



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 147 • NUMBER 115 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, September 24, 2014

—

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, September 24, 2014

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

• (1405)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of our national anthem, led by the hon. member for Mississauga East—Cooksville.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

HEALTH AND FITNESS ADVOCATE

Mr. John Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when we members rise to pay tribute to a person from our ridings, we identify those who inspire not only our communities, but also our country. Today I pay tribute to just such a hero, Frank Kurucz, who has literally saved people's lives through his coaching.

Among other things, Frank created the Nomads running group 50 years ago, which is an informal club of men who run together on weekends. As recently as last Saturday, 84-year-old Frank was running, inspiring those of us who ran with him.

Frank also initiated Fit Fellas, a well-attended fitness class now led by Barrie Chapman, at the very busy West Vancouver recreation centre.

Frank also initiated the West Van Masters Mile race, and coached at the YMCA, UBC volleyball and soccer, and at women's and other groups.

Frank was also West Van's first director of parks and recreation, and the hero who lit the Olympic cauldron there in 2010.

The single theme in all of these activities is the importance of integrating health and fitness to maintain a successful, well-balanced life and a strong community.

Mr. Speaker, through you, I say thank you, Frank, on behalf of the many you have inspired.

VETERANS ADVOCATE

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the House of Commons to pay tribute to a great Canadian, Steinar Jarle Engeset.

Steinar was born in Norway in 1942. In 1966 he immigrated to Canada with his wife.

He became instrumental in Harbour Grace, Newfoundland, for opening up the northern shrimp fishery. He created many jobs in that part of the country.

Steinar is best known for his advocacy on behalf of Canadian veterans. He was born during the war and has never forgotten that it was the Canadians and our allies who liberated his country and his parents. Thus, Steinar arranged the first Convoy Cup.

The Convoy Cup is made up of the air force, Canadian navy, and merchant mariners who sailed essential supplies to Britain at that time for the liberation of a free Europe.

What an honour it was to be with Steinar on his vessel as he did the sailpast of HMCS *Sackville*, Canada's naval memorial, where he personally took the salute from Canada's honoured merchant navy veterans.

I pay a special tribute from the House of Commons to a great Canadian and a great man in Steinar Engeset.

* * *

FALL FAIRS

Mr. Bev Shipley (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, fall fairs are occurring in my riding of Lambton—Kent—Middlesex and across Canada.

These fairs draw communities together and provide the opportunity for both children and adults to celebrate not only agriculture but also their communities, the backbone of our country.

I am particularly impressed by the young people who put their names forward to act as ambassadors not only for their fair but also for their community and the businesses in it. Each and every one of the contestants I have met so far shows the qualities to be a leader throughout life.

I extend my best wishes to all the young people who participate in the Fair Ambassador competitions. Each ambassador for their regional fair then goes on to compete for the Ontario Ambassador. Many times that title has been brought home to Lambton—Kent—Middlesex.

Statements by Members

Fall fairs are not done yet, and I look forward to many more before the snow flies.

[*Translation*]

* * *

[*Translation*]

CREOLE MONTH

Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker,

[*Member spoke in Creole as follows:*]

sak pasé? Jodia mwen salué toute collègue mwen yo nan Parlement canadien, nan langue zancêtre mwen, le créole.

I have the great privilege of highlighting the 13th edition of the Mois du créole, which has been organized by KEPKAA, an organization that has been working to promote Creole in Quebec through education, culture, and the arts since 2002.

In Canada, more than 200,000 people, including yours truly, come from countries where Creole is spoken. Those countries include Haiti, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Guyana, the Seychelles, and islands of the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean. We are proud to contribute to Canada's cultural richness.

I would like to congratulate the organizing committee and the president of KEPKAA, Arcelle Appolon, for the work they do to promote Creole.

To conclude, I would like to salute all those who speak Creole, the language taught to me by my parents, that I have taught it to my children, and that I am proud to speak here.

[*Member spoke in Creole*]

* * *

[*English*]

RIDING OF CALGARY NORTHEAST

Mr. Devinder Shory (Calgary Northeast, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge some great community organizations that make the hardest-working riding of Calgary Northeast a great place to live and raise a family.

First, congratulations to Sue Scott and her team, including volunteers at Cardel Place recreation centre, and to the Country Hills public library on their 10th anniversary.

Congratulations also to the Skyview Ranch Community Association for another successful AGM. I commend it for promoting a diverse and inclusive community. Thanks to community members Fred Ghogomu, Don Monroe, Charles Bonny, Balraj Nijjar, Chand Singh Sadioura and others for their passion in serving the community.

Finally, TV Channel i also deserves congratulations on its 15 years of service to the Bangladesh community here in Canada and throughout the world.

JEANNOT CARON

Ms. Marie-Claude Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today it is my great pleasure to celebrate the exceptional contribution of an individual in my riding.

Jeannot Caron received the Prix d'excellence de leader engagé, an award recognizing his dedication to community leadership, during the 26th symposium of the Réseau québécois de Villes et Villages en santé, an organization that promotes healthy communities.

He is a dynamic man who brings people together and is deeply involved in his community, but his personal history is unusual. After a difficult time in his life, he was forced to live on the street. It was not easy for him to reintegrate, but he chose to use his experience to help those most in need. Every day, Jeannot battles the stereotypes that plague homeless people and those struggling with mental health issues.

He manages several community organizations, co-founded the Solidarité itinérance maskoutaine round table on homelessness, and was an active participant in creating Lit'inérance, which offers shelter to the homeless. He is extremely generous in sharing his experience.

My hat goes off to you, Jeannot. If there were more people like you, the world would definitely be a better place.

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

VASU CHANHLANI

Mr. Patrick Brown (Barric, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 14, I was honoured to attend and speak at a memorial service for my dear friend and mentor, Mr. Vasu Chanchlani. He was not only a close friend of mine, but of Canada's as well.

Mr. Chanchlani was a celebrated businessman and a philanthropist.

Although he came to Canada in 1979, his close ties with his home country of India fuelled his advocacy for building a stronger relationship between our two great nations. As one of the founding members of the Canada India Foundation, he understood the true potential of building a strong bond with India, which led to the rich, long-standing partnership that we continue to build upon today.

His passion for education shone through as he gave generously to many of our Canadian universities in the areas of health, research, international relations, and literature, to name a few.

He accompanied the Prime Minister and the Governor General on their official visits to India.

My thoughts and prayers are with Vasu's family at this time. His contribution to Canada and India will never be forgotten and will be honoured forever.

*Statements by Members***TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARD**

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mr. Byron Ross, who was recently recognized by our Prime Minister with an award for teaching excellence.

Mr. Ross taught in the business program at the Swan Valley Regional Secondary School in Swan River, Manitoba. He taught his students tangible skills that provided them with the tools to become intuitive business leaders and entrepreneurs. He used hands-on techniques to teach the students responsibility and business sense.

His teachings have literally paid dividends for the students and their community. The school's store, the Tigers Den, operates during regular school hours and brings in over \$100,000 in annual sales.

His students have also partnered with the Swan Valley Credit Union to create their very own Tigers Credit Union with their own board of directors and operations.

Finally, through the youth in philanthropy program, his students help evaluate funding proposals through the Community Foundation of Swan Valley, helping to deliver \$5,000 in annual funding to deserving youth programs.

Congratulations to Mr. Ross for living by his students' motto, "To make a difference today for tomorrow".

* * *

URBAN FORESTS

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today on this National Tree Day, I would like to speak to the importance of urban forests.

Urban forests impact a significant number of Canadians, almost 85% of our population, yet Canada lags behind other G7 countries in the value we place on them. In the United States, management of urban forests falls under the responsibility of an individual equivalent to a Canadian deputy minister.

Urban forests are dynamic ecosystems that purify our air and water, help to control storm runoff, and conserve energy. Trees add form, structure, beauty, and breathing room in urban design. They reduce noise, provide recreational space, and add real economic value.

My hometown of London, Ontario, known as the Forest City, has introduced parallel legislation at the municipal level in recognition of the value of urban trees.

My Motion No. 536 proposes a federal leadership strategy to preserve, protect and promote urban forests for their life-giving value to Canadian communities.

I am grateful for the assistance of Michael Rosen, president of Tree Canada, in developing this strategy, as well as my New Democratic colleagues for their support.

I urge every member to support this important initiative, and I wish them all a happy National Tree Day.

ISLAMIC STATE

Hon. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when ISIL began murdering thousands of innocent men, women, children, and religious minorities, it completely violated every value Canadians hold dear. When ISIL threatened Canadians because we do not share its twisted view of the world, our government remained resolute in its strong stand against such atrocities. We condemn these terrorists and their violation of human rights and human dignity.

Though other parties may feel the need to try to rationalize away the threats Canadians face in a dangerous world, our government has been firm and swift in its response, helping to deliver military supplies to Iraqi forces combatting ISIL and sending military advisers to support them.

Our government will not sit idle. We will stand with our allies in condemning the threat and will work with them to extinguish it.

* * *

•(1415)

[*Translation*]

WOMEN IN POLITICS

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of taking part in an evening of seminars with the theme "Laval women in power: models of political engagement".

The event was organized by the Table de concertation de Laval en condition féminine, or TCLCF, under the auspices of the Réseau Lavalloises d'influence. Women from the education sector at the municipal, provincial and federal levels all came out to talk about the political reality and demystify the decision-making structures, hopefully making them less daunting and less intimidating.

I am proud to be part of the NDP, a party that believes in gender equality. In fact, over 40% of our caucus members are women.

Nevertheless, there is still a lot of work to do. Women are underrepresented in politics. We do politics differently and we do it well. It is up to us as female elected representatives to share our experiences and help women across the country get involved and run for political office.

That is why I support initiatives like the one just led by the TCLCF, and I congratulate them on their efforts. We must take our rightful place immediately; we must not wait.

Women in politics—this is non-negotiable. We must show our pride and break the glass ceiling once and for all.

* * *

[*English*]

ISLAMIC STATE

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have been watching the events in Iraq unfold with increasing horror over the past couple of months. There is no doubt that ISIL, also known more appropriately now by the name Daesh, are the most barbaric, heinous terrorists this world has ever known.

Statements by Members

Our Prime Minister and Foreign Affairs Minister have shown unrelenting leadership on this issue. Just this week, Daesh called for attacks on Canadians and all westerners.

In addition to the threat Canadians are facing, what is also alarming is the direct targeting of Christians within Iraq. CNN, churches, and other news organizations have all reported that Daesh is marking their homes with an Arabic symbol signifying “Christian”. Is there anything in history that can compare to this barbarity? It is an affront to everything Canada stands for. It is outrageous to all Canadians. We cannot stand idly by. We cannot be ambiguous.

I urge all members of the House to speak out clearly, loudly, and in unison against the tactics and very existence of Daesh. Let us heed the lessons of history.

* * *

[Translation]

NEW BRUNSWICK ELECTION

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the team of Liberal candidates elected on Monday evening and the new Premier-designate of New Brunswick, Brian Gallant.

Mr. Gallant ran a good campaign with an emphasis on job creation and fiscal responsibility.

[English]

The New Brunswick Liberals, under Brian Gallant's leadership, won a majority government on Monday night by discussing real issues that matter to New Brunswickers: jobs, affordability, and health care.

The Conservatives' record of job losses and financial mismanagement turned voters away from them, and even the visit of the Leader of the Opposition last Friday could not prevent the NDP from being shut out of the New Brunswick legislature.

New Brunswick needs strong leadership at a tough time, and Brian Gallant is up to the task.

[Translation]

I am sure that my colleagues join me in congratulating all the members of all the parties elected in Fredericton on Monday evening.

* * *

[English]

ISLAMIC STATE

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada will not and cannot stand idly by while the barbaric terrorist organization ISIL continues its slaughter of innocent civilians and religious minorities. We stand united with our allies and will work with them to address this threat.

As we have said, inaction is not an option. That is why Canada has delivered military aid to Iraqi forces, has deployed Canadian Armed Forces members to provide strategic and tactical advice, and

has provided funding to support regional efforts to limit the movement of foreign fighters into Iraq and Syria.

We have been clear that the clock on Canada's 30 day, non-combat deployment began on September 5, when it was announced by the Prime Minister. At the end 30 days, we will look at renewing the mission. Opposition leaders have been briefed on this deployment. The ministers of foreign affairs and defence appeared before a parliamentary committee.

While the NDP is primarily concerned with minute details, our focus is on what matters, and that is addressing the threat that ISIL represents, not just to the region but to civilization itself.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Chambly—Borduas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadian soldiers are taking part in a war, and contrary to what we just heard, the government refuses to answer basic questions.

We still do not have any information on the exact number of soldiers taking part in this war and, again, unlike what we just heard, we have not received any real information on the exact duration of the mission in response to the opposition's questions.

Unlike the Liberals, who are prepared to give the Conservatives carte blanche, as usual, we are trying to get more information. The Prime Minister and his parliamentary secretary refuse to be accountable to Canadians. Their presentation yesterday was pathetic.

● (1420)

[English]

When asked if he would condemn this, the member for Kitchener Centre used a horrible comparison. He compared women's weight to the farce we saw in this House yesterday.

Gender issues and terrible comparisons aside, it is obvious the Conservatives know how wrong they are on this issue. The purpose of asking questions in this House, again compared to what we have heard from that member, is to get answers, not to ask questions for nothing. Failing to provide those answers is disrespectful to this institution, to Canadians, and to our soldiers. Canadians deserve better.

* * *

VASU CHANHLANI

Mr. Paul Calandra (Oak Ridges—Markham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada to recognize a great Canadian, Mr. Vasu Chanchlani, who, sadly, passed away on September 7.

Born in India, Vasu immigrated to Canada in 1979. He soon established himself as a successful entrepreneur who directed much of his energy to philanthropy. Vasu provided generous support to university health and other research programs and helped to mentor young leaders in the Indo-Canadian community. He was a founding member of the Canada India Foundation and actively worked to strengthen bilateral relations between Canada and India. His work directly improved the lives of many people, earning him widespread respect.

We join with Vasu's family and many friends in mourning this great loss and express our profound gratitude for Vasu's contributions to our country. He represented the very best of Canada.

* * *

STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The Speaker: Before we proceed to question period, the Chair wishes to make a brief statement.

The office of Speaker is an ancient one, and there are many procedural authorities in this country and abroad that describe the Speaker's role. Our own tome, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, encapsulates my role, as follows, at page 307:

The Speaker is the servant, neither of any part of the House nor of any majority in the House, but of the entire institution and serves the best interests of the House as distilled over many generations in its practices.

Despite the considerable authority of the office, the Speaker may exercise only those powers conferred upon him or her by the House, within the limits established by the House itself.

With respect to question period proceedings, contrary to what some members and others may believe, this means adhering to practices that have evolved over a broad span of time and that have consistently been upheld by successive Speakers.

By way of example, on October 28, 2010, *Debates* page 5505, Speaker Milliken said:

As all of the hon. members know, the Speaker has no authority over the content of answers given by a minister or parliamentary secretary in response to a question asked during question period.

The issue came up again on December 1, 2010, *Debates* page 6677, and on that occasion Speaker Milliken stated:

The minister, in his response, may not have answered the question, but it is not the role of the Chair to decide whether a response is an answer or not to the question. Indeed, the Chair has no authority to rule an answer out of order unless the answer contains unparliamentary remarks or a personal attack on some other member.

It is not for the Chair to decide whether the content of a response is in fact an answer. As we have heard many times, that is why it is called question period not answer period.

In my own ruling regarding question period proceedings, delivered on January 28, 2014, I stated very clearly:

There has been much discussion recently about the nature of answers during question period, with calls for the Speaker to somehow intervene, citing practices in other countries....

Each parliament has its own traditions. Successive speakers in our House have maintained our tradition of not intervening in respect of answers to questions, and I do not intend to change that. For me to deviate from this long-standing practice would require an invitation from the House.

To date, the House has not seen fit to alter our practices or to give directions to the Chair in that regard.

Oral Questions

That being said, I have no doubt that Canadians expect members to elevate the tone and substance of question period exchanges. As your Speaker, I hope the House can rise to that challenge.

To be absolutely clear on another point, any suggestion that the rules of repetition and relevance apply to question period is wrong and ignores the long list of Speakers' rulings to the contrary.

Another of our time-honoured traditions is that of respect for the office of Speaker. O'Brien and Bosc, at page 313, states that:

Reflections on the character or actions of the Speaker—an allegation of bias, for example—could be taken by the House as breeches of privilege and punished accordingly.

I wish to conclude with an appeal to members on all sides. Needless to say, the kind of unsavoury language or expression that we heard yesterday does little to assist the Chair in managing question period proceedings, and I urge all members to be judicious in the expressions they choose to use.

I also ask all members to heed my request of last January 28, when I asked members:

...to consider how the House can improve things so that observers can at least agree that question period presents an exchange of views and provides at least some information. The onus is on all members to raise the quality of both questions and answers.

ORAL QUESTIONS

● (1425)

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are still waiting for answers to the clear questions put to the Conservatives about the military deployment in Iraq.

Yesterday, the Conservatives again refused to answer questions about this and instead chose to make unparliamentary remarks.

The member for Selkirk—Interlake said that the mission will end on October 4. However, he cannot speak for the government because he is not a member of cabinet.

Today in the House, will the Conservative government confirm to Canadians that the 30-day military deployment in Iraq will actually end on October 4?

[*English*]

Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government has been clear both inside and outside the House that the clock started on the 30-day deployment on September 5. At the end of these 30 days, we will look at renewing the mission. The atrocities currently being committed by ISIL cannot be left unanswered.

It is outrageous that the NDP would have us do nothing in the face of that threat. It is time the NDP explained what it would do to stop ISIL and its terrorist regime.

Oral Questions

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it has been confirmed that Canadian soldiers are required to have visas approved by the Iraqi government before they can be deployed. The member for Selkirk—Interlake, even if he is not a minister and cannot really speak for the government, said last night that there were “some difficulties in dealing with logistics”.

Since this military deployment is still ongoing and since it is set to conclude in just 11 days, precisely how many Canadian soldiers are on the ground in Iraq today?

Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no fact to that statement at all. I can confirm that we have committed 69 members of the Canadian special armed forces to be in Iraq to provide tactical and strategic advice in a non-combat role, and that is exactly what we are doing.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): I know the Conservatives find this complicated, Mr. Speaker, but it was actually a question and not a statement. The question was, how many of them are on the ground in Iraq now?

When asked two weeks ago in committee, the minister said that a status of forces agreement with Iraq outlining operating rules for Canadian Forces had not yet been completed. That was two weeks ago in a parliamentary committee with the foreign affairs minister.

Has that status of forces agreement now been completed and, if so, will the government table it in Parliament, yes or no?

Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have committed to 69 members being deployed to northern Iraq to fight—to be in an advisory role with the Peshmerga, helping it out, along with the invitation of the Iraqi government. We are there strictly in an advisory role, non-combat, and it is very clear what we are trying to do there. It has been laid out by the Minister of National Defence and it has been laid out by the Minister of Foreign Affairs over and over again. The NDP just does not get it.

Why are the New Democrats so opposed to us sending over members of the Canadian Armed Forces who have expertise in the area of counterterrorism?

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there are no boots on the ground, so they must be in sandals or levitating. They are not in a combat mission, but they are there to fight.

[*Translation*]

Yesterday, the member for Selkirk—Interlake also hinted that it is entirely possible that the 30-day mission in Iraq could last longer.

Before Canada commits itself any further, when will the Conservatives keep their promise to provide all the information to which Canadians and parliamentarians are entitled and to hold a vote in Parliament after a thorough debate?

We have the right to vote, as the Conservatives promised, on whether Canada is to go to war.

• (1430)

[*English*]

Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has routinely deployed the Canadian Armed Forces around the world in non-combat roles. It has never been the practice to have a vote on such deployments in Parliament.

Just recently, we have HMCS *Toronto* in the Black Sea, we have troops on the ground in Poland taking part in exercise,s and we have members of the Royal Canadian Air Force plus equipment of the RCAF involved in air policing missions, all as part of NATO's Operation Reassurance. We never voted on any of that.

Having said that, the opposition has its own opposition days when it can bring this forward for debate and also a vote.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this evening the House will vote on the issue of missing and murdered aboriginal women.

We are very proud of the role the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou played in forcing this debate and less proud of the Government of Canada, which has categorically refused to hold a public inquiry into the fate of 1,200 aboriginal women.

Will the Conservatives finally support aboriginal women this evening?

[*English*]

Tonight the Conservatives can do the right thing and agree to a full public inquiry so families of these missing and murdered women can begin to have closure. Will they vote yes or no?

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch (Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have been very clear multiple times in the House, we are standing up for these victims of crime.

So the Leader of the Opposition can hear it clearly, let me quote yet again from Bernadette Smith, whose sister Claudette Osborne went missing in 2008. She said, “This Action Plan is something that our families have been waiting for. I would like to thank...the Government for their commitment to addressing this issue.” This is addressing it now, not waiting for the future.

She also said, “This Action Plan will have a direct impact on families and it will help keep our women and girls safe.”

That is what it is about. It is about acting now, ensuring they are safe now and are no longer victims of these crimes.

*Oral Questions***THE ECONOMY**

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today's young people are the first generation of Canadians to be worse off than their parents. The gap in income between older and younger workers has grown nearly 50% wider since the 1980s.

What will the government do to restore the promise of progress for all Canadians?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government has provided record support for low-income Canadians. For example, we have removed over one million low-income Canadians, 380,000 of whom are seniors, from the tax rolls.

We have increased the amount that Canadians can earn without paying taxes. We have created landmark working income tax benefits to support low-income Canadians who work. We have increased the guaranteed income supplement for the most vulnerable seniors.

