



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 147 • NUMBER 134 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, October 29, 2014

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 29, 2014

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

• (1405)

[English]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem, led by the hon. member for Lambton—Kent—Middlesex.

[Members sang the national anthem]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our Conservative government is continuing to deliver on jobs and opportunities, just as we promised. We are on track to balance the budget, and we are upholding and defending Canadian values on the world stage. We will keep our taxes low, stay on track with a balanced budget, and continue our efforts to make our country and communities safe.

In the shadow of this tragic week, we are reminded of the new challenges that lie ahead of us. In the past, we have brought in legislation aimed at combatting terrorism and strengthening our Citizenship Act to guard against the activities of terror groups. We will continue now to strengthen our security institutions so that they have the necessary tools at their disposal to better protect Canadians.

Canadians can count on their government to stand up for them. I wish all Canadians the very best.

* * *

[Translation]

BERNADETTE LAFLAMME

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Chambly—Borduas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this summer our community lost a great woman, Bernadette Laflamme, the founder and first president of the historical society of the seigneurie of Chambly.

Today I would like to tell the House about her important contribution. After a wonderful teaching career, she founded the

Société d'histoire de la seigneurie de Chambly in 1979 and served as its president for the next 18 years.

Her great devotion to promoting our region's history led to the publication of important works such as the *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la seigneurie de Chambly, 1609-1950* and helped people learn more about Fort Chambly and its historical significance to Quebec and Canada. Ms. Laflamme was honoured by the federal government in 2002 for her volunteer work and by the Quebec federation of historical societies for her commitment to promoting our region's history.

I was sad to learn of the passing of this great woman who did so much for our community. As a history lover myself, I certainly recognize her important contribution. I would like to offer my sincerest condolences to her family members and loved ones and to our beloved historical society.

* * *

[English]

ROD LOVE

Ms. Joan Crockatt (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour a remarkable Albertan. Rod Love, chief of staff to former Premier Ralph Klein, who died on Sunday, far too soon.

We are all heartbroken, especially for his lifelong love, Charlene, and their three children, James, Katie, and Haley.

More than an icon in Alberta politics, Rod was respected from coast to coast as one of Canada's very best. He had a remarkable, uncanny ability to communicate what Martha and Henry were thinking.

One of his proudest moments was when he was able to stand beside Ralph Klein and hold up the big sign on Alberta's debt that said "Paid in Full".

Rod was acting on my local board. Just a month ago, I rode in his beloved red convertible in a parade.

I want to leave members with three Rod-isms:

Kids are proof that life is funny, but no joke.

If it is in the yellow pages, governments should not try to do it.

If it is stupid, but it works, it is not stupid.

Thanks, Rod.

*Statements by Members***BRAIN TUMOUR AWARENESS MONTH**

Ms. Chrystia Freeland (Toronto Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, October is Brain Tumour Awareness Month in Canada.

Brain tumours are an indiscriminate form of cancer, and increasingly one of the most deadly. In the last decade, the mortality rate for a child diagnosed with a brain tumour has surpassed all other forms of childhood cancer. There is no clear explanation why.

One reason we cannot answer this question is that there is no central system in Canada that tracks brain tumour statistics.

Seven years ago, in this House, a motion was passed that called for the creation of a national registry to count and classify every brain tumour in the country, but a registry has not been created. Shockingly, Canadian doctors and researchers must rely on statistics from the United States to estimate incidence rates in Canada. Without this data, provinces and territories are unable to properly judge who needs care, resulting in unequal access to drugs and treatment for patients. We can and must do better.

* * *

POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER

Mr. Rob Clarke (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with the shocking events of last week, the safety of security staff, MPs, senators, and visitors to Parliament Hill has become a real concern. It is apparent to all that there must be some changes in the way we do business on the Hill. Most importantly, it is crucial that our first responders have the resources they need to be safe in order to do their jobs.

It is also important, in the aftermath of these incidents that brought terror into the lives of so many of my colleagues and friends, that the signs and symptoms of PTSD be recognized and treated. As a former RCMP member who deals with PTSD every day, I can say that it is manageable when one understands that it exists, and there is no shame in seeking help to deal with it.

I encourage anyone who is suffering from the after-effects of these events to get help. I am always available to talk to people and help them find the assistance they need.

I urge hon. members to learn the signs and make sure that they do whatever is necessary to relieve the anxiety and emotional pain of PTSD.

* * *

• (1410)

LITTERLESS LUNCH CHALLENGE

Mr. Fin Donnelly (New Westminster—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the winner of my fifth annual Litterless Lunch Challenge. The challenge, which I hold every year during Waste Reduction Week, encourages students to pack litter-free lunches.

With an average elementary school producing over 20,000 pounds of lunch waste annually, it is critical that waste reduction become part of our daily routine.

This year over 500 students in my riding participated. This year's winning class, which went an amazing 93% litter-free, is Mrs. Sandy Bellet's kindergarten class at Riverview Park Elementary School.

Congratulations to all the students, teachers, and parents who made this year's challenge another success. They all did a great job, and I hope that the spirit of Waste Reduction Week will continue throughout the year.

* * *

CANADIAN HEAVYWEIGHT BOXING TITLE

Mr. Daryl Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings, CPC): Mr. Speaker, born in Madoc, my hometown, Dillon Carman participated in high school boxing, where he grew to love the sport.

Today I rise to congratulate Dillon Carman on winning the Canadian heavyweight boxing title. Dillon, who is known as "Big Country", was crowned on Saturday, October 25, in Toronto, at the Mattamy Athletic Centre, formerly known as Maple Leaf Gardens. Going seven rounds, Dillon ended the proceedings with a wicked left-right combo to rugged Eric Martel Bahoeli.

Dillon's heart is as big as his powerful punch. He is proud to be a Canadian and encourages building the sport of boxing.

Congratulations to Big Country. He is an inspiration to our youth for demonstrating the confidence and determination necessary to achieve one's goals. The next time folks hear, "Let's get ready to rumble", think of Big Country Carman.

* * *

BILL DIACHUK

Mr. Peter Goldring (Edmonton East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Bill Diachuk, an alumnus of the Cheremosh Ukrainian Dance Company and a former member of the Alberta legislature who represented Edmonton-Beverly for 16 years, until 1986.

Born in 1929, Bill attended the University of Alberta and was very active in community affairs, which led him to serve as an Edmonton Catholic School District trustee for years. For 25 years, Bill volunteered full time with the Ukrainian Canadian Social Services, tirelessly advocating for others in Canada and contributing to community development in foreign countries.

I met with Bill many times in my office, where he was a consummate humanitarian, advocating for others' well-being. I recall his attendance in full Knights of Columbus regalia at every Remembrance Day ceremony at Alberta's oldest cenotaph in Beverly.

Statements by Members

My sincere condolences to Ollie, Bill's wife of 62 years, and their children and grandchildren. Bill set a standard of excellence and service toward his fellow man. Bill will be dearly missed by all.

Memories eternal.

* * *

CEREMONIAL GUARD

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the man standing next to Corporal Nathan Cirillo at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier was his best and closest friend, fellow reservist Corporal Branden Stevenson, son of my constituents Jim Stevenson and his wife Kelly-Ann.

Nathan and Branden attended school together. They joined the reserves together, and together they volunteered to perform the tremendous ceremonial honour of standing guard at our cenotaph.

The shooter fired at Branden and missed. He then fired two shots at Nathan and shot him in the back. Branden chased the coward briefly before returning to his friend, where he tried, along with several bystanders, to revive the wounded reservist. Witnesses say he never wavered when it came to giving help. "Put pressure here. He's been shot twice", he said, as he instructed those helping Nathan, showing both courage and professionalism in the face of crisis and emergency.

Branden Stevenson returned to his post standing guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier today. I ask my colleagues in the House to recognize and pay tribute to a brave young man who has suffered a terrible emotional trauma and a great loss in seeing his best friend murdered at his side.

* * *

NATHAN CIRILLO AND PATRICE VINCENT

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our Prime Minister said it best. We can only hope that Corporal Nathan Cirillo's son grows up knowing how much Canadians admire and look up to his dad. No truer words have been spoken this week.

As we stand now, one week since the tragic events that occurred here in Ottawa and Quebec, Warrant Officer Patrice Vincent and Corporal Nathan Cirillo have been forever etched into the Canadian social fabric. Their tragic stories will live on in our minds, while their sacrifice will live on in our hearts.

We stand one week later a stronger, prouder, more resilient nation, all thanks to two soldiers who made the ultimate sacrifice.

* * *

•(1415)

PERSONS CASE

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, I will celebrate the 85th anniversary of the Persons Case with fellow feminists at a breakfast in Halifax for LEAF, the Women's Legal Education and Action Fund.

Professor Julia Hughes will speak on the history of legal disputes for abortion access in New Brunswick, which is timely, as its

Morgentaler clinic closed this summer. This was the only facility in the province where women could get an abortion free of restrictions, and it served women in New Brunswick and P.E.I.

Why do women in the Maritimes still have to fight for a right that was granted 26 years ago to all Canadian women?

It was 85 years ago that we became persons in the eyes of the law in our country, and 85 years later, women in the Maritimes still face inequalities regarding access to abortion facilities.

Today, I stand in solidarity with women in New Brunswick and P.E.I. who say, "my body, my choice".

Happy Persons Day, Mr Speaker, the day in 1929 when women were declared persons under the law. It is now 85 years later and we still stand committed to confronting all forms of discrimination to achieve equality for women and girls.

* * *

AFGHANISTAN MEMORIAL VIGIL

Mr. Corneliu Chisu (Pickering—Scarborough East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada's mission in Afghanistan is an important part of our military heritage. More than 40,000 members of the Canadian Armed Forces deployed to Afghanistan, making it Canada's largest military deployment since the Second World War.

The Afghanistan Memorial Vigil remembers and honours those who have fallen in Afghanistan. It also acknowledges the bravery and dedication of all members of our armed forces.

The Vigil displays 192 plaques that were formerly part of the Kandahar Air Field cenotaph. This cenotaph was a memorial structure for Canadian soldiers to commemorate their fallen comrades.

The plaques represent 158 Canadian Armed Forces personnel, a Canadian diplomat, a DND contractor, a Canadian journalist and more than 40 U.S. armed forces members who were under Canadian command during operations in Afghanistan.

Since the National Day of Honour, the Afghanistan Memorial Vigil has travelled across Canada and to our embassy in the United States. It will soon arrive in Ottawa during Remembrance Week and will be open to the public in the Hall of Honour.

I encourage Canadians to come and pay their respects to our nation's fallen heroes.

* * *

MARK DUNN

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Mark Dunn, a distinguished member of the Press Gallery, who we lost far too soon.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Mark loved and served Canada with all his heart and soul. He served his country throughout his remarkable career in journalism and as senior adviser to the Hon. Denis Coderre and to yours truly, when I was leader of the opposition.

Mark was a consummate professional whose rigour and discretion were matched only by his sharp wit.

[English]

Mark Dunn's politics were grounded in the relentless pursuit of truth and authenticity. He was a teacher to countless young staff and parliamentarians, who enjoyed both his tough advice and the bonhomie that followed.

I wish I could share stories from some of his more colourful briefings, but Mark's vocabulary was as unparliamentary as it gets.

To all those who loved him, and especially Gloria, we in Canada's House of Commons grieve with them. We are also thankful for the times we had with Mark and what he gave our country, which he knew so well and loved so much.

Rest in peace, Mark.

* * *

ISLAMIC STATE

Mr. Ryan Leef (Yukon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Yukon Party government expressed its support for Canada's commitment to the fight against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

In passing a motion of support, Premier Darrell Pasloski said,

The Yukon Party brought forward this motion to publicly state our support for our nation and our troops and to stand with Canada's friends and allies in combating the terrorist group ISIL. This is a priority for all Canadians. We have made our position clear—oppression needs to be confronted.

I want to thank Premier Pasloski for his government's support for Operation Impact.

ISIL is a terrorist caliphate that poses a major threat not only to the region but also to Canada and Canadians.

As the Prime Minister said, it has never been the Canadian way to only do what is easy or to do what is safe—being a free rider means not being taken seriously. We will not abandon our international commitments.

Once again, we would like to thank the brave men and women in the Canadian uniform who protect us each and every day.

* * *

● (1420)

NATHAN CIRILLO

Mr. Wayne Marston (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday our nation came together, standing to honour Corporal Nathan Cirillo.

As the member of Parliament for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, I was the corporal's MP. Yesterday, above all else, I was honoured to have been part of a contingent of Canadian government officials there to express our deepest condolences to Corporal Cirillo's family.

During such times of tremendous loss, words often fail us.

Together in Hamilton, along with Canadians from coast to coast to coast, we expressed our collective and profound appreciation for the sacrifice made by this young man.

Our grief as a nation is nothing compared to that of Corporal Cirillo's loved ones—his parents, siblings, and most important, his five-year old son. It is our hope that they understand how closely Canadians continue to hold them in our thoughts, that they know that we as a country pray they somehow find the strength and courage to face the difficult days ahead.

