling services or other support services.

Here is how Insite works: the supervised injection site is located on the first floor, while on the second floor, a whole range of people work to help these drug addicts overcome their addiction. Furthermore, in committee we heard some clear examples of people who managed to overcome their addiction with the help of those working at the Insite supervised injection site.

If the member reads the “blues” from the committee, he will even see that most of his Conservative colleagues were quite moved by this testimony and agreed with what the witnesses had to say on this topic.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Insite location received a great deal of debate during second reading. When the bill mentions community consultation, let us recognize that the federal government at the time, the provincial and municipal governments, as well as many different stakeholders and even communities, all participated in one way or another in what has been deemed as a very successful program. This is something we should be giving credit to.

The bill seems to say that when we have a site of this nature, there needs to be more consultation. Would the member not agree that

there was a great deal of consultation regarding Insite and that it is wrong for the government to try to give the impression that there was no community consultation done and that, in fact, the whole issue surrounding Insite has been nothing but a resounding success?

•(1050)

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, I will not repeat everything my colleague from Winnipeg North said, but I fully agree with what he just mentioned.

When it comes to supervised injection sites, it is extremely important to hold consultations and there were plenty in the case of Insite. A lot of follow-up goes on to check in with the community to see if it agrees with what is happening. A number of studies were done in this case. Among other things, I can say that roughly 80% of the people asked, living or working in downtown Vancouver, support the Insite supervised injection site.

This brings me to the many consultations that were held in Montreal with a number of health groups, law enforcement representatives, community members, citizens and elected officials. Everyone agreed that Montreal should have a supervised injection site like the one in Vancouver. Consultations were held.

Let us not create obstacles and let us certainly not give a minister discretionary power over this type of supervised injection site.

[English]

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be a part of the debate today about such an important bill, Bill C-2, the respect for communities act. I suspect that we all agree that illegal drugs have a terrible impact on our communities. There may be different opinions on how the challenges they pose should be addressed, but we all know that the worst drugs such as heroin have a terrible impact on our communities and destroy lives. These drugs also cause serious harm to public health and public safety.

Bill C-2 forms an important piece of our government's effort to protect public health from the serious and negative effects of drug abuse and to maintain public safety from the impacts associated with drug use and addictions.

It is always good to have the facts when we are debating important topics like this, so I would like to briefly mention a report from Justice Canada entitled, “The Cost of Crime in Canada”. The report estimated that the direct health care costs associated with illicit drug use in Canada totalled \$1.3 billion in 2008. It is estimated that over \$2 billion is spent annually on justice-related costs, such as law enforcement, courts, and correctional services as a result of illicit drug use. These are enormous expenditures and costs to society.

Even worse when we consider the terrible impact on individuals, communities, and Canadian society, where the costs are enormous. These are the direct costs to the health and justice systems only. The impact on the individuals who suffer and the negative consequences for their families is immeasurable. No parent should have to suffer as their child gets involved with drug abuse and end up worrying about the broken dreams and perilous, uncertain future that addiction brings.

Statements by Members

This government is committed to preventing drug abuse and breaking the cycle of drug addiction so that our communities can be healthy and safe and that no family has to watch a loved one suffer from addiction. Part of our plan to address addiction is the national anti-drug strategy that was launched in 2007 as the federal government's comprehensive response to combat illicit drug use in Canada.

With its three key action plans, the strategy focuses on preventing illicit drug use, treating drug dependency, and combatting the production and trafficking of illicit drugs. Today I would like to elaborate on our government's commitment to preventing illicit drug use through the strategy's prevention action plan.

The prevention action plan contributes to reducing illicit drug use and prescription drug abuse in key target groups such as youth. It does this by funding the development and implementation of community-based interventions and initiatives to prevent illicit drug use and abuse of prescription drugs, especially among youth; discouraging illicit drug use and prescription drug abuse by providing information directly to youth, parents, and concerned adults; and supporting the development of awareness materials and the provision of awareness sessions to school-aged youth, parents, professionals, and other community members.

The government also supports prevention activities through the drug safety community initiatives fund. This funding program supports Canadian communities and their collective efforts at health promotion and prevention of illicit and prescription drug abuse. The projects supported through the fund focus on informing and educating Canadians on illicit drugs and prescription drug abuse and their adverse health and social effects; offering tools to foster resiliency and coping skills among youth to deal with peer pressure regarding illicit drug use; and promoting healthy behaviours and supportive environments that discourage drug use among young people.

Projects take place on the national, provincial, territorial, and local community levels and can include a wide range of activities, such as school-based and peer support programs and outreach. Project activities can also include the development and distribution of resource materials as well as the sharing of best practices.

Since 2007, Health Canada has provided \$75 million to fund some 140 projects to discourage and prevent illicit drug use among youth. As part of our ongoing commitment to curbing drug abuse in Canada, the government is supporting projects across the country to address a wide range of illicit and prescription drug abuse issues, especially among vulnerable youth, who have a higher risk of substance abuse and dependence.

• (1055)

Many of the projects serve to equip young people with the knowledge and skills required to recognize and avoid situations where there may be peer pressure to use drugs. Others are designed to provide parents and those who work with youth with drug education and prevention strategies that will help families and communities deal with the growing problem of substance abuse.

In addition to providing financial support for prevention work, our government also completed a successful five-year, \$30 million mass

media campaign known as "DrugsNot4Me", which was aimed at youth and their parents. A key part of the DrugsNot4Me campaign was developing awareness by providing prevention materials for use in elementary and secondary schools. We also provided facts and background information for parents to help prepare them to engage in conversations with their children about substance abuse and staying off drugs.

The campaign made a difference. There were over one million visits to the DrugsNot4Me website, and one in four parents reached out to the campaign and took action by engaging in discussions with their children about drugs. Even more importantly, there was an increase in the proportion of youth who said they knew about the potential effects of illicit drug use on relationships with family and friends, and they sought information on how to avoid drugs or to deal with drug-use issues.

However, despite these prevention efforts, the challenges are far from over. Illicit drug use in Canada is changing, with prescription drug abuse becoming a concern. In 2012-13, more than 80,000 Canadian kids admitted to using prescription drugs to get high. This is a very serious and alarming situation. The misuse and abuse of prescription drugs carries the same health and public safety concerns as illicit drugs do.

To combat the concern about prescription drug abuse, our government has committed an additional \$44.9 million in funding over five years to expand the national anti-drug strategy to target prescription drug abuse.

The health committee has recently been studying these issues and heard from a large number of expert witnesses. In fact, the committee recently completed studies both on prescription drug abuse and the health risks of marijuana.

I know that my time is coming to an end and perhaps this is a good place for me to stop. I imagine I will have a little time left when the debate resumes after question period.

The Deputy Speaker: Yes, the hon. member will have roughly two minutes and 30 seconds, plus five minutes of questions and comments.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, CPC): Mr. Speaker, many Canadians are shocked that law societies across the country voted to discriminate against Trinity Western University law graduates.

Statements by Members

Compounding the alarm is the revelation that it is big banks and big money interests, led by the Bank of Montreal, that influenced the law societies. BMO and other large banks and corporations have been requiring legal and financial service contractors to reveal the diversity metrics of their associates, partners and management teams. The initiative branded “Legal Leaders for Diversity” is apparently opposed to religious diversity.

Asking a prospective employee about their sexual preferences would be against the law. Denying economic opportunity to any individual or any law firm based upon religious belief is just as surely a charter violation. The Supreme Court of Canada, and now the Nova Scotia Supreme Court, ruled against such religious discrimination.

Canadians expect our banks and our leading corporations to respect the charter rights and freedoms of all Canadians. We call upon the BMO and its recruits from corporate Canada to reverse this misguided initiative.

* * *

• (1100)

[Translation]

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, forestry is tremendously important to Canada and the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean region, but it is vulnerable. We have no choice but to innovate. Unfortunately, the Conservative government's lack of interest in forestry innovation is compromising the future of our forestry communities.

For example, the government has not yet renewed a high-level research initiative by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, NSERC, in forestry sector research and development. If that federal funding dries up in 32 days, strong research programs and groups will be dismantled. We cannot afford to lose the people who are building the forestry industry of the future.

I would also like to talk about the \$90 million over four years that was set aside in the last budget for the investments in forest industry transformation program. That amount is already gone. Demand is so high that the money ran out in a year. This is not complicated: the forestry industry needs \$500 million over six years. The federal government has to do more.

The forest was central to the lives of my ancestors, and to this day it is vital for forestry communities, including mine, the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean. The government must take action now to renew and improve these two programs.

* * *

[English]

2015 CANADA WINTER GAMES

Mrs. Pat Perkins (Whitby—Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, from February 13 to March 1, athletes from all of our provinces and territories are participating in the 2015 Canada Winter Games in Prince George, British Columbia.

It is a pleasure for me to rise in the House today to send my best wishes to the coaches, volunteers and the nearly 2,400 athletes who are participating in the 2015 Canada Games.

In particular, I would like to extend my warmest wishes and congratulations to the 10 athletes from Whitby—Oshawa. Our community is very proud of Rhyen McGill, Jessica Klimkait, Bradley Langlois, Ethan Vandersanden, Tyler Ronald, Lindsey Barbosam, Tyler Ronald Jackson, Innzbruk Richards, Gibson Himbeault, Melanie Donelle and Hisham Mohammad for their participation in the Winter Games.

I congratulate all of them.

* * *

TERRY KELLY

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the House of the passing of Terry Kelly, from Oshawa, last month.

I first met Terry when he offered me a job as an articling student. As many members will know, articling is only slightly removed from indentured servitude. Not with Terry. He was generous with his time, wise in his advice and reasonable in his expectations.

Terry was Durham's super lawyer. In the morning, he would dominate the criminal docket and in the afternoon, the civil one.

Terry was also known as “superfan”. His idea of a good time was to go to seven different cities, on seven different nights and watch seven different sporting events. His idea of a quiz was to name the All England starting lineup for the 1966 World Cup. If we got that, then he would ask us to name the substitutes.

Not only was Terry a super lawyer and a super fan, he was also a super citizen. His support for various civic projects are too numerous to list. Oshawa and Durham lost their biggest civic booster when Terry died. His generosity of time and spirit touched us all.

Please join me in recognizing a life well lived; a super fan, a super lawyer and a super citizen, wise and generous to the end.

* * *

TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our right to freedom of religion was recently questioned by law societies and national banks across the country.

Once again, law students at Trinity Western University were under threat of being barred from practising in Canada simply because of their religion. Let me be clear. Because they believe in God, they were being told that they had no right to be lawyers in our country.

Clearly, neither law societies nor the Bank of Montreal have any right to deny Canadians the right to practise law because of their religious views. Thank God, Trinity Western has defeated this most recent discriminatory attack.

It is unacceptable that organizations such as the Bank of Montreal and members of the law societies have attempted to undermine this most fundamental of rights.

Statements by Members

Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms confirms and protects our religious freedoms in our country, and that includes the religious freedoms of Christians.

* * *

● (1105)

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. John Rafferty (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will be attending, along with the Leader of the Opposition and other New Democratic MPs, the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada annual conference in Toronto this weekend.

As members know, mining is a very important part of northern and northwestern Ontario's economy, and new investment in the sector is needed more than ever. Why? Because nearly every other sector in our economy is in crisis or on the verge.

The forestry sector has lost more than 38,000 jobs in northern Ontario alone since the Conservative government came to power. In Thunder Bay—Rainy River, we have seen hundreds of jobs lost in forestry and other sectors. With the closure of Resolute's pulp and paper mill in Fort Frances, 240 jobs were lost. Another 46 jobs were cut at Wasaya Airways on the Fort William First Nation. Another 160 jobs were announced last week at Teleperformance in Thunder Bay. Another 200 jobs will be lost at our Target store in Thunder Bay.

We urgently need new investment in our fledgling mining projects, especially the \$50 billion Ring of Fire project. As we head to the PDAC meetings this weekend, it is clearer than ever that the families of northern and northwestern Ontario want and need an active and engaged federal government that finally puts their interests first.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government has made it a priority to continue to take concrete actions to strengthen the confidence of Canadians in our criminal justice system. This is why I am pleased that earlier this month, our Prime Minister announced that we were moving forward with new legislation to better protect Canadians from serious criminals who would be released into our communities across the country after serving only two thirds of their sentence under this current system of statutory release.

We have all heard of criminals who go on to reoffend, sometimes violently. There are too many criminals who commit serious offences while on statutory release, and Canadians refuse to accept this.

This legislation would ensure that repeat violent criminals would no longer be automatically granted statutory release after serving two thirds of their sentence. This upcoming legislation would see the most serious criminals kept off our streets for as long as possible.

I am proud of our government's strong action to keep our streets and communities safe, and placing the rights of victims ahead of those of criminals.

GERALDINE SEELY

Mr. Paul Calandra (Oak Ridges—Markham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to Geraldine Seely, a close personal friend who recently lost her battle with cancer.

Gerri was a fighter. She fought and beat cancer once before. She overcame a kidney transplant. Even with the challenges she faced, she never lost her faith or love of life.

Gerri married Dennis in 1969, and to see them together was truly special. They were a great team who, until the end, were inseparable.

As much as we mourn her loss, we can also be inspired by her example. Gerri never stopped giving back to the community and despite the challenges she faced, always found time for others. Although only 67, she volunteered for over 45 years at our community's Markham Fair. She was a member of the church choir, a junior choir leader, hosted Bible studies at her home and facilitated others at her church.

A full day would not be enough to explain the many ways in which she touched the lives of the people around her. To her entire family, I give thanks for sharing Gerri with us. She will not soon be forgotten.

* * *

ROLLER DERBY

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, the Moncton Lumbersmacks take on the Rock Coast Rollers from Maine. This is a really big deal. Not only is roller derby the fastest growing women's sport in the world and not only are the Lumbersmacks the number one derby team in the Atlantic provinces, but this bout will make history as the first ever WFTDA sanctioned bout in Atlantic Canada.

Roller derby is about competition, strength and athletics, but it is also about community. I am a proud member of the Anchor City Rollers in Halifax, and ACR is thrilled to cheer on the success of our Lumbersmacks sisters. In the true spirit of community, the Smacks have players from New Brunswick, P.E.I., and Nova Scotia, including Anchor City's own star jammer and blocker, Smashy and Box Blocker.

As usual in derby, this is a community effort, bringing together multiple leagues, their tireless volunteers and their amazing fans. With big derby love from Halifax, from Anchor City and from the House of Commons, Lumbersmacks, vous l'avez. "You got this".

Statements by Members

●(1110)

FIFA WOMEN'S WORLD CUP**Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont, CPC):**

Mr. Speaker, in less than 100 days, Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Ottawa, Montreal and Moncton will welcome the world when the FIFA Women's World Cup begins. This competition is the largest in women's sports, featuring 24 nations from around the globe. We look forward to welcoming them and the approximately 1.5 million spectators who will take part in the festivities.

Having the best of the best in women's soccer competing here on Canadian soil will inspire women and girls to realize the benefits of physical activity and sport. This is a big year for sports in Canada, and our government remains committed to helping Canadians get fit and active. That is why we first introduced the children's fitness tax credit then doubled it last year, allowing more families to get their kids involved in organized sports.

To our Canadian women's soccer team, we are proud. We wish it all the best in its quest for gold this summer. Know that all of Canada is behind them.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, International Women's Day is just a few days away, and it will kick off with the 2015 World March of Women. This year's theme is "Liberate our bodies, our earth and our territories".

Like every year, this will be an opportunity to realize how far women still are from achieving full equality around the world, and even right here in Canada. This is the perfect time to remind certain Conservative members who are stuck in the stone age that it is our bodies, our choice. This is also an opportunity to add our voices to those of women who are currently mobilizing to protect Canada's failing social safety net, which we worked so hard to build in Canada. Women are too often the victims when it unravels. Yes, women have made some progress in recent years, but there is no denying that our bodies, our careers and our lives are not yet entirely our own.

Until all women are entirely free, we will march. I am proud of each and every one of us. Happy International Women's Day.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION**Mr. Robert Goguen (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, CPC):**

Mr. Speaker, New Brunswickers are deeply concerned about an apparent Liberal plan that would permit the New Brunswick provincial Liberals to increase taxes and put tolls on roads without consulting New Brunswickers with a referendum. That is what Liberals consistently do: raise taxes and take monies from hard-working Canadians.

At the federal level, in addition to the Liberal carbon tax that would raise the cost of gas, groceries and literally everything, it has been exposed that the Liberal federal leader is even looking at

reversing the doubling of the children's fitness tax credit. Perhaps only someone with a trust fund would think middle-class families can afford these higher taxes and costs on everything.

We reject the high-tax Liberal plan. We have introduced the GST reduction. We have introduced pension splitting. We have tax-free savings accounts. We have implemented the family tax cut, which will provide 100% of Canadian families with more monies in their pockets. That is where the money belongs, in the hands of hard-working Canadians. We stand up for lower tax as do they.

* * *

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions and dedication of Father Paul Abbass.

Father Abbass is a good friend of mine. I have known him for 35 years back when he was first ordained to the priesthood. He was my local parish priest and works in many communities across Cape Breton. He is well known for helping men suffering from addiction and his commitment to helping our youth.

Father Abbass has been instrumental with the Talbot House in Frenchvale. Talbot House is a place for hope and healing for men struggling with addiction. The men receive the help they need to get a fresh start. I had the honour of being on the board of directors with him.

Father Abbass is retiring from Talbot House and he is leaving it in great shape. He is a man that never stops. Even as he retires from the Talbot House, he plans to continue to give spiritual guidance to many in our community. He is currently overseeing seven parishes.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Father Abbass for his many years of tireless service to those who are most vulnerable in our communities.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Joe Daniel (Don Valley East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it should come as no surprise that our Conservative government is the only one that stands up for middle-class Canadian families. Through our intensive low-tax plan, our government has managed to help 100% of families receive the benefits they need so they can put their hard-earned money toward their own priorities.

We have doubled the children's fitness tax credit, enhanced the universal child care benefit, and now we have implemented the family tax cut. All parents, including single parents, will benefit from our family tax cut. That is over four million families and over seven million parents.

Meanwhile, the idea of the Liberals and the New Democrats for Canadians is high taxes and high debt. They would take away our benefits and implement a job-killing carbon tax that would raise the price of everything.

Oral Questions

The facts are crystal clear. Only our Conservative government can be trusted to keep money in the pockets of Canadian families.

* * *

•(1115)

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians learned a long time ago to judge politicians according to their actions and not their fine words.

The Liberals are all talk and no action.

When he learned that the new Minister of Foreign Affairs was a unilingual anglophone, the member for Westmount—Ville-Marie said that it was not the end of the world.

The member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville is outraged that ministers do not tweet in both official languages, even though only 22% of the questions asked by his own party last year were in French.

Over the past four years, no Liberal member has introduced a bill on official languages.

However, thanks to the NDP, progress is being made. Officers of Parliament must now be bilingual; the Quebec City marine rescue sub-centre, the only bilingual sub-centre in Canada, was saved; and we are the only ones to have made a firm commitment to restore the CBC's funding.

People of real conviction have learned the importance of being able to walk the talk. They can trust the NDP to fix the damage done by the Liberals and the Conservatives.

* * *

[*English*]

ERNEST CÔTÉ

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Canadians learned of the passing of the World War II veteran, retired Colonel Ernest Côté.

Mr. Côté served as platoon commander in the Royal 22nd Regiment and later in the headquarters of the 3rd Canadian Infantry Division, and was ultimately promoted to colonel. He was a senior planner for the invasion of Normandy and landed on Juno Beach on D-Day. He then deployed to Nijmegen during the liberation of the Netherlands. After his time in uniform, Mr. Côté continued to serve Canada as the deputy minister of Veterans Affairs.

The courage and dedication of Canadians like Mr. Côté, who have fought valiantly over the years to defend our freedom and rights, have made it possible for us to live in a peaceful, democratic country where we enjoy the best quality of life in the world. As a veteran myself and as the Parliamentary Secretary for the Minister of Veterans Affairs, I ask all Canadians to join me in thanking Ernest Côté and his family for his exemplary service to and sacrifice for Canada.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today, delegates representing the families of the 1,200 missing and murdered aboriginal women are meeting in Ottawa to try once again to make the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and the Minister of Status of Women understand the need to launch a national public inquiry to put an end to this violence.

Will the government finally listen to aboriginal communities, rather than blaming them for its own inaction?

[*English*]

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as members are aware, the Minister of Status of Women and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs are at the round table. However, I would like to make it very clear that we do not support a national inquiry. There have been more than 40 studies on the plight of missing and murdered aboriginal women. Now is not the time for more study; now is the time for action. We need to make sure that the police catch those who are responsible and ensure that they are punished.

Our government is taking strong action to address the broader problems facing aboriginal women, including the introduction of matrimonial property rights for aboriginals on reserve. Both opposition parties voted against that.

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government is trying to blame this crisis solely on indigenous men. That is shameful. Many of these women and girls met their fate in major cities. Some of the worst perpetrators were not aboriginal, including Robert Pickton.

From mayors, premiers, indigenous leaders, and concerned Canadians around the country from coast to coast to coast, we have heard the call for an inquiry into this heartbreaking tragedy. Instead of blaming indigenous communities, will the government finally commit to a national public inquiry?

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we will not commit to a national inquiry. There have been more than 40 studies. As I said, if we had a national inquiry it would be one more study sitting on a shelf. The action plan the minister tabled in September is a good action plan and addresses issues that will combat violence against aboriginal women and girls. They opposition should support us.

Oral Questions

●(1120)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a month ago when the Prime Minister launched Bill C-51 at a splashy event, he was asked about the lack of oversight in the bill. His response was that the legislative process is the “first and foremost critical aspect of parliamentary oversight” of these new powers. That is funny because the Conservatives have spent the past month trying to get around just that.

Why did the Prime Minister tell Canadians that he wanted a thorough review when the Conservative plan, all along, was to shut down debate?

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after a 10-hour NDP filibuster yesterday, the committee was finally able to agree on a schedule for the study of the anti-terrorism act, 2015. On this side, we look forward to hearing from over 50 expert witnesses, including both the Minister of Public Safety and the Minister of Justice. We are ensuring that this legislation will be passed, despite the opposition by the NDP. Canadians would expect no less.

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Quebec is concerned about certain aspects of Bill C-51. The Quebec justice minister is wondering whether Bill C-51 respects the rights and freedoms set out in our charter.

That remark should remind the Conservative government that it cannot strike out on its own on this issue and that Bill C-51 must be examined from every angle.

Will the Conservatives listen to the plea of the Government of Quebec for once?

[English]

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, once again, we were able to get through committee yesterday after an NDP filibuster, the aim of which was to stop this legislation from even coming to committee. We will be pleased to hear from over 50 expert witnesses in this area. This bill is very clear. There are protections in this bill with respect to the very issue the NDP member is talking about. I look forward to hearing from each and every one of those witnesses.

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have grown accustomed to this Conservative government ignoring Quebec's concerns on this type of issue.

Everyone here will remember Bill C-10, the omnibus crime bill. The Conservatives insisted on going ahead with it until they finally realized that they needed Quebec and the provinces to enforce their laws.

Rather than rushing to pass Bill C-51, will the Conservatives learn from the past and make sure to consult all of the stakeholders affected by this bill?

[English]

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in committee we were more than accommodating to the NDP request. We are pleased to announce to all members of the House that we will hear from a slate of over 50 expert witnesses.

However, it does not surprise me for a moment that New Democrats would try to obstruct this very important legislation coming before the House. They want to stop it from committee.

This is the party that voted against the Combating Terrorism Act, an act that makes it illegal for people to travel overseas to engage in terrorism. New Democrats are fundamentally opposed to revoking passports, and they do not believe that someone should have their citizenship stripped if they commit terrorism in this country.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the status quo on the missing and murdered indigenous women and girls simply cannot continue. Indigenous leaders, premiers, and the families of victims are in Ottawa today to discuss a coordinated action plan to end this epidemic of violence.

They are looking for a federal partner. They are calling for new federal funding and for a national public inquiry.

Will the government finally listen?

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of our action plan that the minister tabled in September.

We will continue to work with communities to develop safety plans to raise awareness and take measures to empower aboriginal women and girls. We are developing more community safety plans on and off reserve, including regions identified specifically by the RCMP.

This action plan will also raise awareness to break intergenerational cycles of violence, engage men and boys, and will address underlying causes of violence, and it will restructure training initiatives.

●(1125)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a national crisis that is getting worse, and the same old talking points are an insult to the victims and their families.

What the government claims to be action is a series of general justice measures not targeted specifically at indigenous women and girls. They are limited existing programs that have failed to stop the violence and inadequate funding commitments recycled from 2010.

Will the government stop defending its failed approach and work toward a coordinated effort to put an end to the violence?

Oral Questions

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this action plan brings together many measures to combat violence against aboriginal women and girls.

In addition to the \$25 million over five years, it includes support for shelters and preventive activities and a DNA database for missing persons, which represents an additional investment.

This action plan clearly demonstrates our government's commitment to combatting all forms of violence against Canada's aboriginal women and girls. It would be nice if the opposition would support that.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 1984, 8% of Canadian women who were murdered were aboriginal. Today, it is 23%, or nearly one-quarter. That is an alarming deterioration. The government is engaging in unfounded speculation on the causes of this tragedy. It refuses to open a public inquiry, which has been called for by the families of victims, aboriginal communities, the provincial premiers, experts and just about everyone.