However, the Liberals and NDP have voted against these measures and against low-income Canadians each and every time.

[Translation]

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, an expert report indicates that the income gap between older and younger workers has grown by almost 50% since the 1980s. Young people not only earn less, but there are also fewer jobs available for them.

This evening, the government has the opportunity to vote in favour of a solution that will create jobs and contribute to economic growth. Will it vote for the Liberals' plan?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, thanks to our government, the percentage of Canadians living in low-income families is now the lowest it has been in 30 years. Since 2006, low-income families have seen a 14% increase in their real after-tax income. Over 40% of all taxpayers are not paying any net taxes. It is therefore not surprising that the federal tax burden is the lowest it has been in 50 years.

* * *

[English]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the last thing Canadians need is the Conservative minister's EI plan that gives a stronger incentive to businesses to shrink and fire than to grow and hire.

Conservatives can still fix this. Tonight, will they vote for our plan to provide an EI premium exemption to Canadian businesses for new jobs they actually create?

• (1435)

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the last thing Liberals are qualified to talk about is EI. The Liberals used EI premiums as a political slush fund, and they completely raided the account by almost \$60 billion.

We are lowering EI premiums by 15%. We are going to save small business over \$550 million. That is 780,000 businesses, 90% of all businesses in our country.

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, while the international community is doing its part to restart negotiations on fighting climate change, the Minister of the Environment is giving speeches to an empty room. No one is interested in what the Conservatives have to say about the environment, because it is straight out of another century. Waiting to see what others announce is not leadership.

What measures will Canada put forward at the Paris conference in 2015?

[English]

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have been clear, going forward to the Paris agreement, that we want an agreement for Canada that is fair, that includes all emitters and all economies. I was very pleased to hear many of the countries speaking at the UN forum yesterday agreeing with Canada's position. That is showing leadership.

Canada has consistently been moving to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in our country and at the same time growing the economy. We have done that without introducing a \$20 billion carbon tax.

Our plan is working. We can do both, not one or the other.

[Translation]

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the fight against climate change is a significant challenge for Canada, but it is also an amazing opportunity for many industries that are involved in developing clean technologies. Canada is going to be left out of decisions that are made and partnerships that are formed in New York.

Why are the Conservatives depriving our companies of these economic opportunities?

[English]

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have stated before in the House, Canada's greenhouse gas emission level represents less than 2% of the global greenhouse gas emissions. Canada has also one of the cleanest electricity systems in the world, with 77% of our electricity supply emitting no greenhouse gas.

Our sector-by-sector approach in Canada is working. We continue to see greenhouse gas emissions decreasing, while at the same time the economy is growing, and that is being done in partnership with private industry in our country.

We are doing this without introducing a \$20 billion carbon tax that would kill jobs.

Oral Questions

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, any credit given to the electricity sector is thanks to the provinces. The federal government is not getting the job done, and we are playing catch-up to the U.S.

This so-called sector-by-sector approach ignores the single most polluting sector. The oil and gas sector makes up 25% of all emissions in Canada, and its emissions are predicted to triple. What we get are re-announced vehicle regulations that will not even come into force until 2017.

Once again, when will the government introduce its oil and gas regulations?

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was very proud to announce further action that we were taking related to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the auto industry. We announced that in New York this week. At the same time, we are moving forward to introduce regulations for the heavy-duty vehicles again. That will result in further reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

Again, we are doing this without introducing a \$20 billion carbon tax that would kill jobs in our country.

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, leadership means being out in front, not following the U.S. because we do not have a choice. Nothing that has been re-announced this week will get Canada any closer to meeting our emissions goals. In fact, we are going to miss it by 100 million tonnes or more. That is not leadership, and nobody is fooled.

Instead of bragging about what little the government has done, could the minister explain to us how it plans to meet its climate change goals?

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are very proud of our record in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

In 2012, Canada became the first major coal user to ban the construction of traditional coal-fired electricity. The United States followed suit in 2014. Now that is showing leadership.

We are also the founding member of the Climate and Clean Air Coalition that is focused on taking immediate actions, which is producing real results in two years. We are moving forward.

I encourage the member to read the annual report that was released at the UN, which demonstrates we are taking—

• (1440)

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Saint-Lambert.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé (Saint-Lambert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Employment and Social Development lectured the provinces over the issue of temporary foreign workers. He thinks the real problem is that the provinces are not investing enough in

technical and vocational schools. There is nothing but cynicism from the man who is responsible for bungling the temporary foreign worker program and who is incapable of providing reliable job market data to the provinces.

Will the minister finally get his own program in order instead of pointing fingers at the provinces?

Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the question was not clear. That said, we conducted a comprehensive reform of the temporary foreign worker program, which led to a 75% drop in employers' requests for foreign workers.

I am working closely with the provinces and territories to improve the training systems in order to give young Canadians the skills and abilities they need to take on the jobs that exist all across our growing economy.

[English]

Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Employment and Social Development seemed to be a tad confused yesterday. Instead of accepting responsibility for his own mismanagement of the temporary foreign worker program, the minister is out there blaming the provinces for letting the program get out of hand. He takes no responsibility for his own mistakes.

Where is the minister's accountability for the way he completely bungled the temporary foreign worker program?

Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my NDP critic, it might behoove her to actually read the remarks that I made, which had nothing to do at all with the temporary foreign worker program. I was talking about the skills agenda, about our work with the provinces to retool our training programs to ensure that young Canadians have skills that are relevant for the labour market of today and the future. I was not talking about the temporary foreign worker program. I was encouraging provinces to use the 50% increase in the Canada social transfer that our government has provided them with and ensure that it goes toward relevant training, training that leads to real jobs and bright career prospects for young Canadians.

I would encourage the NDP to join us in this work to provide those skills.

Oral Questions

Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister mismanaged the temporary foreign worker program for six years. Surely if he thought it was growing out of control, as he mentioned, he had plenty of opportunity to take action. Instead, the Conservatives relaxed the rules and made it easier to bring in foreign workers. Now the minister wants us all to believe that this was the fault of the provinces. Why will the minister not take responsibility for the mess he has made and finally fix the program?

Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I made no such suggestion, comment, statement, or allusion. It is a complete fabrication of the member's imagination. However, I have a question for the member. Her leader said on live TV earlier this year that the temporary foreign worker program “morphed into having everybody in your McDonald's or your Tim Hortons coming from another country”. However, 98% of the people who work at Canadian restaurants, and 96% of those who work at McDonald's, for example, are Canadian citizens or permanent residents.

My question for the Leader of the Opposition is, who are those people he sees when he says everybody working in those restaurants is coming from another country?

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have an important vote tonight on an important debate. I ask my colleagues on the other side to do the right thing, to recognize the growing and overwhelming consensus for a national inquiry into the issue of the 1,200 missing and murdered indigenous women, to recognize that their special committee report is not the answer to this social crisis. It is not the answer families are still looking for. Will they finally listen?

• (1445)

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch (Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, having gone out and spoken to aboriginal families across the country, I can say that what they have asked for is our action plan. As opposed to waiting like the NDP would like to, they would like action and they would like it now. They want to be supported. They want prevention programs. They want to make sure they are protected. These have been victims of domestic violence, and I must say I commend the RCMP, because 90% of these crimes have been solved. We are focused on the others. However, let us be clear: we are taking action now for these families and victims of crime as opposed to what the NDP wants to do, which is just sit and watch the world go by.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister's so-called action plan cannot be trusted. We are talking about 1,200 missing and murdered aboriginal women, and the problem continues. This evening, my colleagues opposite will have the opportunity to take meaningful action in memory of these women who were victims of violence.

They can vote against a report that symbolizes 30 years of indifference and 30 years of inaction, and they can finally

acknowledge the need for a national public inquiry. Will they take action?

[*English*]

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch (Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I guess what I would like to ask the NDP is to support our concrete plan to make sure that we are getting action for these victims of crime. This is very clear. Aboriginal women and aboriginal families have asked us and compelled us to move forward with this. We are acting now, and I ask the NDP to support it, but I do not expect that, because New Democrats have opposed every initiative we have put forward. Whether it be shelters for aboriginal women on reserve or whether it be matrimonial property rights, they vote against these things. Let us be clear. We are about action, making sure these families and victims of crime are supported now.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Quebec Superior Court halted exploratory drilling in Cacouna, and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is the one responsible for the whole mess. She refused to provide the Quebec environment minister with a scientific assessment of the impact this drilling would have on the health of belugas, an iconic species that is threatened.

When will the Conservatives stop pitting environmental protection against economic development, to the detriment of both the environment and the economy?

[*English*]

Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me clarify something. The object of yesterday's ruling was a review and authorization undertaken by the Quebec provincial government under provincial laws in Quebec.

DFO conducted its own review of TransCanada's work and improved it, based on strict conditions. I remain confident in the diligence and the expertise of DFO scientists, and as this is a legal matter, I have nothing more to add.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Conservatives are clearly out of ideas on the economy, and their fiscal incompetence is putting middle-class jobs and families at risk. The Conservative EI scheme would hurt small businesses by incentivizing the firing of people, rather than encouraging job creation. However, the Liberal EI premium exemption would help create jobs and encourage growth in Canada's economy.

Oral Questions

When are the Conservatives going to abandon their narrow interests and adopt the Liberal plan, which is great for Canada?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal leader's hastily conceived back-of-the-envelope mishmash of ideas would do the very thing he indirectly and incorrectly identifies is the problem with our plan. It would encourage firing workers, especially temporary or seasonal workers. In contrast, our plan would generate 25,000 jobs and provide \$550 million to the small business sector, which is the generator of employment in this country.

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal plan to provide an EI break for new hires is endorsed by Canadian job creators.

Restaurants Canada says, "This Liberal proposal for an EI exemption for new hires would help restaurants create jobs". Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters says, "Liberal plan would create jobs". CFIB says, "Love the [Liberal] plan.... Lots of job potential". They all agree that the Liberal plan would help create jobs and growth.

Will the Conservatives listen to Canadian business and adopt the Liberal plan for jobs and growth?

• (1450)

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the CFIB was very clear. Our plan would create 25,000 person-years. This is extremely advantageous for the economy, for the generation of employment in this country. In contrast, the Liberal plan would encourage the firing of seasonal and temporary workers, precisely the opposite of what we want to achieve.

Ours is a plan that would generate employment and economic growth. We are onside for an economic surplus, which would provide advantages to all Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Ms. Éline Michaud (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in 2008, the Conservatives decided to cancel the contract to replace the Royal Canadian Navy's supply ships.

Because of these delays, in a few months the navy will find itself without any joint supply ships and may have to stay in port.

Caught off guard, the Conservatives are now going to buy ships that are at the end of their lifespan from the American military. Well done.

Can the Minister of National Defence tell us how much the Conservatives' mismanagement of the supply ships is going to cost Canadians?

[English]

Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is delivering equipment to the Royal Canadian Navy by investing \$4 billion to modernize the *Halifax*-class frigates and \$36.6 billion in the national shipbuilding procurement strategy. The joint supply ship project will deliver two ships and will replace the navy's *Protecteur*-class vessels

that are now more than 40 years old and nearing the end of their service lives. The navy is currently investigating all options to address the immediate impact of retiring these two vessels.

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear about what is happening here. Conservative mismanagement has left our navy without critical resupply capabilities. The government knew full well that these ships in service since the 1960s needed urgent replacement, yet it cancelled the joint support ship contract in 2008. These ships would be in the water now.

Why has the navy been left to scramble, and what will this new gambit of buying aging ships from the United States cost Canadians?

Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Royal Canadian Navy, as I already said, is currently undertaking the most comprehensive fleet modernization and renewal in peacetime history. This includes the modernization of 12 *Halifax*-class frigates, seven of which are already completed with their refits.

As always, we are going to ensure that the Canadian Armed Forces have the tools and the equipment to get the job done.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Conservatives like to go hard on these great big announcements, but they are so soft on the real follow-through.

Let us look at the government's sanctions against Russia, because they are full of loopholes. On top of refusing to sanction key business players close to President Putin, it turns out that Canadian sanctions are three times less likely to penalize Russian oil companies as sanctions from the United States.

Will the minister please explain how letting Russian oil companies off the hook helps Ukraine?

Hon. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada has one of the strongest sanctions against the Russian regime. Let me quote the figures exactly. Canada has approximately 171 sanctions against the Russians. In contrast, the U. S. has only 107 and the European Union 146.

This government is leading the sanctions against Russia. She should check her facts.

[Translation]

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is not about the number of sanctions but their targets.

According to *The Canadian Press*, the sanctions imposed on Russia very carefully avoid targeting oil and gas companies. The United States is targeting 13 oil companies, while the Conservative sanctions target only five. It is strange. The four largest companies are completely immune.

What is the Conservatives' priority? Is it to support the people of Ukraine or to protect the economic interests of oil companies?

[English]

Hon. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should have listened to the President of Ukraine when he said that Canada is one of the best friends that Ukraine has ever had. That should answer her question in reference to Canada's very strong support for the Ukrainian people, including their government.

We will continue, as we have said, to look at this situation, and we will continue to be a strong supporter of Ukraine in its fight for freedom from Russia.

* * *

• (1455)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. John Carmichael (Don Valley West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have seen atrocity after atrocity committed by the barbaric group ISIL. Western journalists have been executed in cold blood, residents of Iraq and Syria have been brutalized, and Canadians have been singled out as a target. This is all in the name of radical Islamic terrorism. While our Conservative government has created new tools for protecting national security, the Liberal leader has mused that taking a passport away from a radical extremist is an affront to Canadian values.

Can the Minister of Public Safety update the House on what our government is doing to protect Canadians from the threat of ISIL?

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Don Valley West is right. The Islamic State is a threat to Canadians and our way of life. That is why our government listed this barbaric group as a terrorist organization today.

[Translation]

The Islamic State is a serious threat to our country and our way of life. That is why, today, the government added this terrorist entity, whose actions are shameful and barbaric, to Canada's list of terrorist groups.

Let us be clear. Individuals who engage in acts of terrorism are not worthy of carrying a Canadian passport.

* * *

[English]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Malcolm Allen (Welland, NDP): Mr. Speaker, once again the Conservatives have proven that they are unwilling to defend grain producers. When the pressure was on, the Minister of Agriculture stood up in the House, before committee and as part

Oral Questions

of the order in council, and said that we were going to fine those rail companies \$100,000 a day.

Here is today's reality. The Minister of Transport says no, hang on, it is only going to be \$100,000 a week. So much for tough talk.

I have a simple question for the minister. Why did he back down and when will he finally stand up for farmers?

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may have missed it, but in my opinion, this is the best agriculture minister that we have seen. He has stood up, all the time, for grain farmers. He has consistently acted to ensure that grain farmers are protected. CN has not hit its levels. We will enforce. It is in violation, and we will continue to make sure that we protect, through the Minister of Agriculture, grain farmers in Canada.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that last spring, the Ministers of Transport and Agriculture crossed the country talking tough, announcing fines of \$100,000 a day, but when it came to cracking down on rail companies that failed to deliver Canadian grain, Conservatives just rolled over.

Now we have learned that the actual fines are only a fraction of that amount. Prairie farmers are saying that this is just par for the course; the intervention was too little, too late.

Can the minister tell our farmers why the minimal penalties?

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, again I want to personally thank the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food for his great work on the file, to ensure that we are working together as a government on this matter.

We should also talk to the people out there who are the ones who are the beneficiaries of Bill C-30.

Brett Halstead, president of the Canadian Canola Growers Association stated:

This action demonstrates that Government is listening to farmers' concerns. We look forward to working with the Government and other industry stakeholders.

Quite frankly, the opposition is not in the game on this one. The government is the one that is dealing with this on a daily basis and is out front through the minister.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. François Lapointe (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a Superior Court judge had to suspend drilling off the coast of Cacouna.

In her decision, she criticized Quebec, which never received the scientific opinions that were requested from Fisheries and Oceans Canada's science branch. The scientists' inability to speak up resulted in the premature commencement of an oil company's operations with complete disregard for our environmental obligations.

Contrary to what the minister said, they are drilling in beluga habitat without knowing what beluga experts think of the undertaking.

Oral Questions

Will the minister finally let the experts speak and will she provide the scientific opinions? This whole screw-up happened because of how her department is run. They are not fooling anyone.

[English]

Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me repeat again. The object of yesterday's ruling was a review of a Quebec provincial government law. I cannot speak for the Province of Quebec, but what I can say is that DFO conducted its own review of TransCanada's work and approved it based on strict conditions. The decision was based on science, carried out with the expertise of DFO scientists.

I find it ironic that the New Democrats claim to be on the side of science and then turn around and question our scientists' competence when it suits their politics.

• (1500)

[Translation]

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that is the problem. Fisheries and Oceans Canada did not provide a scientific opinion. There were opinions for seismic surveys, but not for drilling.

The judge was clear: none of the officials involved in reviewing the file had any expertise on marine mammals. She also noted that Quebec never obtained scientific opinions from Fisheries and Oceans Canada's science branch.

Does the minister realize that by keeping those scientists quiet and allowing drilling at Cacouna to begin prematurely, she is responsible for this whole mess and she failed to meet her environmental obligations?

[English]

Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, again let me repeat: the judge was not ruling on a federal authorization; the judge was ruling on a Quebec provincial authorization, and I cannot speak for the Province of Quebec.

However, I do know that our DFO scientists conducted reviews, reviewed TransCanada's work, and approved it based on the very strictest conditions.

This is a legal matter. I have nothing more to add. As I said before, all of the scientific information is on the Internet.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Ms. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the navy trusted the Conservative government's claims that it would replace its aging ships. What a mistake. Now Canada's only naval supply ships are being retired, but replacements the government finally commissioned are way behind schedule and will not be available for years. That means our navy will simply not be functional. Now the government is panicking and may have to buy old, used American ships instead.

Let us give the parliamentary secretary another chance to level with Canadians. How much will the Conservatives' woeful incompetence cost when they have to cancel their made-in-Canada supply ships that they already commissioned?

Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is really rich coming from the Liberal Party, a party that cancelled our replacements to the Sea Kings, the party that went and bought used submarines.

The member for Markham—Unionville back in 2008 said, when referring to the defence file, that he thought the defence budget had gone up at an alarming rate, so we will take no lessons from the Liberals while we are trying to help the Royal Canadian Navy. We are investing in modernizing the frigates and we have a \$36.6 billion program in the national shipbuilding procurement.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Trinity—Spadina, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not only is climate change having a disastrous impact on the environment; it is wreaking havoc on municipalities and their budgets. Just like with climate change, the federal government's response to natural disasters is also missing in action when it comes to this issue.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities is pleading with the government to review and rewrite its disaster protocols. Cities should not have to wait months for financial help.

On the environment, the government is at best negligent; on disaster relief, it is just plain incompetent.

When will Canadians and municipalities be able to depend on the government to show up when it is needed?

[Translation]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our Canadian government has a remarkable record when it comes to supporting Canadian communities struggling to cope with natural disasters. What is insulting is that the Liberal member voted against a \$200 million budget to prepare Canada and communities for natural disasters. If anyone is missing in action, Mr. Speaker, it is the gentleman on the other side of the House.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has just stated in New York that the United States has requested additional resources from Canada in Iraq. The Prime Minister says that he needs to have some debate in cabinet before he can make any decision on this file.

Will there also be a debate and vote in the House of Commons?

Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have been supportive of U.S. efforts in forming the coalition to tackle ISIL, and that is why we have committed Canadian Forces in a non-combat role. We are coming up to the end of 30 days from September 5 and we will have these discussions as we review our progress and look at renewing our commitment.

* * *

● (1505)

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, you are quite right; this is called question period and not answer period, unfortunately.

Along with the NDP, there are now 87 municipalities that have passed resolutions opposing the end of home mail delivery in Canada. Now we have heard that Canada Post will need to rent commercial space in large cities for its mailboxes. Knowing the Conservatives, it will probably cost more to rent thousands of square feet of space than it would to just deliver the mail to people. Enough with the wasteful spending.

Will the Conservatives ask Canada Post to go back to the drawing board and defend and protect this service, which people really want?

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2013, Canada Post delivered one billion fewer letters than it did in 2006. Two-thirds of Canadians do not receive mail at their door.

[English]

In answer to the member's question, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities overwhelmingly defeated a motion asking the government to turn over the changes at Canada Post. Maybe he should check his facts.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mrs. Nina Grewal (Fleetwood—Port Kells, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the community of Surrey is rightly outraged. On Monday, a convicted high-risk sex offender who was released into the community last year was charged with the second degree murder of 17-year-old Serena Vermeersch.

Cases such as these make it clear that we must continue to make the protection of our communities a top priority, especially when it comes to protecting our children.

Our government committed to supporting victims and punishing criminals. Could the Minister of Justice update the House on our progress?

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is a horrific case. Our thoughts are with the Vermeersch family.

After years of soft-on-crime policies from the Liberal government, Canadians can now count on our government to re-establish Canada as a country where those who break the law are punished with penalties that match the crime.

Oral Questions

To date, our government has presented over 30 justice bills. We made it a priority to protect our most vulnerable, our children, by cracking down on child sex predators. We have introduced more consecutive and mandatory minimum sentences for serious violent crime. We ended house arrest for child sex offences. We got rid of the faint hope clause, raised the age of consent, and gave more protection for victims.

Serious violent crime deserves serious time. That is what our government is delivering.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, finally but long overdue, the government signed an agreement with South Korea, such that we have implementation legislation before the House.

However, the government's tardiness in getting to this point has cost the beef and hog industry countless millions of dollars, allowing the United States to displace us in that important market. If it is not implemented by January 1, the government stands to give our competitors a further 2.5% tariff advantage.