* * *

NATHAN CIRILLO AND PATRICE VINCENT

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the honour to represent my home community at Corporal Nathan Cirillo's funeral. What a sight to see thousands of neighbours and fellow Canadians winding through every road and street in Hamilton, some cheering, some visibly moved, others singing O'Canada, but all standing in solidarity with Corporal Nathan Cirillo and his family, and his home regiment the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders.

In times of national tragedy, a country has the choice to shutter its windows and close itself off from the world, but after yesterday, I can say with absolute confidence that my home town of Hamilton and our great country of Canada have chosen another path.

Canada has come together stronger than ever to stand behind Corporal Nathan Cirillo and Warrant Officer Patrice Vincent. Our society, our democracy, mourns their loss, and we are stronger and all the more confident because of their sacrifice.

God bless the families of Nathan Cirillo and Patrice Vincent, and God bless Canada.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as we just heard, yesterday many of us were able to attend the regimental funeral of Corporal Nathan Cirillo. His family, friends, colleagues and thousands of others were there in Hamilton, Ontario.

This week millions of Canadians from coast to coast to coast are remembering Corporal Cirillo and Warrant Officer Patrice Vincent.

Would the Prime Minister update Canadians on any new developments regarding last week's tragic events and tell us if any new measures are being taken to protect Canadian Forces members on duty here at home?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition and the House as a whole will be aware, there are ongoing investigations into this matter. We know full well that the RCMP has been regularly updating Canadians on this. I have nothing to add to its public statements.

Oral Questions

I will note that the Chief of the Defence Staff has taken some measures with regard to the security of armed forces personnel. That is within his purview and we respect his decisions in that matter.

I am also delighted to see, as I mentioned yesterday, that the honour guard has resumed its duties at the national war memorial.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in the wake of last week's events, the federal, provincial, and territorial privacy commissioners met to discuss Canada's security legislation.

They agreed that the first step should be to consult with Canadians to discuss potential new measures as well as the impact those measures will have on their personal freedoms.

How does the Prime Minister plan to consult with Canadians on the issue of new security legislation?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, of course we are very interested in hearing the views of the various stakeholders on this matter.

On this side of the House, we do not presume that protecting people's rights and ensuring their safety are mutually exclusive. I think Canadians expect us to do both.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have known for some time now that our homes as well as our rights must be protected.

The privacy commissioners also said it is crucial that any new legislation include some sort of civilian oversight mechanism. In 2012, the Conservatives eliminated the CSIS inspector general position. At this time, two of the five seats on the Security Intelligence Review Committee are vacant.

When will those seats be filled, and will the Prime Minister hold a real consultation this time?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government will fill those seats in the near future.

I must point out that CSIS has an excellent record on protecting rights and complying with the law. Those have been the findings of the oversight agencies for a long time now.

After the events of last week, it is time to recognize the important work that this organization does to protect Canadians.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have not just reduced oversight mechanisms in the area of security. In 2012, they cut funding for public safety by \$688 million.

Before introducing new legislation that could restrict Canadians' freedoms, will the Prime Minister restore funding to Canadian security agencies?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government always ensures that these agencies have the necessary resources to do their jobs.

[*English*]

Let me repeat my previous answer. Since we are talking about this in the shadow of two terrorist attacks last week, it is important to say that CSIS does important work to protect Canadians. Not only does it do important work, but repeatedly, over a long period of time, the agencies that are in place to provide oversight for that work have reported the agency's unfailing dedication to the law and to the respect and protection of Canadians. That is something, at this point in time, we should be recognizing.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister understands, as do Canadians, the fundamental difference between the horrific acts of a profoundly disturbed individual and organized terror.

That being said, if there is one thing that we will agree on, it is the importance of keeping Canadians safe. I would like to know if the Prime Minister would accept sitting down with all parties and analyzing the situation in order to decide together the best legislative reaction to these horrific events.

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): There is, of course, Mr. Speaker, no contradiction to individuals who may have a series of personal financial and mental difficulties and also be engaged in terrorist Jihadist activities as, indeed, the police have already said.

We do not think it helps Canadians to do anything but address these matters head on and face them for what they are, and this government will take its responsibilities seriously and bring forward measures to protect the country.

• (1430)

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, keeping Canadians safe in a way consistent with Canadian values is one of our highest responsibilities. In order to do that, we must ensure both the security of Canadians and the protection of their rights.

We are the only one of the Five Eyes allies without one, so will the government create an all-party national security oversight committee?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in fact, under successive governments of different political stripes, the government has long had a system of effective oversight of CSIS and our security agencies. Those oversight bodies have long concluded that these organizations respect their mandates within the law and do a good job of protecting Canadians. It is a system that works, and we will continue moving forward.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, keeping Canadians safe while respecting their rights is one of our greatest responsibilities as parliamentarians.

Will the government follow the lead of our closest allies and create an all-party democratic oversight committee?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I just answered that question.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

I must say once again that while, obviously, we always recognize that certain risks exist, I do not think we should start from the assumption that everything our police and security agencies do is somehow a threat to the rights of Canadians.

On the contrary, more often than not, security and rights find themselves on the same side of the ledger. Canadians do not have effective rights unless we can ensure their security, and that is what we intend to do.

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister needs to know that oversight is as much about ensuring that everything is done to protect Canadians as it is to protecting their rights.

In 2006 Justice O'Connor's inquiry into the Arar case made clear recommendations for improving national security training, coordination, and oversight. Will the government's upcoming legislation finally act on those recommendations?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Once again, Mr. Speaker, we have acted. The truth of the matter is that we have the Canadian Security Intelligence Agency, an organization that we believe works hard, that is dedicated to protecting Canadians.

Oversight of that body, effective oversight over a long period of time, has determined that this organization is not only effective at protecting Canadians but works within the scope of the law. We will continue to enforce that oversight and we thank those people for the hard work that they do on our behalf.

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as we consider how to respond to last week's terrible events, one thing is clear. We need an approach that protects both public safety and our civil liberties. Today, the Information and Privacy Commissioners issued a joint statement underlining this fact.

Will the government listen to their recommendations and ensure that any new legislation contains new and effective oversight for our intelligence agencies?

[Translation]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are already listening to those recommendations. That is exactly the balance that this bill strikes. We have a balanced bill that clarifies the mandate, role, and responsibilities of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service with respect to the protection of Canadians. I invite the opposition to support this bill and the measures that we will introduce to protect Canadians. That is the main role of a state and the government.

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the CSIS civilian oversight system is not working.

We are still waiting for the government to act on the recommendations made by the 2006 commission of inquiry on the Maher Arar case. Eight years have gone by.

We recently learned that CSIS is refusing to answer to its civilian oversight committee, which is quite simply unacceptable.

If the minister is proposing to give additional powers to CSIS, why is he not giving more powers to its civilian oversight committee?

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, by clarifying the role of CSIS, Bill C-44 will facilitate oversight activities.

That is why I invite the opposition to support a balanced bill that will strengthen the security of Canadians while keeping a balance between civil rights and the protection of Canadians, which is the primary responsibility of a state.

* * *

● (1435)

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Hoang Mai (Brossard—La Prairie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government continues to allow the rail industry to regulate itself.

How can we trust this government when the Transportation Safety Board believes that it has proven incapable of monitoring the industry?

Recently, we learned that 254 accidents were not reported, and all the minister is doing is saying that she is not happy.

Will the minister finally increase the number of inspectors and impose heavy fines on the offending companies?

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, indeed, we have already increased the number of inspectors in this country. We put \$100 million into this file.

More importantly, we continue to work on the rail safety measures because we want to ensure that we have a transportation system that works.

The unfortunate incident in Lac-Mégantic was due to the fact that somebody did not follow the rules. We have rules in place for a reason. They are being prosecuted under the fullest extent of the law, and that is the appropriate way to deal with it.

[Translation]

Mr. Hoang Mai (Brossard—La Prairie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is how it is. The minister continues to make promises, but nothing concrete has been done since the Lac-Mégantic disaster that would instill confidence in Canadians.

Hundreds of accidents are not being reported and safety plans are not carefully followed. Despite all this, the minister refuses to take action.

Why does the minister not immediately start imposing heavy fines on the offending companies?

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have issued numerous emergency directives. We have also included ministerial orders to ensure that we have the safest system that we can in Canada.

Oral Questions

We have also invested in rail safety, increasing the budgets for rail safety year after year to ensure that they have the resources they need at Transport Canada to do the work that we expect them to do, and they will continue to do that work.

Mr. Matthew Kellway (Beaches—East York, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister is missing the point and failing to address the heart of the matter.

In 2009 there was one inspector for every 14 tank cars of oil. Only five years later, there is one inspector for every 4,000. The situation, we know, is getting increasingly dangerous.

Here we have the minister standing in front of Canadians today, telling them she plans to audit the problem away.

Can the minister see why Canadians will not rest easy with that response?

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the reality in this country is that there are 46,000 kilometres of track.

Over 20 years ago it was recognized that in order to properly deal with the risks and inspections, we would create something called the safety management system. It is world renowned. It is state of the art. That is what we utilize here in Canada.

The Transportation Safety Board has clearly said that it is the way to go. That is what countries do around the world when they are dealing effectively both with inspections and with audit of safety culture in railways.

* * *

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, deregulating safety is working so well.

While the Conservatives allowed employers to bring in cheap labour to replace Canadian workers, they were also allowing good, high-paying Canadian jobs to disappear at an astonishing rate.

Over the last decade of Liberal and Conservative governments, under their watch, 600,000 manufacturing jobs have vanished. Far too many communities have been devastated by the government's unwillingness to act.

Where is the government strategy to create good manufacturing jobs here in Canada?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2013 Canada went from sixth to second in Bloomberg's ranking of the best places in the world to create jobs based on the growth that we have seen in manufacturing which, this year, is up 25% since the depth of the recession.

Further to that, the Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters Association, if she is looking for action, pointed to this year's budget that is before the Parliament of Canada, that the NDP is free to vote for, and noted that budget 2014 will assist manufacturers and exporters in finding and training skilled workers, lowering regulatory costs and helping win major new investments in Canada to create jobs.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Beauharnois—Salaberry, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives do not have a job creation plan. In fact, they have put all their eggs in one basket. Now that the oil industry is slowing down, they are caught unprepared, without a strategy to revitalize the manufacturing industry. How many layoffs will it take—like the ones at Electrolux in L'Assomption, at Masonite in Berthierville, at Fortress in Thurso, at Société Laurentide in Shawinigan and at Cascades in East Angus—for the Conservatives to understand that they need to provide better support for jobs in the manufacturing industry?

● (1440)

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are taking action and we have taken action in the past. We announced new measures in budget 2014 to ensure that our system and our economy, which both rely on manufacturers, are in good shape for the future.

[*English*]

We have a number of measures in budget 2014 that speak directly to the item that the NDP is raising in the Parliament of Canada. Unfortunately, NDP members have said they will vote against the budget, before they read it; they will ignore the advice from the experts; and they will ignore the advice from the Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters Association who, on the very front lines of Canada's manufacturing community, has said these measures in the budget that we have before the Parliament of Canada are in the best interests of Canadian manufacturing.

It is time that the NDP stands with us and stands with them.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE BUDGET

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since growth in the oil industry is slowing and the manufacturing sector has stalled, we would have expected the Conservatives to use the budget implementation bill to breathe some life into the job market. However, all that they decided to do was to dip into the EI fund to finance a bad plan that has already been lambasted by the Parliamentary Budget Officer. Allocating \$550 million to create 800 jobs is ridiculous.

How does the minister explain his inability to create jobs, especially in the manufacturing sector, when we have given him all kinds of suggestions?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our hiring credit for small business will cut employment insurance payroll costs by 15% and will help businesses save more than \$550 million.

The CFIB says that the credit will create 25,000 person-years of employment. We are reducing payroll costs for 90% of businesses.

The Liberals and the NDP support a 40- to 45-day work year.

Oral Questions

[English]

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I bet that plan looked great when the minister sketched it out on the back of a napkin.

There are 600,000 lost manufacturing jobs and Conservatives refuse to even acknowledge that there is a problem. There is a dramatic drop in oil prices. With youth unemployment still at twice the national average and virtually no growth in private-sector jobs for more than a year, Canadians expect their government to bring forward ideas.

Instead, we have a 460-page omnibus bill that does nothing to help get youth back to work, does nothing to help bring those manufacturing jobs back and does nothing to help stimulate growth in the private sector.

When is the minister going to drop his failed attempt and EI plan, spending half a billion dollars for 800 jobs, and give Canadians a job plan that they can actually believe in?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is focused on what matters most to Canadians: jobs and economic growth. More than 1.1 million net new jobs have been created since the depths of the recession, over 80% full-time, nearly 80% in the private sector.

We are taking action in our budget implementation plan to create opportunities right across the country for small businesses, large businesses, and employees. We are making life more affordable for Canadian families by doubling the children's tax credit to \$1,000. We are ending pay-to-pay billing practices and we are doing a great deal more.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Ms. Chrystia Freeland (Toronto Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the minister's talking points, the Parliamentary Budget Officer's numbers do not lie. The story they tell is that the government's EI tax credit will cost taxpayers \$550 million to create a paltry 800 jobs, at a ridiculous cost of \$700,000 per position.