Why is the government turning its back on history? Will the Prime Minister at least attend the round table today? I am asking my colleague. Will the Prime Minister attend the round table today, yes or no?

[*English*]

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development and the Minister of Status of Women are attending the round table today.

There have been more than 40 studies on the plight of murdered and missing aboriginal women, and now is not the time for studies; it is the time for action. The minister tabled an action plan in September.

Our government has taken strong action to address the broader problems facing aboriginal women. We will continue to listen to those families and deliver programs that help the most. Again, it would be nice if the member opposite would support those initiatives that help women and girls.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives would like us to fast-track Bill C-51 without asking any questions or following the rules of democracy.

However, when the Prime Minister introduced Bill C-51 in front of a crowd of party supporters, he said that this legislative process is the most critical aspect of parliamentary oversight.

Why does the Prime Minister refuse to let us truly study Bill C-51? What does he have to hide with this bill?

[*English*]

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr.

Speaker, that question is absolutely false. It was the opposition party, the NDP, whose filibuster yesterday delayed the committee coming to an agreement on the number of meetings. We were more than accommodating. We finally agreed on having more than 50 witnesses come to speak on this particular legislation.

It is extremely critical. On this side of the House, we are looking forward to hearing from that expert testimony, including both the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness and the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, over a hundred of Canada's leading law professors wrote to the government today saying it has to amend it, or kill the bill. How many of those law professors are going to be cut out because the government does not respect principles of law and justice and it does not want a study on Bill C-51?

The fact is, Conservatives are fighting hard to avoid scrutiny on the bill, and that is a disservice to Canadians. This open letter from Canada's leading law professors raises even greater concerns about this dangerous piece of legislation. What are the Conservatives hiding? Why are they so afraid to subject this overreaching new law to proper scrutiny?

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians do not expect parliamentarians to waste days debating schedules of when to hear from witnesses. We spent more than 10 hours in committee trying to come to some sort of an agreement. We were more accommodating. We are looking forward to more than 50 expert witnesses coming to committee to hear this.

Let me talk about one of the good measures of the bill. This is hard to believe for Canadians because they would expect that when one branch of government hears information that is pertinent to national security that it could communicate that to our national security agencies. That is not the case today. Canadians would be shocked. The bill would correct that. The NDP member needs to stop filibustering and let us get—

• (1130)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie.

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in January, six young people left Quebec for Syria. The police believe that they joined jihadist groups. Their parents tried to stop them, but to no avail, and now they feel as though they are being left to fend for themselves.

Why are the Conservatives doing nothing to help parents who are concerned about the radicalization of their children?

[English]

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member is correct. During this week, during committee filibuster by the NDP debating how many witnesses we should hear from, we heard stories just like this of many Canadians who have gone overseas to engage or join ISIL.

There are measures in the bill that would give our national security agencies the ability to intervene and to disrupt terrorist travel. We also have measures in the bill that would change the passenger protect program and allow no-board orders to be issued in the very instances that the member is talking about.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we know that education helps in preventing radicalization. Nevertheless, it has been several months since last June's replenishment conference and the Conservatives still have not committed to supporting the Global Partnership for Education. This partnership has a proven track record.

Why is the government dragging its feet on this? Would it happen to be waiting for an opportunity for self-promotion instead of just helping children and young people now?

[English]

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, recently we have seen attacks in Copenhagen, in Paris, in Australia, and in Canada, right here in this Parliament on October 22 of last year. That is why our government is standing shoulder to shoulder with our allies fighting a global fight against terrorism and why we are conducting air strikes in Iraq.

ISIL is a terrorist scourge. We are degrading what it is trying to do in that region. It has also put Canada on a list of countries to carry out jihadist attacks against. That is why we brought forward Bill C-51. I am looking forward to hearing from each of those 50 witnesses.

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is about the GPE.

The Minister for International Development has said that Canada's job is to ensure that children are able to keep learning and that no child should be left behind as a result of the ongoing crisis in Iraq. However, the pledging conference for the Global Partnership for Education took place over eight months ago and Canada has yet to make a pledge.

Are the Conservatives waiting for an opportunity for a self-serving big press conference rather than helping these kids now?

Ms. Lois Brown (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada has been deeply committed to ensuring that children get education. We continue to work with our partners globally on these issues to look for ways that we can help. We have been one of the largest

Oral Questions

contributors to helping in Iraq to make sure that the children there are being taken care of, and in Syria as well.

We look at the great success we have had in Afghanistan with getting the girls into schools, millions of girls in school today who were never there before.

We are watching with our allies. We will continue to do that, and we will put our money where it gets the best effect.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. John Rafferty (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we heard the sad news yesterday that Ernest Côté, a Second World War D-Day veteran, passed away at age 101.

Now we need to be there to better help our veterans today, like the story of Master Corporal Paul Franklin who lost both of his legs in Afghanistan. Unbelievably, Veterans Affairs has required him yearly to prove that he has no legs. Yesterday we learned that he is once again being asked to prove that he is disabled.

Can the minister explain this callous incompetence?

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Veterans Affairs is engaged and committed to improving the services for veterans. In fact, when this issue first came to light, he made a personal phone call to this veteran to determine the nature of the problem.

As a result of veterans' feedback several weeks ago, the minister asked for this process to be reviewed.

On behalf of the Minister of Veterans Affairs, I am pleased to inform this House that the VIP renewal will move to a three-year cycle instead of a one-year cycle. Veterans will also have six months to complete this renewal, which is significantly longer than they have today. The form and the letter will also be updated for simplicity and to promote wellness.

● (1135)

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, under these Conservatives, veterans have endured failure after failure. Enough is enough. Veterans are still struggling to access the services they need and deserve.

Nothing could be more emblematic of the Conservative government's indifference than the struggles of Corporal Paul Franklin who is trying to access his disability benefits.

When will Conservatives finally take action so that retired Master Corporal Franklin does not have to prove yet again that he has lost his legs?

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we thank Corporal Franklin for his service to Canada, and we are here to help him and veterans like him across Canada.

Oral Questions

The NDP has voted against every single initiative that we have brought forward to actually help our veterans in concrete ways. To give members an example, our Conservative government is delivering on new front-line mental health treatment facilities. We are delivering enhanced financial benefits to veterans, and we are supporting them in retraining and rehabilitation.

Through eight budgets, our government has earmarked over \$5 billion in new funding to improve the benefits and services that we provide to veterans and their families.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, families of the 1,200 missing and murdered aboriginal women are joining the national round table today in good faith, but instead they will have to face the Minister of Status of Women simplistically blaming the communities and indigenous men. This will not excuse her own government's inaction on this file.

With all the evidence we have, how can the Conservative government still think this is not a sociological crisis and refuse the call for a national public inquiry?

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, we do not need a national inquiry. We need the action plan that the minister tabled in September. We need the police to catch those who are responsible and ensure that they are punished.

Since coming to office, this government has taken action. We have passed more than 30 criminal justice and public safety initiatives, including tougher sentences for murder, kidnapping, sexual assault, and mandatory prison sentences for the most serious crimes.

It is a shame that the opposition votes against them every single time that we try to do something for women and girls in this country.

[Translation]

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Legal Strategy Coalition on Violence Against Indigenous Women reviewed the 40 studies the Conservatives like to cite when it comes to this issue, confirming that almost none of the 700 recommendations made over the past two decades have really been implemented, including the recommendation to hold a national public inquiry.

Why is the government refusing to take action?

[English]

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government has already taken significant action in this area. It is important to remember that many of these recommendations are outside of federal jurisdiction.

Since coming to office, we have passed more than 30 criminal justice and public safety initiatives, as I just mentioned, including tougher sentences for murder, sexual assault, kidnapping, and mandatory prison sentences for the most serious crimes. Again, the opposition votes against them.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Hon. John McCallum (Markham—Unionville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, gridlock in the 905 is not only a drag on the economy, it keeps families separated for longer every day. Instead of supporting our commuters, the Conservatives have cut the building Canada fund by nearly 90% for the next two years.

What is their real priority, ads costing more than \$100,000 a pop during the Oscars last weekend?

Why is the government turning its back on York region and the 905 to fund its own self-promotion?

Mr. Peter Braid (Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in actual fact, since our Conservative government took office in 2006, Canada has consistently ranked at the very top of the list of all G7 countries with respect to investments in infrastructure as a percentage of GDP. Contrast that to the Liberal years, when Canada was at the bottom of the list. Clearly we had a decade of darkness, not only for defence but for infrastructure as well under the Liberals.

* * *

● (1140)

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister scored a rare double-double last week. He managed to damage both the economy and the environment. By betting on Congress rather than listening to the most powerful man on earth, he lost Keystone XL. Simultaneously, he made a 44% cut to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. He also cut Sustainable Development Technology Canada. He also cut species at risk and meteorological services.

Should double-doubles not be best served at Tim Hortons?

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the main estimates are exactly that, estimates, and they do not represent departments' total budgets for the year. Our government will remain committed to a strong environmental assessment process. In fact, we have increased funding and opportunities for aboriginal consultations and public participation throughout the environmental assessment process.

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just when Alberta and Canada could use an economic boost, the Prime Minister cancels a meeting with the president because he knows that the president will ask him about our ever-increasing GHG emissions. He should know that the president is also a serious basketball player. The PM lined up with a dysfunctional team of climate change deniers in Congress and the president dunked them both.

Is that what the Conservative Party means by an economic action plan?

Oral Questions

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we will take no lessons from the Liberal Party as far as greenhouse gases. Under its watch, greenhouse gas emissions increased over 30%, 130 megatonnes.

Our government's record is clear. We have taken decisive action on the environment while protecting our economy. Under our watch since 2005, we have seen that greenhouse gases have decreased 5.1% while the economy has grown 10.6%.

On that side of the House, that member and his party are supporting the NDP climate change bill that would decrease greenhouse gas emissions 80%, which means it would shut down the oil and gas sector, the transportation sector, the—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Beaches—East York.

* * *

CANADA POST

Mr. Matthew Kellway (Beaches—East York, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative plan for ending door-to-door mail delivery has been a disaster. Residents are plagued by thefts and snow-covered and frozen community mailboxes. Cities are stuck with the costs. Hundreds of cities right across this country, big and small, including my own City of Toronto, have called upon the government to abandon this plan, and now postal workers have launched a court challenge. Montreal says it will join that lawsuit.

When will the Conservatives abandon this plan and restore door-to-door mail delivery?

Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the plan is Canada Post's five-point plan. It is an independent crown corporation. It is dealing with a situation where it delivered 1.2 billion fewer pieces of mail in 2013 than it did just in 2006. The member also well knows that two-thirds of Canadians currently do not receive door-to-door delivery.

We expect Canada Post to operate on a financially self-sustaining basis, as is the law. We expect nothing less than that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Blanchette (Louis-Hébert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Union des municipalités du Québec, which represents 300 municipalities, is considering going to court to contest the end of door-to-door mail delivery and the installation of community mailboxes. Mayors are sick and tired of the government cavalierly taking action without consulting them.

Will the government listen to reason and restore door-to-door mail delivery?

Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada Post delivered 1.2 billion fewer pieces of mail in 2013 than it did in 2006. Two-thirds of Canadians do not receive their mail at home. Canada Post has to balance its budget without burdening taxpayers. We expect nothing less than that.

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the end of door-to-door mail delivery and the installation of community mailboxes is a real nightmare for municipalities.

The mayor of Montreal is even getting ready to challenge Canada Post's plans in court. He is condemning the crown corporation's cavalier and ludicrous attitude and is demanding that the Conservative government impose a moratorium immediately.

Will the government finally listen to citizens and local elected representatives and restore door-to-door mail delivery?

• (1145)

Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada Post, an independent crown corporation, is responsible for its own operations, which include its commercial and financial decisions. Canadians are choosing means other than letters to communicate with each other. Because of the drop in demand, the volume of mail has plunged by nearly 25% since 2008, and the trend is steady.

The Conference Board of Canada expects Canada Post to lose about \$1 billion per year between now and 2020.

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if the Conservatives had taken the time to consult people and municipalities beforehand, we would not be where we are today. Deployment of community mailboxes is really being messed up, and Canada Post is not keeping its promises. Nobody is clearing snow off the boxes, they are being covered in graffiti, and papers are lying around all over the place.

People are not happy, businesses are not happy, and municipalities are not happy.

What will it take for the government to put an end to Canada Post's nonsense?

[*English*]

Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada Post has a responsibility, obviously, in the conversion of community mailboxes, to be doing its consultations with communities as well as to be taking the important measures to ensure that the areas in front of community mailboxes are kept clear. We expect it to hold to its responsibilities.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, following the tragic attacks here in Ottawa last year as well as in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, we are reminded of the magnitude of the threat that terrorism poses to us and all Canadians. Today the international Financial Action Task Force that combats terrorist financing has announced that it will be pressuring governments that are failing to combat the flow of cash to the ISIL death cult.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance please update the House on the steps the government has taken to combat terrorist financing in Canada?

Oral Questions

Mr. Andrew Saxton (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since elected, our government has taken numerous steps to combat terrorist financing. This includes strengthening FINTRAC's ability to disclose threats to Canadian law enforcement agencies. We are pleased that the international Financial Action Task Force has endorsed our government's anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing regime. Canadians should remain vigilant and always report any suspicious activities to police immediately.

The NDP and the Liberals have voted against our efforts to combat terrorist financing. We call on them to start supporting our efforts to protect Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since 2002, Mauricie's manufacturing sector has lost 50% of its workforce. That means 12,000 fewer jobs in Mauricie. In 2014, Trois-Rivières was Canada's only metropolitan area whose GDP dropped.

Mauricie needs investments and economic diversification, but instead, this government cut EDC's budget for the Quebec economic development program by 27%.

Why is this government abandoning the people in my riding?

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec is working with economic players from Quebec and every region to diversify the economy in all regions of Quebec. We are there. The agency receives applications from many regions and they are all examined based on merit. We invite the Mauricie region to send its own applications to the regional office.

Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, over the past nine years, 400,000 well-paying jobs have been lost in the manufacturing sector. That is the reality.

The Conservatives have abandoned middle-class families and instead are helping the richest 15% in Canada.

The Quebec economic development program has been cut by \$13 million. That is the number: \$13 million less to invest in developing our communities.

Will the minister do something besides pose for photo ops and really work on diversifying Quebec's economy?

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since 2006, the Economic Development Agency of Canada has invested more than \$1 billion in all regions of Quebec. We are present throughout Quebec, with 14 regional offices, and we will continue working on developing Quebec's economy as a whole.

Mr. François Lapointe (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, NDP): Mr. Speaker, enough with the completely lame answers. That makes no sense.

Not only has the Quebec economic development program lost 27% of its funding, but the business development program of the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario has lost 15% of its funding.

The government must understand that it has a very poor economic track record. Last year the Lower St. Lawrence lost 14,000 jobs in the retail sector alone. It seems that the government wants to make things worse with these cuts.

Does the minister realize that our regions need help and that these cuts will result in job losses for families and the middle class?

● (1150)

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Economic Development Agency of Canada has a presence in every Quebec region. I invite the opposition member to work on the economic development of his own region. That would perhaps improve his region's situation.

* * *

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mrs. Anne-Marie Day (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Canadian Heritage was delighted with the progress made on official languages. The reality is that French television programming outside Quebec is steadily disappearing.

Even the Montreal Canadiens hockey games are no longer available to francophones across Canada. That is a source of concern for the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne.

Will the minister support our request that a committee study Canada's television programming and respect the rights of francophone minorities?

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Standing Committee on Official Languages received a request from the NDP to study this situation, and we will study the request in order to determine whether we will proceed.

* * *

[English]

TRANSPORTATION

Hon. Gerry Byrne (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that Marine Atlantic's 2015 corporate plan has not yet been approved by cabinet, but until then, the crown corporation's operating budget is very uncertain. The company has said that there is absolutely no doubt that cabinet will approve its five-year plan before the delivery of the Minister of Finance's budget, and full details of their funding will be available this spring.

Oral Questions

Will the finance minister confirm that the five-year corporate plan will indeed be approved in this time frame, that more money will be in the budget for Marine Atlantic, and that this funding will be no less than last year's allocation?

Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, obviously, budgets wait until budgets are actually revealed, but what I can tell the member is that this government has made substantial investments in Marine Atlantic. It has done so on a major capital program, which is just winding up, and we continue to ensure that it has the operational funding it needs to deliver its quality service to Atlantic Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, why is the government treating the regions in Quebec however it pleases instead of according to fair criteria?

It is funding a natural gas network in Thetford Mines, which is good, but it is refusing to do the same in Lévis-Bellechasse. The Coalition gaz naturel Bellechasse did a good job bringing together the municipalities, chambers of commerce, local development centres and RCMs around an exciting project.

Why are the Conservatives taking such an arbitrary approach to our regions?

[English]

Mrs. Kelly Block (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, liquefied natural gas has the potential to diversify our markets, an energy product offering in energy markets, creating jobs and economic growth for Canadians.

Our responsible resource development plan includes a world-class independent regulatory process that makes decisions based on science and facts, provides for clearer timelines, and reduces duplication to strengthen investor confidence in energy projects. That said, decisions respecting the development of liquefied natural gas rest primarily with the province, and we respect its jurisdiction.

* * *

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives' plans for a monument to victims of communism has drawn criticism from Canada's Chief Justice, the mayor of Ottawa, Canada's leading architecture and design experts, local MPs, and local elected representatives. All parties support a memorial to remember those silenced by tyranny and to honour those who fought for change. However, Ottawa residents and their representatives were not consulted on the location, the size, and the design of the memorial.

When building a monument to victims of communism, why is the current government ignoring democratic consultation?

Mr. Rick Dykstra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is actually not true. Consultation has taken place on this monument, and the fact that it was brought forward by the organizations involved should be

respected by the member across. The memorial will honour more than 100 million lives lost under communist regimes and will pay tribute to the Canadian ideas of liberty, freedom, democracy, and human rights.

Our government committed to honouring the victims of communism in our Speech from the Throne in 2010. We look forward to fulfilling that commitment.

* * *

● (1155)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Ottawa Police Service is asking the government for funds to recover costs from the Parliament Hill shooting and for a renewal of the \$2 million they received in 2009, in recognition of their crucial role in keeping the federal government safe.

Ottawa's Police Service faces a unique challenge. Protecting the national capital is a huge cost to our city. This should not compromise the safety of the wider Ottawa community. Will the federal government give the city of Ottawa the support it needs to keep our community safe?

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when we think back to October 22, I think most of us in this room today can recall the events that took place here in Parliament and just out front on the streets, as well.

We are very thankful for the work that was done by all the various levels of policing agencies, whether it was the Ottawa police or the RCMP or, of course, our security right here inside Parliament.

I will take that question under advisement to the minister.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Daryl Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the terrorist group, ISIL, is already responsible for countless heinous and barbaric war crimes. Now it appears that it is intent on erasing the record of an entire civilization from the history books. A new video has shown ISIL thugs destroying ancient and priceless Mesopotamian statues and other Assyrian Christian artifacts in northern Iraq.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs please provide Canada's reaction to the destruction of these priceless artifacts?

Oral Questions

Mr. Bernard Trottier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for La Francophonie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this part of the world is called the cradle of civilization. These priceless artifacts belong to all of humanity. They tell us something about who we are and where we come from. For these barbarians to so wantonly destroy a part of human history in an attempt to wipe out an entire people is offensive to the core.

Canada strongly condemns this barbarism. This is why the Canadian Armed Forces is there. We will not sit on the sidelines while an entire civilization is extinguished not just from the Earth but from history itself.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE

Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, municipalities across this country continue to find a financial black hole where federal infrastructure should be. The current government is all talk when it comes to infrastructure spending.

In the Cape Breton regional municipality alone, \$400-million worth of waste water system upgrades are required. Will the current government finally live up to its responsibility and bring the money to the table so we can get the job done, keep our water safe, and get our people back to work?

Mr. Peter Braid (Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in actual fact, as the Conservative government, our investments in infrastructure are three times higher than the previous Liberal government's.

In addition to being at the top of the list of all G7 countries with respect to investments in infrastructure, I am also very pleased to report to the House that under our Conservative government, the average age of public infrastructure in Canada is now at its lowest level since 1980.

With the new Building Canada plan, this progress will continue, creating jobs and prosperity for all Canadians.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-18, the Agricultural Growth Act, is a bill designed to modernize and strengthen federal agricultural legislation, support innovation in the Canadian agriculture industry, and enhance global market opportunities. Unfortunately, the NDP must oppose all of these positive items, because it voted against the bill.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture provide an update on this important piece of legislation?

Mr. Gerald Keddy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette for that important question. I am pleased to report to the House that Bill C-18, the Agricultural Growth Act, received royal assent this week.

The bill will strengthen intellectual property rights for plant varieties, reduce red tape, improve how government carries out its business with the Canadian agriculture industry, enhance trade, and grow Canada's economy. Importantly, the bill also includes farmer's privilege, which explicitly permits farmers to use seeds from the crops they grow.

It is absolutely shocking that the official opposition voted against the bill.

* * *

● (1200)

HEALTH

Mr. Bruce Hyer (Thunder Bay—Superior North, GP): Mr. Speaker, Thunder Bay's acute care hospital has been in gridlock for years. On January 26, the hospital designed for 375 acute care beds had 469 patients stacked up in public hallways.

Tommy Douglas worked with the Liberals to create a world-leading system funded 50% by the feds. The feds' share now is less than half of that.

Do the Conservatives have a plan to restore and renew our health care system?

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and for Western Economic Diversification, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is an absolutely absurd statement. We have the highest recorded health care transfer dollars right now in history. Since forming government, transfers to the provinces have gone up by 70% and will reach \$40 billion annually.

We have committed to increasing transfers year after year. I am very proud of our government's record on transfers, unlike the Liberals who, for many years, balanced their budget on the backs of the provinces.

* * *

[Translation]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. Sana Hassainia (Verchères—Les Patriotes, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, first there was the UN special rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, and now Amnesty International in its annual report is condemning Canada for how it treats aboriginal people.

The report criticizes the government's refusal to hold a public inquiry into the many murdered and missing aboriginal women and condemns the deplorable living conditions of first nations.

Will the government finally hold a public inquiry to shed light on these murders and disappearances? Will it finally do something tangible to improve the living conditions of first nations, or will it continue to turn a deaf ear?

*Routine Proceedings**[English]*

Mrs. Susan Truppe (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, no, we will not support a national inquiry. We have an action plan that was tabled in September, which we support on this side of the House because it helps aboriginal women and girls.

This action plan provides the tools and resources needed for preventing violence and supporting community level solutions. It supports aboriginal victims with appropriate services, and protects aboriginal women and girls by investing in shelters and continuing to improve Canada's law enforcement and justice systems.

On this side of the House, we stand up to protect the rights of aboriginal women and girls. Every time we move to safeguard these rights, the opposition members vote against them.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Bruce Hyer (Thunder Bay—Superior North, GP): Mr. Speaker, not just in Thunder Bay, but all across Canada, we have seniors stacked up like cordwood in cots in hallways, without comfort or dignity.

This is a problem all across Canada for three reasons: inadequate federal funding, aging parents waiting hopelessly for long-term care and home care, and the fact we are the only G20 country with no national health care strategy.

When will the Conservatives commit to investing long-term and preventative health care?

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and for Western Economic Diversification, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have talked already about the increase in transfers to the provinces that will continue to take place year after year.

However, it is also important to look to a commitment to innovation in the health care system, because the reality is that more money is not going to be the only thing that we need to fix inefficiencies. I want to quote Brad Wall, who says:

This can no longer just be about money. We've got to find ways to ensure that health care is here for the future generations—that it's sustainable—without sacrificing patient care.

We are a partner with the provinces. We have to move forward.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS*[Translation]***INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

Mr. Bernard Trottier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for La Francophonie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the World Wine Trade Group's Agreement on Requirements for Wine Labelling, which was signed in Canberra on January 23, 2007. There is an explanatory note with the agreement.

*[English]***GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 10 petitions.

* * *

● (1205)

PETITIONS

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Dave Van Kesteren (Chatham-Kent—Essex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of constituents who have signed a lengthy petition that Canada adopt international aid policies that support small family farmers, especially women, and recognize their role in the struggle against hunger and poverty; to ensure that Canadian policies and programs are developed in consultation with small family farmers; and to ensure that the rights of small family farmers in the global south to preserve, use, and freely exchange seeds are protected.

[Translation]

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a petition signed by hundreds of people who are concerned about the threat against the ancestral rights of small family farmers all around the world to preserve, use and exchange their seeds, as a result of some aspects of the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants.

The petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to adopt international assistance policies that support small family farmers, and particularly women, to recognize their vital role in the fight against hunger and poverty. They also want the government to ensure that policies and programs are developed in consultation with small family farmers and that these policies protect the rights of small family farmers in the global south to preserve, use and freely exchange seeds.

[English]

Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present this petition on behalf of the National Farmers Union and residents of Quebec calling upon the government to recognize the rights of farmers to save, reuse, select, exchange, and sell seeds.

Routine Proceedings

ANAPHYLAXIS

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from a number of Londoners who want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that on May 22, 2013, this Parliament voted unanimously in support of anaphylaxis Motion No. 230. As we all know, there are many victims of anaphylaxis, including children, who are vulnerable, particularly when travelling. The petitioners request that Parliament enact a policy to reduce the risks to anaphylactic passengers when travelling anywhere in this country, whether by plane, train, or forms of public transit so that they will be safe.