Will the minister act with urgency and assure the industry that this will be implemented by the January 1 deadline?

Hon. Ed Fast (Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government was very pleased to host President Park of Korea this year, when we actually signed the final trade agreement. We have asked every party in the House to move this agreement forward legislatively in a timely way. This agreement is very important to Canada. It would increase our exports by 32%. We expect it to add close to \$2 billion of economic activity to our economy. In more than 13 long, dark years under the Liberals, they got nothing done on the trade file. On this side, we get it. We are standing up for Canadians.

* * *

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, tonight the House will vote on a bill that can help cut off—

Hon. Ralph Goodale: What a joke.

The Speaker: Order, please. We have moved on to the next question.

The hon. member for Ottawa Centre has the floor.

Points of Order

Mr. Paul Dewar: Mr. Speaker, tonight the House will vote on a bill that can help cut off resources to violent extremists in the Great Lakes region of Africa. These extremists have killed millions, used rape as a weapon of war, and enslaved children. Their atrocities are financed by the sale of conflict minerals that end up right here in Canada. Civil society and industry, including the Mining Association of Canada, want to see this bill move forward. I have a simple question. Will the Conservatives support this important legislation?

• (1510)

Hon. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government has long been committed to combatting conflict minerals and is always looking for ways to improve our efforts. Unfortunately, Bill C-486 is fundamentally flawed, and instead of making tangible progress on the issue, it stigmatizes the region in Africa and creates burdens and red tape that would only serve to harm the people of the Great Lakes. Canada will continue to work with the Great Lakes region and the Canadian industry to increase transparency and accountability in resource development.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon (Mississauga East—Cooksville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, people in my riding are closely watching international efforts to address the faraway public health threat posed by Ebola and more familiar public health issues closer to home, such as the yearly flu season.

I myself have been very proud to see Canada at the forefront of the world's united response to the Ebola outbreak and the fact that our public health agency has had a significant hand in developing a number of experimental vaccines and treatments. Could the Minister of Health please update the House on the latest developments in Canada's public health agency?

Hon. Rona Ambrose (Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his work on the health committee. He is, in fact, right that Canada is at the forefront of the fight on the Ebola crisis, and leading that effort is Dr. Gregory Taylor. It makes me very happy to inform the House and the country that Dr. Gregory Taylor has just accepted the appointment to become Canada's Chief Public Health Officer. I congratulate him. He has the confidence of the international public health community and, of course, the provinces and territories. I know he will work very hard to earn the confidence of all Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Mrs. Djaouida Sellah (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, elected officials in the greater Longueuil community are angry about the Conservatives' intransigence and arrogance regarding Canada Post. The people of Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, especially seniors and people with disabilities, are very concerned about the arrival of community mailboxes.

How can the government support the elimination of home mail delivery and continue to ignore the unanimous voice of elected officials in the greater Longueuil area?

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have said in the House before, Canada Post is facing a reality where people are simply not utilizing the mail anymore. They are using other means to send their transmissions. As a result, there were one billion fewer pieces of mail delivered in 2012. It has taken a five-point plan, put together to ensure that going forward it will be self-sufficient, as it is supposed to be under its legislation.

We support Canada Post and what it is doing.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Claude Patry (Jonquière—Alma, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Quebec Superior Court issued an injunction to halt work on the Cacouna oil terminal until October 15. Quebec called on Fisheries and Oceans Canada to provide clarification on the scientific analysis that raised concerns about the project, but those requests were ignored.

What is more, the company refuses to commit in writing to protecting the belugas' natural habitat. The federal government is so confused that it seems to be more concerned about supporting TransCanada than protecting our environment. Will the government wait and comply with the studies and findings of the Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement, the BAPE, before proceeding with the project?

[English]

Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak to Quebec's authorization, but that was the subject of yesterday's ruling. It was a review undertaken by the Quebec provincial government under Quebec provincial laws.

DFO conducted its own review of TransCanada's work, and we did approve it, based on science advice and under the strictest conditions.

The Speaker: That concludes question period for today.

The Chair has notice of a point of order from the hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

* * *

[Translation]

POINTS OF ORDER**ORAL QUESTIONS**

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today on a point of order to draw your attention to something that happened yesterday in the House. The hon. member for Wascana misled the House.

[English]

As you know, Mr. Speaker, misleading the House is a grave offence. The precedents that support this view are extensive. It is important that I rise to raise this question to hold the member for Wascana accountable for what he says.

During question period yesterday, the member said:

Mr. Speaker, the CFIB and economists like Mintz, Moffatt, and Gordon all support the jobs approach of my colleague, the member for Papineau.

Stephen Gordon reacted to this on social media by saying the member for Wascana "...misrepresents my views of the House of Commons.... I never said anything nice about LPC EI proposal". He then added, "...I think the...proposal is yet another gimmick in a long line of 'job-creation' gimmicks. I should be pleased if the hon. member for Wascana could read that into Hansard."

I believe this problem could be easily fixed and I hope the member for Wascana will take this opportunity to correct the record and not bring Mr. Gordon into his ill-fated scheme.

• (1515)

The Speaker: It sounds like that might be more of a matter of debate, but I see the hon. member for Wascana is rising. I will give the hon. member for Wascana the floor if he wishes to respond.

The hon. member for Wascana.

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Gordon holds those views, I am happy to accommodate him, but I would also point out that his views are also contradicting Jack Layton's platform from 2011.

The Speaker: Perhaps it is best if we move on to tabling of documents.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

STATE OF CANADA'S FORESTS

Hon. Greg Rickford (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table the 2014 State of Canada's Forests report.

[Translation]

I encourage all Canadians to read this document on Canada's forests.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL FIDDLE DAY ACT

Mrs. Tilly O'Neill Gordon (Miramichi, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill S-218, an act respecting national fiddling day.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce Bill S-218, an act respecting national fiddling day, which would designate the third Saturday in May of each year as national fiddling day.

Routine Proceedings

The art of fiddle playing has a significant role in culture and social history of Canada and is practised in all regions of our great country. The enactment of a national fiddling day would give Canadians a chance to celebrate and appreciate the rich history and beauty of fiddle music in Canada.

I trust all members of the House will support this bill.

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

* * *

[Translation]

PETITIONS

PENSIONS

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hands a petition signed by people from New Brunswick. Provincial government pension experts and seniors' support agencies are in favour of an increase in Canada pension plan and Quebec pension plan benefits.

They are calling on the federal government to work together with the provincial and territorial governments to increase pension benefits under the Canada and Quebec pension plans and implement a fully funded plan to phase in such an increase without delay.

• (1520)

[English]

CANADA POST

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition from the people of Bathurst, New Brunswick.

The petition states that between 6,000 and 8,000 Canada Post workers will lose their jobs and that the reduction in service could lead to the privatization of Canada Post, which is essential to public service.

The petitioners call upon the government to reject the Canada Post plan to reduce service and to explore other options to update the crown corporation business plan.

Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present more petitions on the issue of Canada Post's cancellation of services. The petitioners ask that the necessary legislative steps be taken to reverse Canada Post's proposal and ensure that we have door-to-door postal delivery service throughout Canada.

The petitions call on the Government of Canada to take the necessary legislative and regulatory steps to immediately reverse the implementation of recently announced service rollbacks and cost increases proposed by Canada Post Corporation.

PROSTITUTION

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions that I am pleased to present on behalf of constituents.

Routine Proceedings

The first is on prostitution. The petitioners note that the current rules on prostitution have been struck down by the Supreme Court. They also note that a high percentage of people are forced into prostitution through human smuggling.

The petitioners call on the Canadian House of Commons to legislate the purchase of sex with a woman, man, or child as a criminal offence. They would be delighted to know that our government is doing exactly that.

SEX SELECTION

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition notes that 92% of Canadians believe that sex-selective pregnancy termination should be illegal.

The petitioners call on the Canadian Parliament to end discrimination against girls occurring through gender selection abortions.

CANADA POST

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to stand in the House to bring forward a petition signed by hundreds of people in the community of North Bay who are frustrated with the plan by the government to allow the end of door-to-door service by Canada Post, with 6,000 to 8,000 jobs being lost.

The petitioners have also expressed their deep frustration that they have no real political representation in North Bay that is willing stand up and defend the interests of the people who are trying to protect home delivery.

Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition. It will come as no surprise that residents in my riding are continuing to sign petitions protesting the loss of home mail delivery by Canada Post.

The petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to reject Canada Post's plan for reduced services and to explore other options to update the Canada Post business plan.

Ms. Judy Foote (Random—Burin—St. George's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I stand to present four petitions, again based on the reduction in postal services by Canada Post.

There is one from the community of Garden Cove in my riding of Random—Burin—St. George's, another from Robinsons, another from Conne River, and another from the community of Heatherton.

The petitioners are saying that what is happening with Canada Post under the government and under its direction is in fact not fair. The government is cutting back on services in communities where sometimes the only federal presence is the post office. Not only is Canada Post cutting back on hours throughout the week, but it is also cutting out the entire service on Saturdays, the time when most people are able access service at the postal outlets.

The petitioners are calling on the government to reinstate the hours that have been reduced as well as to reinstate full-time service on Saturdays.

FIREARMS RECLASSIFICATION

Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present that has been signed by a large number of people in my riding.

The petition came about due to a reclassification of firearms made by the RCMP in recent months. The petitioners are calling on the government to enforce the Firearms Act and regulations in an open, transparent, and fair manner.

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present petitions on behalf of dozens of members of my riding of Parkdale—High Park who are very concerned about the dramatic increase of tank cars carrying crude oil and other hazardous substances through the neighbourhood, in some cases right behind many homes.

There has been a community meeting. Sadly, Transport Canada officials were not permitted to attend. The petitioners have many questions about rail safety.

The petitioners are specifically asking to know what is being transported through the neighbourhood in the DOT-111 cars; what the strategies and timetables are for phasing out the DOT-111 cars; whether there is any plan to reroute any of these cars; what emergency plan is in place should there be a derailment; and what resources and funding are available should there be a disaster from an oil spill, car malfunction, or train derailment.

● (1525)

HEALTH

Mr. Frank Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians in Guelph and across Canada are calling on the Government of Canada to require all producers and manufacturers to include potassium on the nutritional facts table on all food labels. They are seriously concerned that many prepackaged foods are not required to list potassium additives. In the best interests of those who must keep an eye on their potassium intake, such as people suffering from heart and kidney diseases, hypertension, and many other similar conditions, the petitioners are calling on the government for assistance to take a proper and more active role in the promotion of health by requiring potassium to be included on lists of nutritional facts.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have two sets of petitions from constituents in my riding of Wellington—Halton Hills.

The first set calls on the House of Commons to immediately hold an inquiry into the deaths and disappearances of aboriginal women and girls.

ANAPHYLAXIS

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second set of petitioners requests that Parliament enact a policy to reduce the risk for anaphylactic passengers.

CONFLICT MINERALS

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today I have petitions from right across the country, but primarily from Calgary. These petitioners are asking the government to deal with the horrific conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo, where 5.4 million people have died since 1998. The petitioners want the government to enact Bill C-486 to stop the revenues coming from conflict minerals and the trade therein. They are also asking that the government support Bill C-486, which, as I noted today in question period, is being supported by the Mining Association of Canada.

DNA DATABASES

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present three petitions.

The first is from residents in my own constituency of Saanich—Gulf Islands. The petitioners are calling for the establishment of a DNA data bank. This would assist in finding missing persons and solving cases. We are very gratified that money for this was included in the 2014 budget. I do note that that money is not to be spent until 2017. The petitioners would certainly like to see the data bank established sooner.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is for a tanker ban along the B.C. west coast. I am proud to have seconded the bill put forward by the hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley earlier this week. The petitioners from Vancouver would support that as well.

Mr. Speaker, the third petition is from residents of British Columbia, calling for the government to rejoin the UN convention on drought and desertification.

PROSTITUTION

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have here more than one petition from Canadians who acknowledge that prostitution laws have been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, but who do not want Canada to be lawless with respect to prostitution. They are calling on the House of Commons to legislate so that it would be a criminal offence to purchase sex with a woman, man, or child, and they would like the House of Commons to move forward quickly on that.

[Translation]

VIA RAIL

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour today to present a petition from some of my constituents calling on the government to restore VIA Rail passenger service. My region is remote, and without VIA Rail service it is even more isolated. We hope that the government will listen.

[English]

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present a petition from thousands of people in British Columbia.

Government Orders

This petition highlights the fact that 22-year-old Kassandra Kaulius was killed by a drunk driver. A group of people who have also lost loved ones to impaired drivers, called Families for Justice, believes that the current impaired-driving laws are much too lenient. The petitioners are calling for new mandatory minimum sentencing for people who have been convicted of impaired driving causing death.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

● (1530)

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Before we go to the orders of the day, I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that it has passed the following bill, to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-221, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (assaults against public transit operators).

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA-KOREA ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PROSPERITY ACT

Hon. Ed Fast (Minister of International Trade, CPC) moved that Bill C-41, An Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the Republic of Korea, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak today about the landmark Canada-Korea free trade agreement and to outline clearly why it should be implemented without delay.

Both the 2013 budget and Speech from the Throne are clear that this government's top priority remains the creation of jobs, economic growth, and long-term prosperity.

As an export-driven economy, Canada requires an aggressive international trade strategy that continues to open up new markets for Canadian businesses.

Government Orders

One in every five Canadian jobs is dependent on exports, and over 40,000 Canadian companies are active exporters around the globe. They include global leaders in a diverse range of sectors, from aerospace to ice wine and everything in-between.

In a competitive globalized economy, hard-working Canadians depend on freer and more open markets for their economic security. That is a reality that this government understands. We know that our Canadian companies can compete with the very best in the world and win anywhere in the world, and our Conservative government is committed to supporting them as they grow and succeed.

The global economy is rapidly evolving, and emerging markets in Asia and elsewhere represent significant untapped trade and investment opportunities. It is imperative that we keep up with the times.

That is why this Conservative government has embarked upon the most ambitious pro-trade plan in our nation's history. Increased trade means greater employment prospects, more prosperity, and more food on the table for Canadians and their families. It also means more choice and better value for consumers. It means better priced and higher quality input, which would allow our Canadian manufacturers to remain competitive in a fiercely competitive global marketplace.

Let me provide some historical context. Members may recall that a previous Conservative government had the vision to negotiate the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, followed by the North American Free Trade Agreement, which, of course, included Mexico. Members may also remember that it was both the NDP and the Liberals who loudly opposed both of those agreements, claiming that they would cause Canada to lose its culture, its health care system, its sovereignty over water resources, and that we would see our economy hollowed out and lose millions of Canadian jobs. In fact, the Liberal Party of the day even threatened to tear up NAFTA.

Of course, none of those dire predictions came true. Over the last 25 years, Canada's economy has added millions of jobs and attracted hundreds of billions of dollars of foreign investment. Our trade with the U.S. has tripled, and our bilateral trade with Mexico has increased more than sevenfold. The last time I looked, our health care system was intact, we still had full control over our water resources, and Canadian culture is alive and well.

My point today is that many of those same naysayers and anti-trade activists are trotting out the same old tired arguments against every new trade agreement that Canada negotiates. I want to assure the members that their dire predictions were wrong 25 years ago, and they are just as wrong today.

Prior to 2006, the previous Liberal government largely neglected trade as an engine of economic growth. In fact, during 13 long, dark years in power, the Liberals were only able to sign three small trade agreements, putting Canadian workers and businesses at severe risk of falling behind in the global marketplace.

However, there is good news. We have delivered on our commitment to dramatically expand economic opportunities for Canadians through trade and investment. Over the eight short years since our Conservative government was elected, we have successfully concluded free trade agreements with no less than 38 different

countries. That number includes the most comprehensive and ambitious trade initiative in Canada's history, the Canada-European Union free trade agreement. This past summer, we announced that we had completed the text of that treaty, and later this week we will be celebrating that achievement.

● (1535)

However, make no mistake about it, our efforts on the trade file are far from over. The cornerstone of our pro-trade plan going forward is the global markets action plan, which we call GMAP. We released it last fall. The GMAP guides our government's activities on trade and investment. It is our blueprint for increasing exports and supporting Canadian companies in markets all around the world. The GMAP outlines a broad array of trade initiatives, from negotiations of trade and investment agreements, to extensive stakeholder consultations and revamped market access plans. Crucially, we have identified priority foreign markets and priority sectors of our economy that are most important to Canadian exporters, and we are focusing our energies and resources on those priorities.

Not surprisingly, countries in the Asia-Pacific region figure prominently in GMAP because of the growing importance of that region of the world. That brings me to the legislation before us today. This past Monday, I was pleased to sign Canada's first free trade agreement with an Asian country, namely the Canada-Korea free trade agreement. South Korea is a modern economic miracle. That country's economic growth over the last 30 years has been remarkable. Since 1980, South Korea's GDP has grown more than six-fold and its economy has experienced an average annual growth rate of 6.5%. Korea has become a technological powerhouse and its global conglomerates, many now household names within our own country, anchor key regional and global value chains.

Given the size and dynamism of South Korea and our long history as friends and allies, implementing this historic agreement should be a no-brainer. As I noted, the Canada-Korea free trade agreement marks Canada's first bilateral trade agreement in Asia and will strengthen our economic ties with an increasingly important country that is both a priority market and a natural and complementary partner for us.

This agreement truly represents Canada's gateway to Asia. Commercial engagement between Canada and South Korea is already significant. Last year, two-way bilateral merchandise trade between our countries was roughly \$11 billion, and two-way investment is approaching \$6 billion. However, there remains great potential to expand this important partnership and this agreement will help unlock that potential. Indeed, the Canada-Korea free trade agreement will, in a very positive way, forever transform the way we do business with each other.

Government Orders

All told, this agreement is projected to boost Canada's economy by nearly \$2 billion a year and increase Canadian exports to South Korea by 32%, creating thousands of new jobs in every region of our country and across every sector of our economy. As significant as those numbers are, there is another equally compelling reason to get this agreement implemented as quickly as possible. The Canada-Korea free trade agreement will restore a level playing field for Canadian companies in the South Korean market, where our fiercest competitors, including the United States and the European Union, are already benefiting from their own preferential access due to their own free trade agreements with South Korea.

Canada cannot continue to idly stand by as our competitors' goods maintain an advantage over Canadian ones. Implementing this trade agreement without delay is the best way to support Canadian businesses and the hard-working Canadians they employ. However, one does not have to take my word for it: stakeholders representing every sector and every region of the country have been calling on our government to move with dispatch to get this agreement in place.

On March 11 of this year, in Seoul, Korea, I was delighted to witness our Prime Minister and South Korean President Park announce the conclusion of negotiations. In the days that followed, many different companies and business associations publicly congratulated our government on that achievement. During the latest milestone in the implementation process, the tabling of the text of the treaty in the House this past June, we again heard from Canadians. Their message to us was loud and clear, that this agreement needed to be brought into force as quickly as possible.

● (1540)

Canadians overwhelmingly support this deal and when we look at the agreement, that should be no surprise. Our Conservative government is firmly committed to only signing trade agreements that are in the best interest of Canadians.

Let us look at some of the details of this agreement.

This is a 21st century, state-of-the-art free trade agreement that is ambitious in reach and comprehensive in its scope. It covers virtually every facet of modern commerce, including trade in goods and services, business mobility, investment, government procurement, intellectual property, technical barriers to trade, the environment and labour rights.

The centrepiece of the agreement is, of course, the elimination of tariffs on virtually all trade between Canada and South Korea. In numerical terms, nearly 90% of Canada's exports will be duty free upon entry into force of the agreement, and over 99% will be duty free once the agreement is fully implemented. These numbers translate into concrete benefits and opportunities for Canadian exporters, importers, investors, manufacturers and consumers all across our country and across all sectors of our economy.

Canada is a nation endowed with a wealth of both natural resources and human resources. We have people with the creativity and skill to turn the natural resources into a wide range of industrial goods, including in the aerospace, rail, information technology, chemical and pharmaceutical sectors, to name just a few.

I am pleased to say that over 95% of Canadian industrial exports to South Korea will be duty free immediately with the remainder

being phased out over a number of years. This agreement will also result in the immediate elimination of South Korea's tariffs on liquefied natural gas, which is a commodity that has great potential to become a key driver of Canadian exports to South Korea in the future, especially from the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Then there is Canada's forestry sector. This sector is another key contributor to the Canadian economy. In 2012, the sector contributed over \$20 billion to Canada's GDP and employed close to 250,000 Canadians, many in well-paying, high-skill jobs. This agreement will benefit Canadian forestry workers by eliminating tariffs on forestry and value-added wood products, while further diversifying our exports into Asian markets and reducing the sector's dependence on the United States.

I will speak for a moment about Canada's high-quality, premium fish and seafood products.

Canada's proximity to the Arctic, Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Great Lakes and other resources has allowed Canadians to develop one of the world's most valuable commercial fishing industries. This sector contributes more than \$2 billion to Canada's GDP and provides over 40,000 jobs for Canadians in everything from fishing to aquaculture to fish processing. It is the economic mainstay of approximately 1,500 communities in rural and coastal Canada. We know the quality of Canada's fish and seafood products is second to none, and South Koreans are already showing a great appetite for our products.

In fact, shortly after the announcement of the conclusion of negotiations for this trade agreement, Korean Air Cargo launched weekly service to South Korea from Halifax and expected to transport a minimum of 40,000 kilograms of live lobster over the course of the last summer. Not only have these shipments helped to develop the South Korean market for fresh Canadian lobster, they have positioned South Korea as Canada's gateway for fish and seafood exports to other Asian markets, most notably Japan and China.