Economists warn that this flawed measure also creates a perverse incentive to reduce employment. Why will the government not scrap this wasteful plan and instead adopt the Liberal policy, which would create a substantial number of jobs for Canadians?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is the Liberals' back-of-the-envelope plan that would actually reduce jobs by encouraging companies to fire people.

Let me quote from the CFIB about our plan. It said, "It's a big, big deal for small businesses. It's good news for people looking for jobs."

It will lower payroll taxes by 15%. It will create 25,000 person-years of jobs. It will impact 90% of businesses. Some 780,000 businesses will benefit from this plan. That is in contrast to the 45-day work year, which will cost—

• (1445)

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Markham—Unionville.

[Translation]

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. John McCallum (Markham—Unionville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government's continued attacks on asylum seekers are disturbing.

Yesterday we learned that the government consulted only one province, Ontario, and Ontario does not even want that power. In fact, not one province has asked the government to make these changes.

Will the government stop inventing solutions to problems that do not exist, and will it eliminate this unfair provision?

Hon. Chris Alexander (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the rules that apply to refugees and asylum seekers are not going to change because of any measures in this bill.

Why do the Liberals insist on talking about this measure and not all the other budget measures we have taken to make Canada's middle class the strongest in the world, as indicated in *The New York Times* study? This is thanks to successive Conservative budgets and our economic policy, which is why we are so proud of this budget and the measures in this bill.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

[English]

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the omnibus budget bill corrects 10 mistakes from earlier bills. Haste makes waste, and Conservatives make mistakes. Finance officials admit little internal analysis was done on the small business job credit, which has been panned by Jack Mintz as a disincentive to growth. Instead of correcting this mistake in a future bill, will the Conservatives accept the Liberal proposal for a two-year tax holiday for new hires, a plan endorsed by Restaurants Canada, the Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters, and the CFIB?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, by now everyone understands that the Liberal plan is an incentive for companies to fire employees. Let me talk a little more about our budget plan. The budget bill supports amateur athletes. It makes the tax system simpler and fairer for farming and fishing businesses. It makes it easier for charities to raise funds by easing tax rules. It improves competition in telecommunications markets by allowing regulators to impose monetary penalties on companies that violate rules such as the Wireless Code. It has a great deal to—

Oral Questions

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

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé (Saint-Lambert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, nobody believes the minister any more. He cannot even count, and nobody can count on him.

The temporary foreign worker program is a real mess. More unskilled foreign workers are coming to Canada. Unemployment is still high, and the minister's job market numbers do not reflect the reality that businesses are experiencing.

When will the minister admit that he messed up?

Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, the government's reforms are a success. We know this because the number of employer requests for temporary foreign workers has dropped by 75%.

Just yesterday, I heard about a major employer in Alberta that launched a program to recruit unemployed aboriginal people in its region. That is because of our changes to the temporary foreign worker program, which are putting Canadians first in the job market.

[English]

Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is a clear pattern with Conservatives on the temporary foreign worker program. They made promises when the issue was in the news and then did not do anything about them later. In 2013, they gave themselves new powers to inspect. Seven months later not a single inspection had happened. They also promised to crack down on use of the program, and a year later, the number of foreign workers was up by 6%.

Why did the Conservatives manage the program so badly?

Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC): Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to invite my colleagues opposite to attend a technical briefing any time they would like so they could actually understand this. For example, the new powers for inspecting workplaces could only be legally applied prospectively for temporary foreign workers who are being applied for and would arrive in the future, not for those who applied in the past.

Perhaps the NDP members have a new principle whereby they would like to retroactively apply all new laws, but the reality is that since our reforms were put into place last year, we have seen a reduction by 75% in the number of temporary foreign workers applied for by employers. We are ensuring that Canadians come first in the workforce.

* * *

• (1450)

CANADA POST

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative move to end home mail delivery has raised controversy and opposition across the country. Now the new superboxes are causing their own trouble, because just last week a woman from Nova Scotia

realized that her mailbox key opens the mailbox of one of her neighbours.

Canadians count on sensitive personal mail information being kept confidential. Why are the Conservatives still backing a plan that manages to make getting mail both less accessible and less secure?

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2013 Canada Post delivered 1.2 billion fewer pieces of mail than it had done in the previous years. As a result, it has to make sure that it continues to be self-sufficient, as per its act. It has devised a five-point plan. In that five-point plan, it is taking the final one-third of households in this country that do receive mail at their door to community mailboxes. It is rolling out that change across the country now. I encourage people to work with Canada Post to make sure that it gets it right.

[Translation]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we already knew that the Conservatives were too incompetent to deliver people's mail to their homes. Now we know that they cannot even install secure mailboxes. We used to have boxes made in Saint-Jean-Port-Joli, but now we have boxes made in the United States, and it turns out that one key can open several boxes. This is happening from Repentigny to Nova Scotia. It looks like the idea of keeping mail confidential has gone out the window along with home mail delivery.

Why are the Conservatives in such a hurry to gut Canada Post, and why are they putting the privacy of Canadian citizens at risk?

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated before, currently two-thirds of Canadians do not receive their mail at their door but go to community mailboxes. I know Canada Post is now rolling that out across the country to the remaining one-third of Canadian households. As it goes through that process, I encourage people to work with it to make sure that any complaints they have are brought to the attention of Canada Post.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Devinder Shory (Calgary Northeast, CPC): Mr. Speaker, ISIL terrorists are creating chaos in the Middle East and inciting violence that has sadly reached us on home soil. Canada has joined our international partners in providing military assistance and humanitarian aid to stop the further spread of ISIL and to ensure the humanitarian crisis does not worsen.

Oral Questions

Can the Minister of Foreign Affairs please update the House on how Canada continues to work with our allies to stop the ISIL terrorists?

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, obviously working on a combat mission with the United States is an important part of the attack on terrorism in Iraq and the threat that is posed by ISIL.

One of the other things that Canada and the international community can do is to clamp down on the financing of such terrorism. This government, through listing terrorist organizations, has done a lot in recent years. An international conference will be held on November 9 in Manama, Bahrain, to look at what we can do to work together to attack the financing of ISIL. That is another example of this government getting tough on terrorism.

* * *

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. Glenn Thibeault (Sudbury, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for years New Democrats have stood in this chamber and asked the government to take action on credit card merchant fees—fees that are the highest in the world, fees that the Competition Tribunal found were anti-competitive and excessive, fees that raise prices for consumers and hold small businesses back—yet for years the government has done nothing.

Can the minister tell us when he will finally act and introduce mandatory regulations?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is working with stakeholders on a voluntary approach to reduce credit fees for merchants while encouraging them to lower prices for consumers.

We also heard the concerns of small business and introduced a code of conduct. The code has been welcomed by consumers and by industry groups, especially small businesses. However, the NDP voted against the code and against supporting small businesses and consumers.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Annick Papillon (Québec, NDP): Mr. Speaker, after promising to curb the greed of credit card companies that impose abusive fees on merchants and therefore consumers, the Conservatives have now reversed that decision and are proposing a voluntary code. Once again, the Conservatives are favouring the credit card companies instead of defending small business owners and consumers. Does the minister really believe that credit card companies will suddenly stop abusing their monopoly voluntarily?

• (1455)

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the NDP always wants more legislation and higher fees for Canadians.

Our government is working with stakeholders on a voluntary approach to reduce credit fees for merchants while encouraging them to lower prices for consumers. This is the right way to proceed.

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Ms. Annick Papillon (Québec, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we all know that the NDP government of 2015 will defend both consumers and SMEs, of course.

The Canada Revenue Agency recognizes that its letters are so complicated and so poorly written, that often taxpayers do not know whether to write a cheque or wait for a refund. It is a mystery. Ultimately, this mismanagement leaves Canadians confused and paying penalties.

Will the government move quickly to correct the situation, reassure Canadians, and finally provide adequate service?

[*English*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay (Minister of National Revenue, CPC): Mr. Speaker, regarding the recommendations referred to by the hon. member, this was an evaluation that was initiated by the agency. It was done to keep it accountable and ensure services to Canadians are constantly improving. The agency regularly receives feedback on communications. Clarity is essential. These recommendations will lead to change and improve services for all Canadian taxpayers. We are taking action.

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, things have gotten so bad at the Canada Revenue Agency that people cannot even understand the letters it is sending out. Just think about that. The letters are so poorly written that fully one-half of the people who receive them do not know what to do when they get them.

Would the Minister of National Revenue explain why she spent over \$100,000 on consultants to figure out that this might be a problem, and what she intends to do to fix it?

Hon. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay (Minister of National Revenue, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am a strong believer in plain language. As I said, clarity is essential in communications. This third-party evaluation was initiated by CRA as part of our effort to provide critical input into reducing red tape and to support taxpayers in compliance.

The CRA is aligning with best practices for effective correspondence. We are taking action now. That action was started before this evaluation. It continues now through these recommendations.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Frank Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the veterans affairs committee was unanimous in its recommendations to improve the new veterans charter because eight more years of inaction for our veterans is unacceptable. The minister said he agreed with all the recommendations, yet in the nearly 500 pages of the government's recent omnibus budget bill, there is nothing in there for veterans—nothing at all.

Oral Questions

Why, when these men and women were willing to sacrifice everything for us, will the minister not act on the things veterans actually need?

Hon. Julian Fantino (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, contrary to the comments just made, our government agrees with the spirit and intent of the vast majority of the committee's recommendations. Our response was positive, and is positive, that we would be bringing forward a phased approach, and we accepted a significant portion of the committee's recommendations.

The work is going on. It is continuing. We care deeply about supporting our veterans. If that member would only have a moment of thought, the committee agreed on the recommendations and we are following through on them.

* * *

SENIORS

Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the depths to which the Conservatives will sink to attack our seniors is shocking. Conservatives started by taxing income trusts and then delaying old age security, but now they want to go even further. Finance officials confirm that the budget bill would hit not-for-profit health centres' facilities with a bill for HST. That is right. After taxing investments and delaying pensions, the budget is again targeting seniors for collection. We know that winter is coming, and Conservatives clearly have their hands in our seniors' pockets.

Did they really think that nobody was going to notice this?

● (1500)

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government has, over the years, reduced taxes for Canadians to the point where they are lower than they have been in the last 50 years. We will continue in this next budget, because we are expecting a surplus, to reduce taxes further for hard-working Canadian families, including seniors.

* * *

[Translation]

HOUSING

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in Canada, there are at least 235,000 homeless people.

According to a report on the state of homelessness in Canada published today, with little effort we could practically eliminate homelessness. It is time for the federal government to stop withdrawing support for social housing and start funding new units. To govern is to make choices.

When will the government truly make social housing a priority?

[English]

Hon. Candice Bergen (Minister of State (Social Development), CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government renewed our homelessness partnering strategy with a focus on Housing First, which is an evidence-based model that takes those who are chronically homeless out of this situation.

Experts across the country have lauded our approach. In fact, the most recent report on homelessness said that the federal govern-

ment's shift to focus on Housing First is a transformational change to Canada's response to homelessness.

We will continue to use evidence-based facts. The NDP unfortunately opposes that approach.

Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that federal investment in housing has declined by 46% over the last 25 years, leading to a shrinking supply of affordable housing. Communities and municipalities are struggling to meet the demand for affordable housing, which is essential to ending homelessness in Canada.

Why will the Conservatives not restore long-term housing funding to address Canada's growing homelessness and housing crisis?

Hon. Candice Bergen (Minister of State (Social Development), CPC): Mr. Speaker, together with our homelessness partnering strategy, we also are investing in affordable housing with the provinces. With our partners, we have helped almost one million individuals and families with affordable housing.

We know that the NDP wants to create big, bureaucratic Ottawa programs to increase taxes on Canadians. We are going to make smart investments. We are going to work together with provinces and municipalities. We will address these issues not with big programs but smart investments.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. John Carmichael (Don Valley West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today we learned yet again of another act of barbarism committed by ISIL. In the town of Hit just west of Baghdad, 30 Sunni men were paraded through the city before being summarily executed by ISIL. Unfortunately, this is not an isolated incident but another example of the brutality and inhumanity of ISIL that we have seen in the past few months.

Could the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration please comment on this latest incident?

Hon. Chris Alexander (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the truth is that ISIL is conducting a campaign of unspeakable atrocities that represents a threat to the people of Iraq and Syria as well as Canada. In response to this threat, this government has introduced Bill C-44, which would strengthen the hand of our security agencies. We have passed the Combating Terrorism Act and we have introduced Canada's first strategy to address terrorism in all its forms.

It is the responsibility of all of us in the House to protect Canadians and defend our citizens.

*Oral Questions***HOUSING**

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Trinity—Spadina, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since coming to power the Conservative government has increased spending on outside consultants by almost \$2 billion a year. A report that was released today on homelessness identifies that if they had spent that money on housing, they would have drastically and dramatically reduced homelessness in this country. Instead, they have hired their friends.

With respect to housing wait times, does the minister want some evidence? Housing wait times across this country are growing. In Vancouver, close to 5,000 people are waiting. In Montreal, it is close to 10,000. In Winnipeg, over 4,500 people are waiting for housing.