INSECT POLLINATORS

Mr. Matthew Kellway (Beaches—East York, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I was invited by Ms. Dietz's grade 4 class at Crescent Town Elementary School to come to speak to the kids about bees. There I met a classroom full of bee experts and pollinator advocates. They gave me letters to give to the ministers of the government.

They also gave me this petition to present before the House, which is about the protection of insect pollinators. It calls upon the House of Commons specifically to take concrete steps to solve the problem of high mortality rates among bees and other insect pollinators; to develop a strategy to address the multiple factors related to bee colony deaths, such as the destruction and disturbance of habitat and pesticide use; and to encourage seed companies to produce and facilitate the purchase of seed that is not treated with neonics.

SEX SELECTION

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present today.

In the first petition, the petitioners call on Parliament to condemn the discrimination against girls that occurs through gender selection abortion.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the second petition, the petitioners call upon Parliament to bring in tougher laws on impaired driving. One of the things they call for is to change the charge of impaired driving causing death to the offence of vehicular manslaughter.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, not too long ago my colleague from Beaches—East York introduced a private member's bill, Bill C-619, the climate change accountability act. Here I am holding in my hand a petition that many people have signed saying that they want to see this bill turned into law, that we need a climate change accountability act.

They also point out the fact that the government has done things like cancelled the eco-energy home retrofit program and that it continues to give subsidies to the oil and gas industry.

The petitioners are asking that we take action and pass this bill into law so we can start reducing our greenhouse gas emissions.

● (1210)

FALUN GONG

Mr. Bruce Hyer (Thunder Bay—Superior North, GP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians from Thunder Bay—Superior North and across Canada are repeatedly sending me petitions about the Communist Chinese persecuting Falun Gong only because the latter have a spiritual belief in truth, compassion, and forbearance.

David Kilgour, a former member, has compiled tremendous amounts of evidence about murders and organ harvesting, and so my petitioners request that we condemn the Communist Chinese government for murdering people for their organs, and to end the persecution of Falun Gong in China.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 935, 937 and 943.

[Text]

Question No. 935—**Ms. Megan Leslie:**

With regard to the operations of the Halifax Port Authority (HPA): (a) for each of the last five years, what amount of money was paid by the HPA in rebates to shipping lines or their agents, (i) in total, (ii) by shipping line or their agents, (iii) in each case, where these expenditures authorized by the HPA Board of directors; (b) for each of the last five years, (i) what amount of money was paid or received by the HPA in rebates to or from contractors or those holding leases with the HPA, (ii) in each case, were these expenditures authorized by the HPA Board of directors; (c) for each of the last ten years, what amount of money was paid by the HPA for legal services, (i) in total, (ii) by law firm; (d) during each of the last five years, has the chairman's law firm represented companies or individuals holding leases with the HPA or otherwise doing business with the HPA and, if so, which companies or individuals; (e) concerning the trip to the Far East by HPA representatives in November 2014, (i) which HPA representatives made this trip, (ii) what was the total cost for the trip for each HPA representative, (iii) how many days was each representative away on this trip, (iv) what was the purpose of this trip, (v) which cities did each representative visit on this trip, (vi) which company and government offices did each HPA representative visit on this trip, (vii) did any Nova Scotia companies or organizations travel with the HPA representatives and, if so, which ones; and (f) regarding the recent management takeover of the Provincial Port of Sheet Harbour by the HPA, (i) why are Posh Management Inc. and Sheet Harbour Management Group incorporated to do the management of the Port of Sheet Harbour, (ii) are the officers, directors and lawyers paid in addition to and separate from the HPA and, if so, how much in each case, (iii) who are the officers and directors of the Port of Sheet Harbour Management Group, (iv) how much in per diems and expenses are they paid in the case of each of the two companies?

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada Port Authorities, such as the Halifax Port Authority, operate at arm's length from the Federal Government and on a commercial basis, within the parameters set by the Canada Marine Act and associated regulations, and their individual Letters Patent.

Routine Proceedings

Each Canada Port Authority has an independent Board of Directors that which is responsible for determining the Port Authority's strategic direction and overseeing the Port Authority's operations, including expenditures, leases, legal services, business development, and travel. The Letter Patent for each Canada port authority contains a code of conduct that provides the principles and rules by which Directors are expected to carry out their duties, with particular emphasis regarding potential conflict of interest.

As Transport Canada has no oversight over the day-to-day operations at Canada Port Authorities, questions regarding expenditures, leases, legal services, business development, and travel at the Halifax Port Authority should be directed to that the Port Authority.

Question No. 937—Mr. Wayne Easter:

With regard to changes to the Large Business Audit Program, whereby audits may be performed by Canada Revenue Agency offices in cities other than the location of the business audited: what has been the effect of these changes for audits conducted after the change compared to those conducted before, particularly in terms of penalties, fines, and revenue collected per audit?

Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay (Minister of National Revenue, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the national workload portability initiative, NWPI, was formally adopted in August 2014. It is a business transformation initiative at the Canada Revenue Agency, CRA, that seeks to improve program operations.

The NWPI sets out a framework to guide inter-regional workload transfers, that is, portable files, for the CRA's international and large business programs. The purpose of the framework is to enable the CRA to make the most effective use of its resources and its technical capacity on a national basis.

Under the NWPI, large business income tax audits will be assigned to regions according to the principles of integrity, capacity, taxpayer service, and practicality. An effective risk-based approach to workload selection and allocation is imperative to ensuring that audit resources are managed in the most efficient and effective manner.

As the NWPI was newly formalized, the CRA has not yet finalized audits that would allow it to produce the type of information requested. Therefore, the CRA is unable to provide a response at this time.

Question No. 943—Mr. Pat Martin:

With respect to electronic records and messages including, in particular, text messages, short message service (SMS), and BlackBerry Messenger (BBM), broken-down by government departments, institutions and agencies: (a) what are the departmental policies for storage and retention of these records and messages, broken-down by record type; (b) if these records and messages are stored and retained, what are the storage and retention periods; (c) is there any policy in place to protect records or messages that are of business value; and (d) are there any planned changes to these policies, and if so, what will be proposed?

Hon. Tony Clement (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Policy on Information Management and the Directive on Recordkeeping outline the types of records to be maintained as well as the responsibilities for establishing mechanisms to maintain and make information available.

The Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat sets government-wide direction in targeted areas of management, including information management, IM; information technology, IT; and access to

information and privacy and security. Mandatory direction regarding the management of information, including email and instant messages, can be found in the following instruments: Policy on Information Management, Directive on Roles and Responsibilities, and the Standard on Email Management. Guidance to departments is also available in the Information Management Protocol—Instant Messaging Using a Mobile Device, and the Guideline for Employees of the Government of Canada: Information Management (IM) Basics.

The Policy on Information Management, 2007, and the Directive on Recordkeeping, 2009, are the primary instruments for information and policy direction within the Government of Canada. The Information Management Protocol—Instant Messaging using a Mobile Device, issued in November 2014, adds precision to existing requirements that pertain specifically to instant messaging.

The Policy on Information Management, the Directive on Recordkeeping, and the Information Management Protocol—Instant Messaging using Mobile Device are available online at: <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=12742>, <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=16552>, and <https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/im-gi/imp-pgi/mobile-eng.asp>, respectively.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if a revised response to Question No. 328, originally tabled on March 6, 2014; revised responses to Questions Nos. 528 and 586, both originally tabled on September 15, 2014; and a revised response to Question No. 880, originally tabled on January 26, 2015, could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

Question No. 328—Mr. John McKay:

With regard to any contracting paid for by the budgets of each Minister's Office since May 1, 2011, what are the details of all contracts over \$500 including (i) the name of the supplier, vendor or individual who received the contract, (ii) the date on which the contract was entered into, (iii) the date the contract terminated, (iv) a brief description of the good or service provided, (v) the amount of payment initially agreed upon for the contract, (vi) the final amount paid for the contract?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 528—Mr. MacAulay:

With regard to contracts under \$10,000 granted by Natural Resources Canada since January 1, 2013: what are the (a) vendors' names; (b) contracts' reference numbers; (c) dates of the contracts; (d) descriptions of the services provided; (e) delivery dates; (f) original contracts' values; and (g) final contracts' values if different from the original contracts' values?

(Return tabled)

*Points of Order***Question No. 586—Mr. Dubourg:**

With regard to government procurement: what are the details of all contracts for the provision of research or speechwriting services to Ministers since April 1, 2006, (a) providing for each such contract (i) the start and end dates, (ii) contracting parties, (iii) file number, (iv) nature or description of the work; and (b) providing, in the case of a contract for speechwriting, the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) audience or event at which the speech was, or was intended to be, delivered?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 880—Mr. Arnold Chan:

With regard to government and agency contracts for communications since 2006: (a) how much has the government spent on contracts for communications products; (b) whom has the government contracted for writing, specifying (i) the name of the organization or individual, (ii) the type of service provided, (iii) the event or announcement that was linked to the contract, (iv) whether the contract was tendered, (v) how much the contract was for, including whether the contract value changed, (vi) the date the product was release, (vii) the date of the announcement; (c) whom has the government contracted for media training, specifying (i) the name of the organization or individual, (ii) the persons that the training was provided to, including their title, (iii) whether the contract was tendered, (iv) how much the contract was for, including whether the contract value changed, (v) the date of the contract; (d) whom has the government contracted for media monitoring, specifying (i) the name of the organization or individual, (ii) the length of the contract, (iii) the cost of the contract, (iv) whether the contract was tendered; (e) whom has the government contracted for distribution of press releases, including (i) the name of the organization or individual, (ii) the length of the contract, (iii) the cost of the contract, (iv) whether the contract was tendered; (f) whom has the government contracted for event staging, specifying (i) the name of the organization or individual, (ii) the type of service provided, (iii) the event or announcement that was linked to the contract, (iv) whether the contract was tendered, (v) how much the contract was for, including whether the contract value changed, (vi) the date the product was release, (vii) the date of the announcement; and (g) whom has the government contracted for any other communications product, specifying (i) the name of the organization or individual, (ii) the length of the contract, (iii) the cost of the contract, (iv) whether the contract was tendered, (v) what the contract was for?

(Return tabled)

[English]

Mr. Colin Carrie: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions by allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to the point of order that was raised this morning by the opposition House leader. At the outset, I want to reserve the right to come back and provide some further submissions. I have had a little more than an hour to prepare a response. Most of that time I have actually spent in the chamber for statements by members, question period and now routine proceedings. Therefore, I may wish to come back.

However, I want to provide you with an initial response, Mr. Speaker. What you are being asked to do is to interfere in the affairs of a committee and as we all know, committees are masters of their own process.

However, the real issue is whether MPs will be allowed to study and consider the anti-terrorism bill that is before the House, Bill C-51, or can the opposition, by endless speeches and obstruction,

obstruct such a bill and prevent it from ever being studied or passed. Let us call it a tyranny of the minority.

There is a paradox here. The opposition members say that they want to have extensive study of the bill, yet at the same time they will not let it happen. The real objective is to filibuster and to block the bill. We on the government side think the bill is important. We are very open to discussion. We are open to study, but we do want to see the bill become law in this Parliament.

Every week we have stories of new attacks that are taking place and that are inspired or called upon, or actually undertaken, by ISIS, the Islamic State. It continues to increase the tempo of that. That is after the specific ISIL inspired attacks in Canada on October 20 and 22. We also have recent reports, with increasing tempo again, of foreign fighters, people leaving our country to join ISIL. Also alarming, we have again had recent reports of other jihadist groups, al Shabaab being the most recent one, making public calls for terrorist attacks on Canadian civilians on Canadian soil.

Needless to say, in that context, there is a need for government and for this Parliament to take action. Having identified that there are gaps and additional things we could do to protect Canadians, there really is a duty upon us to do that and to allow that to happen. That speaks to the need to take action and to provide Canadians with those additional protections we have identified.

We are in a situation where time actually does matter. Endless delay and obstruction can have a cost and that can be a very high cost indeed.

Let us be clear about what the New Democratic Party was doing. The New Democrats have said it in their own words. In yesterday's communications they repeatedly indicated that what they were engaging in was a filibuster. I have one tweet here that was put out by the New Democratic Party. I will substitute the names for constituencies. It says, the member for Alfred-Pellan, a New Democrat, "happening now...is standing up to the Prime Minister and filibustering Bill C-51". That is what was said, not asking for more witnesses, but rather filibustering.

Similarly, Shawn Dearn, who is the director of communications for the Leader of the Opposition, tweeted out that the member for Alfred-Pellan "is fighting for your rights and freedoms right now...by filibustering Bill C51".

Similarly, the New Democratic Party headquarters put out a similar statement that the member for Alfred-Pellan "is fighting for our rights and freedoms right now by filibustering Bill C-51".

The member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley cited the same thing, "standing up for rights and filibustering".

This is clear evidence of that what the committee was dealing with was not considered debate and discussion, but rather filibustering.

What is filibustering? There are probably some normal people at home who are not familiar with that world and they should be made familiar with it. I will give them some indications.

The *Gage Canadian Dictionary*, the Canadian definition of it, defines filibuster as "the deliberate hindering of the passage of a bill in a legislature by long speeches or other means of delay".

Points of Order

The Webster dictionary, a slightly smaller version, defines it as “a member of a legislature who obstructs a bill by making long speeches”.

The Oxford dictionary, which is my preferred dictionary, defines it as “prolonged speaking or other action which obstructs progress in a legislative assembly while not technically contravening the required procedures”. Then it says the origin is from the French “flibustier”, first applied to pirates who pillaged the Spanish colonies in the West Indies. I like that.

● (1215)

In any event, what was taking place at that committee was a filibuster, and that certainly then leaves us with the question of what are committees to do when faced with such filibuster efforts by one individual or a minority to prevent them from engaging in their work, to obstruct, to block, as those definitions show, a bill from passage, to prevent that tyranny of the minority from happening.

The question is, what is the appropriate balance? In this case we are talking about a committee that had met for two days after Bill C-51 was sent to it by the House to debate and discuss process. I have heard they went on as many as 10 hours to discuss these questions of process. At what point do they get past that and actually begin engaging in the study that everybody claims is so important? Certainly opposition members keeps claiming they want more of it, but they keep using up the time for other things, for this filibuster of which they are so proud and so fond.

I would submit in the simplest terms, Mr. Speaker, that you are being asked to intervene by the official opposition members to give them a blank cheque, an unlimited right to be able to filibuster and forever prevent members of that committee of the House of Commons from debating the bill, from being able to hear witnesses, that they should have an unlimited right to block and filibuster without end. It would be an extraordinary thing for you to step in, Mr. Speaker, and provide them with such right and to do so in the context of a bill so critical to the public safety of Canadians, so critical to protecting their lives at a time when we know that every week the people who have targeted Canada are killing people, killing innocents around the world and they have identified and targeted Canadians to do exactly that.

To get into the dry legalese of my submissions in terms of the rules, I will continue by pointing out that the meeting we are talking about was one designed to deal with the organization, simply the discussion and debate of how the bill should be processed by the committee and what witnesses it should hear.

At the meeting yesterday, which was held in public, the committee debated a Conservative motion, then the New Democratic amendment and then a Conservative subamendment. This was all part and parcel of the normal iterative dialogue which happens at committees. It is a normal thing when they seek to schedule business. However, that iterative process, that back and forth discussion and debate, simply stopped when the NDP refused to engage in any further serious effort toward a productive discussion and launched into a filibuster.

At that point, it went over six hours of debate on just the subamendment yesterday. That is the point at which it was clear

there was no discussion and it was, as the public statements started coming out at that point, just about filibustering. It was becoming increasingly repetitive and irrelevant to the question before the committee.

I understand a number of points of order were made related to this concern yesterday afternoon at committee. After some time, the hon. member for Northumberland—Quinte West, a member of the committee, raised a point of order calling for the chair to put the questions before the committee to a vote, citing the persistence in repetition and irrelevance on the part of the New Democrats. We know that repetition and irrelevance is a clear part of our Standing Orders in the House. Committees are masters of their own process, have their own rules so on, but repetition and irrelevance is simply not permitted. You, Mr. Speaker, have been a champion on that question.

The chair then made a ruling which the hon. member for Northumberland—Quinte West appealed. The majority of the committee sided with the hon. member and voted not to sustain the chair's ruling, as was the right of those members. Subsequently the committee endorsed our government's reasonable proposal to allow for approximately 50 witnesses to appear before and during the study of Bill C-51. The Chair is now being asked to interfere in the decision taken by a majority of that standing committee.

First, the Chair should reject the challenge immediately, given that it is made in the absence of any report from the committee on this specific matter. To make the finding without a report in front of you, Mr. Speaker, would simply fly in the face of the traditions, conventions and practices of the House.

Page 1046 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, second edition, acknowledges that, “the Speaker is reluctant to intervene in a committee's internal affairs unless the committee has previously reported on the matter to the House”.

● (1220)

The hon. member for Burnaby—New Westminster this morning urged the Chair to apply to the proceedings of the committee, what we would consider in the world as appellate law, to be a standard of correctness.

Footnote 517, on page 1046 of O'Brien and Bosc, refers to a ruling of Mr. Speaker Fraser, which acknowledged that in “very serious and special circumstances” the Chair may intervene in the absence of a report. This is far beyond any test for “correctness”.

The standard of intervening in the absence of a committee report might be gleaned, for instance, from the decision of Mr. Speaker Parent on November 7, 1996, at page 6225 of *Debates*, in a case where an associate member of a committee, back in the early years of the concept of associate membership, was denied certain participation rights.

In fact, a long line of Speakers' rulings uphold the point that committee decisions ought not to be interfered with in the absence of a report expressly on point.

Mr. Speaker Milliken, on November 27, 2002, at page 1949 of the *Debates*, ruled:

Points of Order

—it is a long tradition in this place that committees are masters of their own proceedings. Ordinarily the House is only seized of a committee matter when the committee reports to the House outlining the situation that must be addressed.

In a subsequent Parliament, he delivered a ruling, on May 10, 2007, at page 9288 of *Debates*, which noted:

—it would be highly inappropriate for the Speaker to break with our past practice and pre-empt any decision the committee may choose to make. The committee is seized of the issue and if a report is presented I will of course deal with any procedural questions which may be raised as a result. Until such a report is presented however, I must leave the matter in the hands of the committee.

In another ruling, on March 14, 2008, at page 4182 of *Debates*, Mr. Speaker Milliken said:

For the present, I cannot find sufficient grounds to usurp the role of committee members in regulating the affairs of the Standing Committee... However, if and when the committee presents a report, should members continue to have concerns about the work of the committee, they will have an opportunity to raise them in the House...

Not only is the convention that the Speaker does not interfere in committee proceedings sound in policy terms, it is sound in its practical application. The minutes of the proceedings or the evidence have not yet been published, so we are arguing on the basis of what we understand to be the facts. That leaves the Chair with representations about what happened at the public safety committee made by two members, myself and my NDP counterpart. We are both not members of that very committee.

In fact, it is because I take the view that committees ought to be the masters of their own proceedings that I am relying upon accounts of what happened there in the absence of any official documents. The House leader of the official opposition grounds his point of order on a claim that a motion for the previous question was proposed. That motion, if proposed in the House, is a debatable motion, so the NDP House leader's construction of the facts simply does not add up to what happened.

The hon. member for Northumberland—Quinte West was, as I understand it, challenging the irrelevant and repetitive interventions by the New Democratic Party, interventions which simply exposed the New Democrats' approach to delaying and obstructing these legislative measures to support our police and security agencies. From that perspective, the hon. member's view was that the debate had been exhausted. I cited some examples that support that from the communications that were put out by the NDP party and by members of the caucus.

If I ended my argument here on the point about the lack of a report, some observers might claim that I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, to allow what happened on a technicality. However, the actions of the public safety committee are also sound on the merits since committees are, as we all know and say often, masters of their own proceedings. This concept is explained, at page 1047, of O'Brien and Bosc, which states:

The concept refers to the freedom committees normally have to organize their work as they see fit and the option they have of defining, on their own, certain rules of procedure that facilitate their own proceedings.

On the next page, it states, “committees may adopt procedural rules to govern their proceedings, but only to the extent the House does not prescribe anything specific”.

Rules concerning repetition and irrelevance are prescribed by the Standing Orders and our practices. When the chair of the committee

was asked for several rulings yesterday on relevance and repetition, this is consistent with his role under Standing Order 117, which states, “The Chair of a standing, special or legislative committee shall maintain order in the committee, deciding all questions of order”.

However, those words are followed by a very germane phrase, “subject to an appeal to the committee; but disorder in a committee can only be censured by the House, on receiving a report thereof”. The hon. member for Northumberland—Quinte West disagreed with the chair's ruling and appealed to the committee. The majority of the committee's members, in turn, agreed with the appeal. Again, that is expressly allowed by the Standing Orders.

● (1225)

Page 1049 of O'Brien and Bosc reiterates the point:

Decisions by the Chair are not debatable. They can, however, be appealed to the full committee.

Speaker Milliken's 2002 ruling, as I said earlier, confirmed this practice:

Even the rulings of the chair of a committee may be made the subject of an appeal to the whole committee. The committee may, if it thinks appropriate, overturn such a ruling.

This passage was cited favourably by our own Speaker in his ruling on November 29, 2012, at page 12609 of the *Debates*. The principle is worth repeating: appeals lie to the committee, not to the House.

The hon. member for Prince Edward—Hastings, a man whose constituents are lucky to have as an MP, a chairman of the public safety committee that those members are privileged to have as a chair, ought to be heartened that O'Brien and Bosc go on to add at page 1049 that:

The overturning of a ruling is not considered a matter of confidence in the Chair.

Citation 716(3) of Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, sixth edition, speaks to committees being the proper venue for committee's procedural disputes being settled:

— that the Speaker has ruled on many occasions that it is not competent for the Speaker to exercise procedural control over the committees. Committees are and must remain masters of their own procedure.

Citation 822, again of Beauchesne's, meanwhile gives us this advice:

Procedural difficulties which arise in committees ought to be settled in the committee and not in the House.

Speaker Fraser, in his ruling of March 26, 1990, at page 9756 of the *Debates*, explained why this is a sound approach:

If I am cautious in not acting now it is simply because the Chair does not supervise the standing committee chairmen. That function belongs to the members of each committee and they have obvious avenues to pursue other than invoking privilege in the House.

Our own Speaker, at page 17795 of the *Debates* for June 6, 2013, said in response to a point of order:

To answer this fully would be to ask the Chair to reach into and adjudicate upon committee matters, a practice the House has long resisted, given that committees are masters of their own proceedings, as we are apt to say.

Beauchesne's citation 762 notes that:

Points of Order

Proceedings in the committees are more relaxed in nature than those in the House as the requirements which must be observed in the Chamber are not so strictly enforced when Members sit as committees.

This point was confirmed in a ruling of our current Speaker on November 29, 2012, at page 12609 of the *Debates*.

—it is true that committee practice is of considerable flexibility and fluidity.

Mr. Speaker Milliken's 2002 ruling, which I already quoted twice, speaks to the wisdom of letting committees resolve their own difficulties, such as those presented by the NDP's persistence, irrelevance, and repetition yesterday at the public safety committee:

That being said, it is true as well that committees are permitted a greater latitude in the conduct of their proceedings than might be allowed in the House. It may not always be clear in a particular set of circumstances how best to proceed and so the ultimate decision is left to the committee itself.

In this case, I suggest that we let the public safety committee's proceedings remain the exclusive concern of the public safety committee unless and until the committee chooses to report this particular matter to the House for our consideration.

I am continuing my review of the detailed submissions that my friend the opposition House leader tendered this morning. As I said, I may wish to come back.

However, I do want to point out again, Mr. Speaker, that if you are going to accede to the point of order that has been forwarded by the opposition House leader, you are essentially going to be ruling that a minority—a single member, perhaps—has the ability to stand through a filibuster, as they have indicated, and block and obstruct legislation from ever passing and from ever being considered. You are going to be ruling that a minority can prevent witnesses from being heard and can prevent legislation from being debated.

When one talks about protecting the rights of the minority, I do not think that the right of the minority is the right to become a majority, to transform itself through extraordinary breath and extraordinary endurance so as to be able to prevent progress on legislation and to be able to block decisions from being made by this legislature. That is not what standing up for the minority means. That would be the establishment of a tyranny of the minority.

• (1230)

In a case like this, the legislation is very important. We would like to see this bill become law in this Parliament because it is a matter of public safety, because Canadian lives are at risk, because the phenomenon that we are seeking to combat has cost us Canadian lives. It cost us a life just steps from this Hill, steps from the very place we are, and it came close to costing lives right here. We are talking about a terrorist threat that threatens all Canada and about solutions that have been identified by the government to make those Canadians safer.

This Parliament has a right to consider those solutions. It has a right to deliberate them. That committee has every right to ensure that it cannot be held hostage to prevent it from considering that legislation, hearing witnesses, deliberating on it, pronouncing on it to us, and providing its report to us on the appropriateness of that legislation.

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I just want to reply to the comments from my friend and colleague, the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.

If anything, he has served to reinforce the point of order that I made this morning.

I reiterate that he has not at any point contradicted that the rule book says that in committee, motions for the previous question are inadmissible. The member has not contradicted that in any way. That reinforces the principal argument that we made this morning, which is that committees cannot just write their own rule book and that they indeed do have to follow *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*.

The government House leader made essentially political arguments, and I want to take a few minutes to reply to the political arguments he made before I come back to the technicality. Political arguments are basically the only thing that the government is hanging its hat on.