It goes without saying that in this free trade agreement, we have obtained a very favourable outcome for fish and seafood, one which eliminates 100% of South Korean tariffs, many immediately.

I do not have to remind my colleagues on the other side of the House, especially those from Atlantic Canada and the Pacific coast, that a vote against the speedy implementation of this trade agreement is a vote against Canadian jobs.

● (1545)

I want to also mention how this trade agreement will benefit our hard-working Canadian farmers and the more than two million people employed in the agriculture and agri-food industry.

In addition to Canadian beef and pork, Canadian icewine is becoming a hit with South Korea and throughout Asia. We want to promote those products. This trade agreement supports Canadian vintners and Canadian beef and pork producers to further expand their market share.

Government Orders

The tariff elimination package contained in this trade agreement represents a tremendous outcome for Canada, particularly given that South Korea's current tariffs are, on average, three times higher than ours. Beyond tariffs, the agreement also contains a wide range of commitments pertaining to non-tariff measures, which is an area that has been identified as a priority for our stakeholders.

The agreement includes ambitious outcomes on services and investment. This trade agreement includes a framework of reasonable protections that would result in a more secure and stable environment for investors in both countries. This will contribute to increased bilateral investment flows between our countries, creating more jobs, spurring creativity and technology, and linking Canada to global value chains.

Canadian investors are already recognizing the significant investment opportunities in South Korea, as well as its ability to be a potential test market for the larger Asian region. Just this past May, Canadian clothing brand Joe Fresh announced that it would open its first store outside of North America in Seoul, Korea. The flagship store in Seoul is only the start of its investment in South Korea, as the company plans to open nine more retail outlets in the capital by the end of the year.

The sooner this agreement is implemented, the sooner Canadians will start benefiting from the outcomes I have just mentioned, and the sooner Canadian companies can leverage the new-found market access into economic success. Our Conservative government will be there to support them every step of the way.

In addition to securing unprecedented market access for our companies, we are also supporting Canadian companies through our suite of trade promotion tools, tools such as Canada's trade commissioner service and the export financing and insurance products delivered by Export Development Canada. They are tools such as the government to government contracting support provided by the Canadian Commercial Corporation. There are many other tools that we are providing, including trade missions, which our government and ministers lead all around the world.

In short, we will be there to support our small and medium-sized businesses as they explore new opportunities in South Korea.

This trade agreement is comprehensive. It is high quality. It will create new opportunities for Canadian companies and contribute to our long-term prosperity.

I would remind my hon. colleagues of the robust outcomes across the board that this agreement would deliver. We owe it to our companies and we owe it to Canadians to ratify this agreement as quickly as possible. Early implementation of this free trade agreement will ensure that Canadians can quickly begin to reap its economic benefits, providing more choice for Canadian consumers and more prosperity for our nation as a whole.

• (1550)

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate the minister on the conclusion of this important agreement.

It is, however, common ground that one of the weaknesses of this agreement is its impact on the Canadian auto sector, which is a key

Canadian industry that adds billions of dollars to Canada's GDP. Industry players, such as Ford and Unifor, which represent most auto workers in Canada, are concerned that removing the 6.1% tariff on Korean products would damage domestic auto production and sales.

The U.S. negotiated a superior chapter on auto with Korea in its deal. There is a longer phasing period for tariff reduction and there is also a snap-back provision that protects U.S. auto production in case of a Korean auto product surge in that country which harms the U.S. auto sector. Canada did not get this measure.

Why did Canada not get as good a deal on the auto sector and the auto chapter as the U.S. did in its deal with Korea?

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the member that the premise of his question is quite incorrect. Canada secured a better outcome on autos than our competitors to the south.

I would remind him that the United States only received temporary accelerated dispute resolution. Canada was able to negotiate permanent accelerated dispute resolution mechanisms, which will clearly benefit our auto sector when it has disputes with the Korean government on non-tariff barriers.

I would also remind the member that on the safety standards relating to autos, we have been able to negotiate rules that allow Canada's manufacturers to build to EU standards and to U.S. standards, something again the U.S. was unable to secure.

I would also remind the member that the tariff phase-out on autos in the U.S. deal is five years. On the Canadian side, our exporters will have access to the Korean market immediately.

There are many other distinctions that make our agreement more valuable.

I would encourage that member and his party to stand in the House and support this agreement because it is in the interests of Canadians.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is important we recognize that the government has not been overly proactive per se on the file. Chile, Singapore, the EU and the United States have already signed free trade agreements with Korea.

As a result of the government not doing its work, markets have been lost. I look at the pork industry in the province of Manitoba. It could have been doing much better had the government really been on the file in a more proactive fashion.

Does the minister believe the pork industry in Manitoba will be compensated for his slowness to achieve an agreement as a result of the U.S. market taking up some of that production and selling to Korea at the expense of many Manitoba pork producers?

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the member that pork producers are strongly in favour of this agreement and have lauded us for getting this deal done.

Government Orders

I would remind the member that this negotiation started under a Liberal government and it never got it done. It took a Conservative government to conclude negotiations with Korea in a way that represented significant benefit to our economy.

I would also remind that Liberal member of the sorry history of the former Liberal government on trade. Over 13 long years, how many trade agreements did it get done? It was three.

This government in a short eight years has concluded free trade agreements with 38 different countries around the world, and there are more to come.

We will not take lessons from the Liberals on trade. We are the ones who have credibility on trade.

Mr. Bev Shipley (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was an honour and a pleasure for me to be on the international trade committee for two years while we were going through the negotiations.

Agriculture in Lambton—Kent—Middlesex is one of many small businesses in my riding, but it is the main industry. With respect to the trade agreements that have been made, I have always believed that agriculture forms the foundation because we want safe, secure food in our country and then we build on that.

Could the minister clarify the significance of what this trade agreement will mean to pork and beef producers in Lambton—Kent—Middlesex? They are some of the best in the country. We have the greatest around the world. What will the impact be on their industries as a result of this agreement?

• (1555)

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, the member really put his finger on what this is all about. It is about improving opportunities for Canadians, for Canadian companies, for our agriculture sector, for processes across the country.

I can tell the member that the beef and pork industries, the cattle producers, are strongly in support of our efforts to conclude this agreement. I can also tell him that our goal was to achieve a balanced outcome to this agreement, one that represented a long-term benefit to Canadians.

Clearly, in the beef and pork sectors, as the U.S. and the EU were able to bring their agreements into force, it represented a tilting of the playing field against Canada. This agreement would, of course, rectify that situation.

I also want to highlight that Canada has a world advantage in a host of sectors. In agrifood and agriculture, we produce premium, high-quality products for which our trading partners are prepared to pay a premium price. That is the opportunity in South Korea. They want our products. We are now going to be able to make those products available to them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of International Trade for his speech. I am also very pleased to hear him say that he was pressured by pork producers, among others. They have better things to do than to pressure the minister.

Considering how long it took for the minister to conclude this agreement—the government has been in power for almost nine years—why did he give priority to signing minor agreements with dictatorships and tax havens in Latin America rather than entering into an agreement with South Korea?

[*English*]

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure exactly where that question was directed, but I will try to understand.

The member refers to smaller economies around the world. Canada has, of course, negotiated trade agreements with countries such as Peru, Colombia, and Honduras.

Unlike the opposition, which believes that isolation is the way to treat countries that are emerging from a troubled history, this government believes that engagement is the way forward. When we engage, when we provide new opportunities for trade and new opportunities for these countries to develop their own prosperity and move more of their people into the middle class, we are also able to share with them our best practices in such things as human rights, the environment, labour, and democracy. That is where Canada's strength is. That is why we engage with those countries.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I reviewed the agreement with Korea, and unless I missed something, I do not see an investor state provision within this agreement.

Did Canada attempt to achieve that with Korea, and if not, why not? Did Korea reject our efforts?

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should read her materials again.

I do not know if she was able to listen to my speech. I highlighted the fact that this agreement does actually include investor protections. Essentially what it does, just for her elucidation, is set out a clear set of rules that apply after an investment is made, such that if a Canadian company invests in the Korean marketplace, the Korean government cannot discriminate against that Canadian company and cannot treat it less beneficially than a Korean company. The same thing holds true for investments into Canada.

The other thing this investment chapter does is set out a clear set of rules under which investment disputes are resolved. Those disputes will be taken out of the domestic context into the international arbitration context, where unbiased, fair, broadly accepted rules will be applied by fair, independent, and impartial arbitrators.

• (1600)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Drummond, The Environment.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as the official opposition critic for international trade, I am pleased to stand to speak on behalf of the New Democratic Party on Bill C-41, an act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the Republic of Korea.

By way of background, Canada and South Korea first discussed the possibility of a trade agreement in 2004, and negotiations for a trade agreement officially launched in July 2005. In a testament both to the challenges that such agreements pose and to less than satisfactory diligence on the part of various governments, it took some nine years to bring this agreement to completion.

Notably, several trade agreements have been concluded by Korea and other partners over the past 10 years. A trade agreement between Korea and the EU entered into force in 2011, and a Korea-U.S. agreement became operative in 2012. As well, Korea and Australia recently concluded negotiations.

As I will expand upon later, these nations' agreements have played a critical role in shaping Canada's bargaining position. As major competitors with Canada, their advantage in securing preferential first entry to the Korean market has done substantial damage to Canadian exporters in a myriad of sectors.

The Canada-Korea free trade agreement was signed on March 11, 2014, and submitted to Parliament on June 12, 2014. Once in effect, the agreement will eliminate 98.2% of South Korea's tariff lines and 97.8% of Canada's tariffs. While many tariffs between our two countries are already quite low, there are a significant number of tariffs and other barriers to market that exist that will either be removed immediately upon this agreement's implementation or phased out over various periods of time.

The NDP uses three important criteria to assess trade agreements. First, is the proposed partner one that respects democracy, human rights, adequate environmental and labour standards, and Canadian values, and if there are challenges in these regards, is the partner on a positive trajectory toward these goals? Second, is the proposed partner's economy of significant and strategic value to Canada? Third, are the terms of the proposed agreement satisfactory?

New Democrats also evaluate trade agreements on a comprehensive basis to determine if they are of net benefit to Canada. In our estimation, we believe that the Korea trade agreement meets these tests.

I will deal with each in turn.

First, since emerging from authoritarian to civilian rule in 1987, South Korea has transitioned into a multi-party democracy with an active trade union movement, a diverse civil society, and freedom of expression. South Korea's so-called tiger economy has succeeded in rapidly industrializing the country and raising the welfare and incomes of the Korean people.

Today South Korea is a developed country, ranking 15th on the Human Development Index, the highest in East Asia. South Korea has developed social programs, sound rule of law, low levels of corruption, and high access to quality education, including having

the highest level of post-secondary education participation in the OECD.

In recent years, South Korea has emerged as a global leader in environmental economics, investing billions in an ambitious green growth strategy aimed at improving energy efficiency while boosting renewables and green technology.

There is no doubt that South Korea is a democratic country that possesses admirable environmental and labour standards and shares important Canadian values, including respect for human rights.

Second, is the proposed partner's economy of significant and strategic value to Canada? South Korea is a G20 country with the 15th-largest GDP. It is the G20's eighth-largest importer. South Korea is Canada's seventh most important trading partner and our third largest in Asia, after the two larger economies of China and Japan.

In 2013, total bilateral trade between our two nations totalled nearly \$11 billion. Canadian exports to South Korea totalled \$3.4 billion, while Korean exports to Canada totalled \$7.3 billion. In relative terms, Canada exports the same amount to South Korea as it exports to France and Germany. We import approximately the same amount as we do from the U.K.

South Korea is also a major part of the Asian global supply chain and is a gateway market for other Asian economies. As this is Canada's first trade agreement with an Asian country, it provides an important opportunity to gain advantages in the Pacific region and diversify Canada's export markets. Economic models predict that this deal is expected to increase Canadian exports to South Korea by 32% and expand our economy by \$1.7 billion.

•(1605)

In addition, the Canadian and South Korean economies are largely complementary, meaning that most Canadian industries do not compete directly with Korean industries. As Korea has emerged as a world leader in renewable energy and green technology and needs energy and energy technology from Canada in return, we can increase our trade in these important sectors and, more importantly, build Canada's green technology sector.

Domestically, a trade agreement with Korea offers significant economic benefits to a broad cross-section of economic sectors in Canada that represent all regions of the country. In fact, this agreement is favoured by almost every industrial sector in Canada.

Government Orders

Sectors that support the Korea free trade agreement include manufacturing, heavy industry, aerospace and transportation, forestry and wood products, agriculture, beef and pork industries, agri-foods and food processing, energy and chemicals, fish and seafoods, financial services, and high technology.

In sum, South Korea is a large market that offers significant opportunities for Canadian business to gain a foothold in important Asian markets.

It is vital to note that Canadian exporters have lost some 30% of their market share in South Korea since 2012, when the EU and the U.S. implemented agreements and secured preferential access for their companies. These losses are estimated to total several hundreds of millions of dollars annually, and are mounting each year that U.S. and European competitors enjoy tariff advantages and increased market access to Korea.

The losses have been particularly heavy in the agri-food, seafood, and aerospace industries. These sectors sustain thousands of quality, family-supporting jobs with high rates of unionization. As an example, when Korea signed the FTAs with the United States and the European Union, Canadian aerospace exports to Korea dropped by 80%, from \$180 million to roughly \$35 million.

Yuen Pau Woo, former president and CEO of the Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada, and, in my estimation, Canada's leading expert on Asia-Pacific issues, said that Canada is:

...an outlier compared to most of our industrialized country competitors, certainly in the G-7 and the OECD, and that puts us at a competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis countries that do have trade agreements with Asian partners. The best example of this competitive disadvantage is in the case of Korea, where we have been negotiating—as you all know—coming to nine years now. In the meantime, we have been overtaken by the United States and more recently, by Australia. Both of those countries now have margins of preference, particularly in the cultural sector, that put our exporters at a disadvantage.

Canadian exporters need a level playing field to compete in Asia and to protect the jobs they provide here in Canada. In the view of New Democrats, this agreement is essential to do so.

This agreement offers the opportunity for Canadian producers and exporters to increase trade with a modern democratic country with a high-income complementary economy. It will allow Canadian producers in a wide variety of sectors to more effectively access an Asian gateway economy that plays a pivotal role in global supply chains and offers entry opportunities not only to Korea but to other Asian economies.

It will level the playing field for Canadian exporters, who can compete with the best in the world when given the opportunity to do so on equal terms. It will permit Canada to deepen our Asian presence and diversify our trade patterns beyond the North American and European markets. There is no doubt that Korea is both a significant and a strategic economic partner for Canada.

Third, are the terms of the proposed deal satisfactory?

This is not the precise agreement that New Democrats would have negotiated. This deal includes investor state dispute settlement, a provision that allows corporations to launch legal challenges to government measures that they believe violate the terms of the agreement. They are permitted to file their suits not in domestic

courts but in international trade tribunals that lack certain fundamental attributes of judicial independence and the rule of law.

This is something the New Democrats would not include in any trade agreement we negotiate. We believe such provisions carry excessive risk and are unnecessary when dealing with nations with independent and well-functioning judiciaries, which both Canada and South Korea possess.

There are also legitimate and well-founded concerns about the possible impact of this agreement on the Canadian auto sector. Knowledgeable industry actors, such as Ford Motor Company and Unifor, which represents most auto workers in Canada, have both expressed the view that this agreement will reduce domestic auto production and sales, and that South Korea adopts policies that serve to impair access to its domestic market.

●(1610)

In our estimation, however, when viewed on a comprehensive basis, this agreement is of net benefit to Canada. It benefits the vast majority of Canadian export sectors, and we believe that its weaknesses can be dealt with by effective Canadian government policies.

An examination of a few key sectors bears this out. This agreement is not only good for Canadian agriculture and the agrifood industry, it is essential. The agrifood sector represents 8% of the Canadian economy and is said to sustain one in eight jobs, or over two million jobs.

As stated, Canada has suffered significant losses in market share for Canadian agricultural exports to Korea following implementation of the Korea-U.S. deal in 2012. For example, Canadian beef exports to South Korea shrank from \$96 million in 2011 to \$8 million in 2013. Canadian pork exporters went from first to fourth in the Korean market. Australia, a major competitor of Canada in many agricultural products, is poised to bring their own agreement with Korea into force. As well, January 1, 2015, will see the next reduction in tariffs for U.S. and EU products, further exacerbating the harm to Canadian sectors.

The Korea FTA will progressively eliminate 86.8% of agricultural tariff lines and allow Canadian exporters to compete on a level playing field and recapture these markets. There are also impressive opportunities for Canadian grains, pulses and oils.

In aerospace, the agreement will gradually eliminate 100% of industrial tariffs. As such, there is general support for the Korea FTA among manufacturing sectors in Canada, notably Bombardier and other Aerospace Industries Association members.

Government Orders

According to Jim Quick, the president of the Aerospace Industries Association of Canada, South Korea is an important market due to its proximity to other major economies, including Japan, China and Malaysia. He said in the next 20 years, airlines in the Asia-Pacific region would account for 37% of global aircraft demand, or 12,000 planes worth \$1.9 trillion. At the same time, half of the world's air traffic would be driven by travel to, from, and within the Pacific region.

Similar opportunities lie in light rail and transit infrastructure. Global Canadian champions like Bombardier see important opportunities in South Korea to position themselves to tap this growth.

Canadian seafood producers on both coasts stand to benefit from the Korea agreement. Pacific seafood and fish product exporters are being out-competed in Korea by their Alaskan competitors due to the fully implemented Korea-U.S. agreement.

Current seafood and fish product tariffs in Korea for Canadian exporters are up to 47%, and most of these tariffs lines will be eliminated. Lobster farmers see growth opportunities in the Korean market on the Atlantic coast.

Canada's forestry and wood products industry, including newsprint, wood pulp, wood panels and other value-added products, contribute over \$20 billion to Canada's GDP and employs over 230,000 Canadians, many of them in high-skill and unionized jobs. Canadian exporters to Korea are disadvantaged by tariff lines on Canadian wood products, which reach 10%. The Korea agreement will provide growth opportunities for value-added wood products. This will help develop good jobs in the vital Canadian value-added economy.

With respect to energy and green technology, New Democrats see sustainable technologies and renewable energy as key industries of the future. They are estimated to be a \$3 trillion sector and we believe that Canada must position itself for this economic opportunity and environmental imperative. As stated, Korea is an emergent global leader in this area and encouraging sustainable trade and technology transfer is one of the most compelling parts of this agreement.

There are positive and negative aspects of this agreement in terms of the Canadian auto sector, and opinions on it are mixed. General Motors, Chrysler, Toyota and Honda all have automotive production facilities in Canada and support this agreement. Ford and Unifor are also significant stakeholders in Canada, but they do not. The Korea FTA will gradually eliminate Canada's 6.1% tariff on auto product imports from Korea over a three-year period. In turn, South Korea's 8% auto tariff will be eliminated immediately upon the Korea agreement's implementation.

Other positives include rules of origin provisions that recognize Canadian-U.S. integrated products without volume limits and an accelerated dispute mechanism that allows for monitoring of non-tariff barriers. This will permit disputes related to motor vehicle trade to be resolved in a timeline that is as fast or faster than the Korea-U.S. deal, and it could be used to obtain remedies to unfair trade barriers to Canadian auto exports into Korea. In addition, transitional safeguards exist in case of a surge in imports.

● (1615)

At the same time, there are legitimate concerns about the deal's impact on the Canadian auto sector. These concerns have validity, as more Korean imports will affect domestic auto sales to some degree, and South Korea has been cited for implementing non-tariff barriers that restrict access to its market.

It is also a fair criticism that this agreement does not go as far as the Korea-U.S. deal does in protecting domestic auto producers. Under that deal, U.S. tariffs are phased out over a longer period, five years, and there is a snap-back provision that permits the U.S. to impose duties if certain import and export numbers are exceeded. The Conservatives were unable to obtain these protections in this agreement.

What is without doubt is that the current 6% Canadian tariff on Korean-made automobiles is insufficient to meaningfully keep products out. Among other things, lower Korean labour costs and vertical integration savings substantial exceed the tariff. More compelling, Korean automakers service the Canadian market from U.S. plants, with more opening in Mexico within two years, and their products enter Canada tariff-free due to NAFTA in any event. Accordingly, between 40% and 50% of Korean auto products already enter the Canadian market tariff-free from the U.S., so the status quo is clearly insufficient to assist Canadian production.

It is clear that the Canadian auto industry faces a very competitive global environment. It is equally apparent that this requires more support from the federal government. In 2013, Canada failed to attract any of the \$17.6 billion in auto investments that were made around the world, not a penny. Competing countries like China, Brazil and our North American trading partners are upping their games, subsidizing up to 60% of the capital investments required to establish auto plants.

New Democrats believe that more needs to be done to support auto manufacturing in Canada, to promote growth in the sector and to encourage the competitiveness of North American brands around the world.

Government Orders

Therefore, a New Democrat government would pursue strategies to strengthen the Canadian auto sector. These would include policies that would encourage Korean automakers to locate production facilities in Canada; assist Canadian automakers to better access Korean and other Asian markets; closely monitor non-tariff barriers and act quickly and effectively to resolve disputes; place substantial resources into trade offices and lead frequent trade missions to Korea; and work with industry and labour to create an effective auto innovation fund.

Both CETA and the China FIPA have provoked widespread public concern in Canada and New Democrat share those concerns.

Importantly, the Korea agreement differs substantially from those two agreements. Unlike the China FIPA, the terms of the Korea agreement are reciprocal. Unlike CETA, the Korea agreement does not apply to provincial, territorial or municipal procurement or crown corporations, where most Canadian procurement is located. Unlike CETA, the Korea agreement does not apply or negatively affect supply-managed agricultural products. Unlike CETA, the Korea agreement does not contain any negative intellectual property provisions, for example, pharmaceutical patents or copyright.