Instead of bringing consultants in-house, when is the government going to start building housing for Canadians who need housing now?

Hon. Candice Bergen (Minister of State (Social Development), CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is completely false. In fact, under our homelessness partnering strategy, we are working with community entities in each specific community. They look at their area and they look to see what needs are required.

I would encourage that member to familiarize himself with our homelessness partnering strategy and our focus on Housing First. The report on the state of homelessness in Canada report said, “The federal implementation of Housing First is easily the most important development in homeless services in Canada this year...”

* * *

• (1505)

[Translation]

MARINE TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about safety.

Half of all Quebeckers get their drinking water from the St. Lawrence, and a number of them are calling on the federal government to ensure that it has the capacity to deal with a major oil spill caused by one of the supertankers leaving Sorel-Tracy. What is more, the environment commissioner seriously doubts that Transport Canada and the Coast Guard are equipped to handle such a spill.

How could the government authorize such a significant increase in tanker traffic on the St. Lawrence, when, by all accounts, it is not prepared to deal with a major oil spill?

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last year my colleague, then minister of transport, set in place a world-class tanker safety panel, chaired by a very eminent captain and former CEO of Port Metro Vancouver. The panel found that we were prepared to respond to spills in the country, but we could do better. We have taken its recommendations and we have been implementing these recommendations and have been announcing this as we go along.

We want to make sure that people are prepared for a spill and that we try to prevent spills as well, and in the case of a spill that has

happened, that the taxpayer is protected from having to cover the price of the entire spill.

* * *

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Patrick Brown (Barrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday UNICEF released a report showing that Canada's child poverty rate decreased during the recession, pulling nearly 180,000 children out of poverty. Could the Minister of State for Social Development please explain to the House what specific actions our government has taken to help lift children out of poverty?

Hon. Candice Bergen (Minister of State (Social Development), CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is right. This is great news. During the recession, under our government's low-tax incentives and with support that goes directly to families, we have been able to pull 180,000 children out of poverty. Why is that? What UNICEF said is it is because of things such as our universal child care benefit and our tax incentives.

Under our Prime Minister and our government, we will continue to put money back into the pockets of hard-working families.

* * *

[Translation]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for years the City of Montreal and the public have been asking Canadian Pacific to install new level crossings to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. The problem is particularly dire in Laurier—Sainte-Marie and Rosemont. However, despite repeated requests, CP is not co-operating.

When will Transport Canada require railway companies such as CP to actually co-operate in good faith with municipalities and consider the safety of pedestrians and cyclists?

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, indeed we have been working very hard on this particular issue. It is this government that has brought in grade crossing regulations in order to deal with the situation the hon. member has outlined, which is a case in which the municipality and the rail operator do not agree on where, when, or how a grade crossing separation could be put in place.

We encourage the parties to work with these regulations, and of course we at Transport Canada will be there to facilitate if we can.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, today the Minister of Transport announced new safety measures for rail transportation. There was nothing about creating a minimum distance between railways and the construction of new buildings.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities recognizes the problem and made recommendations in 2013, but it does not have the authority to establish mandatory standards.

What is the government waiting for to take action and to establish a standard for a minimum distance between the construction of new buildings and railway tracks in Canada?

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Transport Canada has a ministerial advisory council that deals with matters like this. This matter is being considered by that advisory panel at the moment, which is making sure that they cover off all issues with respect to operation and are incorporating it with respect to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. We will continue to have that discussion and move along.

In the meantime, we continue to work on rail safety and measures associated with rail safety. Our government has a great track record in that area and will continue in that way.

* * *

• (1510)

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Manuel A. González Sanz, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Costa Rica.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: I would also like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Right Honourable Edward Richard Schreyer, 22nd Governor General of Canada.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS OF CANADA

Hon. Tony Clement (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to table today, in both official languages, the Public Accounts of Canada 2014.

The Government of Canada is committed to strong financial management and reporting to ensure accountability and transparency. For yet another year, the Auditor General of Canada has provided an unqualified audit opinion of the Government of Canada's financial statements, and we can be justifiably proud of this record.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to 55 petitions.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West—Glanbrook, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have to honour to

Routine Proceedings

present, in both official languages, the following reports of the Canadian delegation to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Parliamentary Assembly respecting its participation at the winter meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly held at Vienna, Austria, from February 12 to 14, 2014, and its participation at the election observation mission at the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly held in Kiev, Ukraine, from May 25 to 28, 2014.

[Translation]

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the reports of the delegation of the Canadian branch of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie concerning its participation at the meeting of the Cooperation and Development Committee of the APF, held in Lomé, Togo, from April 14 to 16, 2014, and the meeting of the Parliamentary Affairs Committee of the APF, held in Hanoi, Vietnam, from April 27 to 29, 2014.

Mr. Robert Goguen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the delegation of the Canadian branch of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie, concerning its participation at the meeting of the Political Committee of the APF, held in Libreville, Gabon, on April 15 and 16, 2014.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL BILL OF RIGHTS

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-634, an act to establish a Canadian environmental bill of rights.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again table my bill, the Canadian environmental bill of rights.

The bill, once enacted, would impose critical duties and extend important rights by, first, enshrining the right in Canadians to a healthy and ecologically balanced environment, including through amendment of the Canadian Bill of Rights; second, by legally enshrining the government's public trust duty to protect the environment to the extent of its jurisdiction, including legislating and enforcing environmental protection laws; and third, by extending to Canadians the right to hold their government accountable through access to environmental information, participation in decision-making impacting their environment, and legal standing to seek judicial intervention where those rights are denied.

In the five years since it was first introduced, this reform has now become all the more critical, as the government has undermined and eroded almost every environmental protection and related public right.

Routine Proceedings

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

* * *

• (1515)

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona, NDP) moved that the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources presented on Wednesday, June 11, 2014, be concurred in.

The Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

SEX SELECTION

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

In the first, the petitioners call upon Parliament to condemn discrimination against females brought about through gender-selection pregnancy termination.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): In the second petition, Mr. Speaker, the petitioners call for stronger action against those who drive impaired, causing death. They call for a mandatory minimum sentence for those persons convicted of impaired driving causing death. They also want the Criminal Code of Canada to be changed to redefine the offence of impaired driving causing death as vehicular manslaughter.

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present three petitions signed by hundreds of people from Beauport, Côte-de-Beaupré, Charlevoix, Île d'Orléans and Haute-Côte-Nord.

The first pertains to stopping the cuts to Canada Post's services.

THE SENATE

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition pertains to abolishing the Senate.

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the third petition pertains to the creation of a social responsibility ombudsman for Canadian

extractive companies. Hundreds of people from my riding signed this petition.

[English]

ENVIRONMENTAL LAKES AREA

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present today, signed by a large number of people in Saskatchewan, particularly in the Saskatoon area.

The petitioners indicate their concern about environmental protection of fresh water in Canada, and especially the loss of the Environmental Lakes Area as an important research facility under federal jurisdiction. They urge the Government of Canada to ensure that freshwater systems in our country are properly protected.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a few petitions that I would like to table on behalf of constituents of Dartmouth—Cole Harbour.

The first petition is in respect to the climate change accountability act that has been tabled by the official opposition caucus. The petition, signed by hundreds of my constituents, supports the New Democratic Party caucus climate change accountability act, which would be a law that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions and hold the government accountable.

CANADA POST

Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls upon the government to stop the cuts to our postal service. Again, it is a petition signed by hundreds of constituents in Dartmouth—Cole Harbour.

The third petition also asks the government to stop the cuts to our postal service, in particular because of the consequences to seniors and people with mobility issues as well as the 8,000 jobs that will be lost as a result of this decision.

AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDERS

Ms. Kirsty Duncan (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this petition with dozens of signatures that were collected by my constituent, Dee Gordon, as she walks twice a week from Etobicoke North to downtown Toronto to raise awareness of autism.

Autism spectrum disorders, ASD, are pervasive disorders that affect one person in 88. They are characterized by social and communication challenges and a pattern of repetitive behaviours and interests. They are lifelong, affect life experience, and exert emotional and financial pressures on families.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners call upon the government to work with the provinces, territories, and stakeholders to develop a pan-Canadian strategy for ASD, including awareness and education campaigns; child, adolescent, and adult intervention; and innovative funding arrangements for financial therapy, surveillance, respite care, community initiatives, and research.

• (1520)

CANADA POST

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to table petitions with respect to the cuts at Canada Post.

The petitioners are upset about the elimination of home delivery for millions of urban customers. They raise the issues that about 8,000 good-paying jobs will be lost and that the postal rates increase will make life more expensive for cash-strapped families, small businesses and charitable organizations, and will not provide them better service.

The petition is signed by people from Elliot Lake and Blind River.

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present three petitions that my constituents in Drummond sent to me this summer. They worked very hard.

The first petition concerns their desire to establish an energy efficiency program for owners of houses, buildings, shops, and businesses that would support job creation and the environment.

CANADA POST

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition seeks to save Canada Post. We heard questions about this today in the House of Commons. It is a very hot topic in my riding as well.

CBC/RADIO-CANADA

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the third petition concerns the cuts to the CBC/Radio-Canada, which have gotten a strong reaction from many residents of Drummond. They are calling for stable and adequate funding for CBC/Radio-Canada.

CANADA POST

Mr. Hoang Mai (Brossard—La Prairie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to rise today to present about a hundred petitions signed by people from my riding of Brossard—La Prairie. These petitions deal with the cuts to Canada Post's services. The petitioners are calling on the government to reject Canada Post's plan for reduced service and to explore other options to modernize the crown corporation's business plan. They know that this will affect many Canadians, including seniors and people with reduced mobility.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker,

the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 645, 656, and 658.

[*Text*]

Question No. 645—**Ms. Chrystia Freeland:**

With regard to negotiations in relation to the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) with the European Union: since January 1, 2012, what are the costs incurred in relation to travel by government officials from the current Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development, as well as the former Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, to (a) Brussels, Belgium, or (b) any other European jurisdictions for meetings about the CETA, broken down by (i) department, (ii) individual, (iii) itemized expenses?

Hon. Ed Fast (Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, information on travel expenses for exempt staff and senior-level employees is available under proactive disclosure at <http://w03.international.gc.ca/dthe-dfva/noms-noms.aspx?lang=eng&dept=it-ci>.

The department undertook an extensive preliminary search for the information requested in order to determine the amount of information that would fall within the scope of the question and the amount of time that would be required to prepare a comprehensive response.

The department concluded that producing a comprehensive response to this question would require a prohibitively lengthy undertaking given that it covers more than a years' worth of travel and would require an extensive manual collection of information and is not possible in the time period allotted.

Question No. 656—**Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia:**

With regard to the government's plan, announced in the 2014 budget, to acquire privately-owned lands through the National Conservation Plan: (a) how much has the government already spent in 2014-2015 on purchasing ecologically-sensitive privately-owned lands and how much does it plan on spending on the purchase of such lands, either directly or through third parties, in the three fiscal years 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017, in Quebec; (b) how much of this amount has been or will be spent specifically on purchasing wetlands in Quebec; (c) where in Quebec has the government purchased, if it has done so, ecologically-sensitive lands, including wetlands, in 2014-2015 and where does it plan to purchase ecologically-sensitive lands in the province, including wetlands, in the three fiscal years 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017; and (d) does the government purchase ecologically-sensitive lands, including wetlands, through programs other than the National Conservation Plan and, if so, (i) how much has been spent in the last three fiscal years purchasing ecologically-sensitive privately-owned lands, including wetlands, (ii) how much will be spent in the next three fiscal years (2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017) on purchasing such lands through any programs other than the National Conservation Plan?

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), Environment Canada does not purchase ecologically sensitive lands directly under the national conservation plan. Rather, funding is provided to non-governmental organizations to purchase these lands with the intent to conserve important habitat for conservation purposes.

In relation to questions (a) to (c), given the wording used in the questions and the interest in information related to actions that were taken before the national conservation plan was announced, our response addresses the natural areas conservation program, rather than all programs under the national conservation plan.

Routine Proceedings

Under the natural areas conservation program, in 2014-15, the amount spent by the Nature Conservancy of Canada, as of August 31, 2014, on purchasing ecologically sensitive, privately owned lands in Quebec is approximately \$260,000. The total planned spending under the natural areas conservation program for 2014-15 in Quebec, including this \$260,000, is \$300,000.

Once the new natural areas conservation program agreement between Environment Canada and the Nature Conservancy of Canada is signed for the \$100 million under the national conservation plan, a work plan for the remainder of 2014-15 will be submitted by the Nature Conservancy of Canada. This will include the planned spending in Quebec for the final months of this fiscal year.

The spending for 2015-16 and 2016-17 is not yet known.

With regard to part (b), in 2014-15, the amount spent, specifically on purchasing wetlands in Quebec is not easily determined at this time, as the Nature Conservancy of Canada does not automatically track wetlands and uplands work. Under the natural areas conservation program, Ducks Unlimited Canada has not spent and does not intend to spend any of its federal funds in Quebec in the 2014-15 fiscal year.

The spending for 2015-16 and 2016-17 is not yet known.