First is the issue of speed and the importance of the legislation. We have no doubt that this is important legislation that needs to be considered. However, as the 100 law professors across the country noted this morning in their open letter to the government and all members of Parliament, saying that this dangerous legislation needs to be amended or killed:

...Bill C-51 does not include “the type of concrete, effective measures that have been proven to work [against radicalization], such as working with communities on measures to counter radicalization of youth — [and the bill] may even undermine outreach.”

On the issue of speed, we have 100 of Canada's leading law professors across the country, most of whom are in Conservative ridings, saying they have read and scrutinized the bill and that what it would actually do is maybe even hinder the types of measures that the government should be putting into place.

We have seen the Conservatives claw back money from the RCMP. That was an issue in this House last week, as you know, Mr. Speaker. It is a program that was supposed to counter radicalization, and instead the government clawed back money.

We have seen the government gut the Canada Border Services Agency, eliminating hundreds of front-line investigative officers in the Canada Border Services Agency. All the measures that the Conservatives should be taking if there is real concern from the government side about taking effective measures, they are not taking. In fact, the Conservatives have done measures that are counterproductive.

Therefore, the issue that the government House leader raises about speed contradicts every action the Conservatives have carried out over the last few months, except putting in place Bill C-51, which the most learned law professors in the country, the experts that the government members refuse to hear from, say does not include the concrete, effective measures that are needed and that bill may even undermine that outreach and those measures.

Government Orders

Second is the issue of the New Democrats speaking in committee. What the government House leader forgot to mention, or omitted mentioning, is that over the course of this week New Democrats have called for hearings that would include hearing expert testimony and hearing from Canadians. The hearings would take place during both day and evening, including the break weeks. It is Conservatives who refuse to sit during break weeks. It is Conservatives who have refused to sit in the evening. Hard-working NDP members of Parliament, such as the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca and the member for Alfred-Pellan, are saying we should sit next week. It is a break week, but let us be in Ottawa and let us hear from experts.

The Conservatives say they do not want to work on this bill next week. We had New Democrats saying they want to sit in the evening and Conservatives saying they do not want to sit, that they want to go to their socials or to the bar and do not want to sit during an evening session.

Quite frankly, it is appalling to hear Conservatives who refused those extra hearings now saying that somehow the New Democrats did not want to work. We always want to work. We are the worker bees in this House. We do not mind being the worker bees. We do not mind scrutinizing legislation. However, it is simply false to pretend that Conservatives wanted to work and New Democrats did not. We want to work night and day on this bill. We believe it requires close scrutiny. It is Conservatives who have systematically blocked that tight scrutiny.

The question has to be asked: what are they afraid of? What are they hiding? Why do they not want full scrutiny of the bill? Who are the Conservatives cutting out by slashing the witness list? How many former prime ministers have expressed concerns about this bill? How many former chief justices or justices of the Supreme Court are they cutting out? How many people who have actually been involved in security issues are they cutting out? How many of those law professors who are some of the leading minds on security issues in the country are the Conservatives refusing to hear from?

• (1235)

They want a short list with only pro-government witnesses, except for a handful of people who may have opposing concerns or real concerns about this bill.

The Conservatives say that they want to hear from the public, but everything they have done this week demonstrates exactly the opposite. They want to shut down debate. They do not want to sit during break weeks. They do not want to sit during the evenings. They want to get through this bill with the minimum amount of public scrutiny.

Finally, we get to the one procedural argument that was raised. I will say this to conclude. You have been very patient, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that. The argument is what the government House leader admits is a technicality. He said that we had not had a report from the committee, and he was going to hang his hat on that technicality. That is the one procedural argument that the Conservatives have to offer— as if a Conservative majority that has just ripped up the rule book and run roughshod over the procedures, precedents, and practice that we have had in the House of Commons for 150 years, as if the Conservatives are going to send the evidence to the House of Commons.

I am simply going to ask members of the House. We can solve this very simply. If that little technicality is the only thing that the government can point to to avoid the important guidance and wisdom that we have asked for from the Speaker, which we hope to get in the coming days, I am going to ask unanimous consent for the following motion: that the official transcript of the 51st meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security of Thursday, February 26, 2015, be deemed to be the 10th report of said committee and that it be deemed reported to the House.

That way, the evidence is delivered. Conservatives cannot hide it. The government cannot hang its hat on a technicality. What that means, of course, is that the truth will come out.

• (1240)

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House leader for the official opposition have unanimous consent to proceed?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: There is obviously no unanimous consent.

I want to thank both House leaders and the member for Winnipeg North for their submissions. I understand that the government House leader may have further submissions. I am sure that the Speaker will be responsive to the point of order as quickly as possible, once the submissions are completed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

RESPECT FOR COMMUNITIES ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, as reported without amendment from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the member for Nanaimo—Alberni has two and half minutes, plus questions and comments.

Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for anyone who is just tuning in now, before question period we were discussing Bill C-2, the respect for communities act, and I was raising the point in the debate that the health committee had heard extensively on these issues from a large number of expert witnesses.

The committee recently completed studies on both prescription drug abuse and the health risk of marijuana use. During these studies, a number of witnesses called for increased action by the government in order to raise awareness of the health problems associated with drug abuse. It is costing us an enormous amount in society in the form of non-productive citizens. People are developing increasing health complications and leading non-productive lives, and it is placing a real burden on the health care system. There is also the terrible destruction of their own lives and families and all of those who love and care for them.

Government Orders

Given the committee's work in this area, I was very pleased that in October of 2014, the Minister of Health launched a preventing drug abuse media campaign. That campaign's purpose was to equip parents with the information tools needed to talk with their teenagers about the harmful effects of prescription drug abuse and marijuana use.

That program is part of our prevention plan that we are working toward. Bill C-2 would provide a framework for communities to discuss so-called safe injection sites before they are implemented. It would give law enforcement, municipal leaders, and residents an opportunity to address the circumstances in the neighbourhood before such a program could be considered by the minister.

I thank the members for the opportunity to speak to this bill and I look forward to questions.

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge my friend's comments at the end. We can agree on his statement that that proliferation and use of some very harmful drugs are affecting lives in our communities.

Where we part company is on how we deal with that problem. He has probably looked at all of the evidence-based research on why we need to have safe injection sites and places where people can get health care at the same time.

No one is looking at trying to proliferate. We are trying to reduce the use of harmful drugs.

Has my friend read all of the evidence from other countries? The issue has been looked at in Germany, Switzerland, and right here in Canada, and the evidence says that this is a health issue and that we need to provide safe support for those people who have these problems so that we can have first contact with them and not abandon them. I think that is where the government's problem is.

I just want to know if he has read all of the evidence-based reports that say that the direction of the government is the wrong direction.

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Ottawa Centre for his intervention.

I think there is a lot of discussion about harm reduction. I had a whole career as a health care professional, and the focus of my career was always on helping people have productive lives, restored lives. I think we have not exhausted the possibilities of actually delivering people from these addictions.

In fact, I would point the member, as I know he is interested in solutions to these vexing problems, to some promising work being done with low-grade, non-invasive treatments, such as magnetic therapies, so-called transcranial magnetic stimulation, for PTSD victims. There is a former army sergeant discussing PTSD treatment at a brain treatment centre in the *Washington Post*. Here is another report from the Canadian Press, from November 2014. The Centre for Addiction and Mental Health in Toronto is treating depression with transcranial magnetic stimulation. This is a low-cost, low-risk intervention that helps people with addictions and with depression.

Rather than reinforcing someone's addiction and keeping a person in that state, although there is a measure of harm reduction there, would we not want to exhaust opportunities to help people be delivered, be restored, live full and productive lives, be restored to

their families, and join the rest of the human family on a path to a better future?

• (1245)

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his statement, as well.

I guess the reason we have the respect for communities act is that we are concerned about public opinion on these kinds of places and are concerned about the neighbours in the areas these places are going to be, in effect, operational. That is why we think it is important to solicit their feedback, along with that of police organizations, et cetera. For us, especially as elected officials, it is pretty obvious that we need public support for these kinds of things and whether they should go in certain areas. That is what the act is about. It is about soliciting support and input on facility location.

I would like to ask the hon. member what he thinks about that. Is it a good idea to solicit public opinion, or is it good, as the opposition would suggest, to just have a one-shot approach and make this happen, regardless of peoples' opinions?

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Speaker, what the act would provide is a framework for that discussion to take place so that local law enforcement, municipal leaders, and residents would actually have a say when someone wanted to establish a facility that, after all, would be dealing with illegal drugs being provided for a safe or legal injection. The drugs themselves are illegal. They could become, in fact, magnets for criminal activity in the region. I think people need to have a discussion. They need to consider the impact of the facility on crime rates, et cetera.

Vancouver, a few years ago, after Insite, was branded the bank robbery capital of North America. That is not the kind of branding we want in our community. Yes, many of the robberies were for small amounts of money, but the same guy would be coming in, time and again, robbing banks, trying to get money to support the addiction.

Would it not be better, colleagues, to exhaust the mechanisms for helping people be delivered from these addictions and going on with productive lives?

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-2. As we have said on this side of the House, this bill is ill-considered and a reaction, frankly, to the government's inability to address a serious problem. As we know, the Supreme Court has had to intervene to guide the government to do more than it has been doing.

However, it is more than that. If we look at the legislation, it tries to address a major void in the approach of the government in dealing with what is a health issue. I would like to underline that point at the start. This is about health, the health of our neighbours and the people we represent as members of Parliament. Too often, this issue has been dressed up as a drug issue, invoking the kind of images we see on TV. Somehow it has been torqued to the point where we forget that we are talking about human beings who are facing addictions.

Government Orders

Recently I met with people who were with the recovery movement in Ottawa. I sponsored a motion, which I would love to have the rest of my colleagues support, with respect to designating a recognized recovery month in September. One of the important topics they spoke of was the people who had taken on an addiction, gone down that brave road and, with the support of many people, been able to deal with it, whether it had been alcohol or drugs. Their point was that we need to take this out of the shadows when we are talking about addictions and celebrate when people have been successful with recovery. We need to talk about it and celebrate it, not hide it or be ashamed of it. That is something we have seen with mental health. We have come a long way when it comes to mental health. However, we need to do the same with addictions.

When people are addicted to drugs, we need to see that as a health issue. It could be my kids who could become addicted, or the kids of other members, our neighbours, or friends. We have seen that pattern.

Before my mother entered politics, her first job was as a public health nurse. One of the things she had to deal with in the 1970s was the kids who were getting addicted to hard drugs and had nowhere to go. She was their first point of contact in dealing with that issue. The problem then was acknowledging that it was a problem. People were hiding behind closed doors and suffering in silence. We have made some progress in that area by now. However, when I look at this bill and listen to the government side, I think we need to take back that approach that we thought we had learned and instead say this is a health issue and that we can solve it if we work together.

It just so happens that this is timely for me. I was very lucky this past week to meet with all the executive directors of all of the community health centres in Ottawa. They were not just community health centre executive directors from Ottawa Centre—I am lucky to have four community health centres in my riding—but also from other areas in Ottawa.

I met with the executive director of the community health centre in the south end of Ottawa, which is not in my area; and from the Queensway Carleton area, which is west of me; as well as Simone Thibault, executive director of the Centretown Community Health Centre, who coordinated it. I want to give her a special mention because she hosted the meeting. Jack McCarthy from the Somerset West Community Health Centre was also there, as was the executive director from Sandy Hill.

It was David Gibson who underlined the point that we have to get smarter when it comes to dealing with addictions, and hard drugs in particular. He laid out a convincing argument on why we need to take a different approach than what is laid out in Bill C-2. Essentially, he said that we have to acknowledge that we have harmful, powerful drugs being used by members of our community. Therefore, the first thing we need to do when dealing with any addiction is to recognize it. The second is that we have to understand what the drugs are, who is taking them, and where they are taking them. Therefore, we must do an analysis. The third is to come up with solutions. It is a fairly straightforward approach that he talked about.

However, he also added to the briefing that he sent me, which I thank him for, the legal piece here, because we know that the Supreme Court has been involved.

• (1250)

I will read some of that report into the record for the benefit of our debate. One of the things he says is the following:

I consider Bill C2 as an important reminder of the lessons of the 2011 Supreme Court's ruling: that governments, and all health and public health organizations, have a duty to act in ways that enhance the health of individuals and their communities.

I do not think anyone in this House would disagree with that statement.

He does go on to say how we can improve that response to achieve the goal he laid out. One of the things he has laid out was from that Supreme Court ruling:

The effect of denying the services of [safe injection sites] to the population it serves and the...increase in the risk of death and disease to injection drug users is grossly disproportionate to any benefit that Canada might derive from presenting a uniform stance on the possession of narcotics.

That was from Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin in her decision in 2011. It goes on to say:

These sites are evidence that health authorities are increasingly recognizing that health care for injection drug users cannot amount to a stark choice between abstinence and forgoing health services.

This is the key for me. We cannot take people who are hiding in the shadows with their addictions and using injection drugs and say that we do not have any role. They are people in our communities. They are people who need help.

We cannot just say get off the drugs. The ads are fine. I have seen them, and they can have some effect, but if an individual is addicted to hard drugs and is using injection drugs, that campaign will not help. It will not do the job.

The Supreme Court was saying that we cannot lay it out and say that abstinence or denial of health services is all that is left for an individual who is a drug user. We have to look at who this person is and how we can help, as I mentioned earlier.

The image I will now tell the House about is from the report I received from one of our community health centre executive directors. It is an actual story. I think it is important, because it lays out what some of the challenges are.

This story is about a person we will call Michael, to protect his privacy. In August 2012, at the age of 19, the same age as my eldest son, Michael visited the downtown City of Ottawa community health centre to exchange his used needles for clean needles. Having declined further support that day, Michael left the community health centre. There is an accompanying photo, which I cannot show the House.

What happened next was that just steps away from the community health centre, Michael was found in an overdosed state. He was found by one of the people in the community health centre, fortunately, because if he had not been found, he would have died of an overdose.

Government Orders

He woke up in the hospital emergency department and was told that he was clinically dead when the paramedics arrived. I will just underline the point that he was 25 metres from the community health centre, and they were able to be there to help him. However, what happened to his friend was not so lucky. A week later, one of his closest friends died of an overdose.

What I am trying to say is that this is preventable. When we have people, and they are in all of our communities, make no mistake, who are dying because of overdoses and the use and misuse of injection drugs, there is a model that is not one-size-fits-all. It is an opportunity for us to deal with it.

In closing, this is not about naming and shaming. This is about taking people out of the shadows and putting them in front of our health care services and providing the supports they need.

It is 2015. The evidence is out. The studies have been done. We know that supervised sites can work. It is not one-size-fits-all. Yes, I agree with the government that it has to have community support, but if we fail to provide that support, we are turning our backs on people.

• (1255)

This is about people's lives. This is about the fact that people are dying in our streets because we are not doing enough, and it would be an abject failure, not only of our duties as members of Parliament but our collective duties as a caring community.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Anne-Marie Day (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague from Ottawa Centre a question.

The Conservative member who spoke before him said that he did his studies in the field of health. He should therefore understand that supervised injection sites exist because drug addicts need this help. Hospitals exist because there are people who are sick. More people do not get sick because hospitals are built. We do not want to create supervised injection sites so that more people will get addicted to drugs. That is ridiculous. That is the wrong way of dealing with the problem.

Does the member for Ottawa Centre think that the Conservative government should address the underlying causes of the problem? We know that billions of dollars' worth of drugs are exported from Canada to the United States and from eastern Canada to Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon, France. Would it not be better for the Conservatives to address the underlying causes of the problem rather than going after sick people?

• (1300)

Mr. Paul Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her question. Our party's view on the approach to take is completely different than that of the government. We recommend an approach that focuses on prevention and on investing in community health centres, such as the Sandy Hill Community Health Centre in downtown Ottawa and the Carlington Community Health Centre.

It is a good idea to invest in local community health centres so that they can do prevention work and provide this type of care. That is what makes us different from the government. The government

would rather act after the fact by investing in a large hospital. That is a bad idea.

[*English*]

Mr. Mathieu Ravignat (Pontiac, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated my hon. colleague's speech. Behind many of his words was compassion, and that is something this debate needs more of. When I spoke on this particular bill, I highlighted many of the points that he did.

Something the other side of the House needs to recognize is that these substances are not natural. They are highly addictive substances. They break the will of most human beings when they are taken several times, and that is what creates addiction; it creates a disease. There is much research that shows that a lot of these people come from difficult backgrounds and have turned to drugs because of various situations. The answer is more compassion, not less.

This is also a fundamental health issue. Does it make sense to take people who are already addicted and put them in an environment where they can catch even more deadly communicable diseases that can essentially kill them? I do not think so.

I would be interested to hear from my hon. colleague as to what he thinks the solution is.

Mr. Paul Dewar: Mr. Speaker, I want to put on the record a couple of statistics on Ottawa regarding this issue.

The most recent research for Ottawa finds that 73% of people who inject drugs test positive for the hepatitis C antibody, and 13% test positive for HIV. These infection rates are attributed in part to the sharing of drug injection equipment. The research finds that one in five people who inject drugs in Ottawa has injected with a needle that was previously used by someone else, and that the rate of needle sharing is more than double this rate among street-involved youth.

In other words, this is clear fact and evidence of why the status quo is not working, not only for individuals' health but the community's health. It is a community health issue and it deserves a better response from the government.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as Canadians we all have a great deal to be proud of. We live in a country where protection of public health and the maintenance of public safety are at the top of our government's priorities. Much of what we do and the decisions we make here in the chamber serve to ensure that all Canadians continue to enjoy a country with sound public safety and public health policies.

Whether it is supporting a strong response to the public health threat of the African Ebola outbreak, or taking action to protect all of us from the very real public safety threat represented by recent terrorist activities, I think Canadians are reassured that our government takes these public health and safety concerns very seriously.

Government Orders

We are also aware of the very real public safety risks that dangerous drugs like heroin represent for our communities. That is why I am pleased to rise today to speak in support of the respect for communities act, a bill that contributes to our efforts to protect public safety and health by ensuring that all perspectives are heard when it comes to the proposals for sites that would use dangerous drugs in our neighbourhoods.

The Controlled Drugs and Substances Act is Canada's federal drug control statute. Its purpose is to protect public health and maintain public safety. Under the CDSA, activities with controlled substances are prohibited unless these are specifically allowed under the act, its regulations, or are authorized under a section 56 exemption.

Section 56 of the CDSA allows the Minister of Health to grant exemptions from the provisions of the CDSA to provide access to controlled substances for unanticipated purposes. For example, in the past a section 56 was issued to enable individuals to provide humanitarian aid. Using this section of the bill for international humanitarian efforts is quite a different thing than the plans put forward for supervised injection sites.

I think we can all agree that improved consultations would be a positive step when the CDSA is being used to control an area that it is not intended to address in the first place. Bill C-2 before us today proposes to add a new section to the CDSA to specifically address supervised consumption sites. The new section would outline the specific area, which would have to be addressed by an applicant seeking exemption from the CDSA for activities involving illicit substances at a supervised consumption site.

There has been a lot of debate thus far, and we have heard a lot of criticism about these criteria. However, they are simply an expansion of the ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada in its 2011 decision regarding Insite, the supervised injection site in Vancouver. In its decision, the court said that the minister should take into consideration evidence, if any, of five factors when assessing future section 56 exemption applications for the operation of a supervised consumption site.

These five factors are, one, the impact of such a site on crime rates; two, local conditions indicating a need for such a site; three, the regulatory structure in place to support the site; four, resources available to support its maintenance; and, five, expressions of community support or opposition to the site.

In its decision, the court also emphasized the need to balance public health and safety with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Bill C-2 proposes to outline information to be provided in an exemption application to satisfy the Supreme Court of Canada's requirement to consider these factors. If we split the criteria up under public health and public safety headings, we would see that the proposed criteria are almost equally divided under each.

I would like to use the rest of my time to outline some of the public safety criteria in the bill, as well as to explain how these criteria will assist the minister into taking into account the factors outlined by the court when assessing section 56 exemption applications for supervised consumption sites.

One criterion suggests that the applicant provide a letter from the head of the police force responsible for policing the municipality in

which the site would be located that outlines his or her opinion on the proposed activities at the site, including any concerns with respect to public safety or security. This criterion expands upon the Supreme Court of Canada's factor that outlines the need for "evidence of community support or opposition".

It just makes sense to consult with the head of local police in the area where the site is proposed, to hear from the official who would be charged with securing the perimeters around the site and keeping the surrounding community and the people at the site safe.

• (1305)

This criterion is a small extension of the communication that would no doubt exist between the site applicant and the local law enforcement agency. The head of police might also be able to provide valuable insight into the exemption application itself, including measures that an applicant might wish to consider to address any potential security and public safety concerns. Dialogue with the head of the local police might also help the applicant obtain information to address other criteria, for example, a description of the potential impacts of the proposed activities at the site on public safety, including information, if any, on crime and public nuisance, information on drug consumption in the area, and law enforcement statistics on these facts, if they exist.

The Supreme Court of Canada said that the minister of health needs to consider the local conditions that indicate a need for a supervised consumption site in the area, if any exist. Given the serious risks to the public health, public safety, and communities associated with the use and production of illicit substances, exemptions to undertake activities with them should be granted only after rigorous criteria have been met.

This criterion is a part of the information used to assess these applications on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the unique circumstances surrounding any proposed site. To further expand on that, these substances are unsafe and can be the subject of criminal activity. It is in the minister's interest to know how the applicant plans to address the security of the substances at the site, as well as the safety of the staff, users of the site, and people in the vicinity. Therefore, the bill would require an applicant to provide a description of the measures that would be taken to minimize the diversion of controlled substances, and the precursors and risks to the health and safety and security of persons at the site or in the vicinity of the site, including staff members.

Again, given the serious harms of illicit substances and the criminality that is often associated with them, it is reasonable for the minister to be aware of the measures in place to protect those who work at the facility and those who use it. The Supreme Court of Canada asked the minister to consider the regulatory structure in place to support the facility, if any. How an applicant plans to minimize diversion and keep the staff and clients safe is a logical piece of information that the minister needs in order to address this Supreme Court factor before granting an exemption.

To summarize, the criteria included in Bill C-2 balance public health and public safety and are consistent with the factors identified by the Supreme Court of Canada. I urge all members of the House to vote in favour of these legislative changes, as the proposed approach will strengthen our laws and enable the government to continue to protect the health and safety of all of our communities.

• (1310)

Mr. Jamie Nicholls (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to share with the member information from 2013 that people in Prince George have the highest rate of HIV-AIDS from injected drug use in Canada. Has the member consulted with the HIV-AIDS reduction partners, community service partners, and needle exchange people in his riding on the bill?

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, I think people of Prince George are concerned. The bill is meant to address that any facility that is going to be proposed as a safe injection site would solicit public feedback and police feedback for its site application. The bill is meant to address the concerns of the whole community, not just one small part of that community.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: It being 1:15 p.m., pursuant to an order made on Thursday, February 26, 2015, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

[English]

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2 to 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

Private Members' Business

The Deputy Speaker: Normally at this time, the House would proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division at the report stage of the bill. However, pursuant to Standing Order 45, the recorded division stands deferred until Monday, March 9, 2015 at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

The hon. member for Oxford is rising.

• (1315)

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you see the clock as 1:30.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

The House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

REMOVAL OF IMPRISONMENT IN RELATION TO MANDATORY SURVEYS ACT

Mr. Joe Preston (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC) moved that Bill C-625, An Act to amend the Statistics Act (removal of imprisonment), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, today, I have the privilege of rising in the House and speaking for the first time to private members' bill, Bill C-625, an act to amend the Statistics Act.

The bill would amend the existing law and address two very important issues. First, it would eliminate the threat of jail time for those who refused to complete the census and all mandatory surveys. Second, it would ensure that historians would have the access to census related records, where permission had been granted, 92 years after the information is collected.

Our government recognizes the importance of collecting quality statistical data. Census data serves as a key resource for government departments and agencies when designing their programs and services. It is also important information for businesses in the private sector when planning ahead for future growth and success.

However, Canadians should not be threatened with jail time in order to take part in this important civic exercise. Back in 2010, our government committed to removing the penalty for jail time for anyone who refused to complete the census or any mandatory survey administered by Statistics Canada.

Private Members' Business

With this bill, I am proud to say that our government is again delivering on its commitments. My bill would remove the jail time provision from under two sections of the Statistics Act, sections 31 and 32. First, we would remove jail time for those who personally refuse to complete the census and mandatory surveys by failing to provide Statistics Canada with their personal information. Second, it would remove jail time for anyone who denies access to any administrative records that Statistics Canada may require. It would also eliminate the threat of jail time for those failing to pay a fine under those two sections.

The threat of jail time in these scenarios is simply inappropriate and it must be removed. Our government has a strong record of being tough on crime and standing up for victims. We have taken decisive action in pursuing measures that combat serious crime and ensuring that penalties and sentences reflect the gravity of the crime committed.

Our record since 2006 includes establishing the youth gang prevention fund, which provides support for successful community programs that assist youth at risk.

We have introduced mandatory prison sentences for serious gun and organized drug crimes. We have implemented mandatory prison sentences for drive-by or reckless shootings. We have toughened bail provisions and penalties for crimes that are committed with guns and linked to organized crime. We have passed new offences to target auto theft and the trafficking of property obtained by crime. We have cracked down on street racing and drug-impaired driving.

We have also announced that we are taking action so that a life sentence will truly mean life behind bars for the worst of the worst criminals.