Notably, intellectual property expert, Professor Michael Geist has pronounced positively on the IP terms of the Korea agreement, calling it an example of a good agreement in this important area. While the Korea FTA does have an ISDS provision, it contains transparency guarantees and is fully cancellable on six months' notice. This is contrasted with the China FIPA, which binds Canada to ISDS for 31 years, and CETA, which appears to do so for 20 years.

Unlike the Conservatives and Liberals, a New Democrat government would involve a full spectrum of Canadian stakeholders, including industry and labour leaders in monitoring and implementing this deal. Unlike those two parties, the New Democrats would work diligently to eliminate non-tariff barriers and scrutinize the use of the investor state provisions very closely. Unlike those two parties, a New Democrat government would not hesitate to renegotiate or terminate this deal if meaningful market access is not achieved or the ISDS provisions are abused.

Overarching all, New Democrats want to deepen Canada's trade linkages with the Asia-Pacific region, something we recognize as essential to maintaining Canadian prosperity in the 21st century. We support breaking down harmful trade barriers, but believe government should provide the support Canadian industry needs to remain competitive in a more open world economy. We agree with such diverse voices as the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and the Canadian Labour Congress that the government needs to do more than sign trade agreements. It must promote Canadian exports, develop sound Canadian industrial strategies, invest resources in trade commission services, and participate meaningfully in regional and international bodies of all types.

The Korea trade agreement presents a vital opportunity to diversify Canada's economy and promote good quality job creation in Canada. We cannot let this opportunity pass.

While certain terms of the agreement are not what an NDP government would have negotiated, on balance we believe that the

benefits of the Canada-Korea trade agreement are significant for Canadians. We will be supporting the legislation accordingly.

● (1620)

Mr. Erin O'Toole (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have only had the honour of being in the House for almost two years, but every once in a while a member of Parliament gets to witness history in this place. It is history because for the first time in the history of the CCF and the New Democratic Party of Canada it seems, from the very intelligent and informed speech from my colleague, that the NDP may stand in the House for the first time and support trade, so I applaud that.

I would note that his colleagues from Windsor West and Parkdale—High Park, a number of his colleagues, have been extremely critical of trade with South Korea, our important first free trade deal in Asia. In fact, the member for Parkdale—High Park has stood in the House saying that we need to get rid of the trade deal with South Korea.

I would ask the member this. GM, Ford, Chrysler, I live in a proud GM community. The decisions on making cars on those lines are made in the U.S., so would it not be in Canada's interests to ensure that the Canadian subsidiaries of these companies have the same market access as their American plants do? Is this not a win for automobile manufacturing in Ontario?

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. colleague that history is made. It is the first time that a member of the Conservative government has called the New Democratic official opposition "intelligent and informed". I would encourage a repetition of that astute observation.

The New Democrats' trade policy is one where we want to look at each trade deal on its own merits. We want to approach it from a rational, thoughtful and balanced point of view, and I have already pointed out the different criteria that we have. That has been typical of the New Democrats' trade policy for the last two years, and certainly this Parliament. Of course, my friend knows that this is not the first agreement that the New Democrats have supported. We supported the Canada-Jordan trade agreement, and we voted in favour of it.

Government Orders

In terms of the automotive sector, I wish it were that simple. We have a Canadian and American integrated auto sector, and I do believe that this agreement provides challenges and the auto sector has raised legitimate concerns. I would encourage the government to work with the auto sector, both industry and labour, to help improve the Canadian auto sector so that we can create good Canadian jobs and increase auto production in this country. Korea provides that opportunity to do so, but only if the government provides the policies that will assist the industry.

Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just for the record, this is the first free trade agreement the New Democrats actually stood and supported. The Jordan one, they did not stand to support. I guess it is complicit in what they were doing. Nevertheless, barring any confusion, yes, they are supporting it.

However, I want to get the member's impression on the shipbuilding industry. Some years ago, when there was first discussion about Korea, there was some concern about the shipbuilding industry itself. How does the member feel about that in this particular agreement? Is he okay with that? I will just leave it at that for now because I am sure there is a lot more to come.

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from my hon. colleague from the Liberal Party because it gives me a chance to comment on the Liberal approach to trade. The Liberal trade critic said about CETA that the Liberals have been very happy to be supporting that agreement for all these years, and they look forward to the text being released so they can finally determine what it is they have been supporting. That is not a thoughtful approach to trade.

As well, I should correct my hon. friend. He knows full well that the New Democrats voted in favour of this, and often votes are taken in the House where some we stand for and some we do not, but we all know what the result of that is. The Liberal Party is an expert in opportunism so the Liberals should know what they are talking about.

In terms of shipbuilding, again I would encourage my hon. colleague and members of his party to read the agreement. They would know that shipbuilding is exempt from this agreement.

• (1625)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Vancouver Kingsway very much for the tremendous job he does in studying bills. He helps me quite a bit with my analysis of the situation.

One of the things I learned in reading this free trade agreement was that there were a number of differences compared to the free trade agreement with China, for example. Although we had many concerns—well-founded ones, I think—about the agreement with China, those concerns seem to have disappeared for a number of the topics in the free trade agreement with Korea.

Are the Conservatives learning from their mistakes? Did they listen to the advice from our critic? How come this time we seem to have a better agreement?

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I cannot really speak about where the government gets its sources of information, but I will say that the Canada-China FIPA stands in stark contrast to the deal before the House. Many Canadians have serious concerns about this FIPA, not the least of which is that it provides for secretive tribunals to hold hearings behind closed doors on lawsuits filed by investors that will put taxpayers' liabilities in the billions of dollars, and which violate the Canadian concept of the rule of law. It is also undemocratic, and worse, the Canada-China deal will be in force for a minimum of 31 years. It is a bad deal and not a good example for Canada. I note that the Liberals support the Canada-China FIPA along with the Conservatives. Only the New Democrats have stood in the House with the Green Party and opposed the deal.

The agreement with Korea, in contrast, has guarantees of transparency in its investor state provisions. The hearings must be open and the agreement is cancellable on six months' notice. All investments under that agreement would not fall under the ISDS provisions after the six-month period, so the New Democrats, when we are government in 2015, will be watching this agreement very carefully to make sure that the procedure is not abused and so that we can protect Canadian taxpayers.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to you for allowing me an opportunity to ask a question of the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway. It allows me to clarify that the investor state provisions in the treaty are not referenced in the bill before us. I apologize for confusion on that score.

Does the member for Vancouver Kingsway find it odd that here we are debating a bill, An Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the Republic of Korea, and never had an opportunity to examine the act to implement the Canada-China investment treaty, the FIPA that was referred to just moments ago, which was passed by order in council, with no opportunity for hearings before the trade committee, no opportunities for examination, and no vote in this place, but passed merely by the royal prerogative exercised by the Prime Minister and Privy Council? I personally find it deeply offensive that such is the case, as the member point out, with this much more dangerous agreement. I do not think the agreement with Korea, other than for the investor state provisions, is a dangerous agreement. The agreement with the People's Republic of China is a dangerous agreement and we had no opportunity to debate it.

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. colleague that it is regrettable and, in fact, wrong that the House did not have an opportunity to debate the Canada-China FIPA. Certainly the New Democrats brought forth a motion and devoted one of our opposition days to that very subject. We also moved motions before the trade committee to have that committee study it. Unfortunately, that was not accepted by the government, so the New Democrats have used every tool we have in the House to try to get a debate on that important deal.

Government Orders

We believe that all trade agreements, including FIPAs that govern investment, ought to be debated in the House. In the case of trade agreements, they usually require enabling legislation. That is why we are debating this, as these agreements must come before the House because they require legislative amendments. FIPAs often do not require legislative amendments, which is why cabinet has the ability to pass them, but as a matter of policy and good governance, both FIPAs and trade agreements should come before the House for thorough scrutiny and debate before Canada commits to them.

• (1630)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we talk about international trade and the importance of free trade agreements. One of the things that is really important for us all to recognize is the overall trade surplus or deficit. We need to recognize that over the last five or six years, there has been a gigantic trade deficit created in Canada. Although it nice to see the trade agreements coming in, Canadians need to be concerned about the growing Conservative trade deficit that started under the current Prime Minister and continues to grow. We need to be concerned about that. Would the member not agree with that?

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I do agree with that. When the government took office in 2006, Canada had a current account surplus of about \$18 billion, and today it has a current account deficit of some \$64 billion, so there has been about an \$80 billion swing to the negative since the government came to power. I think that is because the government has taken an ideological approach to trade. Conservatives will sign any trade agreement with anybody, regardless of the terms, without taking a strategic, thoughtful approach to trade policy. New Democrats believe that we should take a thoughtful strategic approach, with balanced trade agreements that will benefit the Canadian economy. New Democrats would support those agreements if they do, and will oppose them if they do not.

Ms. Chrystia Freeland (Toronto Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, on behalf of the Liberal Party, to support this deal. We are going to be voting in favour of it.

Canada is a trading nation. We understand that, as the 11th largest economy in the world, it is absolutely essential for Canada to be fully plugged into the global economy, and that means doing trade deals.

We are also very pleased that we finally have a deal with South Korea, an advanced and exciting democracy. It is a great country for us to be doing business with.

What I am going to be talking about first is Canada's position in trade, our views on what we should be doing and what we see going wrong. Then I will talk about this specific trade deal with Korea.

Starting with why trade is important and what Canada's current position is, trade has never been more important for Canada or any other western developed economy in this 21st century. We are living in the age of globalization and countries that do not figure out how to plug themselves into the global economy are going to fail. They are going to fail their citizens and, crucially, they are going to fail to deliver the kinds of middle-class jobs and middle-class incomes that are at the centre of the Liberal approach.

For Canada, exports account for about 30% of GDP, and one in five Canadian jobs right now is linked to exports. That is why this is

such an important issue and why the Liberal Party stands so firmly in favour of free trade and an expanding Canadian trade relationship with the world.

What I am very sad to note, however, as my colleague from Winnipeg has already alluded to, is that right now Canada is falling behind in trade. We hear a lot of glowing rhetoric from the other side of the House, but the reality is that we are not doing well in trade, and all Canadians are hurting because of it.

The Liberal Party believes in listening to businesses and to the people who are out there building our economy. That is why we paid so much attention to and are so worried by a report that was published this year by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. The title of this report alone should worry us all. It is called "Turning it Around: How to Restore Canada's Trade Success". That really tells us everything. We used to be doing better than we are doing today, even as the rest of the world is getting better at trade and better at export-led growth.

When we look inside the report, it gets worse. I would like to read parts of it because it really paints a worrying picture of what is happening right now in Canadian trade. This is what the Canadian Chamber of Commerce has to say:

...the increase in exports and outward investment has been slow in recent years, and diversification to emerging economies has been limited.

The Chamber of Commerce points out that Canada's falling behind its own lagging performance has come at precisely the time when the rest of the world has been surging forward. That is something we will see when we turn to speaking specifically about trade with Korea.

The Chamber of Commerce goes on to give some detail about what is happening. It says:

Despite more firms looking abroad, Canada is lagging its peers according to several measures. Over the past decade, the value of exports has increased at only a modest pace...This is despite significant price premiums received by Canadian producers of energy, mineral and agricultural commodities.

Now, here comes the crucial part. The Chamber of Commerce says:

If these price increases are excluded, the volume of merchandise exports shipped in 2012 was actually five per cent lower than in 2000 despite a 57 per cent increase in trade worldwide.

If we take out the growth in commodity prices, what we have seen is a 57% increase in trade worldwide over the past decade and Canada actually falling by 5%. We hear a lot of glowing rhetoric about trade performance. We have a lot of photo ops of trade deals signed. However, the reality is that the numbers reflect a Canadian economy that is performing more poorly in exports. This is also seen in the numbers my colleague referred to in mentioning the swing from a trade surplus to a trade deficit. Exports are an area that we believe is essential to driving growth and producing middle-class jobs. Economists agree with us.

Government Orders

This is a real problem. It is a huge issue for Canada. It is a huge issue for all middle-class Canadians.

Let us turn specifically to Korea. As I said, the Liberal Party is pleased and proud to support a free trade deal with South Korea. However, we have a real problem with the timing of this deal. The problem is that it has come too late. That lag has done real and quantifiable damage to the Canadian economy and to Canadian exporters.

● (1635)

In describing his pride in having secured this deal, the minister spoke earlier today about how this deal will “restore a level playing field”. He also said, “our fiercest competitors...are already benefiting from their own preferential access”. That is sadly true but not something to be proud of. We should be ashamed and sorry that our fiercest competitors are enjoying preferential access and that it has taken us so long to get this deal done.

The United States has already done a deal with South Korea, which was ratified by the U.S. Congress in October 2011. As far as I know, the current Canadian government was in office then. That agreement went into effect in March 2012. Again, the government was in office. We did not have a deal then and that hurt Canadian exporters, who were put at a disadvantage relative to U.S. exporters.

A deal with the EU has provisionally been in force since July 2011. Again, the current government was in office. It allowed a huge trading bloc to do a deal with South Korea, which really did serious damage to Canadian exporters.

Australia is smaller than us. One would think it would have less leverage, yet it has already done a deal. It did its deal in April 2014.

This has done real quantifiable damage to the Canadian economy and to Canadian exporters. We have lost 30% market share. The minister himself pointed out that our fiercest competitors already enjoy preferential access. They have used it and the loss to Canadian exporters is quantified at some \$1 billion. That is serious damage to the economy.

While we are pleased and proud to vote for this deal now, our question is this. Why was it not done sooner and why did the government allow Canada to lose \$1 billion? We could do a lot of good in this economy with another billion dollars.

The minister also spoke about how he is proud of this deal and how it is important because it will provide an essential foothold in Asia. That is a lot of boggle. We think it is very important now for Canada in its trading relationships to move to deal with the fast growing, emerging markets in Asia. However, we are gravely concerned that with the poor performance we have seen in Canada's trade negotiations with Korea, where I underscore we have lagged behind the U.S., the EU, and Australia, all of whom are our competitors and peers, we could see a similar lost opportunity in the absolutely crucial trans-Pacific partnership talks. Canada joined those talks late. They started in 2008. Again, the members on the other side of the House were in government. Canada was not at the table. Canada did not join in until June 2012. If we get to the party late, we have to deal with terms that are not of our own making, and so we start at a disadvantage.

The Liberal Party would like to assure Canadians, and also our friends on the other side of the House, that we will be watching Canada's performance in those negotiations closely. There is already some talk that Canada, in multilateral arenas of all kinds, is not seen as the most valued, the most co-operative, partner. Therefore, we will be watching closely.

I would like to assure our partners in the TPP talks and the Canadians who are so eager for that deal to get done that if the members on the other side of the House do not manage to get it done in the next 12 months or so, it will be a priority for us and we will get that deal done.

What is also essential for us to focus on, and where we would like to see much more performance, is a wider understanding of the other emerging markets that we should be going after.

We are glad to support the Korean deal, which we do without reservation, but the sad history of this deal is that because we started late and did the deal late, Canadian companies have suffered. Making up that 30% lag, that 30% loss, will require a lot of hard work by our companies. They are coming from behind.

● (1640)

We want to ensure that does not happen again. We would like to see the government much more aggressively pursue trade deals with other fast-growing emerging markets around the world; particularly, in Africa. That is a part of the world that is full of opportunity for Canada, for Canadian companies, and where a trading relationship can do a lot of good.

I would also like to see much more action from the government in an area where we see very strong rhetoric but, sadly, not always the action to match; that is, our relationship with Ukraine.

Most of us here were proud to be in this House when President Petro Poroshenko spoke to us and talked about how proud he is of the Canadian relationship with Ukraine. He also invited us to quickly conclude a free trade agreement with Ukraine.

Again here, I am sad to say, Canada is falling behind. Europe signed a trade deal with Ukraine last Tuesday. We like to call ourselves, Canada, Ukraine's best friend. Where are we on that file? It is time, really, for us to act. The message is the same. The rhetoric is okay. We really want to see action. We will strongly support and work with the government on a deal with Ukraine. That is something, surely, we can get some cross-party support on and act quickly and get it done.

We are very happy to support this deal. We think a free trade agreement with Korea is important. We understand the absolute importance of free trade for Canada.

We would like to see the government do a better job of actually focusing on the results. It is really important.

We have spoken in this debate already of the swing we have had from trade surplus to trade deficit. That is not a good report card for the Canadian export sector. That is the number we have to look at and we really have to focus on. A big part of the problem is that we are coming late to these trade deals.

I want to remind this House that the United States Congress ratified its deal with Korea in October 2011. It went into effect in March 2012.

The EU agreement has been in force since July 2011.

Again, even in Australia, which is smaller than we are, their agreement was signed on April 2014.

So, it is great that we are doing this deal with a strong democratic country in Asia. It is great for our exporters to now have access to those essential Asian economies. However, we really need to underscore, even as we support this deal, that it should have been done more quickly and that our exporters have suffered. They have lost \$1 billion. They have lost about 30% of their market because, again, as the minister himself said, our fiercest competitors are already enjoying preferential access.

Nonetheless, it is better late than never. We are pleased to be supporting this deal. Korea is already our seventh-largest merchandise trading partner. It is a democracy. There are a lot of exciting technologies there. It is a great match for us.

We have heard particular enthusiasm from agriculture food producers, from the aerospace industry, and from spirits industries. We are hopeful that, thanks to this agreement, those Canadian exporters who lost out because their competitors enjoyed preferential access, while they did not, will be able to make up some of those gains.

We are going to be supporting them in that effort. We are glad that we finally have a deal that will allow them to do that.

However, again, we must not lose sight, even as we back this deal, of the fact that it has taken a long time to get there and that, going forward, it is really essential for Canada to not be following in the wake of the U.S., the EU, and Australia when it comes to doing trade agreements with emerging markets.

It is really important for us to be in the lead. When one is first at the table, one gets the best deal—and not only does the country get the best deal, but its businesses get the best deal. It can be very hard to unseat a competitor who gets in first because he or she enjoyed preferential access because his or her government was more on the ball.

• (1645)

On TPP, it is going to be really important for Canada to shift from this hostility, this sort of go-it-alone bullying approach that has characterized our attitude in multilateral organizations of late. This is a really important deal, and with this opening up of the Asian markets, about which we have spoken so much today, and of which we hope the Korean deal will be a harbinger, TPP is going to be where the rubber meets the road on that. It is an essential opening to Asia.

Government Orders

We understand the need for some closed-door negotiations in trade agreements. We get that. These are very complicated. TPP is particularly complicated because so many parties are at the table. However, it is important to note that we have started those negotiations at a disadvantage. We did not get there until 2012. Everyone else, apart from Mexico, was there from 2008. We had to agree to accept some of the terms that had already been laid out without us there.

It is really important that we play ball now, that we are involved and seen as productive partners. It can sometimes be appealing, and maybe make a testosterone-type person feel particularly good, to use harsh, bullying, tough-guy rhetoric when talking, perhaps in the House. However, we are only the world's 11th largest economy, and when it comes to trade negotiations we have to be co-operative and collaborative and earn the trust of our partners. I would strongly urge the members on the other side of the House to take that kind of approach—dare I call it a small / liberal approach?—when they sit down at the table at the TPP negotiations. This is really essential for the future of Canada's export economy. If the Conservatives want some tips on how to do that, we are happy to talk.

In closing, we do support the deal. South Korea is a powerful economy. It is a democracy. It is a great place for our Canadian companies to be doing business. We regret the fact that we have lost 30% of market share due to the slowness of the agreement being done. However, we are confident that the House will support the deal and that Canadian companies are strong enough to bounce back.

Mr. Erin O'Toole (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Toronto Centre for her remarks, but what I find stunning is that her passion for trade is bubbling over here today, yet the Liberal trade critic has yet to join the trade committee. In fact, the strategy she talks about, of emerging markets like Africa and all these sorts of things, were discussed for weeks at the trade committee when all parties in the House discussed the global markets action plan, where we talked about this strategy. I would urge the member to consider actually attending the committee of which she is the critic, to talk about these ideas in more detail.

I would also note, from her remarks, that Australia's deal with South Korea has not been ratified. In fact, we have the opportunity to be pretty much almost at the same time as Australia.

In terms of her enthusiasm, I appreciate that. Perhaps she would find her home better on this side of the House, because historically, if we look at market access for Canadian companies, we see that 98% of market access has been secured through Conservative government free trade deals.

My question relates more to her continued reference to TPP. We are at the table with TPP, which has a potential market of 700 million consumers, but this is about making decisions. Our side has supported long-standing commitment to supply management. One of the leadership contenders for her party suggested that supply management should be tossed aside to get a TPP deal done. Does the hon. member take that same position?

Government Orders

• (1650)

Ms. Chrystia Freeland: Mr. Speaker, I will go through the member's comments one by one.

First, on the facts with respect to Australia. The negotiations started in 2009 and the agreement was signed in April 2014, which is what I said. It was tabled in the Australian parliament in May 2014. Australia signed the deal before we did. Again, we have to get better at this.

I am rather touched by the hon. member and his colleagues' interest in the Liberal Party's allocation of the valuable time of our MPs and who sits on which committee. I am proud to work with my skilled and knowledgeable colleague from Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, who represents us effectively on the trade committee.

As far as I know, a majority government has a lot of prerogatives, but it does not get to decide how opposition members spend their time and which committees they formally sit on. I do really want to clarify this. I want to be clear that I do not sit on that committee for the Liberal Party, and so to allege that I am absent and not performing a duty that I am obliged to perform is not correct. I want to be able to say that in this House. That is very important—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Order, please. The hon. member might have the opportunity on some of the other comments and questions to continue with that.