With regard to part (c), in 2014-15 in Quebec, ecologically sensitive lands, including wetlands have been acquired within the Nature Conservancy of Canada's priority natural area of the Northern Green Mountains.

The spending for 2015-16 and 2016-17 is not yet known.

With regard to part (d), Environment Canada does not purchase ecologically sensitive lands directly. Funding is provided through a variety of programs, including those under the national conservation plan, to non-governmental organizations to purchase ecologically sensitive lands, including wetlands.

Regarding (d)(i), in the last three fiscal years, 2011-12 to 2013-14, Environment Canada's partners have spent a total amount of \$73,136,568 in government funds on purchasing ecologically sensitive, privately owned lands, including wetlands. This includes \$68.9 million under the natural areas conservation program and \$4.2 million under other programs.

Regarding (d)(ii), as part of the national conservation plan, \$100 million was announced for the continuation of the natural areas conservation program, which is managed by the Nature Conservancy of Canada. Given that the natural areas conservation program is now within the national conservation plan for 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17, it is not included here.

Planning for the next three years in various programs is currently under way.

Question No. 658—**Hon. Mauril Bélanger:**

With regard to the renaming of the Rockcliffe Parkway to the Sir George-Étienne Cartier Parkway: (a) was this change preceded by public and private consultations; (b) what was the consultation process and what were the methods involved; (c) when was the consultation process launched; and (d) what organizations were consulted?

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a) of the question, this change was not preceded by consultations.

On July 8, 2014, the Minister of Foreign Affairs wrote to the chair of the commission on behalf of the Government of Canada asking the commission to consider renaming the Rockcliffe Parkway the "Sir George-Étienne Cartier Parkway".

After discussion, the NCC board of directors voted in favour of the renaming of the parkway.

The member of Parliament for Ottawa—Orléans made the announcement on September 6, 2014, on behalf of the Government of Canada that the Rockcliffe Parkway would be renamed the Sir George-Étienne Cartier Parkway to honour one of Canada's founding fathers.

As stated by the Member of Parliament for Ottawa—Orléans:

When...the [hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs] announced the renaming of the former Ottawa River Parkway to the Sir John A. Macdonald Parkway two years ago, I felt compelled to write him to commend him for this important gesture and also to make the case for this renaming in George-Étienne Cartier's honour....

Sir George-Étienne Cartier fought for a united country.... He was a man of vision and worked tirelessly to achieve not just Confederation, but a confederation that accommodated and respected differences. Today [September 6, 2014] is, in fact, Cartier's 200th birthday and I do not believe that we could pay tribute to him in a more befitting manner. Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George-Étienne Cartier were the two leaders of the pre-Confederation province of Canada and they both played pivotal roles in Confederation. These two Fathers of Confederation are commonly recognized together, such as in the Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, the Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, and the Macdonald-Cartier International Airport.

With regard to parts (b), (c), and (d), they are not applicable.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 649, 650, 651, 652, 657 and 659 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 649—**Mr. Frank Valeriote:**

With regard to internal trade barriers within Canada: (a) what does each department of the public service list as an internal trade barrier; (b) for how long has each department maintained a list of all existing internal trade barriers; (c) what are details on how this list is maintained and updated; (d) what are the materials prepared for the Minister, the Minister's staff, or departmental bureaucrats on any and all of these meetings with provinces and territories advising on additions to the list of internal trade barriers; and (e) what are the materials prepared for the Minister, the Minister's staff, or departmental bureaucrats advising on additions to the list of internal trade barriers?

Routine Proceedings

(Return tabled)

Question No. 650—**Mr. Frank Valeriote:**

With respect to software developed by the government since January 2011 for use by any non-government entity or the public, including, without limitation, software programs, mobile applications, website applications, embedded systems, and all other programming done by or on behalf of the government: (a) what were all names for the software, broken down by dates of use; (b) on what date was the software released for public use, or on what day is its public release anticipated; (c) through what means is the software accessible by its intended users; (d) what was the total cost of developing the software; (e) what is the total revenue generated for the government by the software; (f) how many times has the software been downloaded, copied, or otherwise accessed by its intended audience; (g) how many times has the software been downloaded, copied, or otherwise accessed by anyone other than its intended audience; (h) for what reason was the software developed; (i) for what reason was the software released, or in the case where it has not been and will not be released, for what reason will the software not be released; (j) under what license was the software released; and (k) what are the file numbers and details of all ministerial briefings or departmental correspondence or other government records relating to the software, broken down by (i) minister or department, (ii) relevant file number, (iii) correspondence or file type, (iv) date, (v) purpose, (vi) origin, (vii) intended destination, (viii) other officials copied or involved?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 651—**Mr. Justin Trudeau:**

With regard to the Northern Gateway Project: (a) did the government request an assessment or legal opinion from any department or agency as to whether consultations conducted by the Joint Review Panel on the Northern Gateway Project fulfilled the Crown's duty to consult with Aboriginal peoples, and if so, what were the contents of those assessments, broken down by (i) department or agency, (ii) date; (b) did the government provide oversight for, monitor or evaluate the adequacy or sufficiency of the Joint Review Panel's Aboriginal consultation efforts throughout the panel process, and if so, what were the findings of said oversight, monitoring and evaluation, broken down by (i) department or agency, (ii) date; (c) which Aboriginal communities or groups did the Joint Review Process engage with during the five phases of consultation described in the "Aboriginal Consultation Framework for the Northern Gateway Pipeline Project" document, broken down by (i) phase, (ii) Aboriginal community or group, (iii) year; (d) how much participant funding was requested by Aboriginal communities or groups throughout the Joint Review Panel Process, broken down by (i) Aboriginal community or group, (ii) year funding was provided; and (e) how much participant funding was provided to Aboriginal communities or groups throughout the Joint Review Panel Process, broken down by (i) Aboriginal community or group, (ii) year funding was provided?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 652—**Ms. Kirsty Duncan:**

With respect to any information in the government's possession regarding Alzheimer's disease and related dementias (ADRDs) in Canada: (a) how many Canadians are impacted by ADRDs today, (i) what is the incidence and prevalence in Canada, broken down by gender and by 5-year cohort above 65 years of age, (ii) what is the average age of onset, (iii) what is the average time from diagnosis to requiring informal caregiving, (iv) what is the average time from diagnosis to requiring formal caregiving; (b) how many Canadians are currently in hospital, as a result of having ADRDs, (i) what are the benefits and risks of having people with ADRDs in regular hospital care, (ii) do people with ADRDs get the care they need in hospital care and if not, why not; (c) how do the number of hospitalizations compare for older adults with ADRDs than for age-matched older adults without ADRDs, (i) how do clinical outcomes compare for hospitalized people with ADRDs than for age-matched older adults without ADRDs; (d) what is the average cost of an acute care bed in hospital compared with the cost of a bed in long-term care; (e) what is the average length of time people with ADRDs spend in fully dependent care, and how does this length of time compare with other conditions, including, but not limited to, cardiovascular disease and cancer, (i) how does this length of time impact the health economics of ADRDs; (f) how many Canadians are caregivers to people with ADRDs, (i) what is the average length of time (in years) caregivers provide to people with ADRDs, both informally and within formal care, (ii) what is the annual estimated value of the care caregivers provide for those with ADRDs in Canada, (iii) how many Canadian caregivers suffer stress, illness, or economic hardship as a result of caregiving, (iv) what are the estimated economic costs to the health care and social care systems; (g) what training do medical students and practising family physicians

receive to ensure dementia is detected before it reaches a critical level; (h) do best practices exist for people with ADRDs, (i) how does care vary from one province and territory to another, and from one facility to another; (i) what research and studies has the government done, and what funding has it given following (i) the World Health Organization and Alzheimer's Disease International report, "Dementia: A Public Health Priority", and the Alzheimer Society of Canada's report, "Rising Tide: The Impact of Dementia on Canadian Society", (ii) what are the dates, results, recommendations, and funding amounts; (j) what is done by the government to (i) promote a dementia-friendly society, (ii) make ADRDs a national public health and social care priority, (iii) improve public and professional attitudes to, and understanding of, ADRDs, (iv) replicate some of the evidence-based approaches and solutions already adopted by countries to tackle ADRDs, (v) prioritize research, (vi) raise awareness about prevention, (vii) promote early diagnosis and management, (viii) strengthen workforce training and capacity, (ix) implement responsive care and health service delivery, especially for caregivers; (k) what research and studies has the government done, and what funding has it given regarding the need to work with the provinces, territories and stakeholders to develop a community-based dementia framework, designed to keep persons with dementia safely at home for as long as possible, (i) what are the dates, results, recommendations, and funding amounts; (l) what research, studies, funding has the government devoted to how a community-based dementia strategy would impact (i) emergency department overcrowding, (ii) hospitalizations, (iii) Alternative Level of Care rates, (iv) long-term bed placement, (v) freeing-up of hospital beds, (vi) hospital overcrowding, (vii) wait times, (viii) number of new nursing homes that would need to be built, (ix) quality of life for those with ADRDs, (x) costs; (m) how are ADRDs expected to increase over the next 20 years, (i) what are the estimated costs to families and the health care system; (n) how are healthcare costs and healthcare resources expected to increase over the next 20 years given the rapidly increasing numbers of persons with ADRDs; (o) what research, studies, funding has the government devoted to developing a pan-Canadian brain strategy to address (i) neurodevelopmental brain conditions, (ii) neurodegenerative brain conditions, (iii) brain and spinal cord injury, (iv) what are the dates of any studies, results, recommendations, and funding amounts; (p) what research, studies, and funding has the government given to developing a pan-Canadian dementia strategy, (i) what are the dates of any studies, results, recommendations, and funding amounts; (q) what consultations has the government undertaken with respect to a pan-Canadian brain strategy, (i) how many stakeholders are calling for such a strategy, (ii) how many Canadians and their families do each of the identified stakeholders represent; and (r) what consultations has the government undertaken with respect to a pan-Canadian dementia strategy, (i) how many stakeholders are calling for such a strategy, (ii) how many Canadians and their families do each of the identified stakeholders represent?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 657—**Mr. Bruce Hyer:**

With regard to radioactive material: (a) which national authorities hold electronic records of transports of radioactive material (especially of fissile material) within Canada or those imported, exported and moved in transit; (b) what information (e.g. sender, sender's address, recipient, recipient's address, date of transport, type of cask, quantity of radioactive material) is recorded over what period of time; (c) does the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission compile separate electronic records of transports of radioactive material (especially of fissile material) within Canada or those imported, exported and moved in transit; and (d) what are the details of all non-confidential recorded information related to transports of radioactive material within Canada as well as those imported, exported and moved in transit in the last 10 years?

(Return tabled)

Government Orders

Question No. 659—**Mr. Wayne Marston:**

With regard to government spending in the Hamilton East—Stoney Creek riding, what was the total amount spent, from fiscal year 2010-11 up to and including the current fiscal year, broken down by (i) the date the funds were received in the riding, (ii) the dollar amount, (iii) the program through which the funding was allocated, (iv) the department responsible, (v) the designated recipient?

(Return tabled)

[*English*]

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

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 Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ECONOMIC ACTION PLAN 2014 ACT, NO. 2

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC) moved that Bill C-43, A Second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 11, 2014 and other measures, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Andrew Saxton (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for this opportunity to introduce Bill C-43 at second reading. Today's legislation builds on the strong foundation that was laid last year. We are continuing to build on our portfolio of initiatives we have introduced since 2006, with affordable measures to create jobs, promote growth and support long-term prosperity.

This key strategy is working, creating jobs, keeping the economy growing and returning to balanced budgets in 2015. Since we introduced the economic action plan to respond to the global recession, our economy has created nearly 1.2 million net new jobs since the depths of the recession in 2009, one of the strongest job creation records in the G7.

I would be remiss if I did not tout some of the outcomes of our economic action plan.

According to KPMG, total business tax costs in Canada are the lowest in the G7 and 46% lower than those in the United States. When was the last time that happened? What is more, Canada leapt from sixth to second place in Bloomberg's ranking of the most attractive destinations to do business in the world.

Both the IMF and the OECD still expect Canada to be among the strongest-growing economies in the G7 over this year and next.

For the seventh year in a row, the World Economic Forum rated Canada's banking system the soundest in the world.

All the major credit rating agencies accord Canada a top AAA rating with a stable outlook, a rating shared by very few countries.

A recent *New York Times* study found that after tax, middle-class incomes in Canada were substantially behind in 2000 and now appeared to be higher than those in the United States. In fact, the Canadian middle class is among the richest in the developed world for the first time ever.

The federal tax burden is at its lowest level in over 50 years, and remember we have removed more than one million low-income Canadians from the tax rolls entirely. The average family of four will save nearly \$3,400 this year and a small business earning \$500,000 now saves over \$28,000 in taxes, thanks to our low-tax plan.

It is clear that Canada has become an international success story, but Canada is still not immune to the global economic challenges beyond our borders. Our government has been adamant that as long as Canadians are still looking for jobs, there is more work to be done.

With that, let me now turn to the measures in today's legislation that would build on our success and ensure that we would continue to keep Canada on track for job creation and balanced budgets.