We have established the anti-drug strategy to help prevent illicit drug use and support access to treatment for those with drug dependencies.

We have included the tougher penalties in the child predator act, which will ensure that those convicted of multiple child sexual offences serve their sentences consecutively.

We have strengthened the National Sex Offender Registry and the National DNA Data Bank to better protect our children and our communities from sexual predators.

We have established the Federal Ombudsman for Victims of Crime to provide information on victims' rights and the services for victims. We have strengthened the sentencing and monitoring of dangerous, high-risk offenders. We have introduced the Canadian victims bill of rights, giving victims of a crime a more effective voice in the criminal justice system.

Jail time is a punishment for the most serious and heinous offences. We should reserve jail time for those who truly deserve it. It is meant for real criminals, terrorists, child predators and murderers, not for Canadians who fail to complete mandatory surveys. When Canadians are asked to provide their personal information and to participate in any survey, they should be able to do so without threat of imprisonment.

Our government is committed to re-establishing Canada as a country where those who break the law are held accountable for their

crimes, where punishments are proportionate to the crime committed and where we defend the rights of our most vulnerable citizens.

• (1320)

The changes in my bill would ensure that Statistics Canada's programs reflect an appropriate balance between the collection of useful information and guaranteeing that the privacy rights of Canadians are upheld.

With that said, I come to the second purpose of the bill. The second major change to the act that I am proposing in Bill C-625 would deliver on another government commitment. An amendment would ask Canadians for their consent to release their personal information in statistical records. Once their consent is given, 92 years following the collection, Canadian information would be released to Library and Archives Canada. It is important to leave a record of present-day Canada for future generations, researchers, historians, and genealogists. The information from today will be valuable for our children and grandchildren, who will contribute to the future growth and prosperity of our great nation.

This change mirrors a 2005 decision that was debated and passed into law by the House to release census records after 92 years. My bill before the House today would simply extend this provision so that it applies to all surveys related to the census of population.

However, I will reiterate that this would not change the consent provision. It would ensure that Canadians continue to have the right to privacy and are able to decide whether their private information should be made available. With this amendment to the Statistics Act, we would be giving Canadians a choice.

In closing, I will say that this bill is good old-fashioned common sense legislation. I would encourage my colleagues from all parties to join me and our government in showing Canadians the respect and confidence they deserve. By removing jail times and maintaining records for future generations, our government would be fulfilling its commitment to continue to collect reliable statistical data while maintaining the privacy of everyday Canadians.

I hope all members will support this piece of legislation.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I support the principle behind this private member's bill, but I am puzzled by it, since we know that no one has ever been imprisoned for refusing to respond to the Statistics Canada census. It is a problem that does not exist.

Private Members' Business

The real problem is that since the Conservatives took power, they have made cuts to Statistics Canada, which has prevented this agency from collecting high-quality data. The Conservatives also eliminated the long form census, which severely impaired Statistics Canada's ability to gather reliable data to help federal and provincial governments make decisions and provide services to the public.

Could my hon. colleague speak to the fact that Statistics Canada can no longer provide data to assist with making fact-based decisions? Can he also speak to the fact that Munir Sheikh, the former chief statistician of Canada, resigned in 2010 because of the Conservatives' attack on Statistics Canada and because Statistics Canada was no longer able to gather reliable information?

• (1325)

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Preston: Mr. Speaker, the member started off by saying she is confused, and I can hopefully help with that just a little.

This bill, as I have said more than once, would remove jail time and the chance that anyone could ever go to jail for not filling out a survey for Statistics Canada. She may be right that it is not an often-enforced piece of legislation, so it should not be hard for us to collectively decide to remove it. A great compassionate government like the one that Canada currently enjoys would of course never use that legislation, but why leave it in place to provide an opportunity for bad governments that might follow in the far distant future?

On top of the other statistical data that she asked about that comes from the long form census, the short form census, and the other pieces of information collected by Statistics Canada, we currently have the household survey, a volunteer form, that complements the short form census. Ridings like Elgin—Middlesex—London, where I come from—and many members in the House have ridings exactly like it—run on volunteerism, on people being able to voluntarily help their government by supplying information or doing other things in their communities that are voluntarily driven. The national household survey would continue in that long practice.

Mr. Ted Hsu (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hope the members of his riding take paying income tax as seriously as everybody else in the country.

However, my question is specific to the member's claim that the government has promised, going back in 2011, to remove the jail terms that exist in the Statistics Act.

If the Conservatives were really serious about this in the 46 months or so of their majority government, and the thousands of pages contained in the many omnibus bills that the government has put forward compared to the one page that Bill C-625 occupies, why have they not done this yet? Why has the government waited until this Parliament has only a few weeks left and then put it into a private member's bill? What kind of way to keep a promise is that?

Mr. Joe Preston: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his kind comments about some of the better legislation that our government has been able to bring forward; some of it has been very large in structure. I thank him for suggesting that we can put anything we want in any of those pieces of legislation. I would be happy to quote him the next time somebody from his party gets up and talks about omnibus bills.

I ran in 2011, and I ran in three elections before that, but this was an issue in the 2011 election with many of the members in my riding. I made a promise that we would get rid of it. As the member knows, we use a lottery system to pick when private members' bills come forward. It is my time. It is my topic. It is what we need to do.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in today's debate on Bill C-625, An Act to amend the Statistics Act (removal of imprisonment). I would like to say right away that, as the official opposition, the NDP will be supporting the bill at second reading.

What does this bill mean? The title summarizes its intention quite well, I must admit. The bill officially removes the possibility of incarcerating someone who fails to comply with a mandatory survey. That is already in the provisions of the Statistics Act. I would also add, for the benefit of those watching us at home and following this debate closely, that no one has ever been imprisoned under the Statistics Act. That has never happened in Canada. This legislation absolutely must be fixed. I want to mention one other thing that is really important: the bill does nothing to address the serious difficulties currently facing Statistics Canada, difficulties that, in fact, it has been facing since this Conservative government took power. I will talk about that in greater detail throughout my speech.

As the official opposition, our position is quite clear and we have expressed it on a number of occasions. Ever since cuts have been made to Statistics Canada, we in the NDP have been speaking out against them. We do not think that is the right thing to do and for several reasons. With this bill, the Conservatives are once again trying to use smoke and mirrors to make us forget that they are waging an ideological and political war—and I am choosing my words carefully—against Statistics Canada. Instead of directly tackling the real problems and putting an end to the years of poor management of Statistics Canada, including for instance, the disastrous decision to eliminate the long form census, honestly, they are wasting their time creating problems where there are none.

Private Members' Business

The Conservatives' cuts have left Statistics Canada clearly underfunded and unable to produce data that is in keeping with international standards. When we had the long form census, we could be relatively proud as a country to have very good statistics on various subjects that are very important to Canadians and all community organizations across the country, from coast to coast. The Conservatives should have supported the NDP strategy to put Statistics Canada back on strong footing instead of dismantling it, eliminate jail time, and reinstate a long form census. It is no secret that we are completely in favour of eliminating the section of the legislation that could put someone in jail. I also think that reinstating the long form census would have been more useful than cutting Statistics Canada's budget.

Let me provide some context. The modern census was created in 1971 and was conducted roughly every five years until 2006. In June 2010, the Government of Canada announced it was getting rid of the mandatory long form census and replacing it with the national household survey. This is an abridged version of the long form census we used to have, and participation is voluntary. That is one of the problems we have with the Conservative government's cuts and choices.

Replacing the mandatory long form census with a voluntary survey leads to many serious problems that will not be resolved in any way whatsoever by the bill introduced by my colleague across the way.

For many Canadian communities, the quality of the data was so poor that Statistics Canada simply refused to publish it. In order to try to obtain better data, and following consultations I had with various organizations in the Laval region, I moved a motion to that effect. I will explain.

• (1330)

As an MP, I have been fortunate to meet with people from such organizations as Afeas, an advocacy group for women's rights that is present in several Quebec ridings. These women want their rights to be respected and absolutely want equality for men and women. They are serious feminists who have accomplished much in the past few decades, and I thank them for it. I would also like to thank them for their confidence, because before I was elected one of my predecessors—not in the riding I represent, but the member for Laval—had introduced a bill to establish Invisible Work Day.

Invisible work is all the work done by a caregiver, mother or father in the home. It is unpaid work that has a very significant social and economic impact in our communities.

The entire House voted in favour of the bill to recognize Invisible Work Day, which is celebrated at the beginning of April. I am proud to contribute to and participate in these celebrations every year because I think it is very important. I was raised by a very courageous woman, my mother, who did invisible work and who stayed at home to raise me and my brother when we were young. Furthermore, she showed twice as much courage when she went back to work in her fifties. It is absolutely necessary that we acknowledge the invisible work done by people to meet the needs of children or parents in need.

Afeas and I decided to take this a little further together. The Statistics Canada questionnaire has never recorded invisible work, which we know has huge social and economic implications for the country. We do not know exactly what those implications are. That is why I moved a motion to recognize invisible work and set a few guidelines, such as an exact definition of invisible work. I am also asking the government to reverse its decision to eliminate the long form census and even add a section about invisible work. That would have given us reliable statistics that would probably have helped communities and organizations affected by this. In addition, I think it could have helped the government make more informed decisions about the budget, such as how to play with the budget, how to support people who do invisible work and how to properly represent these communities and these people during a budget period.

My motion is still on the table. If the Conservatives think that it is an excellent idea, then I suggest that they move it in the House or examine it more closely. The details of the proposed motion can be found on the Parliament of Canada website. If the Canadians who are watching at home today are interested in learning more about invisible work in general or about the motion that I proposed to recognize that work, I invite them to visit the Parliament of Canada website or my website for more information. However, the Parliament of Canada website will provide them with all of the information that they need and they can find out exactly what the legislation provides for and what this motion involves.

As the official opposition, the NDP believes that we must reinstate the long form census to provide social scientists, governments and businesses with the data that they need and have been calling for since the budget cuts were made to Statistics Canada. Once again, the Conservatives are trying to fool us into thinking that they are managing Statistics Canada effectively, but the agency has had nothing but problems since the Conservatives took office.

In closing, I would like to mention that this affects many minority groups. As I said before, there are women, like the members of Afeas, but there are also members of first nations who have been negatively affected by the elimination of the long form census.

With that, I would like to mention once more that I will support my colleague's bill but that it does not directly address the problem of the budget cuts at Statistics Canada.

Private Members' Business

• (1335)

[English]

Mr. Ted Hsu (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak today to Bill C-625. The bill would amend the Statistics Act to protect the privacy of Canadians by requiring their consent for the release, which happens after 92 years, of the information they provide, in this case in a census-related household survey. It would also remove the jail term from two of the Statistics Act offence provisions, and would provide that a jail term would not be imposed in default of payment of a fine imposed under those same provisions. I see no reason not to support these provisions, therefore, I support the bill.

However, I welcome the opportunity to discuss Statistics Canada again, only a month after debate on my private member's bill, Bill C-626 to restore the quality of data that the long form census gave us.

I want to thank the Conservative strategist who decided in this election year to create the opportunity to extend the public discussion about Statistics Canada and the value to Canada of the long form census. It is clear that Canadians are interested in this issue. In fact, there are articles now in the press overseas. The information in the long form census is important to our country.

My private member's bill, Bill C-626 on the long form census, also replaced jail term with a fine for those refusing to complete a mandatory survey. Conservative MPs voted against that. The penalties are what make a survey mandatory instead of voluntary.

I want to explain why a voluntary census cannot replace a mandatory one, and that is why we need to have some sort of penalty such as these fines, which will remain after this bill is passed if there is enough time in this Parliament. This is a statement that the Chief Statistician made as he resigned in 2010 when the Conservatives eliminated the long form census.

It is all about sample bias, and I want to explain what that is. Sample bias is about the people who are not counted when one does a survey. As an example, politicians often refer to the Ottawa bubble. What happens is a certain kind of people inhabit Parliament Hill and the surrounding area. If we only talk to one another, we have to realize that is not a representative sample of the country. We understand that here on Parliament Hill.

When members are back in their own communities, if they only read letters to the editor in their newspaper, that is also not a fair sample of the community. There is a bias. That is what scientists mean by "sample bias". Politicians instinctively understand this, and I know the Conservative members of Parliament understand it. We know there is no substitute for knocking on doors and listening to a proper sample of people. We know we cannot just knock on doors in the daytime on weekdays because then we will still get a biased sample of the people we represent and want to listen to.

Does the threat of sample bias mean that all surveys need to have penalties for not filling them out? Is that the only way to do surveys? How could anybody do surveys if that were the case? No, it does not have to be like that. The mandatory long form census in Canada allows the other surveys to be voluntary. This cannot be emphasized enough. The mandatory long form census is the one that allows the

other surveys that Statistics Canada and a whole bunch of organizations, businesses included, do to be voluntary. All other surveys can and do use the mandatory long form census to correct their sample bias.

Another way of thinking about this is the people who fulfill their civic duty to Canada and fill out the mandatory long form census give up their time so other surveys can reduce their sample bias without being mandatory. This is not a big burden in bother or privacy. One big survey every five years sent to one in five households means that on average our country asks us to answer the 50 questions on the long form census every 25 years. Compare that to all the private information honest citizens report on their income tax every year.

Canadians from across the country have mobilized around this issue because they know that accurate, reliable data from a mandatory long form census is necessary if they want to use resources wisely in business, but especially when it comes to government. Over 60 organizations endorsed my private member's bill, including the Canadian Association for Business Economics, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and the Canadian Medical Association. Reinstating the census has generated support from Canadians across the country. Thousands of Canadians wrote the government and their members of Parliament asking them to reinstate the long form census.

• (1340)

Reinstating the census has generated support from Canadians across the country. Thousands of Canadians wrote the government and their members of Parliament asking them to reinstate the long form census.

I would like to end by talking about the Conservative election promise to remove the jail term. The Conservative speakers in this House have said, and I will quote the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence:

Our government committed to the removal of jail-time penalties for not filling out mandatory surveys.

They talk about "our" government. Why, in the 46 long months of the Conservative majority government, has the government not slipped this one-page bill into one of the many omnibus bills containing hundreds of pages of legislation? It could have done it. Instead, I do not think the Conservatives are serious. They are putting the elimination of the jail term into a private member's bill in a Parliament that only has a few weeks to go.

Private Members' Business

I know that I am short of time, so I will conclude by saying that I call on the government to restore the place of facts and evidence in Canadian governments and their policies, in civil society, and in the economy to make sure that Canadians identify challenges and opportunities by measuring them and measuring the success or failure of our efforts and enterprise.

We need that for Canada to thrive, prosper, and lead the world in the 21st century.

● (1345)

[Translation]

Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to Bill C-625, An Act to amend the Statistics Act. This private member's bill, which was introduced by a Conservative member, will officially eliminate the possibility of imprisoning someone who fails to respond to a mandatory survey.

I believe that no Canadian should be imprisoned for failing to fill in a survey or census form. Although I support this bill, I am still a bit perplexed, since no one in Canadian history has ever been imprisoned under the Statistics Act. This is not even necessarily a problem and does not affect Canadians' daily lives.

I have to wonder why the member chose to tackle this issue instead of the Conservative government's worrisome underfunding of Statistics Canada. He could have also looked at the elimination of the long form census, which the government replaced with the national household survey—even though this survey does not provide reliable and usable data. I urge my colleague to take a look at these issues that are vital to our country's future and that are essential in making evidence-based decisions.

The Conservative government's decision to eliminate the long form census is fairly high on the list of attacks that the government has made against science and evidence-based decision making. Like many New Democrats in the House and many experts have mentioned, this was an ill-advised decision, given how important it is for governments to have reliable and quality data on which to base their decisions. I am not just talking about the federal government here. I am also talking about provincial and municipal governments.

When the former industry minister announced that the long form census would be replaced by the national household survey or NHS, stakeholders from across the country questioned whether this was a good idea. They were concerned that the elimination of the long form census might undermine Statistics Canada's ability to collect data that the government could use to make a multitude of decisions.

The New Democrats fought tooth and nail to prevent the Conservative government from eliminating the long form census. Unlike the Conservatives, the New Democrats believe that the long form census is a valuable and essential tool for collecting clear and concise statistics, which are important for decision-making in areas such as health, housing and public transportation.

Parliamentarians and politicians use this information to make appropriate decisions on government policy. We heard from a number of experts on economy, statistics, urban planning and health,

among others, who clearly stated that the data collected by the NHS were basically unusable.

The Conservative government is undermining the capacity of current and future governments to provide Canadians with essential services. What is more, these questionable and inadequate data will negatively affect the decision-making of businesses and the federal, provincial and municipal governments.

● (1350)

Just as an aside, in 2013, the Government of Quebec published a document entitled *The Québec Research and Innovation Strategy*. The document heavily criticized the Conservative government's approach to Statistics Canada. At the time, the Government of Quebec argued that it needed a long form census, which it used to deliver health services and make decisions about our education system for example. This Government of Quebec document criticized the political motivation for getting rid of the long form census. It stated that when the government made the decision to eliminate the long form census, it assumed that a state could operate without reliable data about its own population. The Government of Quebec also stated that, in making the decision, the government took for granted that the personal preferences of elected representatives could serve as an adequate substitute for specific facts about the reality on the ground.

As the experts have said, the Conservative government's census is an inadequate substitute for the long form census. It is clearly not an acceptable substitute. However, the Conservatives are yet again refusing to listen to the experts, and they are continuing to govern with blinkers on. The Conservative government's foolish decision was yet another attack on science in Canada.

Data on immigration, place of birth, citizenship, ethnic origin and visible minorities in Canada as well as data on the languages and religions of Canadians are also problematic because of the low response rates. There is a huge problem with the current system that the Conservative government has put in place.

I would like to point out that in 2010, the former chief statistician, Munir Sheikh, could not tolerate the Conservatives' attack on the integrity and independence of Statistics Canada. In fact, he resigned to protest the Conservatives' irresponsible approach. He did try to convince them to use evidence and facts rather than following their ideology. Munir Sheikh said that Statistics Canada data were important and that they were a great help to the government in identifying financial crises and developing policies to respond to them.

I have to say that this is very ironic because this Conservative government claims that it is the best economic manager when, in reality, it is attacking the data that allow us to make reliable decisions about managing the Canadian economy.

Private Members' Business

Clearly, there is a lack of consistency on the part of this Conservative government. Since I am almost out of time, I would like to reiterate that an NDP government will bring back the long form census and reinvest in Statistics Canada so that we can make reliable decisions and continue delivering services to Canadians across the country.

● (1355)

It is crucial to continue to support science, evidence and data in Canada, rather than ideology.

[English]

Hon. Mike Lake (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-625 and the commitments our government made to amend the Statistics Act. Our government committed to removing the penalty of jail time for anyone who refuses to complete the census or any mandatory Statistics Canada survey. We also committed to allowing for the release of historical household survey records related to the census of population.

Currently the Statistics Act provides only for the release of the census of population records. This amendment would allow Statistics Canada to transfer census-related records, including those for all voluntary surveys, to Library and Archives Canada for genealogical and historical research.

A bill on the release of census records after 92 years was debated and passed into law by the House in 2005. That bill ensured that individuals had the choice of deciding if they wanted their census information made publicly available 92 years later. Prior to 2005, many members of Parliament received letters, calls, and petitions of support from Canadians who felt strongly that historical records are a fundamental part of Canada's heritage and should be made available to everyone.

I am sure we would all agree that the reasons genealogists, historians, and researchers want access to historical information are legitimate and important. It is also as important to leave a record of present-day Canada for future generations as it is to have historical records from 1911. This amendment makes it possible for all of us to have a place in history and contribute to the future growth and prosperity of our great nation. However, while there is undeniable value attached to historical census records, an important principle of privacy does come into play.

I would like to take a few minutes to quickly outline the steps that led to the introduction of the census bill in 2005. During the late 1990s, a number of genealogical associations, researchers, and other interested individuals held a campaign to express dissatisfaction with the inability to access historical records for censuses after 1901. The census records up to and including 1901 were not taken with a guarantee of confidentiality, and records were therefore made available to the public 92 years after the event. Census information after 1901 was collected with a promise of confidentiality. As a result, these census records were never made available to the public. It was therefore recognized that clarifications to the Statistics Act were required.

The Statistics Act contains confidentiality provisions that protect all census and survey information collected by Statistics Canada.

The 2005 amendments made it possible to release records from the census of population 92 years after the census has taken place. The bill before the House today would extend this provision to surveys related to the census of population. Therefore, it would ensure the release provisions also apply to the 2011 national household survey and any other future surveys related to the census of population.

As with the census, Canadians responding to the national household survey are asked to consent to the release of their personal information after 92 years. If consent is given, 92 years following collection their information will be released to Library and Archives Canada. This amendment allows Canadians to decide if others can have access to their personal information.

Canadians should have the right to decide for themselves if they want their personal records to be made publicly available in the future. If they answer no, their information will never be publicly accessible.

With this point in mind, I would like to assure my colleagues that the addition of a consent question will not impact the timeliness of statistical data from the national household survey. Information that does not identify individuals will be disseminated by Statistics Canada in a timely fashion, as was the case for the 2011 national household survey.

In closing, I would ask hon. colleagues for their support for Bill C-625. This government firmly believes that no Canadian should ever face the threat of jail time for failing to respond to a survey. The bill seeks to remove jail-time penalties for Canadians who fail to respond to mandatory surveys or who do not release administrative data.

The amendments proposed in the bill would remove this threat and ensure that Canadians can respond to surveys in complete confidence. The bill also seeks to make administrative records accessible, provided Canadians give their consent.

I would urge all members to support Bill C-625, to ensure that important records from today can be made available to all Canadians in the future, and to ensure that we remove the unnecessary threat of jail-time penalties.

● (1400)

Mr. Jamie Nicholls (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in the past few years, the Conservatives have unfortunately been the victim of the most human of emotions, that of fear. While I understand the inclination to embrace this most human of emotions, I do not find it logical.

Private Members' Business

Statistics and their collection are indeed logical. In these times we must embrace the interaction of science and the imagination. Statistics Canada gives Canadians tools and data that are rooted in science. In order for the thinkers of tomorrow to become tomorrow's innovators, we need to give them these tools. It is unfortunate that so many cuts have been made to this agency in the past years.

While we will support Bill C-625 at second reading, we are concerned that the cuts to Statistics Canada have affected the efficiency of the data that is provided. This bill before us in the House today does nothing to address any of the serious issues facing Statistics Canada. What it does is formally remove the possibility of imprisonment for failure to complete the mandatory survey. However, when we look at the historical record of this, no person has ever been imprisoned under the Statistics Act. Therefore, I return to where I began my discourse and the fact that this bill is yet again playing on the emotion of fear. It is saying to Canadians that they could be imprisoned when in fact they never have been. It is yet another example of electoral style legislating, trying to market fear through legislation, a type of window dressing to gloss over the war that the Conservatives have been waging against science in general and against Statistics Canada in particular, including the disastrous decision to remove the long form census.

Now the Conservatives are wasting time and creating problems where none exist. There are no problems that exist here, though the bill may permit the Conservatives to speak to a fear that Canadians have. I have seen that in many other bills they have presented before the House, which have been presented in order to inculcate fear in Canadians. As I have said, it is a powerful human emotion, and it often works with the electorate if one promotes fear in the hearts of Canadians.

However, our vision on this side is quite different. We prefer the human emotions of love, the idea of hope and being optimistic about our future, and we refuse to play on the fears of Canadians. We stand here to protect the rights of Canadians, who are perhaps fearful that the government would enact legislation that would decrease their privacy rights. That is certainly true, but the idea of imprisoning Canadians under the Statistics Act is laughable, because it has never happened. No one has ever been imprisoned under this act.

Instead of scrapping the long form census, as the Conservatives did, and making cuts to Statistics Canada, they should have supported the NDP's plan to fix Statistics Canada, remove the possibility of imprisonment, and restore the long form census. Because they did not take this approach, unfortunately the data that Canadians can get from Statistics Canada is not of the same quality. Officials from Statistics Canada have said the same thing.

• (1405)

We have seen in committee studies and in numerous places that whenever Statistics Canada appears as a witness or whenever people are using Statistics Canada data to try to make a case, it is always pointed out that the data is now insufficient because of the elimination of the long form census.

As I said, no person has ever been imprisoned for an offence under the Statistics Act. Some people have been charged under the Statistics Act, but they never did actual jail time, and their charges

were linked to their activities in protesting against the Statistics Act. However, no one has ever been put in jail for this.

In 2006, Statistics Canada reported that there were 64 cases of non-compliance, with a mandatory sentence. The cases were prosecuted and resolved, but none of them resulted in prison. Canadians were told that if they did not fill out the long form census, they would be put in prison for that wrongdoing, but it never actually happened. No one was ever actually put in prison for non-compliance with the long form census.

The NDP believes that the long form census has to be restored to provide social scientists, governments, and businesses with the data that they need. The Conservatives are merely providing window dressing to look like they are effective at managing Statistics Canada, but we have seen problem after problem at the agency under the current government.

Many people agree with our position that independence should be restored to Statistics Canada. We should give it the tools that Canadians need to be the innovators of tomorrow, to mate their imagination with science and come up with the innovations of tomorrow.

Professor C.E.S. Franks, from Queen's University, said in 2010 that:

The issue of a voluntary survey rather than a mandatory census is far more than the "technical statistical issue" it was described as by Mr. Sheikh. The voluntary survey will fundamentally weaken the data on which many of Canada's government and business policies are based.

La Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne said that it applied to the Federal Court for an injunction against the Conservative government on the grounds that the voluntary NHS violated the Official Languages Act by providing less accurate information about French-speaking communities. The injunction was not granted by the court.

The fact that we do not have the proper statistics on minority language communities is a serious problem, because it makes enforcement of the Official Languages Act more difficult, and over the past years we have seen the attitude that the government has towards official languages.

For instance, just yesterday, when the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages was at committee, she used the words "official languages" and "national languages" interchangeably, as if they were the same thing. I pointed out to her that the difference between an "official" language and a "national" language is that a national language does not have any protection under the Official Languages Act. The legal status of a national language is not as strong as that of an official language, so to hear those terms used interchangeably is troubling indeed.

We do have the Official Languages Act in this country. Minority linguistic communities depend on this act to fight for their rights, but we need the statistics to show where minority Francophone speakers are and where minority Anglophone speakers in Quebec are so that we can provide the proper services, design the programs that these communities need, and evolve the programs, services, and financing of those services according to need. For that we need statistics.

The mandatory long form census was doing a good job of that. It is true that there was the threat of imprisonment on the books. No one, however, has been—

• (1410)

The Deputy Speaker: The member has exceeded his time by almost a minute.

Seeing no member rise, the member for Elgin—Middlesex—London will have five minutes for his response. Unfortunately, we have only two minutes remaining in today's debate.

Mr. Joe Preston (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the constituents of Elgin—Middlesex—London for helping me come up with this idea for a private member's bill, the member for Chatham-Kent—Essex for seconding it today, and members of all parties who have suggested they are in favour of it, some reading a lot more into it than there is. I would like to thank them all.

It would be good that Canadians could no longer go to jail for not filling out census forms.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Private Members' Business

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 93 the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, March 11, immediately before the time provided for private members' business.

[*Translation*]

It being 2:15 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, March 9, 2015, at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28(2) and 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2:14 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. ANDREW SCHEER

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. JOE COMARTIN

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BARRY DEVOLIN

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BRUCE STANTON

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. ANDREW SCHEER

MRS. STELLA AMBLER

HON. JOHN DUNCAN

HON. DOMINIC LEBLANC

MR. PHILIP TOONE

MS. NYCOLE TURMEL

HON. PETER VAN LOAN

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Forty-first Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	Alberta	CPC
Adams, Eve	Mississauga—Brampton South	Ontario	Lib.
Adler, Mark	York Centre	Ontario	CPC
Aglukkaq, Hon. Leona, Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council	Nunavut	Nunavut	CPC
Albas, Dan, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Okanagan—Coquihalla	British Columbia	CPC
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	Ontario	CPC
Alexander, Hon. Chris, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Ajax—Pickering	Ontario	CPC
Allen, Malcolm	Welland	Ontario	NDP
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	New Brunswick	CPC
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	Ontario	CPC
Ambler, Stella	Mississauga South	Ontario	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, Minister of Health	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	Alberta	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	CPC
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Consular	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Saskatchewan	CPC
Andrews, Scott	Avalon	Newfoundland and Labrador	Ind.
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	Ontario	NDP
Armstrong, Scott, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister of Labour	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley	Nova Scotia	CPC
Ashfield, Hon. Keith	Fredericton	New Brunswick	CPC
Ashton, Niki	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Aspin, Jay	Nipissing—Timiskaming	Ontario	CPC
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	British Columbia	NDP
Aubin, Robert	Trois-Rivières	Québec	NDP
Ayala, Paulina	Honoré-Mercier	Québec	NDP
Baird, Hon. John	Ottawa West—Nepean	Ontario	CPC
Barlow, John	Macleod	Alberta	CPC
Bateman, Joyce	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	CPC
Bélangier, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	Québec	Ind.
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	Alberta	CPC
Benskin, Tyrone	Jeanne-Le Ber	Québec	NDP
Bergen, Hon. Candice, Minister of State (Social Development)	Portage—Lisgar	Manitoba	CPC
Bernier, Hon. Maxime, Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism, and Agriculture)	Beauce	Québec	CPC
Bevington, Dennis	Northwest Territories	Northwest Territories	NDP
Bezan, James, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Selkirk—Interlake	Manitoba	CPC
Blanchette, Denis	Louis-Hébert	Québec	NDP
Blanchette-Lamothe, Lysane	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Québec	NDP
Blaney, Hon. Steven, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Lévis—Bellechasse	Québec	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Block, Kelly, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	Saskatchewan	CPC
Boivin, Françoise	Gatineau	Québec	NDP
Borg, Charmaine	Terrebonne—Blainville	Québec	NDP
Boughen, Ray	Palliser	Saskatchewan	CPC
Boulerice, Alexandre	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie	Québec	NDP
Boutin-Sweet, Marjolaine	Hochelaga	Québec	NDP
Brahmi, Tarik	Saint-Jean	Québec	NDP
Braid, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities	Kitchener—Waterloo	Ontario	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Saskatchewan	CPC
Brison, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Brosseau, Ruth Ellen	Berthier—Maskinongé	Québec	NDP
Brown, Gordon	Leeds—Grenville	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Lois, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development	Newmarket—Aurora	Ontario	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	Ontario	CPC
Bruinooge, Rod	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	CPC
Butt, Brad	Mississauga—Streetsville	Ontario	CPC
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Calandra, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs	Oak Ridges—Markham	Ontario	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	CPC
Cannan, Hon. Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	British Columbia	CPC
Carmichael, John	Don Valley West	Ontario	CPC
Caron, Guy	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	Québec	NDP
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Casey, Sean	Charlottetown	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Cash, Andrew	Davenport	Ontario	NDP
Chan, Arnold	Scarborough—Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Charlton, Chris	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	NDP
Chicoine, Sylvain	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	Québec	NDP
Chisholm, Robert	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	Nova Scotia	NDP
Chisu, Corneliu	Pickering—Scarborough East	Ontario	CPC
Chong, Hon. Michael	Wellington—Halton Hills	Ontario	CPC
Choquette, François	Drummond	Québec	NDP
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	Ontario	NDP
Clarke, Rob	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River	Saskatchewan	CPC
Cleary, Ryan	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	Newfoundland and Labrador	NDP
Clement, Hon. Tony, President of the Treasury Board	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Ontario	CPC
Comartin, Joe, The Deputy Speaker	Windsor—Tecumseh	Ontario	NDP
Côté, Raymond	Beauport—Limoilou	Québec	NDP
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Québec	Lib.
Crockatt, Joan	Calgary Centre	Alberta	CPC
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	British Columbia	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Daniel, Joe	Don Valley East	Ontario	CPC
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	Ontario	CPC
Davies, Don	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	NDP
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
Day, Anne-Marie	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	Québec	NDP
Dechert, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Mississauga—Erindale	Ontario	CPC
Devolin, Barry, The Acting Speaker	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	Ontario	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	NDP
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Québec	Lib.
Dionne Labelle, Pierre	Rivière-du-Nord	Québec	NDP
Donnelly, Fin	New Westminster—Coquitlam	British Columbia	NDP
Doré Lefebvre, Rosane	Alfred-Pellan	Québec	NDP
Dreeshen, Earl	Red Deer	Alberta	CPC
Dubé, Matthew	Chambly—Borduas	Québec	NDP
Dubourg, Emmanuel	Bourassa	Québec	Lib.
Duncan, Hon. John, Minister of State and Chief Government Whip	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	CPC
Duncan, Kirsty	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Duncan, Linda	Edmonton—Strathcona	Alberta	NDP
Dusseault, Pierre-Luc	Sherbrooke	Québec	NDP
Dykstra, Rick, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	St. Catharines	Ontario	CPC
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eglinski, Jim	Yellowhead	Alberta	CPC
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Falk, Ted	Provencher	Manitoba	CPC
Fantino, Hon. Julian, Associate Minister of National Defence	Vaughan	Ontario	CPC
Fast, Hon. Ed, Minister of International Trade	Abbotsford	British Columbia	CPC
Findlay, Hon. Kerry-Lynne D., Minister of National Revenue	Delta—Richmond East	British Columbia	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Haldimand—Norfolk	Ontario	CPC
Fletcher, Hon. Steven	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	Manitoba	CPC
Foote, Judy	Random—Burin—St. George's	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Fortin, Jean-François	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia	Québec	FD
Freeland, Chrystia	Toronto Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Freeman, Mylène	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	Québec	NDP
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Galipeau, Royal	Ottawa—Orléans	Ontario	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Ontario	CPC
Garneau, Marc	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Québec	Lib.
Garrison, Randall	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	NDP
Genest, Réjean	Shefford	Québec	NDP
Genest-Jourdain, Jonathan	Manicouagan	Québec	NDP
Giguère, Alain	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	Québec	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Gill, Parm, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	Brampton—Springdale	Ontario	CPC
Glover, Hon. Shelly, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	CPC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goguen, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	New Brunswick	CPC
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Goodyear, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario)	Cambridge	Ontario	CPC
Gosal, Hon. Bal, Minister of State (Sport)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Ontario	CPC
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	Québec	CPC
Gravelle, Claude	Nickel Belt	Ontario	NDP
Grewal, Nina	Fleetwood—Port Kells	British Columbia	CPC
Groguhé, Sadia	Saint-Lambert	Québec	NDP
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	CPC
Harris, Dan	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	NDP
Harris, Jack	St. John's East	Newfoundland and Labrador	NDP
Harris, Richard	Cariboo—Prince George	British Columbia	CPC
Hassainia, Sana	Verchères—Les Patriotes	Québec	Ind.
Hawn, Hon. Laurie	Edmonton Centre	Alberta	CPC
Hayes, Bryan	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	CPC
Hiebert, Russ	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale	British Columbia	CPC
Hillyer, Jim	Lethbridge	Alberta	CPC
Hoback, Randy	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	CPC
Holder, Hon. Ed, Minister of State (Science and Technology)	London West	Ontario	CPC
Hsu, Ted	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Hughes, Carol	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing	Ontario	NDP
Hyer, Bruce	Thunder Bay—Superior North	Ontario	GP
Jacob, Pierre	Brome—Missisquoi	Québec	NDP
James, Roxanne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	CPC
Jones, Yvonne	Labrador	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Julian, Peter	Burnaby—New Westminster	British Columbia	NDP
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission	British Columbia	CPC
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	South Shore—St. Margaret's	Nova Scotia	CPC
Kellway, Matthew	Beaches—East York	Ontario	NDP
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Minister of National Defence and Minister for Multiculturalism	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	CPC
Kent, Hon. Peter	Thornhill	Ontario	CPC
Kerr, Greg	West Nova	Nova Scotia	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed	Souris—Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	CPC
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	Ontario	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lake, Hon. Mike, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Edmonton—Mill Woods— Beaumont.....	Alberta	CPC
Lamoureux, Kevin	Winnipeg North	Manitoba	Lib.
Lapointe, François	Montmagny—L'Islet— Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup	Québec	NDP
Larose, Jean-François	Repentigny	Québec	FD
Latendresse, Alexandrine	Louis-Saint-Laurent.....	Québec	NDP
Lauzon, Guy.....	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengary	Ontario	CPC
Laverdière, Hélène	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	Québec	NDP
Lebel, Hon. Denis, Minister of Infrastructure, Communities and Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of the Economic Devel- opment Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean.....	Québec	CPC
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour.....	New Brunswick.....	Lib.
LeBlanc, Hélène.....	LaSalle—Émard.....	Québec	NDP
Leef, Ryan	Yukon.....	Yukon	CPC
Leitch, Hon. K. Kellie, Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women	Simcoe—Grey	Ontario	CPC
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs.....	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell .	Ontario	CPC
Leslie, Megan	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
Leung, Chungsen, Parliamentary Secretary for Multiculturalism ...	Willowdale	Ontario	CPC
Liu, Laurin.....	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.....	Québec	NDP
Lizon, Wladyslaw	Mississauga East—Cooksville .	Ontario	CPC
Lobb, Ben	Huron—Bruce.....	Ontario	CPC
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre.....	Saskatchewan	CPC
Lunney, James.....	Nanaimo—Alberni	British Columbia	CPC
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island....	Lib.
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Central Nova	Nova Scotia	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave	Oxford	Ontario	CPC
Maguire, Larry	Brandon—Souris.....	Manitoba	CPC
Mai, Hoang	Brossard—La Prairie	Québec	NDP
Marston, Wayne	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek .	Ontario	NDP
Martin, Pat.....	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Masse, Brian.....	Windsor West	Ontario	NDP
Mathyssen, Irene	London—Fanshawe.....	Ontario	NDP
May, Elizabeth	Saanich—Gulf Islands	British Columbia	GP
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	British Columbia	CPC
McCallum, Hon. John	Markham—Unionville.....	Ontario	Lib.
McColeman, Phil.....	Brant	Ontario	CPC
McGuinty, David.....	Ottawa South.....	Ontario	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John	Scarborough—Guildwood.....	Ontario	Lib.
McLeod, Cathy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and for Western Economic Diversification	Kamloops—Thompson— Cariboo	British Columbia	CPC
Menegakis, Costas, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Richmond Hill	Ontario	CPC
Michaud, Éline	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier.....	Québec	NDP
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound...	Ontario	CPC
Moore, Christine	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	Québec	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Moore, Hon. James, Minister of Industry	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	British Columbia	CPC
Moore, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Fundy Royal	New Brunswick	CPC
Morin, Dany	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	Québec	NDP
Morin, Isabelle	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce— Lachine	Québec	NDP
Morin, Marc-André	Laurentides—Labelle	Québec	NDP
Morin, Marie-Claude	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	Québec	NDP
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	Québec	Ind.
Mulcair, Hon. Thomas, Leader of the Opposition	Outremont	Québec	NDP
Murray, Joyce	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Nantel, Pierre	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	Québec	NDP
Nash, Peggy	Parkdale—High Park	Ontario	NDP
Nicholls, Jamie	Vaudreuil-Soulanges	Québec	NDP
Nicholson, Hon. Rob, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Niagara Falls	Ontario	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	Ontario	CPC
Nunez-Melo, José	Laval	Québec	NDP
Obhrai, Hon. Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights	Calgary East	Alberta	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	Ontario	CPC
Oliver, Hon. Joe, Minister of Finance	Eglinton—Lawrence	Ontario	CPC
O'Neill Gordon, Tilly	Miramichi	New Brunswick	CPC
Opitz, Ted	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	CPC
O'Toole, Hon. Erin, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Durham	Ontario	CPC
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Québec	Ind.
Papillon, Annick	Québec	Québec	NDP
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Minister of International Development and Minister for La Francophonie	Mégantic—L'Érable	Québec	CPC
Patry, Claude	Jonquière—Alma	Québec	BQ
Payne, LaVar	Medicine Hat	Alberta	CPC
Péclet, Ève	La Pointe-de-l'Île	Québec	NDP
Perkins, Pat	Whitby—Oshawa	Ontario	CPC
Perreault, Manon	Montcalm	Québec	Ind.
Pilon, François	Laval—Les Îles	Québec	NDP
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet— Bécancour	Québec	BQ
Poilievre, Hon. Pierre, Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform	Nepean—Carleton	Ontario	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Ontario	CPC
Quach, Anne Minh-Thu	Beauharnois—Salaberry	Québec	NDP
Rafferty, John	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	Ontario	NDP
Raitt, Hon. Lisa, Minister of Transport	Halton	Ontario	CPC
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	Alberta	CPC
Rankin, Murray	Victoria	British Columbia	NDP
Rathgeber, Brent	Edmonton—St. Albert	Alberta	Ind.
Ravignat, Mathieu	Pontiac	Québec	NDP
Raynault, Francine	Joliette	Québec	NDP
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Ontario	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Rempel, Hon. Michelle, Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)	Calgary Centre-North	Alberta	CPC
Richards, Blake	Wild Rose	Alberta	CPC
Rickford, Hon. Greg, Minister of Natural Resources and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario	Kenora	Ontario	CPC
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	CPC
Rousseau, Jean	Compton—Stanstead	Québec	NDP
Saganash, Romeo	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	Québec	NDP
Sandhu, Jasbir	Surrey North	British Columbia	NDP
Saxton, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	North Vancouver	British Columbia	CPC
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Québec	Lib.
Scheer, Hon. Andrew, Speaker of the House of Commons	Regina—Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	CPC
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	Ontario	CPC
Scott, Craig	Toronto—Danforth	Ontario	NDP
Seeback, Kyle	Brampton West	Ontario	CPC
Sellah, Djaouida	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	Québec	NDP
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Shea, Hon. Gail, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	CPC
Shipley, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Ontario	CPC
Shory, Devinder	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	CPC
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Newfoundland and Labrador	Lib.
Sims, Jinny Jogindera	Newton—North Delta	British Columbia	NDP
Sitsabaiesan, Rathika	Scarborough—Rouge River	Ontario	NDP
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	Manitoba	CPC
Sopuck, Robert	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	Manitoba	CPC
Sorenson, Hon. Kevin, Minister of State (Finance)	Crowfoot	Alberta	CPC
Stanton, Bruce, The Acting Speaker	Simcoe North	Ontario	CPC
St-Denis, Lise	Saint-Maurice—Champlain	Québec	Lib.
Stewart, Kennedy	Burnaby—Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	Alberta	CPC
Strahl, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	British Columbia	CPC
Sullivan, Mike	York South—Weston	Ontario	NDP
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale	Ontario	CPC
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	Ontario	CPC
Toet, Lawrence	Elmwood—Transcona	Manitoba	CPC
Toone, Philip	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Québec	NDP
Tremblay, Jonathan	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord	Québec	NDP
Trost, Brad	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Saskatchewan	CPC
Trottier, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for La Francophonie	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Ontario	CPC
Trudeau, Justin	Papineau	Québec	Lib.
Truppe, Susan, Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women	London North Centre	Ontario	CPC
Turmel, Nycole	Hull—Aylmer	Québec	NDP
Uppal, Hon. Tim, Minister of State (Multiculturalism)	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	Alberta	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Valcourt, Hon. Bernard, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development.....	Madawaska—Restigouche	New Brunswick.....	CPC
Valeriote, Frank	Guelph	Ontario	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	Ontario	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	York—Simcoe.....	Ontario	CPC
Vaughan, Adam	Trinity—Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Vellacott, Maurice.....	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin.....	Saskatchewan	CPC
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	Ontario	CPC
Warawa, Mark	Langley	British Columbia	CPC
Warkentin, Chris, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services.....	Peace River.....	Alberta	CPC
Watson, Jeff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport .	Essex.....	Ontario	CPC
Weston, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	British Columbia	CPC
Weston, Rodney	Saint John	New Brunswick.....	CPC
Wilks, David	Kootenay—Columbia.....	British Columbia	CPC
Williamson, John.....	New Brunswick Southwest.....	New Brunswick.....	CPC
Wong, Hon. Alice, Minister of State (Seniors)	Richmond	British Columbia	CPC
Woodworth, Stephen.....	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	CPC
Yelich, Hon. Lynne, Minister of State (Foreign Affairs and Consular)	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	CPC
Young, Terence.....	Oakville.....	Ontario	CPC
Young, Wai	Vancouver South.....	British Columbia	CPC
Yurdiga, David	Fort McMurray—Athabasca ...	Alberta	CPC
Zimmer, Bob	Prince George—Peace River...	British Columbia	CPC
VACANCY	Peterborough	Ontario	
VACANCY	Sudbury.....	Ontario	

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session—Forty-first Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (28)		
Ablonczy, Hon. Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	CPC
Ambrose, Hon. Rona, Minister of Health	Edmonton—Spruce Grove	CPC
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	CPC
Barlow, John	Macleod	CPC
Benoit, Leon	Vegreville—Wainwright	CPC
Calkins, Blaine	Wetaskiwin	CPC
Crockatt, Joan	Calgary Centre	CPC
Dreeshen, Earl	Red Deer	CPC
Duncan, Linda	Edmonton—Strathcona	NDP
Eglinski, Jim	Yellowhead	CPC
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	CPC
Harper, Right Hon. Stephen, Prime Minister	Calgary Southwest	CPC
Hawn, Hon. Laurie	Edmonton Centre	CPC
Hillyer, Jim	Lethbridge	CPC
Kenney, Hon. Jason, Minister of National Defence and Minister for Multiculturalism	Calgary Southeast	CPC
Lake, Hon. Mike, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry	Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont	CPC
Obhrai, Hon. Deepak, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights	Calgary East	CPC
Payne, LaVar	Medicine Hat	CPC
Rajotte, James	Edmonton—Leduc	CPC
Rathgeber, Brent	Edmonton—St. Albert	Ind.
Rempel, Hon. Michelle, Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)	Calgary Centre-North	CPC
Richards, Blake	Wild Rose	CPC
Shory, Devinder	Calgary Northeast	CPC
Sorenson, Hon. Kevin, Minister of State (Finance)	Crowfoot	CPC
Storseth, Brian	Westlock—St. Paul	CPC
Uppal, Hon. Tim, Minister of State (Multiculturalism)	Edmonton—Sherwood Park	CPC
Warkentin, Chris, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Peace River	CPC
Yurdiga, David	Fort McMurray—Athabasca	CPC
BRITISH COLUMBIA (36)		
Albas, Dan, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board	Okanagan—Coquihalla	CPC
Atamanenko, Alex	British Columbia Southern Interior	NDP
Cannan, Hon. Ron	Kelowna—Lake Country	CPC
Crowder, Jean	Nanaimo—Cowichan	NDP
Cullen, Nathan	Skeena—Bulkley Valley	NDP
Davies, Don	Vancouver Kingsway	NDP
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Donnelly, Fin	New Westminster—Coquitlam	NDP
Duncan, Hon. John, Minister of State and Chief Government Whip	Vancouver Island North	CPC
Fast, Hon. Ed, Minister of International Trade	Abbotsford	CPC
Findlay, Hon. Kerry-Lynne D., Minister of National Revenue	Delta—Richmond East	CPC
Fry, Hon. Hedy	Vancouver Centre	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Garrison, Randall	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	NDP
Grewal, Nina	Fleetwood—Port Kells	CPC
Harris, Richard	Cariboo—Prince George	CPC
Hiebert, Russ	South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale	CPC
Julian, Peter	Burnaby—New Westminster	NDP
Kamp, Randy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission	CPC
Lunney, James	Nanaimo—Alberni	CPC
May, Elizabeth	Saanich—Gulf Islands	GP
Mayes, Colin	Okanagan—Shuswap	CPC
McLeod, Cathy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and for Western Economic Diversification	Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo	CPC
Moore, Hon. James, Minister of Industry	Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam	CPC
Murray, Joyce	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Rankin, Murray	Victoria	NDP
Sandhu, Jasbir	Surrey North	NDP
Saxton, Andrew, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	North Vancouver	CPC
Sims, Jinny Jogindera	Newton—North Delta	NDP
Stewart, Kennedy	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Strahl, Mark, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon	CPC
Warawa, Mark	Langley	CPC
Weston, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country	CPC
Wilks, David	Kootenay—Columbia	CPC
Wong, Hon. Alice, Minister of State (Seniors)	Richmond	CPC
Young, Wai	Vancouver South	CPC
Zimmer, Bob	Prince George—Peace River	CPC
MANITOBA (14)		
Ashton, Niki	Churchill	NDP
Bateman, Joyce	Winnipeg South Centre	CPC
Bergen, Hon. Candice, Minister of State (Social Development)	Portage—Lisgar	CPC
Bezan, James, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence	Selkirk—Interlake	CPC
Bruinooge, Rod	Winnipeg South	CPC
Falk, Ted	Provencher	CPC
Fletcher, Hon. Steven	Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia	CPC
Glover, Hon. Shelly, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages	Saint Boniface	CPC
Lamoureux, Kevin	Winnipeg North	Lib.
Maguire, Larry	Brandon—Souris	CPC
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Smith, Joy	Kildonan—St. Paul	CPC
Sopuck, Robert	Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	CPC
Toet, Lawrence	Elmwood—Transcona	CPC
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Allen, Mike	Tobique—Mactaquac	CPC
Ashfield, Hon. Keith	Fredericton	CPC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Goguen, Robert, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
LeBlanc, Hon. Dominic	Beauséjour	Lib.
Moore, Hon. Rob, Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Fundy Royal	CPC
O'Neill Gordon, Tilly	Miramichi	CPC
Valcourt, Hon. Bernard, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development	Madawaska—Restigouche	CPC
Weston, Rodney	Saint John	CPC
Williamson, John	New Brunswick Southwest	CPC

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (7)

Andrews, Scott	Avalon	Ind.
Byrne, Hon. Gerry	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Cleary, Ryan	St. John's South—Mount Pearl	NDP
Foote, Judy	Random—Burin—St. George's	Lib.
Harris, Jack	St. John's East	NDP
Jones, Yvonne	Labrador	Lib.
Simms, Scott	Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor	Lib.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (1)

Bevington, Dennis	Northwest Territories	NDP
-------------------	-----------------------	-----

NOVA SCOTIA (11)

Armstrong, Scott, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister of Labour	Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley	CPC
Brison, Hon. Scott	Kings—Hants	Lib.
Chisholm, Robert	Dartmouth—Cole Harbour	NDP
Cuzner, Rodger	Cape Breton—Canso	Lib.
Eyking, Hon. Mark	Sydney—Victoria	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	South Shore—St. Margaret's	CPC
Kerr, Greg	West Nova	CPC
Leslie, Megan	Halifax	NDP
MacKay, Hon. Peter, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Central Nova	CPC
Regan, Hon. Geoff	Halifax West	Lib.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	NDP