Questions and comments. The hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when speaking about the Canada-EU trade agreement, the Liberal trade critic said:

We have been supportive of the deal from the start.

It's important to say this is a great step, but also we really need to start seeing some details. At some point though we need to see what it is we're actually supporting.

It begs this question. Why is it that the Liberals are willing to support trade deals before they even read them or see the details?

My question is about democracy. My hon. colleague mentioned favourably that Korea is a democracy, yet the Liberals supported a free trade agreement with Honduras, where the democratically elected government was overthrown by a coup, where journalists are regularly killed, where the LGBT community is persecuted, and where human rights are brazenly violated. They also supported the China FIPA, which has all sorts of problems in many other respects as well.

I am just wondering if my hon. colleague could name a single country with which the Liberals would not support signing a trade agreement.

Ms. Chrystia Freeland: Mr. Speaker, on CETA, we in the Liberal Party are adults and we understand and respect the fact that, if trade agreements are going to be done, they need to be done behind closed doors. That is particularly true when it is a complicated agreement, as it necessarily is with the 27-member-state European Union. We get that. From the start we have been supportive of CETA in principle, and I am proud that we have been.

We support free trade. For our government negotiators to go to the table being able to say they have cross-party support is effective and important for Canada.

Equally, we appreciate the reality that we are only able to evaluate an agreement in sum when we see what negotiators have come up with. Trade is like a Rubik's cube; each piece is dependent on the whole. We can only evaluate it definitively when we see the details, and that was the point.

I would be happy to talk about Honduras, but I see the Speaker is telling me to sit down, so I will.

• (1655)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member talked briefly in her opening remarks with respect to the bill about the importance of having an overall balance to trade, where Canada has fallen short in recent years.

Maybe she could give her perspective or provide a bit more clarity on how important a surplus in trade is and that it ultimately equates to more jobs for Canadians, which helps our middle class.

Ms. Chrystia Freeland: Mr. Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North is legendary in the House for his ability to talk about anything and to know about everything, and I salute him for that.

When it comes to trade, our issue is this. We are firmly pro-free trade, and we hear that rhetoric coming from the other side of the House. It is one thing to have bold ambitions, but those ambitions have to be matched with actual performance.

It is not just our party that is concerned about this. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the respected voice of business, is also really concerned. We are seeing the reality, which is that Canadian trade and export performance is falling behind. That is a real problem for the 11th-size economy in a globalized world economy, and it is part of the reason our middle class is falling behind.

[Translation]

Ms. Paulina Ayala (Honoré-Mercier, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am seeing more and more cars coming from South Korea. Even my brother bought one, and it was cheaper. I am therefore concerned about this.

What is the Liberal Party's plan to protect the great work that is being done by the people in Canada's automobile industry? What will the Liberal Party do to make sure these people continue to have jobs? Do the Liberals have a plan for that?

Ms. Chrystia Freeland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her question. I will not try to answer her in French right now, but maybe next month. It is very important to me.

[English]

It is absolutely true that Korean cars are present in the Canadian market, that South Korea currently exports a lot more cars to Canada than the other way around and that there have been some concerns around it.

The reality, though, is the Canadian car export market in South Korea right now is relatively small and the match of Canadian manufactured vehicles that would suit the needs of Korean consumers is really small.

Government Orders

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am slightly off the topic of the Canada-Korea agreement, but I am looking forward to a response from my hon. colleague from Toronto Centre because she made some very important observations about balance of trade issues in the situation with Canadian exporters.

I wonder what the position is of the Liberal Party on the fact that exports from Canada have tilted rather toward raw resource exports and away from manufacturing and value added. My own analysis of the economics of the situation is that we have actually undermined our productivity in doing this because we know the manufacturing sector has a lot more innovation and a lot more R and D than the raw resource sector.

Has she any comment on whether our economy would be healthier if we did more value added prior to export?

Ms. Chrystia Freeland: Mr. Speaker, I absolutely agree with the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands. Part of the reason we are seeing this view, and I emphasize this because it is really important, coming from the business community, among others, that Canada's export performance is falling behind is because of this balance.

We do not need to shrink from the fact that we are a powerful commodity producer. That is a great thing, but that cannot be the only leg on which our economy stands, particularly because our economic performance has been flattered by high commodity prices, which we cannot count on lasting forever.

In building a stronger export-driven Canadian economy, we have to work harder to be sure that value-added exports are a big part of it, including really high-valued manufacturers.

● (1700)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in the House to speak to Bill C-41, An Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the Republic of Korea. I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Dartmouth—Cole Harbour.

I am very pleased to speak to this bill, especially as a member of the Standing Committee on International Trade. I had the opportunity to work with the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway, our international trade critic, who did a great deal of work on this file. He consulted the stakeholders and did an excellent job on Bill C-41.

The NDP uses three criteria to assess free trade agreements. We assess such agreements on an individual basis. In other words, we do our homework on every free trade agreement. The first criterion is respect for democracy, human rights and environmental standards. Free trade agreements must be negotiated with countries that have high standards in these three areas or are in the process of achieving these objectives.

The second criterion for reviewing these free trade agreements has to do with the trading partner's economy. Is the economy of the proposed partner of significant or strategic value to Canada? Third, the terms of the proposed agreement have to be satisfactory.

Unlike the Liberal Party, which is ready to support free trade agreements without even reading them, the NDP feels it is important

to read free trade agreements before taking a position on them. Having studied the free trade agreement with South Korea, we are proud to support Bill C-41 because the agreement fulfills those three criteria. South Korea is a democratic country with very high environmental standards that is of significant strategic value to Canada.

I would like to talk about South Korea's profile and our trade relationship with that country. South Korea is a world leader in environmental policy. Over the past few years, it has invested billions of dollars in an ambitious green growth strategy designed to improve energy efficiency and stimulate green and renewable technology. The Conservative government would do well to follow this innovative country's example.

South Korea also clearly complies with high environmental and labour standards and shares the Canadian values of human rights and democracy. Since South Korea has become a world leader in renewable energy and green technology, Canada can take advantage of this free trade agreement to boost trade in these important sectors.

South Korea is Canada's seventh-largest trading partner and the third-largest economy in Asia after China and Japan. Businesses in my riding of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles will also support a broader free trade relationship with South Korea.

● (1705)

In 2013, Canadian exports to South Korea were valued at \$3.4 billion, while South Korean exports to Canada were worth \$7.3 billion.

I would like to talk a little about my riding and the economic sectors that are crucial to the economy of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, which is in the Lower Laurentians. As many people know, my riding is home to a number of world-class small and medium-sized businesses in the aerospace industry. Examples of those businesses include Patt Technologies and Metcor in Saint-Eustache, as well as DCM Aerospace and TMH Canada in Boisbriand. I am proud to say that there are 20 companies and 4,000 employees working in the aerospace sector in my riding.

I therefore welcome the measures in this free trade agreement that will boost this sector, which is so important to the Montreal region. The Canada-Korea free trade agreement will create more opportunities to access markets in the aerospace industry. In fact, as soon as this agreement enters into force, 100% of tariff lines will be duty free. Current duties can be as high as 8%. This, then, is great news for the aerospace sector.

I would like to quote a stakeholder in that industry. Jim Quick, the president and CEO of the Aerospace Industries Association of Canada, said:

Our industry depends on exports and access to international markets to remain competitive and continue creating jobs and revenues here at home. This agreement is imperative to restoring a level playing field for Canadian firms in the South Korean market, which is especially important given the considerable growth the aerospace industry will see in the Asia-Pacific region in coming years.

Government Orders

Clearly, the gains for this important economic sector have been thoroughly studied, and I support the measures in this free trade agreement.

Another sector that could also benefit from this free trade agreement is the wine and spirits industry. As I tell everyone who visits my beautiful riding, Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, we are home to the largest red wine producers in Quebec, and I am very proud to say so. In the Canada-Korea free trade agreement, tariffs on ice wine, which are currently 15%, will disappear. This is definitely good news for Quebec's wine producers.

As I have little time remaining for my speech, I would like to speak briefly about the part of this free trade agreement that concerns investor state disputes. There is a caveat with respect to the NDP's support for this bill. An NDP government would not have included this type of dispute settlement mechanism in a free trade agreement with Korea. Canada and Korea are both democratic countries with strong justice systems. It should be noted that Korea's main opposition party is also opposed to this mechanism. An NDP government would negotiate with South Korea in order to drop this part of the agreement.

Fortunately, unlike the Canada-China investment agreement, this agreement is not binding on the government for 31 years and can be renegotiated or terminated with six months' notice. That is good news.

• (1710)

I welcome questions from my hon. colleagues. I would like to say once again that I support Bill C-41.

[English]

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I must say it is a refreshing change for members of the New Democratic Party to support a trade deal. This is the first time in all the years I have been here, in fact, that the New Democrats have supported any of the trade deals that have been signed.

However, richer than that was the former speaker, the member of the Liberal Party, who stood up and had the gall to ask why this deal was not done sooner. Her party was 13 years in government, and what trade deals did it sign? I think it was three, with Costa Rica and Panama. The Liberals just did not do the job. That is clear.

She had the gall to do that, and it surprised me. At least this member is finally changing her ways, and I want to commend her for doing that.

I would ask this question: why have the New Democrats finally seen the light on trade? Why do they finally see it as something that is important to the Canadian economy and to jobs?

[Translation]

Ms. Laurin Liu: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his question.

I have had the opportunity to work with him on different parliamentary committees. He must have been absent quite a bit since being elected because the NDP has supported a number of free trade agreements with other countries.

I would like to speak about our record. We opposed the Canada-Colombia free trade agreement. However, the NDP rose in the House to support the Canada-Jordan free trade agreement in March 2012, when my colleague was an MP. Jordan is a democratic country of strategic value to Canada. The NDP will also support the South Korea free trade agreement.

It is not true that we oppose all free trade agreements. Unfortunately, this Conservative government focuses too much on agreements with countries such as Honduras, an undemocratic country of no value to Canada.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for Canadians who might be watching, the New Democrats are being a bit deceiving here. Technically, this will hopefully be the first agreement for which the New Democrats will stand in their place and vote. People and viewers should be aware of the fact that the New Democrats have never stood in their place and actually voted in favour of a free trade agreement.

Having said that, I want to question the comment from the Conservative member.

He talked about the Korea deal. We need to recognize that Korea itself began the process in 2003 and that Paul Martin initiated Canada's interest in 2004. That is pretty rapid. It seems to me that the slowness crept in when the new Prime Minister, the current Prime Minister, took office.

I wonder if the member might want to provide some comment in terms of the opportunities lost because the current Prime Minister was asleep at the switch, which has ultimately cost Canadians jobs.

[Translation]

Ms. Laurin Liu: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Liberal members need to stop toeing the party line.

In March 2012, the NDP rose in the House to vote in favour of the Canada-Jordan free trade agreement. I imagine that the Liberal member was unfortunately not there that day either.

I also want to point out that the Liberals supported the Canada-Honduras free trade agreement. Honduras is a country where the government was recently overturned in a *coup d'état* and journalists are regularly murdered.

Is there a free trade agreement that the Liberal Party will not support?

[English]

Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP): Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, I am very pleased to stand in the House and speak about Bill C-41, an act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the Republic of Korea.

Let me start by saying how pleased and proud I am of my colleague, our trade critic, the member of Parliament for Vancouver Kingsway. He has been on this file for a couple of years now, and he has done a masterful job of carrying forward with the New Democratic Party vision on trade.

Government Orders

The member has analyzed any agreements that have been made public, which, by any stretch of the imagination, are few and far between. That member has done a great job, not only in examining and analyzing any details that we do find out, but also in speaking with people involved in trade from one end of this country to the other and around the world to help develop our policy.

New Democrats want a strategic trade policy whereby we restart multilateral negotiations and sign trade deals both with developed countries that have high standards and with developing countries that are on progressive trajectories. Countries such as Japan, India, Brazil, and South Africa are examples.

The precise terms of this agreement are perhaps not what we would have negotiated, but it is fair to say that we think that—surprise, surprise—it is not a bad deal on balance. We have some concerns about the agreement, but it is a deal that we think deserves to be supported.

Unlike the Canada-China FIPA, this agreement does not tie the government's hands for 31 years. It is unlike CETA, in which the investor state dispute settlement mechanism chapter would continue to apply for 20 years after cancellation of the deal. Under the Korea free trade agreement, it can be fully cancelled after six months.

It is important that members of this House, particularly the Liberal members, understand that it is important to make sure people use their heads when they are negotiating any deal and make sure that they understand what is contained within that deal.

As I said when I started out, we certainly support the idea of trade, but we need to think about it in a responsible manner. We need to approach it in a common sense fashion, as any democratic government would, to make sure it is in the best interests of the people of our country. For example, we need to make sure we do not make deals that tie the hands of sub-national governments, as happens with investor state dispute mechanism provisions.

We need to understand that we are a democracy, that we uphold democratic principles in this country, and that we are not going to give up those principles. We are not going to give up the rights of citizens and governments to make decisions over purchasing and over matters that are determined through democratic process. We are not going to cede those rights to corporations, either here or elsewhere.

What do we want? New Democrats want to deepen Canada's trade linkages with the Asia-Pacific region, something that we recognize is essential to maintaining Canadian prosperity in the 21st century.

We want the government to do more to support our automotive industry, for example. We understand that there are some concerns about the impact that reducing the 6.5% tariff will have on the automotive sector. We have to recognize that the automotive sector is under increasing global pressure as a result of competition, so the government should be participating actively with the automotive sector to make sure that it is providing the supports necessary to maintain a vital and vibrant industry that provides a lot of family-sustaining jobs.

●(1715)

We support breaking down trade barriers, but we believe that government should provide the support the Canadian industry needs to remain competitive in a more open world. We agree with the various organizations and individuals who say that governments need to do more than simply sign trade agreements. They must do more to promote Canadian exports, attract investments, and help Canadian companies penetrate the South Korean and other Asian markets.

Finally, we want a strategic trade policy, as I said earlier, whereby we have multilateral negotiations and sign trade deals with developed countries that have high standards and with developing countries that are on a progressive trajectory.

What do we have here, then?

As has been explained by my colleague, our trade critic, we have three main criteria for trade agreements that we look to in evaluating them.

First, is the proposed partner one that respects democracy, human rights, adequate environmental and labour standards, and Canadian values? I would suggest that South Korea is such a country.

Since South Korea emerged from a dictatorship in 1987, it transitioned into a vibrant, multi-party democracy with an active trade union movement, relatively high wages, a diverse civil society, and freedom of expression. In fact, in recent years, we could learn a great deal from a country like South Korea. It has invested billions in an ambitious green growth strategy aimed at improving energy efficiency as well as boosting renewables and green technology. It clearly respects high environmental and labour standards and it shares our values of human rights and democracy.

Second, is the proposed partner's economy of significant or strategic value to Canada? I would suggest that again South Korea passes the test.

South Korea is Canada's seventh most important trading partner and third in Asia, behind the two largest economies, China and Japan. In 2013, Canadian exports to South Korea totalled \$3.4 billion, while Korean exports to Canada totalled \$7.3 billion. We export the same amount to South Korea as we export to France and Germany. We import the same amount as we do from the U.K. This is Canada's first trade agreement with an Asian country, and it provides an opportunity to take advantage of the Pacific region, which is extremely important.

Third, are the terms of the proposed deal satisfactory? Again I suggest that in this case they are satisfactory.

With regard to jobs, the agreement will create a level playing field for Canadian companies and workers exporting to South Korea.

Government Orders

In agriculture, the free trade deal is essential. Canada has suffered significant losses in market share for Canadian agricultural exports to Korea following the implementation of the Korea-U.S. FTA.

In the aerospace sector, there is general support for a Korean FTA among manufacturing sectors, notably from Bombardier and from aerospace industry associations. The deal will gradually remove 100% of industrial tariffs, with an estimated value of \$1.9 trillion in business to be generated by this sector of the economy.

With regard to seafood, there is a 47% tariff on Canadian exports to Korea. It will be eliminated. It is a big deal for seafood exporters in my community on the east coast and for exporters on the west coast as well.

With forestry and wood products, it is the same thing. This is a good deal.

However, I mentioned that there are concerns about the impact this deal may have on the auto sector. We are calling on the government to pay attention to those concerns. They are very legitimate, and we want the federal government to do more to support the auto industry in Canada.

• (1720)

We will propose solid, effective policy measures to strengthen the Canadian auto sector. It is a move that needs to happen, so I would indicate that to members.

We are using our heads when it comes to analyzing the trade deal. In this case, we give a thumbs-up.

• (1725)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Before we go to questions and comments, I see that the hon. government House leader is rising on a point of order.

* * *

PROTECTION OF COMMUNITIES AND EXPLOITED PERSONS ACT

BILL C-36—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the House that agreements have not been reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) and 78(2) concerning the proceedings at report stage and third reading of Bill C-36, an act to amend the Criminal Code in response to the Supreme Court of Canada decision in *Attorney General of Canada v. Bedford* and to make consequential amendments to other acts.

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

CANADA-KOREA ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PROSPERITY ACT

BILL C-41—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the House that agreements have not been reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) and 78(2) concerning the proceedings at the second reading stage of Bill C-41, an act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the Republic of Korea.

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

* * *

ENERGY SAFETY AND SECURITY ACT

BILL C-22—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the House that agreements have not been reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) and 78(2) concerning the proceedings at the third reading stage of Bill C-22, an act respecting Canada's offshore oil and gas operations, enacting the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act, repealing the Nuclear Liability Act and making consequential amendments to other acts.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I am sure that the House appreciates the notice given by the hon. government House leader.

* * *

CANADA-KOREA ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PROSPERITY ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-41, An Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the Republic of Korea, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused about the question on the investor state provisions in the Canada-Korea free trade agreement. I agreed with my hon. colleague when he said that these agreements by definition would give corporations the ability to sue Canada in arbitrations. They would allow them to sue for damages, for bills and for laws that are passed municipally, provincially or federally. It is anti-democratic.

I do understand that the trade critic for the official opposition, the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway, feels that this investor state agreement is acceptable because there is a level of transparency in the six month opt-out clause, but in principle, it would do the same thing that the hon. member for Dartmouth—Cole Harbour finds objectionable.

I wonder if he is not troubled that we would pass any further bilateral trade agreements that would create these additional powers for foreign corporations.

Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely sensitive to this issue and to any agreement tying the hands of any government. However, I am sufficiently confident, as a result of the analysis that we have done on this, that this free trade agreement would not apply to provincial, territorial or municipal procurement or crown corporations, where most Canadian procurement is located.

Secondly, under the investor state provisions, we understand that not only would the process, for the first time ever, be laid out in a transparent matter, but we would be able to cancel this provision within six months. While it is certainly not what we would negotiate, which I indicated off the bat, and I do have concerns in those areas, in this case I would suggest to my hon. colleague that I am sufficiently convinced that the concerns that she raised are not at issue in this agreement.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to get the member's comments on the potential position that the NDP would have regarding Ukraine.

We had the President of Ukraine address the House. Many of the comments that he made were well received by most people. One of the comments was in relation to Canada going into a free trade agreement with Ukraine. I noticed that there was not as much enthusiasm coming from the New Democratic part of the House.

Has it taken a position? Does the member have any thoughts as to what he feels the NDP is likely to do with any sort of potential trade agreement, listening to what the President of Ukraine said? I appreciate the fact that the New Democrats are very supportive of this particular agreement that we are debating here today. That is why I ask about Ukraine, given the importance of Ukraine today and what is happening.

• (1730)

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the question coming from the member for Winnipeg North would have absolutely nothing to do with the piece of legislation on the table at the moment. I do not know if he is troubled by the fact that we have given thoughtful consideration to this piece of legislation and we support it. I do not know exactly why he is asking another question.

This is an important deal. Let us not forget, this is the first time that the government has negotiated a deal that we are comfortable in supporting, that we believe meets the three criteria that we laid out that are in the best interests of Canadian industry and of Canadians, and we think it is worthy of support. That should be something that we are all paying attention to and that we are all concerned with because let us be clear that the government House leader just stood and talked about the fact that they were not able to come to an agreement on anything. Once again, Conservatives are going to apply time allocation and closure on a whole host of bills, a whole host of important issues. Yes, we are surprised that they were able to negotiate any deal that we could support, but wonders never cease in this chamber.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Before we get to the interruption and finish government orders, there are just a couple of

Business of Supply

things that occurred in the course of this afternoon's debate that I would pass along for the benefit of all hon. members. First, members should be cautious not to use the actual given name or family name of other hon. members, but to use their riding name in reference in the course of their speeches.

Second, there were a couple of occasions where you may recall in reading our procedures that members should be cautious to watch that they do not come in front of a member who has been so recognized and is standing and giving their remarks or commentary, do not come between them and the Speaker, particularly if they are in the camera shot. This is kind of a disrespectful thing, and members should honour the member who does in fact have the floor and is recognized as such. I know members are usually very careful about that, but this is just a reminder to watch that. It particularly occurs when members at the south end of the chamber are speaking. There are other ways. Members can go in behind and so on to avoid the camera shot. That is a suggestion to keep our discourse here in the chamber as civil and respectable as it always is.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The House resumed from September 23 consideration of the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): It being 5:33 p.m., the House will proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion by the member for Kings—Hants relating to the business of supply.

Call in the members.