First, Bill C-43 reaffirms this government's commitment to making our tax system simpler and fairer. It also closes tax loopholes and strengthens tax enforcement to ensure low taxes for all taxpayers, not only a select few.

Allow me to highlight some of the measures we have taken to improve the fairness and integrity of the tax system.

First, today's legislation would simplify the tax rules relating to the lifetime capital gains exemption, LCGE, and the intergenerational rollover for taxpayers who carry on farming and fishing businesses in combination. This builds on our original measure to increase the potential rewards of investing in small business, farming and fishing.

Economic action plan 2013 increased the LCGE from \$750,000 to \$800,000 in 2014. To ensure that real value is not eroded over time, we also indexed the \$800,000 limit to inflation for the first time ever. The first indexation adjustment will occur for the 2015 taxation year. To accomplish this, the government proposes to generally treat a taxpayer's combined farming and fishing business the same as separate farming and fishing businesses conducted by the same taxpayer. This would ensure consistent treatment for taxpayers who conducted farming and fishing activities in different legal forms.

Government Orders

Similarly, a special income tax rule is currently available to farmers who dispose of breeding livestock due to drought or excess moisture conditions existing in specific regions in a given year. This rule permits farmers to exclude up to 90% of the sale proceeds from their taxable income until the year following the sale or a later year if the conditions persist.

• (1525)

Bill C-43 proposes to extend this tax deferral to beekeepers and horse breeders, effective for 2014 and subsequent taxation years. These are two examples of our Conservative government standing up for the interests of Canadian farmers, fishers, and others who own and operate businesses in Canada.

As I mentioned, our government takes tax evasion seriously, and we want to close loopholes to ensure that all taxpayers are paying their fair share. Bill C-43 would tackle tax loopholes head-on.

It is vital that the government have the ability to obtain tax information from other jurisdictions through revised tax treaties and through tax information exchange agreements with non-treaty countries. Current, reliable information is key to our government's efforts to verify compliance with Canadian laws and to reduce opportunities for abuse. Bill C-43 would take another important step in this direction by adjusting the policy encouraging the exchange of information for tax purposes.

Specifically, the definition of "non-qualifying country" in the Income Tax Act is relevant in determining the foreign accrual property income of a foreign affiliate of a taxpayer for a year. Today's legislation in that regard proposes two changes. First, it proposes to amend the definition of "non-qualifying country" so that it does not apply to those jurisdictions for which the convention on mutual administrative assistance in tax matters is in force and in effect. Second, it proposes to ensure that the FAPI rules do not apply inappropriately with respect to the British overseas territory the British Virgin Islands, a jurisdiction that now has a comprehensive tax information agreement with Canada.

Our Conservative government has also consistently demonstrated that it recognizes the importance of a strong financial sector. Bill C-43 would be no different. Our government is moving forward with its dual agenda with respect to credit unions, ensuring that the regulatory framework is clear and supporting those provincial credit unions that want to be federally regulated.

Since the financial crisis, we have pursued an important agenda of regulatory reform to ensure that the federal financial system is stable and competitive and serves the needs of various participants. Stability has been the dominant theme of the federal reform agenda.

Bill C-43 would deliver on the announcement made in economic action plan 2014 about withdrawing the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions' supervision of provincial credit union centrals and clarifying access to federal intervention tools for provincial credit union centrals, credit unions, and caisses populaires.

As many hon. members appreciate, Canada's credit unions are a valuable source of financial services in communities across the country, including in my area of North Vancouver. We want to

promote the continued growth and competition of the credit union sector on a national scale.

In recognition of the important role credit unions play, our government created in economic action plan 2010 a new legislative framework for federal credit unions as a platform to broaden choices for consumers and to improve services for existing members. To continue to grow, some credit unions are looking to amalgamate with credit unions in other provinces to become a federal credit union.

In economic action plan 2014, the federal government also announced streamlining the process of amalgamating provincial credit unions, continuing into the federal credit framework, to make it less costly and complex. Bill C-43 would deliver on that announcement.

Yes, there is more. As we have said many times, we understand that the main priority of Canadians is jobs. Let me highlight three measures that are helping small businesses and ensuring that Canadians are first in line for jobs.

Bill C-43 would implement our recently announced small business job credit, which would save small employers more than \$550 million over 2015 and 2016. It would also lower EI payroll taxes by 15%. This is real money that a small business could use to help defray the cost of hiring new workers and to take advantage of emerging economic opportunities supporting growth and job creation.

We have listened to the experts on small business. For example, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business estimates that our small business job credit would create 25,000 person years of employment over the next few years.

• (1530)

Monique Moreau, of the CFIB, said, "small businesses in Canada should be thrilled with this announcement...because they told us time and time again that payroll taxes like EI are the biggest disincentive to hiring."

Our Conservative government recognizes the fundamental importance of small businesses in fuelling the Canadian economy, so while the opposition insists on attacking job creators with massive tax hikes, we will continue to lower payroll taxes for 90% of businesses to support some of Canada's most important job creators.

However, that is not all. Today's legislation would build on our support for small businesses and entrepreneurs by reducing barriers to the international and domestic flow of goods and services. This measure in today's legislation would promote job creation and would improve the conditions of business investment.

Government Orders

Currently, Canada's framework for protecting intellectual property is not aligned with international practices, creating unnecessary costs for innovative businesses. Harmonizing Canada's intellectual property regime with international norms would help improve Canada's innovative businesses' access to international markets, lower costs, and draw foreign investment to Canada by reducing the regulatory burden and red tape faced by businesses. Economic action plan 2014 proposes to modernize Canada's intellectual property framework by ratifying or acceding to the following widely recognized international treaties: the Madrid protocol, the Singapore treaty, the Nice agreement, the patent law treaty, and the Hague agreement.

Bill C-43 would complete the required legislative amendments to the Patent Act, the Trade-marks Act, and the Industrial Design Act to align Canada's intellectual property framework with international practices. The benefits expected for Canadian businesses from these reforms are significant. For example, accession to the trademark treaties would make it possible for a company to obtain protection for trademarks in a number of countries through a single international application, filed in one language and in one currency with the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, thus cutting red tape and reducing paperwork and business costs.

Finally, we are implementing certain reforms to the temporary foreign worker program. Our message to employers has been clear and unequivocal: Canadians must always be first in line for available jobs. Our comprehensive and balanced reforms would restore the temporary foreign worker program to its original purpose as a short-term, last resort for employers when there are no qualified Canadians to fill available jobs.

Make no mistake about it, through these amendments in Bill C-43, we are making a comprehensive and balanced overhaul of the program. This clearly contrasts with the Liberals and the New Democrats, who have been completely incoherent about where they stand. While inundating our government with requests for foreign workers for their individual ridings, they are voting in favour of an expansive moratorium on the program. While they are demanding change to the program, they have voted against all our previous reforms to tighten access to the program and to crack down on abuse. These reforms would require that employers make greater efforts to recruit and train Canadians for jobs through initiatives like the Canada job grant.

Some of our temporary foreign worker program reforms include the following:

Employers seeking to hire high-wage TFWs would now be required to submit transition plans showing how they will be hiring more Canadians.

A new enhanced job-matching service would allow Canadians to apply directly, through the Canada job bank, for jobs that match their skills and experience. It would provide information to program officers reviewing an employer's labour market opinion impact assessment application on how many qualified Canadians have applied for specific jobs, meaning more and better labour market information.

There would be stronger enforcement and tougher penalties for abuse of the program through the expansion of the ability to publicly blacklist employers who have been suspended and are under investigation and those who have had an LMIA revoked and are banned from using the program. There would be improved information-sharing among departments and agencies involved in the oversight of the TFWP, including in provincial and territorial governments.

At the end of the day, this program should accomplish exactly what the name says. It would only be used to provide temporary help where clear and acute labour shortages exist and Canadians are not available.

● (1535)

Our government will always stand up for connecting Canadians with available jobs, and these measures allow us to do just that.

I could talk all day about the positive measures in the bill, so let me list a few more before my time runs out.

We are supporting families by doubling the children's fitness tax credit to \$1,000 and making it refundable. As we promised in our 2013 Speech from the Throne, we are ending the pay-to-pay billing practices of telecommunication service providers whereby subscribers are charged to receive bills in paper form. We are creating a national DNA-based missing persons index to assist law enforcement in investigations and to help bring closure to the families of missing persons through DNA matching. We are reducing the administrative burden on charities by allowing them to use modern electronic tools to raise funds. The list goes on.

While these measures are a sign of excellent progress, again, our work is not done. Our government will continue to ensure that our tax system is fair for everyone. We will continue to close loopholes, address aggressive tax planning, clarify tax rules, and crack down on international tax evasion and avoidance. In doing so, our government will also build on the responsible management that has kept taxes low for Canadian families and has kept Canada's net debt burden the lowest, by far, among the Group of Seven countries.

For those reasons, and many other measures in today's legislation that I have not mentioned, I urge all hon. members to accord the bill their full support.

● (1540)

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let me start my question with a comment about something good that is in this massive 460-page omnibus bill. I do not know if the word "omnibus" actually left the member's lips during that entire 20-minute speech, but it is huge and has very little to do with the actual budget itself.

Government Orders

The DNA data bank is an important thing that has been recognized by police forces and by victims' families for a number of years. New Democrats have been asking for this option. We are glad to see it here in the budget.

The member mentioned the temporary foreign worker program and somehow attempted to cast aspersions that it was someone else's creation, this monster that has been taking jobs from Canadians, and in effect suppressing wages for those Canadians who are able to find jobs.

The temporary foreign worker program began under the Liberals but exploded under the Conservative government. If the member is looking around for someone to blame, certainly he can at least acknowledge some level of ownership for the mistakes that were made.

In the budget bill, there are a number of changes to the temporary foreign worker program to increase monitoring, and as he said, crack down on those who abuse the program, so that the temporary foreign worker, in his words, should not be a first option for employers.

My question is simply this. The program has been around for years but has been expanded massively by the Conservatives. Why was it allowed to grow to this point where it was a first option for so many employers, where Canadians had to wait second and third in line behind temporary foreign workers? Why was there so little monitoring done of the program? It is only being introduced now, in 2014, only after it hit the news and only after it became such an abused and misused program.

Mr. Andrew Saxton: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite is absolutely correct in the sense that the temporary foreign worker program was introduced by the previous Liberal government. We are now taking important measures to reform that program to ensure that Canadians are given the first chance at available jobs and that the program continues to operate in the best interests of Canadians and our economy.

Over the past two years, we have made several reforms as part of the temporary foreign worker program review. Specifically, the government has already taken action to impose conditions on employers who hire foreign workers. They must do the following: demonstrate that they are meeting the conditions of hiring foreign workers, such as paying them proper wages and providing safe and healthy working conditions, consistent with Canadian standards; allow CIC and ESDC officials to conduct inspections of employers who hire foreign workers to ensure that they are meeting the conditions of employment; allow CIC to revoke or suspend the processing of work permits and ESDC to revoke, suspend, or refuse to process labour market impact assessments; and require employers requesting LMIA's to pay temporary foreign workers at the prevailing wage by removing the existing wage flexibility.

These are some of the measures we have brought in to reform the program.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister is being somewhat less than honest with respect to the role the current government has actually played with the temporary foreign worker program. This is a program that has provided great economic and social benefit for Canadians for many years. Yes, it was a Liberal prime minister who ultimately brought in the program,

but the program had been a huge success prior to the current government taking office. It is the current government that embellished, and in essence, put the program into a crisis situation.

If we go into the Prairies, or even into Atlantic Canada and other regions, we would find that there has been a great value to the program. It is the current government that has made a mess of the program. It has turned it into a crisis situation, and the Canadian economy is paying as a direct result of its incompetence.

My question for the minister is with respect to areas of the country where the temporary foreign worker program has proven to be very useful and necessary. I am sure if he did some work by going out and checking with some of those employers, maybe the government would recognize that there is some value to properly fixing the program to get it back on track so that the overall economy would be that much better.

This is a very specific question. Does the minister believe that the temporary foreign worker program has a valuable role to contribute to Canada's economy?

• (1545)

Mr. Andrew Saxton: Mr. Speaker, I understand why the member opposite is so defensive, because it did come into effect under his government, and, as we have seen, it did have significant problems.

Obviously, we do recognize the value of the temporary foreign worker program in its reformed state, which is why we are reforming it, and not getting rid of it. There are obviously regions in this country that rely upon it and it has helped out significantly in those regions. What we are doing now is ensuring that compliance is done appropriately and that the government has effective penalties and fines in place for those who chose to abuse the program.

Here are some more of the reforms that we have made to the program.

We will introduce fees for employers for the processing of LMIA's and increase the fees for work permits so that taxpayers are no longer subsidizing the cost of the program. We will ensure that employers who rely upon temporary foreign workers have a firm plan in place to transition to a Canadian workforce over the long term because too many businesses have, as part of their business models, relied on this program. We want to ensure there is a transition in place so that they can transition to a Canadian workforce over time. We are suspending the accelerated labour market opinion process, and we are prohibiting employers who request an LMIA from requesting a non-official language as a requirement of the job.