NUNAVUT (1)

Aglukkaq, Hon. Leona, Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council	Nunavut	CPC
--	---------	-----

ONTARIO (104)

Adams, Eve	Mississauga—Brampton South	Lib.
Adler, Mark	York Centre	CPC
Albrecht, Harold	Kitchener—Conestoga	CPC
Alexander, Hon. Chris, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Ajax—Pickering	CPC
Allen, Malcolm	Welland	NDP
Allison, Dean	Niagara West—Glanbrook	CPC
Ambler, Stella	Mississauga South	CPC
Angus, Charlie	Timmins—James Bay	NDP
Aspin, Jay	Nipissing—Timiskaming	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Baird, Hon. John	Ottawa West—Nepean	CPC
Bélanger, Hon. Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bennett, Hon. Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Braid, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities	Kitchener—Waterloo	CPC
Brown, Gordon	Leeds—Grenville	CPC
Brown, Lois, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development	Newmarket—Aurora	CPC
Brown, Patrick	Barrie	CPC
Butt, Brad	Mississauga—Streetsville	CPC
Calandra, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs	Oak Ridges—Markham	CPC
Carmichael, John	Don Valley West	CPC
Carrie, Colin, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment	Oshawa	CPC
Cash, Andrew	Davenport	NDP
Chan, Arnold	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Charlton, Chris	Hamilton Mountain	NDP
Chisu, Corneliu	Pickering—Scarborough East	CPC
Chong, Hon. Michael	Wellington—Halton Hills	CPC
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP
Clement, Hon. Tony, President of the Treasury Board	Parry Sound—Muskoka	CPC
Comartin, Joe, The Deputy Speaker	Windsor—Tecumseh	NDP
Daniel, Joe	Don Valley East	CPC
Davidson, Patricia	Sarnia—Lambton	CPC
Dechert, Bob, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	Mississauga—Erindale	CPC
Devolin, Barry, The Acting Speaker	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	CPC
Dewar, Paul	Ottawa Centre	NDP
Duncan, Kirsty	Etobicoke North	Lib.
Dykstra, Rick, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage	St. Catharines	CPC
Fantino, Hon. Julian, Associate Minister of National Defence	Vaughan	CPC
Finley, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Haldimand—Norfolk	CPC
Freeland, Chrystia	Toronto Centre	Lib.
Galipeau, Royal	Ottawa—Orléans	CPC
Gallant, Cheryl	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	CPC
Gill, Parm, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade	Brampton—Springdale	CPC
Goodyear, Hon. Gary, Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario)	Cambridge	CPC
Gosal, Hon. Bal, Minister of State (Sport)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	CPC
Gravelle, Claude	Nickel Belt	NDP
Harris, Dan	Scarborough Southwest	NDP
Hayes, Bryan	Sault Ste. Marie	CPC
Holder, Hon. Ed, Minister of State (Science and Technology)	London West	CPC
Hsu, Ted	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Hughes, Carol	Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking	NDP
Hyer, Bruce	Thunder Bay—Superior North	GP
James, Roxanne, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Scarborough Centre	CPC
Kellway, Matthew	Beaches—East York	NDP
Kent, Hon. Peter	Thornhill	CPC
Kramp, Daryl	Prince Edward—Hastings	CPC
Lauzon, Guy	Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry	CPC
Leitch, Hon. K. Kellie, Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women	Simcoe—Grey	CPC

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lemieux, Pierre, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	CPC
Leung, Chungsen, Parliamentary Secretary for Multiculturalism	Willowdale	CPC
Lizon, Wladyslaw	Mississauga East—Cooksville	CPC
Lobb, Ben	Huron—Bruce	CPC
MacKenzie, Dave	Oxford	CPC
Marston, Wayne	Hamilton East—Stoney Creek	NDP
Masse, Brian	Windsor West	NDP
Mathysen, Irene	London—Fanshawe	NDP
McCallum, Hon. John	Markham—Unionville	Lib.
McColeman, Phil	Brant	CPC
McGuinty, David	Ottawa South	Lib.
McKay, Hon. John	Scarborough—Guildwood	Lib.
Menegakis, Costas, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Richmond Hill	CPC
Miller, Larry	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	CPC
Nash, Peggy	Parkdale—High Park	NDP
Nicholson, Hon. Rob, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Niagara Falls	CPC
Norlock, Rick	Northumberland—Quinte West	CPC
O'Connor, Hon. Gordon	Carleton—Mississippi Mills	CPC
Oliver, Hon. Joe, Minister of Finance	Eglinton—Lawrence	CPC
Opitz, Ted	Etobicoke Centre	CPC
O'Toole, Hon. Erin, Minister of Veterans Affairs	Durham	CPC
Perkins, Pat	Whitby—Oshawa	CPC
Poilievre, Hon. Pierre, Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform	Nepean—Carleton	CPC
Preston, Joe	Elgin—Middlesex—London	CPC
Rafferty, John	Thunder Bay—Rainy River	NDP
Raitt, Hon. Lisa, Minister of Transport	Halton	CPC
Reid, Scott	Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	CPC
Rickford, Hon. Greg, Minister of Natural Resources and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario	Kenora	CPC
Schellenberger, Gary	Perth—Wellington	CPC
Scott, Craig	Toronto—Danforth	NDP
Seeback, Kyle	Brampton West	CPC
Sgro, Hon. Judy	York West	Lib.
Shiple, Bev	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	CPC
Sitsabaiesan, Rathika	Scarborough—Rouge River	NDP
Stanton, Bruce, The Acting Speaker	Simcoe North	CPC
Sullivan, Mike	York South—Weston	NDP
Sweet, David	Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale	CPC
Tilson, David	Dufferin—Caledon	CPC
Trottier, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for La Francophonie	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	CPC
Truppe, Susan, Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women	London North Centre	CPC
Valeriote, Frank	Guelph	Lib.
Van Kesteren, Dave	Chatham-Kent—Essex	CPC
Van Loan, Hon. Peter, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	York—Simcoe	CPC
Vaughan, Adam	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Wallace, Mike	Burlington	CPC
Watson, Jeff, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport	Essex	CPC
Woodworth, Stephen	Kitchener Centre	CPC
Young, Terence	Oakville	CPC
VACANCY	Peterborough	
VACANCY	Sudbury	

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Casey, Sean	Charlottetown	Lib.
Easter, Hon. Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence	Cardigan	Lib.
Shea, Hon. Gail, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Egmont	CPC

QUÉBEC (75)

Aubin, Robert	Trois-Rivières	NDP
Ayala, Paulina	Honoré-Mercier	NDP
Bellavance, André	Richmond—Arthabaska	Ind.
Benskin, Tyrone	Jeanne-Le Ber	NDP
Bernier, Hon. Maxime, Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism, and Agriculture)	Beauce	CPC
Blanchette, Denis	Louis-Hébert	NDP
Blanchette-Lamothe, Lysane	Pierrefonds—Dollard	NDP
Blaney, Hon. Steven, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	Lévis—Bellechasse	CPC
Boivin, Françoise	Gatineau	NDP
Borg, Charmaine	Terrebonne—Blainville	NDP
Boulerice, Alexandre	Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie	NDP
Boutin-Sweet, Marjolaine	Hochelaga	NDP
Brahmi, Tarik	Saint-Jean	NDP
Brosseau, Ruth Ellen	Berthier—Maskinongé	NDP
Caron, Guy	Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques	NDP
Chicoine, Sylvain	Châteauguay—Saint-Constant	NDP
Choquette, François	Drummond	NDP
Côté, Raymond	Beauport—Limoilou	NDP
Cotler, Hon. Irwin	Mount Royal	Lib.
Day, Anne-Marie	Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles	NDP
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Dionne Labelle, Pierre	Rivière-du-Nord	NDP
Doré Lefebvre, Rosane	Alfred-Pellan	NDP
Dubé, Matthew	Chambly—Borduas	NDP
Dubourg, Emmanuel	Bourassa	Lib.
Dusseault, Pierre-Luc	Sherbrooke	NDP
Fortin, Jean-François	Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia	FD
Freeman, Mylène	Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel	NDP
Garneau, Marc	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.
Genest, Réjean	Shefford	NDP
Genest-Jourdain, Jonathan	Manicouagan	NDP
Giguère, Alain	Marc-Aurèle-Fortin	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Gourde, Jacques, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière	CPC
Groguhé, Sadia	Saint-Lambert	NDP
Hassainia, Sana	Verchères—Les Patriotes	Ind.
Jacob, Pierre	Brome—Missisquoi	NDP
Lapointe, François	Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup	NDP
Larose, Jean-François	Repentigny	FD
Latendresse, Alexandrine	Louis-Saint-Laurent	NDP
Laverdière, Hélène	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	NDP
Lebel, Hon. Denis, Minister of Infrastructure, Communities and Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	Roberval—Lac-Saint-Jean	CPC
LeBlanc, Hélène	LaSalle—Émard	NDP
Liu, Laurin	Rivière-des-Mille-Îles	NDP
Mai, Hoang	Brossard—La Prairie	NDP
Michaud, Élane	Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier	NDP
Moore, Christine	Abitibi—Témiscamingue	NDP
Morin, Dany	Chicoutimi—Le Fjord	NDP
Morin, Isabelle	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	NDP
Morin, Marc-André	Laurentides—Labelle	NDP
Morin, Marie-Claude	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	NDP
Mourani, Maria	Ahuntsic	Ind.
Mulcair, Hon. Thomas, Leader of the Opposition	Outremont	NDP
Nantel, Pierre	Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher	NDP
Nicholls, Jamie	Vaudreuil-Soulanges	NDP
Nunez-Melo, José	Laval	NDP
Pacetti, Massimo	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Ind.
Papillon, Annick	Québec	NDP
Paradis, Hon. Christian, Minister of International Development and Minister for La Francophonie	Mégantic—L'Érable	CPC
Patry, Claude	Jonquière—Alma	BQ
Péclet, Ève	La Pointe-de-l'Île	NDP
Perreault, Manon	Montcalm	Ind.
Pilon, François	Laval—Les Îles	NDP
Plamondon, Louis	Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour	BQ
Quach, Anne Minh-Thu	Beauharnois—Salaberry	NDP
Ravignat, Mathieu	Pontiac	NDP
Raynault, Francine	Joliette	NDP
Rousseau, Jean	Compton—Stanstead	NDP
Saganash, Romeo	Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou	NDP
Scarpaleggia, Francis	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Sellah, Djaouida	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	NDP
St-Denis, Lise	Saint-Maurice—Champlain	Lib.
Toone, Philip	Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine	NDP
Tremblay, Jonathan	Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord	NDP
Trudeau, Justin	Papineau	Lib.
Turmel, Nycole	Hull—Aylmer	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Anderson, David, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Consular	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	CPC
Block, Kelly, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	CPC
Boughen, Ray	Palliser	CPC
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	CPC
Clarke, Rob	Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River	CPC
Goodale, Hon. Ralph	Wascana	Lib.
Hoback, Randy	Prince Albert	CPC
Komarnicki, Ed	Souris—Moose Mountain	CPC
Lukiwski, Tom, Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	CPC
Ritz, Hon. Gerry, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Battlefords—Lloydminster	CPC
Scheer, Hon. Andrew, Speaker of the House of Commons	Regina—Qu'Appelle	CPC
Trost, Brad	Saskatoon—Humboldt	CPC
Vellacott, Maurice	Saskatoon—Wanuskewin	CPC
Yelich, Hon. Lynne, Minister of State (Foreign Affairs and Consular)	Blackstrap	CPC
YUKON (1)		
Leef, Ryan	Yukon	CPC

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of February 27, 2015 — 2nd Session, 41st Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chair:

Blake Richards

Vice-Chairs:

Niki Ashton
Carolyn Bennett

John Barlow
Rob Clarke

Earl Dreeshen
Jonathan Genest-Jourdain

Carol Hughes
Kyle Seeback

Mark Strahl

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
Dennis Bevington
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael

Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Joan Crockatt
Nathan Cullen
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent

Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Mathieu Ravignat
Scott Reid

Romeo Saganash
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

Chair:

Pierre-Luc Dusseault

Vice-Chairs:Patricia Davidson
Scott SimmsCharlie Angus
Charmaine BorgRay Boughen
Paul CalandraLarry Maguire
Tilly O'Neill Gordon

Bob Zimmer

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong

David Christopherson
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki

Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Pat Martin
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
Anne Minh-Thu Quach
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton

Gary Schellenberger
Craig Scott
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chair:

Bev Shipley

Vice-Chairs:

 Malcolm Allen
 Mark Eyking

 Ruth Ellen Brosseau
 Earl Dreeshen

 Gerald Keddy
 Larry Maguire

 LaVar Payne
 Francine Raynault

Bob Zimmer

(10)

Associate Members

 Diane Ablonczy
 Mark Adler
 Dan Albas
 Harold Albrecht
 Mike Allen
 Dean Allison
 Stella Ambler
 Rob Anders
 David Anderson
 Scott Armstrong
 Keith Ashfield
 Niki Ashton
 Jay Aspin
 Alex Atamanenko
 John Barlow
 Joyce Bateman
 Leon Benoit
 James Bezan
 Kelly Block
 Ray Boughen
 Peter Braid
 Garry Breitzkreuz
 Gordon Brown
 Lois Brown
 Patrick Brown
 Rod Bruinooge
 Brad Butt
 Paul Calandra
 Blaine Calkins
 Ron Cannan

 John Carmichael
 Colin Carrie
 Corneliu Chisu
 Michael Chong
 Rob Clarke
 Joan Crockatt
 Joe Daniel
 Patricia Davidson
 Bob Dechert
 Linda Duncan
 Rick Dykstra
 Jim Eglinski
 Ted Falk
 Steven Fletcher
 Royal Galipeau
 Cheryl Gallant
 Parm Gill
 Robert Goguen
 Peter Goldring
 Jacques Gourde
 Nina Grewal
 Richard Harris
 Laurie Hawn
 Bryan Hayes
 Russ Hiebert
 Jim Hillyer
 Randy Hoback
 Carol Hughes
 Roxanne James
 Peter Julian

 Randy Kamp
 Peter Kent
 Greg Kerr
 Ed Komarnicki
 Daryl Kramp
 Mike Lake
 Guy Lauzon
 Ryan Leef
 Pierre Lemieux
 Chungsen Leung
 Wladyslaw Lizon
 Ben Lobb
 Tom Lukiwski
 James Lunney
 Dave MacKenzie
 Pat Martin
 Colin Mayes
 Phil McColeman
 Cathy McLeod
 Costas Menegakis
 Larry Miller
 Rick Norlock
 Deepak Obhrai
 Gordon O'Connor
 Tilly O'Neill Gordon
 Ted Opitz
 Pat Perkins
 Joe Preston
 James Rajotte
 Scott Reid

 Blake Richards
 Andrew Saxton
 Gary Schellenberger
 Kyle Seeback
 Devinder Shory
 Joy Smith
 Robert Sopuck
 Brian Storseth
 Mark Strahl
 David Sweet
 David Tilson
 Lawrence Toet
 Brad Trost
 Bernard Trotter
 Susan Truppe
 Dave Van Kesteren
 Maurice Vellacott
 Mike Wallace
 Mark Warawa
 Chris Warkentin
 Jeff Watson
 John Weston
 Rodney Weston
 David Wilks
 John Williamson
 Stephen Woodworth
 Terence Young
 Wai Young
 David Yurdiga

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chair:

Gordon Brown

Vice-Chairs:
Stéphane Dion
Pierre NantelRick Dykstra
Jim HillyerRathika Sitsabaiesan
Kennedy StewartJohn Weston
Terence Young

David Yurdiga

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
Tyrone Benskin
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Charmaine Borg
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael

Colin Carrie
Andrew Cash
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Nathan Cullen
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Matthew Dubé
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Mylène Freeman
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian

Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston

James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Wai Young
Bob Zimmer

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair:

David Tilson

Vice-Chairs:
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe
John McCallumJay Aspin
Jim EglinskiChungsen Leung
Irene MathysenCostas Menegakis
Jasbir Sandhu

Devinder Shory

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Andrew Cash

Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Don Davies
Libby Davies
Bob Dechert
Pierre Dionne Labelle
Earl Dreesen
Rick Dykstra
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Alain Giguère
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian

Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Jinny Jogindera Sims
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chair:	Harold Albrecht	Vice-Chair:	John McKay	
Stella Ambler	Colin Carrie	Megan Leslie	Lawrence Toet	(10)
Dennis Bevington	François Choquette	Robert Sopuck	Stephen Woodworth	

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Michael Chong	Peter Kent	Scott Reid
Mark Adler	Rob Clarke	Greg Kerr	Blake Richards
Dan Albas	Joan Crockatt	Ed Komarnicki	Andrew Saxton
Mike Allen	Nathan Cullen	Daryl Kramp	Gary Schellenberger
Dean Allison	Joe Daniel	Mike Lake	Kyle Seeback
Rob Anders	Patricia Davidson	Guy Lauzon	Bev Shipley
David Anderson	Bob Dechert	Ryan Leef	Devinder Shory
Scott Armstrong	Earl Dreeshen	Pierre Lemieux	Joy Smith
Keith Ashfield	Linda Duncan	Chungsen Leung	Brian Storseth
Jay Aspin	Rick Dykstra	Wladyslaw Lizon	Mark Strahl
Robert Aubin	Jim Eglinski	Ben Lobb	David Sweet
John Barlow	Ted Falk	Tom Lukiwski	David Tilson
Joyce Bateman	Steven Fletcher	James Lunney	Brad Trost
Leon Benoit	Royal Galipeau	Dave MacKenzie	Bernard Trottier
James Bezan	Cheryl Gallant	Larry Maguire	Susan Truppe
Kelly Block	Parm Gill	Colin Mayes	Dave Van Kesteren
Ray Boughen	Robert Goguen	Phil McColeman	Maurice Vellacott
Peter Braid	Peter Goldring	Cathy McLeod	Mike Wallace
Garry Breitkreuz	Jacques Gourde	Costas Menegakis	Mark Warawa
Gordon Brown	Nina Grewal	Larry Miller	Chris Warkentin
Lois Brown	Richard Harris	Rick Norlock	Jeff Watson
Patrick Brown	Laurie Hawn	Deepak Obhrai	John Weston
Rod Bruinooge	Bryan Hayes	Gordon O'Connor	Rodney Weston
Brad Butt	Russ Hiebert	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	David Wilks
Paul Calandra	Jim Hillyer	Ted Opitz	John Williamson
Blaine Calkins	Randy Hoback	LaVar Payne	Terence Young
Ron Cannan	Roxanne James	Pat Perkins	Wai Young
John Carmichael	Peter Julian	Joe Preston	David Yurdiga
Robert Chisholm	Randy Kamp	James Rajotte	Bob Zimmer
Corneliu Chisu	Gerald Keddy		

FINANCE

Chair: James Rajotte

Vice-Chairs: Scott Brison
Nathan Cullen

Mark Adler	Ron Cannan	Pierre Dionne Labelle	Dave Van Kesteren	(10)
Joyce Bateman	Raymond Côté	Andrew Saxton		

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Rob Clarke	Greg Kerr	Blake Richards
Dan Albas	Joan Crockatt	Ed Komarnicki	Gary Schellenberger
Harold Albrecht	Joe Daniel	Daryl Kramp	Kyle Seeback
Mike Allen	Patricia Davidson	Mike Lake	Bev Shipley
Dean Allison	Bob Dechert	Guy Lauzon	Devinder Shory
Stella Ambler	Earl Dreesen	Ryan Leef	Joy Smith
Rob Anders	Emmanuel Dubourg	Pierre Lemieux	Robert Sopuck
David Anderson	Rick Dykstra	Chungsen Leung	Brian Storseth
Scott Armstrong	Jim Eglinski	Wladyslaw Lizon	Mark Strahl
Keith Ashfield	Ted Falk	Ben Lobb	David Sweet
Jay Aspin	Steven Fletcher	Tom Lukiwski	David Tilson
John Barlow	Royal Galipeau	James Lunney	Lawrence Toet
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Dave MacKenzie	Brad Trost
James Bezan	Parm Gill	Larry Maguire	Bernard Trotter
Kelly Block	Robert Goguen	Hoang Mai	Susan Truppe
Ray Boughen	Peter Goldring	Colin Mayes	Maurice Vellacott
Peter Braid	Jacques Gourde	Phil McColeman	Mike Wallace
Garry Breitzkreuz	Nina Grewal	Cathy McLeod	Mark Warawa
Gordon Brown	Richard Harris	Costas Menegakis	Chris Warkentin
Lois Brown	Laurie Hawn	Larry Miller	Jeff Watson
Patrick Brown	Bryan Hayes	Rick Norlock	John Weston
Rod Bruinooge	Russ Hiebert	Deepak Obhrai	Rodney Weston
Brad Butt	Jim Hillyer	Gordon O'Connor	David Wilks
Paul Calandra	Randy Hoback	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	John Williamson
Blaine Calkins	Roxanne James	Ted Opitz	Stephen Woodworth
John Carmichael	Peter Julian	LaVar Payne	Terence Young
Colin Carrie	Randy Kamp	Pat Perkins	Wai Young
Corneliu Chisu	Gerald Keddy	Joe Preston	David Yurdiga
Michael Chong	Peter Kent	Scott Reid	Bob Zimmer

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chair: Rodney Weston

Vice-Chairs:

Robert Chisholm
Lawrence MacAulay

Ryan Cleary
Patricia Davidson

Randy Kamp
François Lapointe

Ryan Leef
Robert Sopuck

John Weston

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie

Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockett
Joe Daniel
Bob Dechert
Fin Donnelly
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Yvon Godin
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent

Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton

Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Philip Toone
Jonathan Tremblay
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Chair:

Pat Martin

Vice-Chairs:Gerry Byrne
Greg KerrMark Adler
Tarik BrahmiBrad Butt
Guy LauzonMathieu Ravignat
Chris Warkentin

Wai Young

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Denis Blanchette
Kelly Block
Françoise Boivin
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie

Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Paul Dewar
Earl Dreeshen
Linda Duncan
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards

Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Nycole Turmel
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

HEALTH**Chair:**

Ben Lobb

Vice-Chairs:Hedy Fry
Murray RankinMatthew Kellway
Wladyslaw LizonJames Lunney
Cathy McLeodChristine Moore
David Wilks

Terence Young

(10)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu ChisuMichael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Carol Hughes
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter KentGreg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Megan Leslie
Chungsen Leung
Tom Lukiwski
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Wayne Marston
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Manon Perreault
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew SaxtonGary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Djaouida Sellah
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Jinny Jogindera Sims
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
Mike Sullivan
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

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

Chair: Phil McColeman

Vice-Chairs:

Rodger Cuzner
Jinny Jogindera Sims

Scott Armstrong
Ray Boughen

Brad Butt
Jim Eglinski

Sadia Groguhé
Colin Mayes

Marie-Claude Morin

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe
Kelly Block
Alexandre Boulerice
Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Chris Charlton
Corneliu Chisu

Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Matthew Dubé
Rick Dykstra
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Mylène Freeman
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Alain Giguère
Parm Gill
Yvon Godin
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Dan Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy

Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Irene Mathysen
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Manon Perreault
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton

Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Rathika Sitsabaiesan
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
Mike Sullivan
David Sweet
David Wilson
Lawrence Toet
Jonathan Tremblay
Brad Trost
Bernard Trottier
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Chair:

David Sweet

Vice-Chairs:
Peggy Nash
Judy SgroJohn Carmichael
Joe DanielCheryl Gallant
Mike LakeBrian Masse
Annick Papillon

Mark Warawa

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Malcolm Allen
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Mauril Bélanger
Leon Benoit
Tyrone Benskin
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Charmaine Borg
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra

Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreesen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Dan Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy

Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Guy Lauzon
Hélène LeBlanc
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
Anne Minh-Thu Quach
James Rajotte
Scott Reid

Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
Glenn Thibeault
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chair: Randy Hoback

Vice-Chairs:

Don Davies
Chrystia Freeland

Mike Allen
Ron Cannan

Parm Gill
Nina Grewal

Laurin Liu
Marc-André Morin

Devinder Shory

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong

Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Paul Dewar
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake

Guy Lauzon
Hélène Laverdière
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Brian Masse
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Mathieu Ravignat
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton

Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Jinny Jogindera Sims
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trottier
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Chair: Mike Wallace

Vice-Chairs:

Françoise Boivin
Sean Casey

Blaine Calkins
Bob Dechert

Robert Goguen
Pierre Jacob

Ève Pécelet
Kyle Seeback

David Wilks

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu

Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Randall Garrison
Parm Gill
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Jack Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Matthew Kellway
Peter Kent

Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Wayne Marston
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Murray Rankin

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

LIAISON

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:	David Christopherson	
Harold Albrecht	Royal Galipeau	Ben Lobb	Blake Richards	(26)
Leon Benoit	Richard Harris	Pat Martin	Bev Shipley	
Gordon Brown	Randy Hoback	Phil McColeman	David Sweet	
Chris Charlton	Peter Kent	Larry Miller	David Tilson	
Michael Chong	Daryl Kramp	Joe Preston	Mike Wallace	
Pierre-Luc Dusseault	Hélène LeBlanc	James Rajotte	Rodney Weston	