• (1810)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 227*)

YEAS

Members

Andrews	Bélanger
Brisson	Casey
Chan	Cuzner
Dion	Dubourg
Easter	Eyking
Foote	Freeland
Fry	Garneau
Goodale	Hsu
Hyer	Jones
Lamoureux	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
MacAulay	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Murray
Regan	Scarpaleggia
Sgro	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
St-Denis	
Valériote	Trudeau
	Vaughan— 34

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander

Private Members' Business

Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinooge	Dewar	Dion
Butt	Calandra	Dionne Labelle	Doré Lefebvre
Cannan	Carmichael	Dubé	Dubourg
Carrie	Chisu	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Chong	Clarke	Easter	Eyking
Clement	Crockatt	Foote	Fortin
Daniel	Davidson	Freeland	Freeman
Dechert	Del Mastro	Fry	Garneau
Devolin	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Garrison	Genest
Dykstra	Falk	Genest-Jourdain	Giguère
Fantino	Fast	Godin	Goodale
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Groguhé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Fletcher	Galipeau	Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu
Gallant	Gill	Hughes	Hyer
Glover	Goguen	Jacob	Jones
Goldring	Goodyear	Julian	Kellway
Gosal	Gourde	Lamoureux	Lapointe
Grewal	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Latendresse	Laverdière
Hawn	Hayes	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Hiebert	Hillyer	Leslie	Liu
Holder	James	MacAulay	Mai
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Marston	Martin
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Kent	Masse	Mathysen
Kerr	Komarnicki	May	McCallum
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake	McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Lauzon	Leaf	Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Leitch	Lemieux	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Leung	Lizon	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Lobb	Lukiwski	Mulcair	Murray
Lunney	Mackay (Central Nova)	Nantel	Nash
MacKenzie	Maguire	Nicholls	Nunez-Melo
Mayes	McColeman	Papillon	Patry
McLeod	Menegakis	Péclet	Plamondon
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	Quach	Rafferty
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Nicholson	Rankin	Rathgeber
Norlock	Obhrai	Ravnault	Raynault
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon	Regan	Rousseau
Opitz	O'Toole	Saganash	Sandhu
Payne	Poilievre	Scarpaleggia	Scott
Preston	Raït	Sellah	Sgro
Rajotte	Reid	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Rempel	Richards	Sims (Newton—North Delta)	St-Denis
Rickford	Ritz	Sitsabaesan	Stoffer
Saxton	Schellenberger	Stewart	Toone
Seeback	Shea	Sullivan	Turmel
Shipley	Shory	Trudeau	Vaughan— 126
Sopuck	Sorenson	Valeriote	
Stanton	Storseth		
Strahl	Sweet		
Tilson	Toet		
Trost	Trottier		
Truppe	Uppal		
Valcourt	Van Kesteren		
Van Loan	Vellacott		
Wallace	Warawa		
Warkentin	Watson		
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)			
Weston (Saint John)			
Wilks	Williamson		
Wong	Woodworth		
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)		
Yurdiga	Zimmer— 148		

NAYS

Members

Allen (Weland)	Andrews
Angus	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Bélanger	Bellavance
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Brahmi	Brisson
Brosseau	Caron
Casey	Cash
Chan	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Côté
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

PAIRED

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

CONFLICT MINERALS ACT

The House resumed from June 19, 2014, consideration of the motion that Bill C-486, An Act respecting corporate practices relating to the extraction, processing, purchase, trade and use of conflict minerals from the Great Lakes Region of Africa, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Monday, September 15, 2014, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the second reading stage of Bill C-486 under private members' business. The question is on the motion.

Private Members' Business

● (1825)

[English]

(The House divided on the motion, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 229)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
Angus	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Bélangier	Bellavance
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Brahmi	Brison
Brosseau	Caron
Casey	Cash
Chan	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Côté
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Doré Lefebvre
Dubé	Dubourg
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Easter	Eyking
Fletcher	Foote
Fortin	Freeland
Freeman	Fry
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Godin
Goodale	Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu	Hughes
Hyer	Jacob
Jones	Julian
Kellway	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Latendresse
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	MacAulay
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mulcair
Murray	Nantel
Nash	Nicholls
Nunez-Melo	Papillon
Patry	Péclét
Plamondon	Quach
Rafferty	Rankin
Rathgeber	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Scarpaleggia
Scott	Sellah
Sgro	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind- sor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
St-Denis	Stewart
Stoffer	Sullivan
Toone	Trudeau
Turnel	Valeriote
Vaughan— 127	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
----------	-------

Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Amblor	Ambrose
Anders	Anderson
Armstrong	Aspin
Barlow	Bateman
Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Bezan
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinooge
Butt	Calandra
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Chisu
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Crockatt
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Del Mastro
Devolin	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Galipeau	Gallant
Gill	Glover
Goguen	Goldring
Goodyear	Gosal
Gourde	Grewal
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Holder	James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
Lunney	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mayes	McColeman
McLeod	Menegakis
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Nicholson
Norlock	Obhrai
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Payne	Poillievre
Preston	Raitt
Rajotte	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rickford	Ritz
Saxton	Schellenberger
Seeback	Shea
Shiple	Shory
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Storseth
Strahl	Sweet
Tilson	Toet
Trost	Trotter
Truppe	Uppal
Valcourt	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	Williamson
Weston (Saint John)	Woodworth
Wilks	Young (Vancouver South)
Wong	Zimmer— 146
Young (Oakville)	
Yurdiga	

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

Private Members' Business

● (1830)

*[Translation]***RESPECTING FAMILIES OF MURDERED AND BRUTALIZED PERSONS ACT**

The House resumed from September 16 consideration of the motion that Bill C-587, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (increasing parole ineligibility), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Monday, September 15, 2014, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the second reading stage of Bill C-587 under private members' business.

● (1835)

[English]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 230)***YEAS**

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambler	Ambrose
Anders	Anderson
Andrews	Armstrong
Aspin	Barlow
Bateman	Bélangier
Bellavance	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Bezan	Blaney
Block	Boughen
Braid	Brisson
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinooge
Butt	Calandra
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Casey
Chan	Chisu
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Crockatt
Cuzner	Daniel
Davidson	Dechert
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dion	Dubourg
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Falk	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Foote	Fortin
Freeland	Fry
Galipeau	Gallant
Garneau	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodale
Goodyear	Gosal
Gourde	Grewal
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Holder
Hsu	James
Jones	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenny (Calgary Southeast)
Kent	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lamoureux
Lauzon	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leef	Leitch
Lemieux	Leung

Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinity
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	McLeod
Menegakis	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Murray	Nicholson
Norlock	Obhrai
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Payne	Poillievre
Preston	Raitt
Rajotte	Rathgeber
Regan	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rickford	Ritz
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Seeback
Sgro	Shea
Shipley	Shory
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sopuck	
Sorenson	Stanton
St-Denis	Storseth
Strahl	Sweet
Tilson	Toet
Trost	Trottier
Trudeau	Truppe
Uppal	Valcourt
Valeriote	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vaughan
Vellacott	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiaga
Zimmer — 183	

NAYS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Angus
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Benskin
Bevington	Blanchette
Boivin	Borg
Boulerice	Brahmi
Brosseau	Caron
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Côté
Crowder	Cullen
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Freeman	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Godin
Grogulé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Hughes
Hyer	Jacob
Julian	Kellway
Lapointe	Latendresse
Laverdière	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leslie	Liu
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair	Nantel
Nash	Nicholls
Nunez-Melo	Papillon

Private Members' Business

Patry	Péclet
Plamondon	Quach
Rafferty	Rankin
Ravignat	Raynault
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Scott
Sellah	Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan	Stewart
Stoffer	Sullivan
Toone	Turmel— 90

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

[Translation]

REFORM ACT, 2014

The House resumed from September 18 consideration of the motion that Bill C-586, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Parliament of Canada Act (candidacy and caucus reforms), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the second reading stage of Bill C-586 under private members' business.

● (1845)

[English]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 231)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander
Allen (Welland)	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Angus	Armstrong
Aspin	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Barlow	Bateman
Bélangier	Bellavance
Benoit	Benskin
Bergen	Bernier
Bevington	Bezan
Blanchette	Blaney
Block	Boivin
Boughen	Boulerice
Braid	Brison
Brosseau	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinooge	Butt
Calandra	Cannan
Carmichael	Caron
Carrie	Casey
Cash	Chan
Chicoine	Chisholm
Chisu	Chong
Choquette	Christopherson
Clarke	Cleary
Clement	Côté
Crockatt	Crowder
Cullen	Cuzner

Daniel	Davidson
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Del Mastro
Devolin	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Falk	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finlay (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Foote	Fortin
Freeland	Fry
Galipeau	Gallant
Garrison	Genest
Gill	Glover
Godin	Goguen
Goodale	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Grewal	Grogouh�
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hiebert	Hillyer
Holder	Hsu
Hughes	Hyer
Jacob	Jones
Julian	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kellway
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Latendresse	Lauzon
Laverdi�re	LeBlanc (Beaus�jour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—�mard)	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leslie	Leung
Liu	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
Lunney	MacAulay
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Maguire	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
May	Mayes
McCallum	McColeman
McGuinity	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McLeod	Menegakis
Miller	Moore (Abitibi—T�miscamingue)
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Gr�ce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nicholson
Norlock	Nunez-Melo
Obhrai	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Papillon	Patry
P�clet	Plamondon
Poilievre	Preston
Quach	Rafferty
Raith	Rajotte
Rankin	Rathgeber
Ravignat	Raynault
Regan	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rickford	Ritz
Saganash	Sandhu
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Scott
Seeback	Sellah
Sgro	Shea
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaiesan	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
St-Denis	Stewart
Stoffer	Storseth
Strahl	Sullivan
Sweet	Tilson
Toet	Toone
Trost	Trottier

Trudeau
Turmel
Valcourt
Van Kesteren
Vaughan
Wallace
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Vancouver South)
Zimmer — 253

Truppe
Uppal
Valeriotte
Van Loan
Vellacott
Warawa
Watson
Wong
Young (Oakville)
Yurdiga

NAYS

Members

Borg
Charlton
Day
Dusseauit
Garneau
Hayes
Michaud
Rousseau
Wilks — 17

Brahmi
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dechert
Freeman
Giguère
James
O'Connor
Shipley

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM

The House resumed from September 22 consideration of the motion.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 497 under private members' business in the name of the member for Drummond.

• (1855)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 232*)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Weland)
Angus
Aubin
Bélanger
Benskin
Blanchette
Borg
Brahmi
Brosseau
Casey
Chan
Chicoine
Choquette
Cleary
Crockatt
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Dion
Doré Lefebvre
Dubourg

Andrews
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bellavance
Bevington
Boivin
Boulerice
Brison
Caron
Cash
Charlton
Chisholm
Christopherson
Côté
Crowder
Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)

Dusseauit
Eyking
Fortin
Freeman
Gameau
Genest
Giguère
Goodale
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hsu
Hyer
Jones
Kellway
Lapointe
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Murray
Nash
Nunez-Melo
Patry
Plamondon
Rankin
Ravignat
Regan
Saganash
Scarpaleggia
Sellah
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan
Stewart
Sullivan
Trudeau
Valeriotte
Woodworth — 127

Private Members' Business

Easter
Foote
Freeland
Fry
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Godin
Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)
Hughes
Jacob
Julian
Lamoureux
Latendresse
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leslie
MacAulay
Marston
Masse
May
McGuinty
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Papillon
Pécllet
Rafferty
Rathgeber
Raynault
Rousseau
Sandhu
Scott
Sgro
St-Denis
Stoffer
Toone
Turmel
Vaughan

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anders
Armstrong
Barlow
Benoit
Bernier
Blaney
Boughen
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Barrie)
Butt
Cannan
Carrie
Chong
Clement
Davidson
Del Mastro
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Falk
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Galipeau
Gill
Goguen
Goodyear
Gourde
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes
Hillyer
James
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)

Adams
Albas
Alexander
Allison
Ambrose
Anderson
Aspin
Bateman
Bergen
Bezan
Block
Braid
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Bruinooge
Calandra
Carmichael
Chisu
Clarke
Daniel
Dechert
Devolin
Dykstra
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Fletcher
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Gosal
Grewal
Hawn
Hiebert
Holder
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)

Private Members' Business

Kent	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lauzon
Leef	Leitch
Lemieux	Leung
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Maguire	Mayes
McColeman	McLeod
Menegakis	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Nicholson	Norlock
Obhrai	O'Connor
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
O'Toole	Payne
Poillievre	Preston
Raitt	Rajotte
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Rickford
Ritz	Saxton
Schellenberger	Seeback
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Tilson
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Truppe
Uppal	Valcourt
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 145	

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

[English]

It being 6:58 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

* * *

• (1900)

LINCOLN ALEXANDER DAY ACT

The House resumed from June 2 consideration of the motion that Bill S-213, An Act respecting Lincoln Alexander Day, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Frank Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise to speak to the designation of January 21 as Lincoln Alexander Day in memory of his myriad contributions to Canada: as a young man who fought for his country, as a lawyer, as Canada's first black member of Parliament and first black cabinet minister, as Her Majesty's representative in Ontario, as chancellor of the University of Guelph, as a husband, and as a father.

It is barely two years since the incomparable Linc, as he was known, passed away, though his legacy lives on as strong as ever.

I thank the hon. member for Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale for sponsoring here the bill of his colleague from the other place, to provide a national day to remember his life and legacy.

I also wish to thank my colleague from Hamilton Mountain for introducing a similar bill, and to all of our colleagues in the last parliament in Ontario, who voted unanimously to recognize January 21 as Lincoln Alexander Day in the province of Ontario.

When I first heard of Lincoln Alexander's passing, I thought of the words of another great statesman, Sir Winston Churchill, who said, "We make a living by what we get, but we make a life by what we give".

For all of the adversity he faced throughout his life, he was never dissuaded from serving his community. Undeterred by discrimination and other obstacles, Lincoln Alexander gave so very much, and his legacy as a great Canadian continues to give to this very day.

Canada in 1922, when Linc was born, was not always a terribly friendly place for black Canadians. He recounted in his memoirs that there were very few other black families and that he was always one of the only black students in his grade when going to school.

From that very early age, Linc faced discrimination, but he made it clear he would not let the blind hatred of others define him. He would be the master of his own destiny. He would not be deterred, so he walked tall and did whatever it took to earn the respect of those around him. That drive and determination would stay with him throughout his life and would become one of his defining features.

Too young to enlist as the Second World War began, Linc took a job helping the Canadian effort as a machinist, helping to assemble anti-aircraft guns in Hamilton, Ontario, until he was old enough to join the Royal Canadian Air Force. During that time, he distinguished himself as a wireless radio operator until his discharge at the end of the war in 1945.

From an early age, his mother instilled in Linc an appreciation for how important an education can be, something that stayed with him throughout his life. Using the resources available to him as a veteran, Linc went back to school and graduated from McMaster in 1949.

Confronted with racism and discrimination when he tried to enter the workforce, Linc went back to law school, determined to blaze his own path if others were more content to prejudge him on the colour of his skin instead of his qualifications as a veteran and top-tier university graduate.

He plowed ahead, graduated, and practised law in Hamilton until first trying his hand in politics. While he was not elected his first time in 1965, he managed to be elected as the Progressive Conservative member of Parliament for Hamilton West in 1968. With that, he became the first black Canadian member of Parliament, a clear message to all Canadians that race would not be allowed to impede the call to service. In fact, he said at that time:

...I accept the responsibility of speaking for...all others in this great nation who feel that they are the subjects of discrimination because of race, creed or colour.

Before retiring from the House of Commons after 12 years as an MP, Linc went on to be the first black Canadian cabinet minister, serving as labour minister under then prime minister Joe Clark.

Private Members' Business

Though he retired from politics in 1980, he was not nearly done with firsts. In 1985, on the advice of then prime minister Brian Mulroney, Linc was appointed the 24th Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, the first black Canadian to hold a vice-regal post in Canada.

Over the course of his six years in this post, he demonstrated to all Ontarians his determination and work ethic.

• (1905)

In its obituary of the legendary man, the Toronto *Star* highlighted that as lieutenant governor, Alexander visited 672 communities, visited 230 schools, received 75,000 guests at 675 receptions, and more, and shook nearly 240,000 hands.

Serving the people of Ontario and Canada drove him. He left an imprint wherever he went and on whomever he met. He always made people feel unique, important and in the moment that one shared with him, that person was the centre of his world. There was such depth of character and integrity there.

When he left Queen's Park and the lieutenant governor's office in 1991, Linc was invested as chancellor of the University of Guelph, where his contributions over an astounding 5 term, 15-year tenure led him to be named chancellor emeritus when he retired in 2007. The appreciation for education his mother had given him as a young boy in Toronto and a young man finding his way in Hamilton held strong and was fundamental to how he approached his position as chancellor. He made an indelible impression on our community in Guelph in that time.

As recent as a couple of years ago, I can recall speaking to Linc at the rededication of the new Lincoln Alexander Hall at the University of Guelph. As always, he was warm and disarmingly charming. At the opening of the hall which now bears his name, I said this:

“The key to the university's engagement in our community as a collaborator and innovator was in part due to the vision and perseverance of the University of Guelph's longest standing chancellor, Chancellor Emeritus Lincoln Alexander”.

I continued:

“We live in Canada's safest community and enjoy one of the highest rates of volunteerism across our country. Regularly, we are ranked as Canada's most compassionate community and one of the best Canadian cities in which to live - a ranking, due in no small part to the leadership generated by the University of Guelph. A new generation of leaders is being created here in Guelph at this university; a generation that will lead Canada and the world for years to come - a generation that will indeed change lives and improve life - with no better a mentor and role model than that found in Chancellor Emeritus Lincoln Alexander”.

I believe it is wholly fitting that his time in Guelph served as a bookend to his time in public life and as a leader. He had come so far from a time when he fought continually for the respect he deserved. He beat a path for generations of young men and women, black or otherwise, to reach their fullest potentials.

Alastair Summerlee, who just recently ended his tenure as president of the University of Guelph, saw Linc's impact on the community very similarly. He stated:

“Linc was an inspiration to thousands of students, alumni, staff and faculty at the University of Guelph. He had a special word for everybody he met. In an instant, as he talked to you, he made you feel that you were special - a talent that no-one I've ever met can match so elegantly”.

Bill Winegard, a predecessor of mine, put it this way when I asked him to share his thoughts on Linc. He said:

“I knew Lincoln Alexander for many years. I remember joking around with him when he was the minister of labour in the Clark government and when I became a minister, he said, “We both made it, Bill”. He did many great things, which I'm sure many other people took credit for. He was a lovely citizen and I am glad to have called him a friend”.

He broke barriers that, while broken, still exist. His life is a reminder that we must each continue the effort to eliminate prejudice and discrimination whatever the source may be. A dedication of a day in his memory will present us an opportunity to remind ourselves that we must continue his efforts on that day and every day of the year.

He was a friend, a leader, a teacher, a trailblazer, a public servant, and a great man. His loss remains significant, but so long as we live well and foster the values of determination, excellence and inclusivity, we will honour his legacy and he will live on.

• (1910)

It is only fitting that we honour that legacy by commemorating it through Lincoln Alexander Day each January 21.

Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise in the House today to speak to Bill S-213, an act respecting Lincoln Alexander Day. I could not be happier that the bill has finally made it to the floor of the House of Commons for debate. What a long and tortuous road it has been.

I remember when I first got the call from Lincoln Alexander's widow, Marni Beal, asking for my help to establish a national day in Linc's honour. I immediately agreed that it was a stellar idea and I was sure that it would get support across party lines. However, I did ask Marni why she was coming to me instead of one of the Hamilton area Conservative MPs, since Linc of course had been the Conservative member of Parliament for Hamilton West. Marni said she had indeed contacted them but no one had committed to moving forward with it and she was really looking for a champion to get the ball rolling.

Private Members' Business

I told her I would be honoured to play that role. Naively, I thought proclaiming a day in Linc's honour would be a piece of cake. At first, when I talked to some Ontario MPs from all political parties, including cabinet ministers, everyone was on side. The only hitch was how to go about doing it. Since everyone appeared to be in agreement, the simplest way of making it happen would be through a motion that the House would adopt unanimously. Lincoln Alexander Day could be proclaimed in minutes, as opposed to sending a bill through the drawn-out legislative process.

The government House leader, himself an Ontario MP, confided that although he was okay with that approach, he wanted to make sure that he would not be in the House when I moved that motion since he had told some of his caucus colleagues that they should not move similar motions but rather should introduce them as private member's bills.

Fair enough. I waited until he left the House and then rose to say the following:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been consultations among the parties, and I believe if you seek it, you would find unanimous consent for the following motion: I move that this House designate January 21 as Lincoln Alexander Day.

Imagine my surprise when some Conservative members said “no”. Clearly, all of the verbal assurances that this was a matter where we could rise above partisanship and simply do the right thing as parliamentarians had meant absolutely nothing. Obviously, there was nothing left that the Conservative Party would not try to use to its own narrow partisan advantage.

I got in touch with Marni and told her what had transpired. It now looked like a bill would be the only option for moving ahead. Right after question period on December 9, I introduced Bill C-563, an act respecting Lincoln Alexander Day. The bill would make January 21, which was Linc's birthday, Lincoln Alexander Day.

I was still cautiously optimistic we might be able to pass the bill in time for the day to be observed this year. That hope was quickly dashed when I learned three hours later that the Conservatives tabled an almost identical bill to mine in the Senate. I say “almost identical”, because in their haste to introduce something of their own, they screwed it up. The English version proclaimed January 21 as Lincoln Alexander Day, but the French version made it July 21. Would it not have been easier just to support mine? Not if one's only goal is to score political points, even if that means scoring on one's own net.