We think these are very important changes and reforms to the program. It will continue to be an important program, especially for those regions of the country that rely upon it.

Mr. Jamie Nicholls (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, NDP): Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, one of the members of the House said:

...in the interest of democracy I ask: How can members represent their constituents on these various areas when they are forced to vote in a block on such legislation and on such concerns?

We can agree with some of the measures but oppose others. How do we express our views and the views of our constituents when the matters are so diverse? Dividing the bill into several components would allow members to represent views of their constituents on each of the different components in the bill.

Government Orders

The Prime Minister believed that 20 years ago. Where has the Prime Minister been in the past 20 years to lose such faith in those fundamental values of democracy?

Mr. Andrew Saxton: Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite feels that he is being forced to vote en bloc, I suggest he take it up with the leader of his party.

I can tell him that this particular bill will be debated lively in the House. It will be debated in numerous committees of the House, as well. He will have his opportunity to discuss and debate the bill.

However, let me just tell members a few things.

First, Canadians expect their government to make decisions to take action on our commitments. That is what our government is doing in the House of Commons with BIA 2. We will continue to keep our commitment to Canadians by introducing and advancing important legislation, legislation such as supporting job creation and growing Canada's economy by introducing the new small business job credit, and by strengthening Canada's intellectual property regime to promote job creation and to improve conditions for business investment and access to international markets.

We are amending legislation to implement certain reforms to the temporary foreign worker program. We are making the tax system simpler and fairer for farming and fishing businesses. We are extending the existing tax credit for interest paid on government-sponsored student loans to interest paid on a Canada apprentice loan. Finally, we are also introducing new reporting standards to meet Canada's 2013 Group of Eight commitment to increase transparency for entities operating in the extractive sector.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, once again we are debating a mammoth bill.

Frankly, I think that Canadians are starting to get sick of seeing this government try to pass such controversial bills that are harmful to society. The government is raiding the employment insurance fund to create a program that will cost \$500 million to create 800 jobs.

Does the government think it has taken enough from the regions, or will it not be satisfied until the regions are completely crushed?

• (1550)

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Saxton: Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite would simply take the time to read the bill he would understand that we are not taking money out of anywhere. Rather, we are giving money back to those who are paying it. It is a payroll tax that is being reduced by 15%. That is \$550 million that stays in the pockets of employers and employees, the ones who are paying that money in the first place. We are simply allowing them to keep it in their pockets.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am trying to find a way to say that it is a pleasure to speak to this particular piece of legislation but it is not, simply because of what we have in front of us. The story that is best told about this mammoth bill, Bill C-43, is the story of the good, the bad and the ugly.

Let me start with the good because it is the shortest section. In here, we have the government seeking to go halfway with respect to some consumer protection. New Democrats have been fighting for years to protect consumers from businesses that operate in hat we believe is an unethical way. We think that is the proper role of government. The Conservatives agreed in part.

Pay to pay, a term that was coined in an NDP office in Toronto, is a concept that Canadians should not have to pay to receive their bills. It is adding a little insult to injury. The Conservatives said, yes, certainly with the telecommunications companies, with which they have a particular fight, and certainly for some of the broadcasting companies, with which they also have a dispute right now. Those will be banned. Pay to pay will not be allowed there by law. However, the banks are a special case for the Conservatives and the Prime Minister. It seem the banks do not earn enough money to have to do away with this unfair practice to their customers, so banking consumers will continue to pay to receive their own bills in the mail.

A second piece that is a good and important piece, which has nothing to do with the budget but here it is in the budget bill, is the establishment of a DNA bank for missing and in some cases murdered Canadians. This is also something the NDP has long believed in, after listening to victims groups and police associations that said this was important. We are happy to see progress there.

Now let us move to the bad, because in the 460 pages that are in this massive bill, most of it is bad. Certainly at the very best it is completely unassociated to anything that we would know as a budget. There are 460 pages with 401 clauses changing dozens of laws in the stroke of a pen. When we vote on the bill it will be a six-to seven-minute process and all of a sudden all of these laws, as has been the case before, will be changed all at once.

What is remarkable about this failed process from the Conservatives is that in this massive omnibus bill are a number of changes to fix mistakes in the last omnibus bill, which fixed mistakes from the previous omnibus bill. If the Conservatives consider this competent governance I would hate to see what they think is incompetent because all this does is make up for the arrogant mistakes that get made time and time again by the government. It says rather than debate any of these individual pieces of legislation, among the dozens, at separate times so that we could hear from witnesses who know what they are talking about and so that MPs could vote freely and fairly with their conscience on each aspect, the Conservatives do this kitchen sink approach.

Government Orders

It is a Trojan horse. Buried within the bill are so many concepts, and some of them at odds with each other, that when we had the briefing last night with government officials they needed to roll in dozens and dozens of civil servants to address all the different parts of Canadian law that would be changed by the bill. I had a great deal of sympathy for these folks. They drag them in here and we sit until eleven, twelve, one o'clock in the morning for these things. The officials get up to the front of the room for their six minutes to address one section out of this massive bill and then go home. I am sure they are salaried and not getting overtime for this hassle the government continues to put them through.

The mistakes that continue to be made by doing legislation by bulldozer is a problem for the government. It is a problem for the Canadian people. My colleague just read a quote from the right hon. Prime Minister from when Conservatives used to occupy these benches. We have quotes from the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Industry and virtually every senior Conservative in cabinet who was at one point in opposition and hated this process when the Liberals did it.

When the Liberals used omnibus bills to ram through legislation, the Conservatives talked about the conscience of Parliament, the inability of MPs to represent their constituents properly and fairly and how this was an abuse of the democratic process.

We agreed with them when they had that conscience. Now, it is the same old story because they picked up some of the worst habits from my Liberal colleagues, and these omnibus bills have grown massively over time. Now we have hundreds and hundreds of pages of legislation being rammed through Parliament with little oversight, affecting virtually hundreds of Canadian laws. They are changing everything from the nuclear act to public safety and Canada's medical act. It goes on and on.

• (1555)

However, what is not in the bill is important. What is in a bill is sometimes very critical. What is not in this so-called budget implement bill is greatly worrisome for me and I believe for the Canadian economy. Taken in the current context, with virtually no private sector growth at all over the last 18 months, the private sector is not creating jobs. We have personal debt rates in this country that are the highest in our history, dramatically higher than any generation has seen before.

We have youth unemployment that is twice the national average and persists from the worst moments of the recession. For young people getting into the economy, getting that first job, which we know is critical for them to become productive and effective members of society, that first job is the most important step.

Youth, as they are coming out of school, training and university, if they are not able to find work, the statistics consistently show us that they will find whatever work they possibly can, and it is usually not in the field for which they trained.

We say we have a skills shortage in this country and in parts of this country we do. However, what we desperately have is an experience shortage. Young people are not getting the apprenticeships, not getting the training and not getting into the jobs for which they were educated.

When we have a youth unemployment rate nearing 14%, and that is not capturing the full rate of unemployment, that should be a problem for any government. This persists. This lasts longer than that one single year. We have also seen 1.3 million Canadians who are unemployed.

I am reminded by the sounds coming from the gallery of something else that is not in this bill. There is no affordable child care in this bill. We know statistically, because we now have evidence from Quebec, and it is proposed by the NDP, that affordable child care is one of the best things that can be done for the economy, never mind for families, never mind for single moms looking for options, and never mind for those families that are struggling to just pay the bills.

When considering having kids, one of the largest factors that comes into play is whether a family can afford it or not. We hear of daycare rates of \$2,100 per child per month in places like Vancouver and Toronto. What single mom can afford that? What couple can afford that? We see rents and the cost of living continually going up.

We have suggested to the government that this is an ideal opportunity to increase women's participation in the workforce, as has been evidenced in Quebec, and to increase the fertility rate of this country. As we know, we have a stalled and declining fertility rate or replacement rate in this country. We have seen a baby boom in Quebec.

I thought Conservatives were focused on family and interested in what happens with family affairs. I guess not so much when it comes to actually providing help for those families.

We have seen the loss of 400,000 good-paying manufacturing jobs just since the Conservatives have taken power that have not come back. According to the Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters Association, 700,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost in the last decade that have not been replaced. The trend is continuing.

There are actual aspects of this bill that we believe offer less scrutiny for foreign takeovers of Canadian companies, a back door process, to allow even less oversight of foreign companies taking over Canadian assets. We know the experience. We have the list of promises made when Canadian firms are taken over. The government just does not even bat an eye. It is a problem for Canadians and it should be a problem for the government.

We see, from the Toronto-Dominion Bank, the serious concern of long-term unemployment. We see time and again that if long-term unemployment persists, it has a huge and important effect on our economy, and there is nothing in here.

We heard from those same lobby groups the Conservatives like to quote all the time, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, and average ordinary everyday people who have businesses. They say that merchant fees, credit card fees, are too high, and that the influx of new credit cards that consumers enjoy is hurting those small and medium-sized businesses.

Government Orders

From Restaurants Canada, we heard that the profit made by restaurants on certain meals, if paid for by certain credit cards, is less than the fees they have to pay to the credit card company. They have to pay fees on the tips that are given to their employees and it comes directly out of the owner's pocket.

If the Conservatives were actually interested in doing something to help small businesses, this would be a good place to start. It hits them and helps them right in the bottom line right away.

However, these are two competing interests. Let us see who wins out, the small businesses of Canada or the large banks and credit card companies. Looking through these 460 pages, the banks and credit card companies win yet again, as they did under the previous Liberal regime.

• (1600)

Let us get into some of the other global concerns. We see a weakening in China. The EU is in trouble again. Paying \$80 for a barrel of oil should be a concern as the Alberta government is now publicly saying that its budget estimates were based on \$93 a barrel. We are asking the government what its estimates are based on because we know how critical the price of oil is as it relates to how much revenue the federal government is able to receive. As one economist said to the finance committee, if oil stays at or below \$80 a barrel and we are losing upward of \$4 billion a year, there is no accounting for that at all.

There is no Conservative budget here. Very expensive promises are about to be made, like income splitting, that will cost the taxpayer upward of \$5 billion just as we remain in a flat and fragile Canadian economy with very little private sector job growth, with a global economy that remains uncertain and with oil prices that have dropped off dramatically. The Conservatives do not seem to acknowledge any of this and yet they call themselves managers of the economy. How could that possibly be?

Let us look at the one job scheme that the government has placed in this legislation. I say scheme purposely because there is nothing else to call this thing. We asked officials last night to give us the evidence that supports any of the claims that the Minister of Finance makes. One would think that if the finance minister and his department had run the numbers and found that the government's half a billion dollar employment scheme would create a lot of jobs in Canada, they would be more than happy to produce the numbers and give us the evidence. They told us that was all advice to the minister and it was protected by confidentiality.

As if ripping off the employment insurance scheme for \$550 million was not the business of the people who paid into it, the employers and employees. As if slipping a bit of advice to the minister was somehow to protect those people from knowing what was happening to the employment insurance fund they paid into.

It is not the government's money. The Conservative member from Toronto who sits on the finance committee said that very thing just this week to a witness. This is not the government's money. Why does the government, as previous Liberal governments, treat it otherwise, as some sort of slush fund that it can use for its pet projects?

The only true analysis we have seen of this scheme so far has been from the Parliamentary Budget Officer, who has a good record when it comes to analyzing Conservative costs. We remember the whole Afghanistan cost, which the Conservatives denied.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has to routinely go to court just to get data from the government, which is ironic and tragic considering it was the Conservatives who created the position of Parliamentary Budget Officer in the first place. He spends half his time in court trying to drag the numbers and the data from the government, so that he can do what he was mandated to do. Why spend the money on this office? Why create the office through legislation in the first place if it is going to be starved of information and denied its right to do its honest and good work?

The PBO did study this employment insurance scheme and found a couple of extremely worrisome discrepancies. One is the perverse incentive regarding employers that sit right around the threshold line as designed in this plan, that are just above the EI contributions of \$15,000. They would have a \$2,200 incentive to drop below that line. How do they drop below that line? They will have to fire somebody. They would have a \$200 incentive to hire somebody that might put them above the line.

Let me do the quick math for my Conservative colleagues: a \$200 incentive to hire somebody and a \$2,200 incentive for those same small and medium-sized businesses to fire somebody. We hope they will not do that. Most small and medium-sized business owners have a good conscience and want to help create jobs. Why, for heaven's sake, would a government create a program that would give them the incentive to do the opposite while taking from the EI fund to do it?

The Parliamentary Budget Officer also ran the numbers on this and found that the \$550 million scheme would create upward of 800 jobs. Wow. That is \$550 million in employment insurance contributions out, 800 jobs into the economy. When that number is broken down, as the Parliamentary Budget Officer did publicly and transparently for everyone, that works out to \$550,000 for every new job created.

I have emails sitting in my inbox and posted on my Facebook page from Canadians saying they want one of those jobs. They want to know how to apply for one of these fancy EI scheme jobs if they are going to be given half a billion dollars. My goodness. Who came up with this thing?

• (1605)

How bad could it possibly be for the Conservatives that they have to grab and desperately search for job creation plans that cost half a million dollars or more per job? My gosh, they have to do better than this. I guess 8, 9, 10 years in, they have completely run out of ideas.