Associate Members

Niki Ashton	Rodger Cuzner	Jack Harris	Pierre Nantel
Mauril Bélanger	Patricia Davidson	Carol Hughes	Peggy Nash
Carolyn Bennett	Don Davies	Yvonne Jones	Jamie Nicholls
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe	Paul Dewar	Greg Kerr	Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Françoise Boivin	Stéphane Dion	Kevin Lamoureux	Murray Rankin
Garry Breitkreuz	Kirsty Duncan	Alexandrine Latendresse	Geoff Regan
Scott Brison	Wayne Easter	Lawrence MacAulay	Judy Sgro
Gerry Byrne	Mark Eyking	Hoang Mai	Scott Simms
John Carmichael	Chrystia Freeland	John McCallum	Jinny Jogindera Sims
Guy Caron	Hedy Fry	David McGuinty	Lise St-Denis
Sean Casey	Marc Garneau	John McKay	Peter Stoffer
Robert Chisholm	Randall Garrison	Joyce Murray	Frank Valeriote
Nathan Cullen			

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE BUDGETS

Chair:	Dean Allison	Vice-Chair:		
David Christopherson	Phil McColeman	Larry Miller	Joe Preston	(6)
Pat Martin				

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Chair: Peter Kent

Vice-Chairs:

Jack Harris
Joyce Murray

James Bezan
Tarik Brahmi

Corneliu Chisu
Cheryl Gallant

Élaine Michaud
Rick Norlock

John Williamson

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Michael Chong

Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Randall Garrison
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp

Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Megan Leslie
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Christine Moore
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton

Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Peter Stoffer
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trottier
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

NATURAL RESOURCES

Chair:

Leon Benoit

Vice-Chairs:
Guy Caron
Geoff ReganKelly Block
Chris CharltonJoan Crockatt
Linda DuncanRyan Leef
Pat Perkins

Brad Trost

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Charlie Angus
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
James Bezan
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong

Rob Clarke
Nathan Cullen
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Yvon Godin
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Claude Gravelle
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Carol Hughes
Roxanne James
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent

Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
John Rafferty
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Romeo Saganash

Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Kennedy Stewart
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Bernard Trottier
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Chair:	Michael Chong	Vice-Chairs:	Jamie Nicholls Lise St-Denis	
Corneliu Chisu Joe Daniel	Anne-Marie Day Jacques Gourde	Claude Gravelle Chungsen Leung	John Williamson	(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Colin Carrie	Greg Kerr	Andrew Saxton
Mark Adler	Rob Clarke	Ed Komarnicki	Gary Schellenberger
Dan Albas	Joan Crockatt	Daryl Kramp	Kyle Seeback
Harold Albrecht	Patricia Davidson	Mike Lake	Bev Shipley
Mike Allen	Bob Dechert	Alexandrine Latendresse	Devinder Shory
Dean Allison	Stéphane Dion	Guy Lauzon	Joy Smith
Stella Ambler	Pierre Dionne Labelle	Ryan Leef	Robert Sopuck
Rob Anders	Earl Dreeshen	Pierre Lemieux	Brian Storseth
David Anderson	Rick Dykstra	Wladyslaw Lizon	Mark Strahl
Scott Armstrong	Jim Eglinski	Ben Lobb	David Sweet
Keith Ashfield	Ted Falk	Tom Lukiwski	David Tilson
Jay Aspin	Steven Fletcher	James Lunney	Lawrence Toet
Robert Aubin	Royal Galipeau	Dave MacKenzie	Brad Trost
John Barlow	Cheryl Gallant	Larry Maguire	Bernard Trotter
Joyce Bateman	Parm Gill	Colin Mayes	Susan Truppe
Leon Benoit	Yvon Godin	Phil McColeman	Nycole Turmel
Tyrone Benskin	Robert Goguen	Cathy McLeod	Dave Van Kesteren
James Bezan	Peter Goldring	Costas Menegakis	Maurice Vellacott
Kelly Block	Nina Grewal	Larry Miller	Mike Wallace
Ray Boughen	Dan Harris	Marie-Claude Morin	Mark Warawa
Peter Braid	Richard Harris	Rick Norlock	Chris Warkentin
Garry Breitkreuz	Laurie Hawn	Deepak Obhrai	Jeff Watson
Gordon Brown	Bryan Hayes	Gordon O'Connor	John Weston
Lois Brown	Russ Hiebert	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	Rodney Weston
Patrick Brown	Jim Hillyer	Ted Opitz	David Wilks
Rod Bruinooge	Randy Hoback	LaVar Payne	Stephen Woodworth
Brad Butt	Roxanne James	Pat Perkins	Terence Young
Paul Calandra	Peter Julian	Joe Preston	Wai Young
Blaine Calkins	Randy Kamp	James Rajotte	David Yurdiga
Ron Cannan	Gerald Keddy	Scott Reid	Bob Zimmer
John Carmichael	Peter Kent	Blake Richards	

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair:	Joe Preston	Vice-Chairs:	Kevin Lamoureux Alexandrine Latendresse	
David Christopherson Tom Lukiwski	Dave MacKenzie Ted Opitz	Scott Reid Blake Richards	Craig Scott	(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy	Corneliu Chisu	Roxanne James	Kyle Seeback
Mark Adler	Michael Chong	Randy Kamp	Bev Shipley
Dan Albas	Rob Clarke	Gerald Keddy	Devinder Shory
Harold Albrecht	Joan Crockatt	Peter Kent	Joy Smith
Mike Allen	Jean Crowder	Greg Kerr	Robert Sopuck
Dean Allison	Nathan Cullen	Ed Komarnicki	Brian Storseth
Stella Ambler	Joe Daniel	Daryl Kramp	Mark Strahl
Rob Anders	Patricia Davidson	Mike Lake	David Sweet
David Anderson	Bob Dechert	Guy Lauzon	David Tilson
Scott Armstrong	Earl Dreshen	Ryan Leef	Lawrence Toet
Keith Ashfield	Kirsty Duncan	Pierre Lemieux	Philip Toone
Niki Ashton	Pierre-Luc Dusseault	Chungsen Leung	Brad Trost
Jay Aspin	Rick Dykstra	Wladyslaw Lizon	Bernard Trotter
John Barlow	Jim Eglinski	Ben Lobb	Susan Truppe
Joyce Bateman	Ted Falk	James Lunney	Nycole Turmel
Carolyn Bennett	Steven Fletcher	Larry Maguire	Frank Valeriote
Leon Benoit	Mylène Freeman	Colin Mayes	Dave Van Kesteren
James Bezan	Royal Galipeau	Phil McColeman	Maurice Vellacott
Kelly Block	Cheryl Gallant	Cathy McLeod	Mike Wallace
Ray Boughen	Parm Gill	Costas Menegakis	Mark Warawa
Peter Braid	Yvon Godin	Larry Miller	Chris Warkentin
Garry Breitzkreuz	Robert Goguen	Rick Norlock	Jeff Watson
Gordon Brown	Peter Goldring	Deepak Obhrai	John Weston
Lois Brown	Jacques Gourde	Gordon O'Connor	Rodney Weston
Patrick Brown	Nina Grewal	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	David Wilks
Rod Bruinooge	Sadia Grogue	LaVar Payne	John Williamson
Paul Calandra	Richard Harris	Pat Perkins	Stephen Woodworth
Blaine Calkins	Laurie Hawn	James Rajotte	Terence Young
Ron Cannan	Bryan Hayes	Murray Rankin	Wai Young
John Carmichael	Russ Hiebert	Andrew Saxton	David Yurdiga
Colin Carrie	Jim Hillyer	Gary Schellenberger	Bob Zimmer
Chris Charlton	Randy Hoback		

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair:	Dave MacKenzie	Vice-Chair:		
Brad Butt	Philip Toone	Frank Valeriote		(4)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON A CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS

Chair:	Joe Preston	Vice-Chair:		
Carolyn Bennett Kelly Block	Joan Crockatt Jean Crowder	Mylène Freeman	Chris Warkentin	(7)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chair:**

David Christopherson

Vice-Chairs:John Carmichael
Yvonne JonesDan Albas
Malcolm AllenJay Aspin
Ted FalkAlain Giguère
Bryan Hayes

Stephen Woodworth

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong

Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Pierre-Luc Dusseault
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Dan Harris
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards

Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Chair:

Daryl Kramp

Vice-Chairs:Wayne Easter
Randall GarrisonDiane Ablonczy
Rosane Doré LefebvreTed Falk
Roxanne JamesRick Norlock
LaVar Payne

Jean Rousseau

(10)

Associate Members

Mark Adler	Corneliu Chisu	Greg Kerr	Gary Schellenberger
Dan Albas	Michael Chong	Ed Komarnicki	Kyle Seeback
Harold Albrecht	Rob Clarke	Mike Lake	Bev Shipley
Mike Allen	Joan Crockatt	Guy Lauzon	Devinder Shory
Dean Allison	Joe Daniel	Ryan Leef	Joy Smith
Stella Ambler	Patricia Davidson	Pierre Lemieux	Robert Sopuck
Rob Anders	Don Davies	Chungsen Leung	Brian Storseth
David Anderson	Bob Dechert	Wladyslaw Lizon	Mark Strahl
Scott Armstrong	Earl Dreshen	Ben Lobb	David Sweet
Keith Ashfield	Rick Dykstra	Tom Lukiwski	David Tilson
Jay Aspin	Jim Eglinski	James Lunney	Lawrence Toet
John Barlow	Steven Fletcher	Dave MacKenzie	Brad Trost
Joyce Bateman	Royal Galipeau	Larry Maguire	Bernard Trottier
Leon Benoit	Cheryl Gallant	Colin Mayes	Susan Truppe
James Bezan	Parm Gill	Phil McColeman	Dave Van Kesteren
Kelly Block	Robert Goguen	Cathy McLeod	Maurice Vellacott
Charmaine Borg	Peter Goldring	Costas Menegakis	Mike Wallace
Ray Boughen	Jacques Gourde	Larry Miller	Mark Warawa
Peter Braid	Nina Grewal	Deepak Obhrai	Chris Warkentin
Garry Breitzkreuz	Jack Harris	Gordon O'Connor	Jeff Watson
Gordon Brown	Richard Harris	Tilly O'Neill Gordon	John Weston
Lois Brown	Laurie Hawn	Ted Opitz	Rodney Weston
Patrick Brown	Bryan Hayes	Pat Perkins	David Wilks
Rod Bruinooge	Russ Hiebert	François Pilon	John Williamson
Brad Butt	Jim Hillyer	Joe Preston	Stephen Woodworth
Paul Calandra	Randy Hoback	James Rajotte	Terence Young
Blaine Calkins	Peter Julian	Murray Rankin	Wai Young
Ron Cannan	Randy Kamp	Scott Reid	David Yurdiga
John Carmichael	Gerald Keddy	Blake Richards	Bob Zimmer
Colin Carrie	Peter Kent	Andrew Saxton	

STATUS OF WOMEN

Chair: Hélène LeBlanc

Vice-Chairs:

Kirsty Duncan
Tilly O'Neill Gordon

John Barlow
Joyce Bateman

Joan Crockatt
Mylène Freeman

Pat Perkins
Djaouida Sellah

Susan Truppe

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Niki Ashton
Jay Aspin
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Lysane Blanchette-Lamothe
Kelly Block
Françoise Boivin
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie

Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Jean Crowder
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Libby Davies
Anne-Marie Day
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Sadia Groguhé
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Megan Leslie
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Ted Opitz
Annick Papillon
LaVar Payne
Joe Preston
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

Chair:

Larry Miller

Vice-Chairs:Hoang Mai
David McGuintyPeter Braid
Ed KomarnickiIsabelle Morin
Mike SullivanJeff Watson
Wai Young

David Yurdiga

(10)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
Robert Aubin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Alexandre Boulerice
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael

Guy Caron
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreesen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Randy Kamp

Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Pierre Nantel
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte

Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Bob Zimmer

VETERANS AFFAIRS**Chair:**

Royal Galipeau

Vice-Chairs:Peter Stoffer
Frank ValeriotteSylvain Chicoine
Laurie HawnBryan Hayes
Pierre LemieuxWladyslaw Lizon
Ted Opitz

John Rafferty

(10)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin CarrieCorneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke
Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Mylène Freeman
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Jack Harris
Richard Harris
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg KerrEd Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Chungsen Leung
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Pat Martin
Irene Mathysen
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Manon Perreault
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards
Andrew SaxtonGary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopusck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trottier
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Chairs: Marie-P. Charette-Poulin
Richard Harris

Joint Vice-Chairs: Carol Hughes
Scott Simms

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Anne C. Cools
Nicole Eaton

Terry M. Mercer
Michel Rivard

Stella Ambler
Tyrone Benskin
Rod Bruinooge
Rob Clarke
Réjean Genest

Guy Lauzon
José Nunez-Melo
Lawrence Toet
Dave Van Kesteren

(17)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Dan Albas
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Rob Anders
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Garry Breitzkreuz
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Patrick Brown
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu

Michael Chong
David Christopherson
Joan Crockett
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Jim Hillyer
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr

Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp
Mike Lake
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards

Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Brian Storseth
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Brad Trost
Bernard Trotter
Susan Truppe
Maurice Vellacott
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Denise Batters
Chris Charlton

Joint Vice-Chairs: Mauril Bélanger
Garry Breitkreuz

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Céline Hervieux-Payette
Thomas Johnson McInnis
Don Meredith

Wilfred P. Moore
Bob Runciman
David P. Smith

Dan Albas
Rob Anders
Paulina Ayala
Patrick Brown
Jim Hillyer

François Pilon
Anne Minh-Thu Quach
Brian Storseth
Maurice Vellacott

(19)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Mark Adler
Harold Albrecht
Mike Allen
Dean Allison
Stella Ambler
David Anderson
Scott Armstrong
Keith Ashfield
Jay Aspin
John Barlow
Joyce Bateman
Leon Benoit
James Bezan
Kelly Block
Ray Boughen
Peter Braid
Gordon Brown
Lois Brown
Rod Bruinooge
Brad Butt
Paul Calandra
Blaine Calkins
Ron Cannan
John Carmichael
Colin Carrie
Corneliu Chisu
Michael Chong
Rob Clarke

Joan Crockatt
Joe Daniel
Patricia Davidson
Bob Dechert
Earl Dreeshen
Rick Dykstra
Jim Eglinski
Ted Falk
Steven Fletcher
Royal Galipeau
Cheryl Gallant
Parm Gill
Robert Goguen
Peter Goldring
Jacques Gourde
Nina Grewal
Richard Harris
Laurie Hawn
Bryan Hayes
Russ Hiebert
Randy Hoback
Roxanne James
Peter Julian
Randy Kamp
Gerald Keddy
Peter Kent
Greg Kerr
Ed Komarnicki
Daryl Kramp

Mike Lake
Guy Lauzon
Ryan Leef
Pierre Lemieux
Chungsen Leung
Wladyslaw Lizon
Ben Lobb
Tom Lukiwski
James Lunney
Dave MacKenzie
Larry Maguire
Brian Masse
Colin Mayes
Phil McColeman
Cathy McLeod
Costas Menegakis
Larry Miller
Rick Norlock
Deepak Obhrai
Gordon O'Connor
Tilly O'Neill Gordon
Ted Opitz
LaVar Payne
Pat Perkins
Joe Preston
James Rajotte
Scott Reid
Blake Richards

Andrew Saxton
Gary Schellenberger
Kyle Seeback
Bev Shipley
Devinder Shory
Joy Smith
Robert Sopuck
Mark Strahl
David Sweet
David Tilson
Lawrence Toet
Brad Trost
Bernard Trottier
Susan Truppe
Dave Van Kesteren
Mike Wallace
Mark Warawa
Chris Warkentin
Jeff Watson
John Weston
Rodney Weston
David Wilks
John Williamson
Stephen Woodworth
Terence Young
Wai Young
David Yurdiga
Bob Zimmer

Panel of Chairs of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. JOE COMARTIN

The Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BARRY DEVOLIN

The Assistant Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole

MR. BRUCE STANTON

MR. MIKE ALLEN

MR. BLAINE CALKINS

MS. JEAN CROWDER

MR. DON DAVIES

MR. BRYAN HAYES

MS. HÉLÈNE LAVERDIÈRE

MS. IRENE MATHYSSEN

MS. JOYCE MURRAY

MR. BLAKE RICHARDS

MR. BRIAN STORSETH

MR. DAVE VAN KESTEREN

MR. BOB ZIMMER

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

Right Hon. Stephen Harper	Prime Minister
Hon. Bernard Valcourt	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development
Hon. Rob Nicholson	Minister of Foreign Affairs
Hon. Peter MacKay	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Hon. Rona Ambrose	Minister of Health
Hon. Diane Finley	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Hon. Tony Clement	President of the Treasury Board
Hon. Peter Van Loan	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Hon. Jason Kenney	Minister of National Defence and Minister for Multiculturalism
Hon. Gerry Ritz	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Hon. Christian Paradis	Minister of International Development and Minister for La Francophonie
Hon. James Moore	Minister of Industry
Hon. Denis Lebel	Minister of Infrastructure, Communities and Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Hon. Leona Aglukkaq	Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council
Hon. Lisa Raitt	Minister of Transport
Hon. Gail Shea	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Hon. Julian Fantino	Associate Minister of National Defence
Hon. Steven Blaney	Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Hon. Ed Fast	Minister of International Trade
Hon. Joe Oliver	Minister of Finance
Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay	Minister of National Revenue
Hon. Pierre Poilievre	Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform
Hon. Shelly Glover	Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages
Hon. Chris Alexander	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. K. Kellie Leitch	Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women
Hon. Greg Rickford	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario
Hon. Erin O'Toole	Minister of Veterans Affairs
Hon. Maxime Bernier	Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism, and Agriculture)
Hon. Lynne Yelich	Minister of State (Foreign Affairs and Consular)
Hon. Gary Goodyear	Minister of State (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario)
Hon. Rob Moore	Minister of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
Hon. John Duncan	Minister of State and Chief Government Whip
Hon. Tim Uppal	Minister of State (Multiculturalism)
Hon. Alice Wong	Minister of State (Seniors)
Hon. Bal Gosal	Minister of State (Sport)
Hon. Kevin Sorenson	Minister of State (Finance)
Hon. Candice Bergen	Minister of State (Social Development)
Hon. Michelle Rempel	Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification)
Hon. Ed Holder	Minister of State (Science and Technology)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr. Dan Albas	to the President of the Treasury Board
Mr. David Anderson	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Consular
Mr. Scott Armstrong	to the Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister of Labour
Mr. James Bezan	to the Minister of National Defence
Mrs. Kelly Block	to the Minister of Natural Resources
Mr. Peter Braid	for Infrastructure and Communities
Ms. Lois Brown	to the Minister of International Development
Mr. Paul Calandra	to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Colin Carrie	to the Minister of the Environment
Mr. Bob Dechert	to the Minister of Justice
Mr. Rick Dykstra	to the Minister of Canadian Heritage
Mr. Parm Gill	to the Minister of International Trade
Mr. Robert Goguen	to the Minister of Justice
Mr. Jacques Gourde	to the Prime Minister, for Official Languages and for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec
Ms. Roxanne James	to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Mr. Randy Kamp	to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Gerald Keddy	to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
Hon. Mike Lake	to the Minister of Industry
Mr. Pierre Lemieux	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs
Mr. Chungsen Leung	for Multiculturalism
Mr. Tom Lukiwski	to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Mrs. Cathy McLeod	to the Minister of Health and for Western Economic Diversification
Mr. Costas Menegakis	to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Hon. Deepak Obhrai	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights
Mr. Andrew Saxton	to the Minister of Finance
Mr. Mark Strahl	to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development
Mr. Bernard Trotter	to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for La Francophonie
Mrs. Susan Truppe	for Status of Women
Mr. Chris Warkentin	to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Mr. Jeff Watson	to the Minister of Transport

CONTENTS

Friday, February 27, 2015

Points of Order

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Mr. Julian.....	11777
Mr. MacKenzie.....	11779
Mr. Lamoureux.....	11779

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Respect for Communities Act

Bill C-2. Report Stage.....	11779
Mr. Eglinski.....	11780
Mr. Nicholls.....	11781
Mr. Lunney.....	11781
Ms. Doré Lefebvre.....	11781
Mr. Wilks.....	11783
Mr. Lamoureux.....	11783
Mr. Lunney.....	11783

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Trinity Western University

Mr. Lunney.....	11784
-----------------	-------

Forestry Industry

Mr. Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord).....	11785
--------------------------------------	-------

2015 Canada Winter Games

Mrs. Perkins.....	11785
-------------------	-------

Terry Kelly

Mr. McKay.....	11785
----------------	-------

Trinity Western University

Mr. Benoit.....	11785
-----------------	-------

Mining Industry

Mr. Rafferty.....	11786
-------------------	-------

Public Safety

Mrs. McLeod.....	11786
------------------	-------

Geraldine Seely

Mr. Calandra.....	11786
-------------------	-------

Roller Derby

Ms. Leslie.....	11786
-----------------	-------

FIFA Women's World Cup

Mr. Lake.....	11787
---------------	-------

International Women's Day

Ms. Boutin-Sweet.....	11787
-----------------------	-------

Taxation

Mr. Goguen.....	11787
-----------------	-------

Community Service

Mr. Eyking.....	11787
-----------------	-------

Taxation

Mr. Daniel.....	11787
-----------------	-------

Official Languages

Mr. Aubin.....	11788
----------------	-------

Ernest Côté

Mr. Lemieux.....	11788
------------------	-------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Aboriginal Affairs

Ms. Leslie.....	11788
Mrs. Truppe.....	11788
Ms. Leslie.....	11788
Mrs. Truppe.....	11788

Public Safety

Ms. Leslie.....	11789
Ms. James.....	11789
Ms. Doré Lefebvre.....	11789
Ms. James.....	11789
Ms. Doré Lefebvre.....	11789
Ms. James.....	11789

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Lamoureux.....	11789
Mrs. Truppe.....	11789
Mr. Lamoureux.....	11789
Mrs. Truppe.....	11790
Mr. Dion.....	11790
Mrs. Truppe.....	11790

Public Safety

Mr. Julian.....	11790
Ms. James.....	11790
Mr. Julian.....	11790
Ms. James.....	11790
Ms. Laverdière.....	11790
Ms. James.....	11791

International Development

Ms. Laverdière.....	11791
Ms. James.....	11791
Ms. Laverdière.....	11791
Ms. Brown (Newmarket—Aurora).....	11791

Veterans Affairs

Mr. Rafferty.....	11791
Mr. Lemieux.....	11791
Ms. Mathysen.....	11791
Mr. Lemieux.....	11791

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Saganash.....	11792
Mrs. Truppe.....	11792
Mr. Saganash.....	11792
Mrs. Truppe.....	11792

Infrastructure

Mr. McCallum.....	11792
Mr. Braid.....	11792

The Environment	
Mr. McKay	11792
Mr. Carrie	11792
Mr. McKay	11792
Mr. Carrie	11793
Canada Post	
Mr. Kellway	11793
Mr. Watson	11793
Mr. Blanchette	11793
Mr. Watson	11793
Ms. Boutin-Sweet	11793
Mr. Watson	11793
Ms. Boutin-Sweet	11793
Mr. Watson	11793
Public Safety	
Mr. Sweet	11793
Mr. Saxton	11794
Regional Economic Development	
Ms. Brosseau	11794
Mr. Gourde	11794
Mr. Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	11794
Mr. Gourde	11794
Mr. Lapointe	11794
Mr. Gourde	11794
Official Languages	
Mrs. Day	11794
Mr. Gourde	11794
Transportation	
Mr. Byrne	11794
Mr. Watson	11795
Natural Resources	
Mr. Dion	11795
Mrs. Block	11795
Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Dewar	11795
Mr. Dykstra	11795
Public Safety	
Mr. Dewar	11795
Ms. James	11795
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Kramp	11795
Mr. Trottier	11796
Infrastructure	
Mr. Eyking	11796
Mr. Braid	11796
Agriculture	
Mr. Sopuck	11796
Mr. Keddy	11796
Health	
Mr. Hyer	11796
Mrs. McLeod	11796
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mrs. Hassainia	11796

Mrs. Truppe	11797
Health	
Mr. Hyer	11797
Mrs. McLeod	11797

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

International Trade	
Mr. Trottier	11797
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Carrie	11797
Petitions	
Agriculture	
Mr. Van Kesteren	11797
Ms. Laverdière	11797
Mr. Eyking	11797
Anaphylaxis	
Ms. Mathysen	11798
Insect Pollinators	
Mr. Kellway	11798
Sex Selection	
Mr. Benoit	11798
Impaired Driving	
Mr. Benoit	11798
The Environment	
Ms. Leslie	11798
Falun Gong	
Mr. Hyer	11798
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Carrie	11798
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
Mr. Carrie	11799
Points of Order	
Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security	
Mr. Van Loan	11800
Mr. Julian	11803

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Respect for Communities Act	
Bill C-2. Report Stage	11804
Mr. Lunney	11804
Mr. Dewar	11805
Mr. Zimmer	11805
Mr. Dewar	11805
Mrs. Day	11807
Mr. Ravignat	11807
Mr. Zimmer	11807
Mr. Nicholls	11809
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	11809

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Removal of Imprisonment in Relation to Mandatory Surveys Act	
Mr. Preston	11809

Bill C-625. Second reading	11809
Ms. Liu	11810
Mr. Hsu	11811
Ms. Doré Lefebvre	11811
Mr. Hsu	11813
Ms. Liu	11814

Mr. Lake	11815
Mr. Nicholls	11815
Mr. Preston	11817
Division on motion deferred	11817

APPENDIX

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>