Senator Meredith did that twice. First by getting the date wrong in the French version of the bill and then by gloating on Twitter that the bill had become law after it was passed in the Senate. However, he forgot one important thing. A bill doesn't become law in Canada without being passed by the House of Commons.

After getting third reading in the Senate, it had to come here, sponsored by a member of Parliament. Of course, that MP is a member of the Conservative caucus. Mission accomplished. The Conservatives can now claim credit for enacting a national day in honour of Lincoln Alexander.

The thing is, I do not care, or ever did care, about who got the political credit. In fact, I mentioned earlier that from the very

beginning I had asked Linc's widow whether she would not rather have a Conservative MP move the bill forward. I just wanted to make sure it happened. Now it finally is. My only regret is that we could not rise above partisanship to make it happen in a more timely way. We missed the opportunity to formally recognize Lincoln Alexander Day this year, and I think that speaks poorly of how we fulfill our roles in this place.

In that regard, we could all stand to learn from Linc. For him, public service was just that. It was all about serving the public and not an end in itself. Born in Toronto in 1922, the son of a maid and a railway porter, Linc embarked on an exemplary life path that involved military service for his country, a successful political career, a thriving law career and vocal advocacy on subjects ranging from anti-racism to the importance of education.

Anyone who has read his biography “Go to School, You're a Little Black Boy” will know that a remarkable series of events helped shape the charismatic and influential leader whose impact continues to be felt today. From facing down racism to challenging the postwar Ontario establishment, serving in the Royal Canadian Air Force, becoming Canada's first black member of Parliament and our country's first black cabinet minister, entertaining royalty as Ontario's lieutenant-governor, and serving as chancellor of the University of Guelph, Linc's is the ultimate, uplifting Canadian success story. He was the embodiment of public service at its finest.

Others who have spoken in this debate have already listed Linc's long list of credentials and accomplishments, and I don't want to repeat them all here. For anyone unfamiliar with Linc's legacy, they need merely read the preamble of my bill. It is a very succinct expression of a man whose spirit in so many ways was too expansive to capture in words.

● (1915)

Sandra Martin also wrote a superb obituary that was published in *The Globe and Mail*. It beautifully describes and honours the life of a man who did so much to advance the cause of Canada's youth, fight racism, and advocate on behalf of seniors.

However, in what little time I have remaining in today's debate, I want to reflect on the Linc I knew personally. I first met him when I was an intern at Queen's Park from 1989 to 1990. Linc was the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario at the time, and always made time to meet with each year's new crop of interns. Our academic advisers and Linc's aide-de-camp primed us for the meeting. Our heads were spinning with protocol. From something as simple as knowing how to pronounce “lieutenant-governor” to being told when to rise and how to greet him, to what we could and should not ask, we were ready, and just a little bit nervous. This was the Queen's representative after all.

After we had all assembled in the foyer, we looked to the top of the grand staircase and down bounded this energetic giant of a man. We politely greeted him in the way that protocol demanded, and with a twinkle in his eye, he said to us what I have heard him say to hundreds of people since, “Just call me Linc”. With that, all of our shyness and awkwardness went out the window. We spent almost an hour with a man who seemed more interested in our education, dreams and goals than he was in talking about himself, yet he shared just enough of himself to leave us awed by his grace and dignity and inspired by this larger-than-life role model.

As *The Globe and Mail* so rightly pointed out on his passing, Linc loved being lieutenant-governor because he loved interacting with people, with royalty and commoners alike. There were no airs about Linc. He was everyone's friend. I remember him calling a heckler to order during a heritage awards ceremony at the Scottish Rite in Hamilton. In a packed hall, it could have been a moment of tension and strife, but instead Linc handled the situation in such a self-deprecating way that he left the audience laughing, the heckler silenced but smiling, and no one in doubt about who owned the stage. For me, I must confess it was the highlight of the event. His exact words still make me chuckle.

Of course, all of us in Hamilton chuckle at the fact that an expressway that bisects my riding of Hamilton Mountain is called the Lincoln Alexander Parkway. Linc never learned to drive and in truth he was afraid of traffic. However, that did not stop him from cruising up and down the main streets of Hamilton in his motorized red scooter after he retired. His body may have been starting to show its age, but there was no way it was going to keep him from getting out and about.

More often than not, it was now Linc who heckled dignitaries at public events. I remember speaking at the opening of Bay Gardens, and Linc heckled one of us there. I so desperately wanted to grab the mic and use the same line that Linc had used at the Scottish Rite. I think he would have laughed like hell if I had reminded him of the reference, but my sense of protocol did not let me do it and I still kind of regret that to this day.

Right to the end, Linc was a force larger than life. He taught us all to never give up and to always use our skills to improve the world. He was an inspiration and a role model. By proclaiming a day in his honour, future generations of Canadians will learn about him and from him. As a man who prized education above all else, that opportunity to learn is the most fitting tribute of all, so let us finally get this bill passed.

[Translation]

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will be making my comments in English, which is unusual for me, but I want my message to be properly understood and for people to see that what I am about to say comes from the heart.

[English]

I am sure many members in the House will actually wonder what a little guy from Rimouski can say about Lincoln Alexander.

They have to understand that after finishing graduate school in Montreal, I had a chance to work at the Canadian Race Relations

Private Members' Business

Foundation in Toronto in 2001. I was working as a media relations officer on the French side. At the time, the chair of the Canadian Race Relations Foundation was Lincoln Alexander, so I had the chance to actually work with him. I worked more closely with him in a couple of instances when we had annual general meetings, where I served as his personal press attaché. I had a chance to know him and meet with him, although not to the extent that some members of this House did. I had a chance to have personal contact with him.

Members will know that I was obviously coming from Quebec, and my first year in Toronto working for this organization was with him.

Given my height, I do not have to raise my eyes too often to look at people's eyes, but in this case I had to. Notwithstanding his personal and physical height, even if he had been 5'6" or 5'7", I would still have had to raise my eyes to meet his gaze. Such was his stature and such was his *gravitas*.

I was not intimidated: he was somebody who was able to put people at ease very easily. Even though he commanded respect, he was somebody who was able to make people feel that he was genuinely, truly interested in what they had to say.

I remember conversations I had with him in which he wondered about my experience as a Quebecker working in Ontario. We did not really talk about politics, but he was interested in knowing about my previous life in the student movement.

I remember working with him. I was his press attaché, so I was doing media relations with him, and I remember how demanding he was of me and of my colleague, who was also doing media relations on the English side. I did the work with pleasure, because I also had the pleasure of seeing, in those instances, how demanding he was of himself.

We have to remember that I spoke of 2001. I was hired to work at the Canadian Race Relations Foundation shortly after 9/11, and tensions were very high at the time. Race relations was an issue that was at the forefront. It was a very sensitive issue.

His past experience and his knowledge of communities made it so that even though those were very difficult times, very sensitive times, he was able to work toward bridging race relations at a time when such relations were in jeopardy. That speaks a lot to his ability to unite people, to create a consensus around him, to speak from a higher authority, his own authority as somebody who had to live through a time when race relations were really not what they are today.

We heard from many hon. members about the difficulties he had in his youth and the efforts he had to make to build his place in this world and make his mark, not only as a member of Parliament and the first black member of Parliament but as the first black member of cabinet as well.

He was able to bring a golden touch to everything he touched, everything he put his mind to, in the sense that he was very successful in bringing the attention of the people around him to those issues with the level of attention that those issues required.

Private Members' Business

• (1920)

I feel fortunate to have been able to stand side by side with this great human being, this great member of the Canadian community, even if for a short amount of time. In that sense, I want to bring this personal touch to the debate. I believe I might be the only speaker on this issue who is not from Ontario, so I am glad to have been able to bring that broader perspective to it. I have been personally touched by his humanity and his ability to create a consensus around him.

At the time I started working with him, I did not know much about Lincoln Alexander, because when I had been growing up in Quebec I had been too young when he was a member of Parliament, and even a member of cabinet, but I had a chance to learn about his past when I was working for him.

I am grateful and appreciate the opportunity to read about his life and his accomplishments. In that sense, I hope that the House will unanimously support this bill to make January 21 Lincoln Alexander day, which I believe will be the case. It is an homage we are paying to this great man, which is probably not sufficient when compared to his contributions to politics, to race relations, and to society as a whole, but it is the least we can do. Therefore, I appreciate the effort on all sides of the House, including the member for Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale and our member for Hamilton Mountain, to bring this forth and make it a reality.

• (1925)

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate. The hon. member for Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale will now have his five minutes of reply.

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a heartfelt thanks to all of the members who spoke so warmly about Linc from their memories of him, from working with him, and from his reputation.

It is an honour for me to close the second hour of debate at second reading of Bill S-213, an act respecting Lincoln Alexander day.

I was blessed to know Lincoln Alexander in his later years, in particular because the riding he represented when he was a member of Parliament back in the late 1960s and 1970s, the constituency of Hamilton West, included some of the same neighbourhoods that are in the constituency I currently represent. More than that, everyone in the Hamilton area has stories of their encounters with Lincoln Alexander. He was approachable. He was a man of the people and the people, loved him for it.

I will note that it is appropriate that we are having this discussion today, since we watched the swearing in of another Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario yesterday, when Elizabeth Dowdeswell became the 29th Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. It is the perfect context for our discussion today of Ontario's 24th Lieutenant-Governor, Lincoln MacCauley Alexander, and one of our most beloved.

Most people knew him better as “Linc”. It is a signature of his character that he preferred the familiar name rather than more formal names that someone of his accomplishment, credentials, and stature could rightly demand.

This legislation seeks to designate January 21 of each year as Lincoln M. Alexander day, and here is why. It is to honour the

memory of this great Canadian, great Ontarian, and great Hamiltonian; to recognize his commitment to building a better future through our young people and to use this day to further Linc's life-long passion of investing in our young people and building up tomorrow's leaders; and to also honour his many contributions, both personal and political, toward equality and fairness, more specifically, to ending racial discrimination. This was equally a lifelong passion of Linc's.

His very presence in public life opened doors and broke down barriers.

As is the hallmark of a great man, many people have many good things to say about him, so I apologize up front if I am repeating a few highlights of Linc's distinguished career that have already been mentioned by members opposite and members on this side of the House during the course of this discussion.

Long before Linc was Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, a post that allowed him to grow his mission exponentially to help youth in our society, he was a scrappy, outspoken member of Parliament from Hamilton. There are more than a few members who will agree that MPs from Hamilton can have that kind of reputation. Perhaps it is the grit of a hard-working city and region, but one thing is for sure: Linc exemplified that day-in and day-out.

I will never forget attending Linc's funeral service in October 2012 at the Hamilton Place auditorium in downtown Hamilton. It was a fitting final tribute to a great man who had laid in state at the Ontario legislature in the days leading up to his funeral.

For a man who came from humble beginnings, who worked hard to make a difference in law and politics despite all the barriers put in his way, how amazing it was that prime ministers, premiers, mayors, cabinet ministers, MPs, and MPPs dropped all their plans on that Friday in October to pay tribute to Linc, along with thousands of his fellow citizens, his fellow Hamiltonians. I dare say it was the latter group, his fellow citizens, who had a larger place in Linc's heart.

Lincoln M. Alexander distinguished himself in the Royal Canadian Air Force in World War II. He believed in our youth. He was a relentless champion for equality and fairness. He was a trailblazer in the fight to end racial discrimination. He was an eloquent ambassador for Ontario and Canada as Lieutenant-Governor. He was an inspiration to so many Canadians. The very least we can do is name January 21 in his honour. Let his birthday and the values he stood for live on forever in the hearts of Canadians.

I ask all members of the House for their support of the bill at second reading so that we may advance it to committee and eventually to the law of the land. I can think of no better tribute.

God bless the memory of Lincoln M. Alexander.

• (1930)

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

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.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in the House to pursue a question that I asked in the last session with respect to the Conservatives' studies on the effects of the oil sands on health and the environment.

In 2012, the Conservatives drafted questions and answers in response to a study on contaminants that accumulate in the snow near oil sands operations. With respect to this alarming fact, they claimed that the polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons that accumulate are no worse than what is found on a barbecued steak.

However, a new study has found that mercury levels in the water and ground are 13 times higher in those areas than elsewhere. Naturally, I asked them if they would stop ignoring the serious problem of the accumulation of mercury, whose levels are 13 times greater in areas where there are oil sands operations than elsewhere in Canada. The Conservatives said that there was no problem. That is just unbelievable.

It is important to rely on science. Recently, we discussed the situation concerning belugas in the St. Lawrence River. An injunction was issued because scientific advice was not disclosed, contrary to what was claimed. The same thing is happening with the accumulation of mercury, whose levels are 13 times higher in areas near oil sands operations.

There is so little science that the Council of Canadian Academies did not even appoint a scientific expert in environmental technologies to chair the oil sands review committee. Instead, it appointed a pioneer in the development of the oil sands who spent 14 years as the CEO of Syncrude, the world's largest producer of crude oil from oil sands. It cannot be said that someone is going to monitor the oil sands industry in Canada.

A recent poll commissioned by the Professional Institute of the Public Service indicates that the vast majority of the federal government's scientists believe that the cuts made to their research and monitoring activities will weaken the government's ability to serve the public interest and that, consequently, Canada has moved backwards with respect to environmental protection.

In addition, last September, hundreds of scientists protested here in Ottawa, calling on the Conservatives to stop muzzling them and cutting their funding. It is not every day that we see scientists protesting on Parliament Hill. It is rare. The situation is very serious.

Adjournment Proceedings

Mercury levels in the soil and water in areas near oil sands projects are 13 times higher. This is a serious problem and something has to be done to fix it.

What do the parliamentary secretary and the Conservative government intend to do about this huge concentration of mercury near oil sands development sites?

● (1935)

[*English*]

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is committed to responsible oil sands resource development and is working with the Government of Alberta to implement a scientifically rigorous, comprehensive, integrated, and transparent environmental monitoring plan. Having a clear understanding of the environmental impacts of developing this valuable resource helps ensure its responsible development.

Since the launch of the joint Canada-Alberta implementation plan for oil sands monitoring in 2012, environmental monitoring of the effects of oil sands resource development has been enhanced. We are now monitoring more areas with more monitoring sites. We are doing so more frequently and for more substances.

All environmental components—air, water, habitat, and wildlife—are being monitored. We have significantly improved our ability to detect environmental change and any cumulative environmental effects.

[*Translation*]

We are able to trace polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and the accumulation of mercury in snow in the oil sands as a result of our efforts to continuously improve monitoring.

As expected, the results so far of the environmental monitoring of oil sands development show low levels of substances associated with the oil sands in the air, snow, water and wildlife. With a few exceptions, these substances are below the established environmental standards, and the levels get lower as you get away from the oil sands development.

Mercury and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons are comparatively low in the entire oil sands area. We know that the impact is highest close to the oil sands development and that it declines rapidly the further away you go.

The concentrations in water and sediment are below the established standards, with the exception of the levels of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in a lake near a site under development.

Adjournment Proceedings

[English]

Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, PAHs, arise from a variety of sources and can be formed by high temperature and incomplete burning of organic materials. Examples include forest fires, burning of waste and fossil fuels, coal, crude oil, combustion.

The exact PAH formed depends on the organic material being burned, thus it is not appropriate to compare PAHs produced from different sources.

With this monitoring plan, we are committed to scientifically rigorous, comprehensive, integrated and transparent environmental monitoring to deliver the most scientifically credible picture of the water, land, air and biodiversity issues in the region.

We see this as a long-term monitoring commitment, so that this work will continue.

• (1940)

[Translation]

Mr. François Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment for his answer. I particularly appreciate the part of the answer that he delivered in French. Also, for once, it was a clear answer. I would like to congratulate him on a very complete answer.

Yes, there is monitoring. The parliamentary secretary himself acknowledged that there are high concentrations of mercury around the oil sands and that the concentrations in some places are so high that they exceed the standards.

I asked what the Conservatives would do to address the situation. Unfortunately, for the time being, all they are doing is monitoring the

situation, not fixing it. They must take action to protect Canadians' health and their environment.

Back in 2011, then-environment commissioner Scott Vaughan criticized the incomplete data. He even said that data on the impact of oil sands development on the environment and health were poor or non-existent.

Now that we have a little information thanks to monitoring, what will the government do to protect Canadians' health and their environment?

[English]

Mr. Colin Carrie: Mr. Speaker, we are implementing a comprehensive approach to monitoring ambient environmental effects from the oil sands development, and we are working with the Government of Alberta to ensure this is complementary to monitoring for regulatory purposes.

For example, regulation requires the industry to monitor and report emissions for individual facilities. Our joint oil sands monitoring effort complements this monitoring of oil sands industrial emission sources by monitoring air, water, wildlife and habitat disturbance in the surrounding region.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:41 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, September 24, 2014

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Health and Fitness Advocate

Mr. Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country) 7767

Veterans Advocate

Mr. Stoffer 7767

Fall Fairs

Mr. Shipley 7767

Creole Month

Mr. Dubourg 7768

Riding of Calgary Northeast

Mr. Shory 7768

Jeannot Caron

Ms. Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot) 7768

Vasu Chanchlani

Mr. Brown (Barrie) 7768

Teaching Excellence Award

Mr. Sopuck 7769

Urban Forests

Ms. Mathysen 7769

Islamic State

Mrs. Ablonczy 7769

Women in Politics

Ms. Doré Lefebvre 7769

Islamic State

Mr. Sweet 7769

New Brunswick Election

Mr. LeBlanc (Beauséjour) 7770

Islamic State

Mr. Bezan 7770

National Defence

Mr. Dubé 7770

Vasu Chanchlani

Mr. Calandra 7770

Statement by the Speaker

The Speaker 7771

ORAL QUESTIONS

National Defence

Mr. Mulcair 7771

Mr. Bezan 7771

Mr. Mulcair 7772

Mr. Bezan 7772

Mr. Mulcair 7772

Mr. Bezan 7772

Mr. Mulcair 7772

Mr. Bezan 7772

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Mulcair 7772

Ms. Leitch 7772

The Economy

Mr. Trudeau 7773

Mr. Oliver 7773

Mr. Trudeau 7773

Mr. Oliver 7773

Employment Insurance

Mr. Trudeau 7773

Mr. Oliver 7773

The Environment

Ms. Leslie 7773

Mrs. Aglukkaq 7773

Ms. Leslie 7773

Mrs. Aglukkaq 7773

Ms. Leslie 7774

Mrs. Aglukkaq 7774

Ms. Leslie 7774

Mrs. Aglukkaq 7774

Employment

Mrs. Groguhé 7774

Mr. Kenney 7774

Ms. Sims 7774

Mr. Kenney 7774

Ms. Sims 7775

Mr. Kenney 7775

Aboriginal Affairs

Mrs. Hughes 7775

Ms. Leitch 7775

Mr. Saganash 7775

Ms. Leitch 7775

The Environment

Mr. Dion 7775

Mrs. Shea 7775

Employment Insurance

Ms. Sgro 7775

Mr. Oliver 7776

Mr. Brison 7776

Mr. Oliver 7776

National Defence

Ms. Michaud 7776

Mr. Bezan 7776

Mr. Harris (St. John's East) 7776

Mr. Bezan 7776

Foreign Affairs

Ms. Nash 7776

Mr. Obhrai 7776

Ms. Laverdière	7776
Mr. Obhrai	7777
Public Safety	
Mr. Carmichael	7777
Mr. Blaney	7777
Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. Allen (Welland)	7777
Ms. Raitt	7777
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	7777
Ms. Raitt	7777
The Environment	
Mr. Lapointe	7777
Mrs. Shea	7778
Mr. Caron	7778
Mrs. Shea	7778
National Defence	
Ms. Murray	7778
Mr. Bezan	7778
Public Safety	
Mr. Vaughan	7778
Mr. Blaney	7778
National Defence	
Mr. Mulcair	7778
Mr. Bezan	7779
Canada Post	
Mr. Boulerice	7779
Ms. Raitt	7779
Public Safety	
Mrs. Grewal	7779
Mr. MacKay	7779
International Trade	
Mr. Easter	7779
Mr. Fast	7779
Mining Industry	
Mr. Dewar	7779
Mr. Obhrai	7780
Health	
Mr. Lizon	7780
Ms. Ambrose	7780
Canada Post	
Mrs. Sellah	7780
Ms. Raitt	7780
The Environment	
Mr. Patry	7780
Mrs. Shea	7780
Points of Order	
Oral Questions	
Mr. Cullen	7780
Mr. Goodale	7781

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

State of Canada's Forests	
Mr. Rickford	7781
National Fiddling Day Act	
Mrs. O'Neill Gordon	7781
Bill S-218. Introduction and first reading	7781
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	7781
Petitions	
Pensions	
Mr. Godin	7781
Canada Post	
Mr. Godin	7781
Ms. Sgro	7781
Prostitution	
Mr. Benoit	7781
Sex Selection	
Mr. Benoit	7782
Canada Post	
Mr. Angus	7782
Mr. Sullivan	7782
Ms. Foote	7782
Firearms Reclassification	
Mr. Miller	7782
Rail Transportation	
Ms. Nash	7782
Health	
Mr. Valeriote	7782
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Chong	7782
Anaphylaxis	
Mr. Chong	7782
Conflict Minerals	
Mr. Dewar	7783
DNA Databases	
Ms. May	7783
The Environment	
Ms. May	7783
Prostitution	
Mr. Lemieux	7783
VIA Rail	
Mr. Toone	7783
Impaired Driving	
Mr. Warawa	7783
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lukiwski	7783
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Lukiwski	7783
Message from the Senate	
The Acting Speaker (Mr. Stanton)	7783

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada-Korea Economic Growth and Prosperity Act	
Mr. Fast	7783
Bill C-41. Second reading	7783

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>