Government Orders

As Churchill once said about anything he would like to change about all his time in government, he said, "Circumstance". He wished that he could have changed the circumstance.

However, the circumstance and reality for the current Conservative government is that our economy continues to struggle from the depths of the recession. The Conservatives cannot have 18 months of virtually no private sector job growth and be satisfied as a government. How can that possibly be true? I would love for the Conservatives to get up and deny that reality. Where does that number come from? It comes from Statistics Canada, the government's own reporting agency.

Let us look at another aspect of this so-called budget bill. Refugee claimants are clearly a concern of the government because it has to crack down on the billions of dollars going to refugees. Oh wait, the changes the Conservatives would make do not affect the federal treasury at all.

What would the changes do? They would affect real people's lives, and those claiming and seeking refugee asylum status in Canada will be denied, through the provinces, which would be enabled by the the bill before us, to receive social assistance.

This is coming after the most recent experience of the Conservative government denying refugees medical service and protection, which a Federal Court judge said was cruel and unusual punishment. Members do not have to take my word for it, they can listen to the judge who, when faced with this case, this absolute atrocity of legislation and policy coming from the government, said that any government that does this to anybody is performing something that is cruel and unusual.

Rather than back up that particular train, the Conservatives decided to double down and say that clearly the refugee claimants are making so much money and living so well that we need to deny them, and we will help the provinces deny them.

We then asked, "Which provinces asked for this measure? Which refugee claimant groups asked for this?" The best we got from the government was that it notified the Ontario government of the changes.

Would members like to know what the Ontario government's official policy is on denying refugee claimants social assistance? It is against it. Therefore, the one province the Conservatives even mentioned this to said not to do it, but here we have it.

The Conservatives, on some ideological rant, some xenophobic policy, meant to attack some perceived enemy, some problem that does not exist. They say that their government cares about people. How dare they. How shameful for them to put this in the middle of an omnibus bill and say that it is about the economy.

The Conservatives go to Canadians and say that they are working for them, yet the first thing they are going to do is go after those refugee claimants because obviously people who are seeking refugee status in Canada have been living so well and have had such a good experience in life that they have decided to seek refugee status here.

Where is that compassionate conservatism? Where are those Canadian values that say we are a place that welcomes the world as

we have welcomed millions over the years? This strikes at the very core of our values and the Conservative have gotten it wrong.

What possible solutions do the Conservatives have?

Well, let us start with one of them. The Prime Minister, in a rare appearance at the UN, did not talk about climate change or activities of peace around the world, but about his program on maternal health, which is a good and decent program. He said that an important thing about the program is that the government is going to measure it because "You can't manage what you can't measure."

Well, guess what? We do not have good statistics to measure what is going on in the labour force in Canada. The Conservatives have denied gathering census data, which all the economists, banks and credit unions say is an atrocity and a bad way to run a government.

This is a story of the good, the bad and the ugly. It is a story of a government that has absolutely gotten it wrong yet again. It is a failed opportunity to actually help Canadians and our economy.

I move, seconded by the member for Laval:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:

this House decline to give second reading to Bill C-43, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 11, 2014 and other measures, because it:

- a) amends dozens of unrelated Acts without adequate parliamentary debate and oversight;
- b) fails to address persistent unemployment and sluggish economic growth;
- c) aims to strip refugee claimants of access to social assistance to meet their basic needs;
- d) imposes a poorly designed job credit that will create few, if any, jobs while depleting Employment Insurance Funds; and
- e) breaks the government's promises to protect small businesses from merchant fees and to ban banks from charging pay-to-pay fees.

● (1610)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The amendment is in order.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Winnipeg North.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up on an area with which I know the member is somewhat familiar. It is an area that is really important to all Canadians, even though there is no real mention of it within this budget bill. That is the issue of the infrastructure expenditures. The government has cut actual spending, estimated to be between 80% to 90%, for this year in anticipation that possibly in the next year, the election year cycle, we might see some substantial increases.

The real concern is that the infrastructure is so vitally important. We have seen this in some of the municipal elections that have taken place. We talked about Toronto yesterday and the city of Winnipeg a week prior. Different council members, mayoral candidates, and others talking about the need for infrastructure. This is at a time when the federal government has not seen fit to recognize it within this bill or within its overall budget. This is important to the Canadian economy. Investing in the infrastructure not only helps create direct jobs, but also indirect jobs, and adds so much more value to the Canadian economy.

Government Orders

Would the member comment on the importance of infrastructure and why it would have been good to have had it incorporated into the bill?

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have essentially back loaded all of their infrastructure promises. They announce a large, long-term number with 90% of it coming in the 9th and 10th year, and 4% or 5% of it coming in the first year. Then they say that the number is really large and that they are investing more than ever. We just have to read the fine print when it comes to Conservative promises.

The challenge is this. One example is that the Conservatives handed down new water regulations to the cities last year. The FCM estimates that the cost to meet the new federal standards is somewhere in the order of \$18 billion. One would have assumed that the federal government knew this when handing down these new requirements for cities to achieve and that it would also have handed down maybe something like money to help the cities meet the \$18 billion gap, because cities are able to tax the lowest. They have not.

We also know that gridlock is one of the largest drags on the Canadian economy right now, simply getting from A to B, that is both people getting to work and getting products to market, and we see a government that has turned itself away completely. There is no infrastructure mentioned in the budget at all. My friend is right.

We need to have something balanced and we have to work with the cities as opposed to working against them, or as opposed to in isolation from them, which seems to be more and more often the case of a government that has become used to doing things its way and not the right way.

• (1615)

Mr. Jamie Nicholls (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if we had implemented smart growth policies 20 years ago, we would be in a much different situation with infrastructure.

Facing a lack of rational economic policy from the other side, I would like to engage in a visioning exercise with my friend from Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

The member knows that global competitiveness is being harmed in Canada. Countries which are succeeding, such as Switzerland, Finland, Sweden, all have robust cradle-to-grave programs from compassionate governments, and it pays economically.

If we look at Finland, which has had universal access to quality child care since 1990 and pre-school since 1996, the outcomes that have been tested and measured in Finland show it is more competitive globally as a whole society.

Finland's head of international relations for Helsinki's education department says that it is not a place where people dump their children when they are working. It is a place for their children to play, learn and make friends. Good parents put their children in daycare. It is not related to socio-economic status.

Could my friend from Skeena—Bulkley Valley elaborate on the vision the NDP has in place of this imagined—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting thing. Some watching may wonder why there is a question about child care on a speech about the economy and the budget. However, everyone who has studied the aspects of affordable child care knows that the impacts can be enormous for the economy. It represents, much like infrastructure spending, a true investment. We throw the term “investment” around here all the time, but we know that some things are investments and some things are not. Investing in affordable, good child care is a smart thing to do, both on the social side and the economic side.

We see other G7 and OECD countries struggling to increase worker participation in the economy, spending tens of billions of dollars to help people get into that economy because productivity is so low. Canada has struggled with productivity for years now, and one would argue generations. There is a great deal of evidence, and this is not coming from one sector of economists, left, progressive or conservative but across the board, showing that to help families out directly is an effective way for government to invest in the economy. This is not with some token \$100 cheque that comes once a month, which gets taxed, and pretending that is a child care strategy, but a real child care plan. We have working models from which to borrow. We can look to Quebec and understand what the benefits have been to it as a society and its economy. The government gets back more than it puts in. That is a good investment for me.

Perhaps the Conservatives believe in some other world view. That is obviously the case.

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague is a fellow member of the finance committee. A range of witnesses who came before that committee, from the Canadian Labour Congress to the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, said that we had an unprecedented opportunity to invest in infrastructure. We have a record low of bond yields and real interest rates are negative. It is an opportunity to invest in fixing Canada's crumbling infrastructure.

Does the member agree that we have a significant opportunity and that our pension funds, such as OMERS, teachers' and CPPIB, could be very important partners in progress in fixing Canada's infrastructure? Our pension funds are building infrastructure around the world. We probably have the greatest concentration of expertise in the design, financing and construction of infrastructure in the world resident in Canada. Does the member agree that we should be engaging those pension funds in Canada to fix our infrastructure?

Government Orders

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Mr. Speaker, the analogy of a household is often used by Conservatives when talking about the economy, that we have to manage ourselves like a household would. If our house were falling down, if we did not have enough food in the fridge, if our parents said that whatever we did we had to pay off the mortgage today or next month and that it did not matter if the roof leaked and the kids did not have shoes on their feet, that would be a bit of a drastic economic model.

When bank economists come to us and when the world view is predominated by the idea of incredibly low interest rates, it seems like an opportunity to invest in infrastructure now rather than at some point later when interest rates rise. That investment could lead to a more productive economy and could help our completely stagnant private growth sector rate. We know productivity is directly connected to our ability to move around the country. As my friend has said, there are willing and incredibly competent fund managers who know what they are doing because they are building things around the world and they are doing it well. However, it runs up against an ideology that has its eyes transfixed on an election promise, such as income splitting. The government would rather spend \$5 billion helping out a little less than 16% of Canadians who are predominately wealthier, leaving 86% of Canadians with nothing. It would rather fixate on this ideological promise rather than address the reality in front of it.

This is the demise of every government. It seems that over time its ability to listen and learn from what it hears is replaced increasingly by its idea that it always has it right, that it cannot listen to anybody else, that everybody is an opponent who needs to be beaten down rather than a conversation that needs to happen in a place like this, on the floor of the House of Commons and at the finance committee, where we to listen to experts and we talk about what the options are going ahead. Investing in child care is important. Having a living wage is something that is worthwhile to our economy. It helps small and medium businesses because those people spend money locally. We know that and a living wage makes sense.

In large part, I agree with what my friend has to say. It is about time the Conservatives drop the ideological mantra of their fixations and pet projects and actually pick up the evidence in front of us and realize that this our economy needs a little help right now. Otherwise, future generations will certainly curse our actions of today.

• (1620)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, The Environment; and the hon. member for Beauport—Limoilou, The Environment.

[*English*]

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to speak to the latest Conservative omnibus bill. This bill is a product of a tired, old Conservative government that has lost touch with the challenges and opportunities of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Bill C-43 is overflowing with changes that have no place in a budget bill, such as the petty change the Conservatives want to make to deny refugee claimants access to social assistance.

[*English*]

The Conservatives are actually using Bill C-43 in an effort to deny income support to refugee claimants, right after their attempt to limit refugee claimants' access to health care was struck down by the Federal Court. The court called that Conservative policy “cruel and unusual treatment” that “outrages (Canadians') standards of decency.”

A recent editorial in *The Globe and Mail* called this bill “an abuse of process and shown contempt for Parliament by subverting its role”. The *Globe* is right. It is anti-democratic for the Conservatives to once again use a massive omnibus budget bill to limit debate and ram through so many unrelated measures in Parliament.

In the last few years, the Conservatives have concocted and implemented a process that prevents MPs from all parties from doing their jobs in properly scrutinizing legislation. This is leading to a lot of sloppy mistakes. The Conservatives' general disdain for Canada's democratic institutions and their outright contempt for Parliament have led to countless errors being cemented into Canadian law.

This bill would try to fix a number of previous Conservative mistakes. I would like to give members a few examples of areas where the Conservatives are trying to use this omnibus bill to fix errors in previous bills.

First, the Conservatives forgot to include a tax credit in the last omnibus budget bill, Bill C-31, for interest paid on Canada apprentice loans. The Conservatives try to fix that in clause 35 of Bill C-43.

• (1625)

[*Translation*]

The second is that the government forgot to ensure that PRPPs are subject to similar GST treatment as RRSPs. The fix for that is found in part 2 of Bill C-43.

[*English*]

Third, they forgot to include a refund in Bill C-31 for duties paid on destroyed tobacco products. That correction is in Bill C-43, part 3.

Fourth, they forgot to change a legal heading when the Conservatives used Bill C-19 to transfer spending powers from the Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. The Conservatives gave all of the powers in that section of the law to the immigration minister, but still named the section “Minister of Foreign Affairs”.

Fifth, they forgot in Bill C-38 to allow the Minister of Industry to publicly disclose certain information regarding the review process.

Government Orders

Sixth, they forgot in Bill C-31 to include foreign money services businesses as foreign entities under the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act.

Seventh, they ignored expert advice and capped the size of the Social Security Tribunal in Bill C-38, leading to massive backlogs in the system.

Eighth, they failed to realize in Bill C-4 that the amalgamation of the Blue Water Bridge Authority might not go as planned.

Ninth, they created confusion in Bill C-4 with various amendments related to public service labour, including a reference to the wrong clause number.

Tenth, they forgot in Bill C-45 to coordinate between RCMP pension rule changes in Bill C-42 and rule changes that raised the age for public service pensions in Bill C-45.

[*Translation*]

There are 10 examples of the the mistakes the Conservatives made in the previous bill that they are trying to fix in this omnibus bill.

[*English*]

The fact is that the Conservatives' game plan of limiting debate and ramming these bills through Parliaments is responsible for creating these mistakes. Parliament is denied its legitimate role to identify these flaws in the process of real parliamentary debate at committee and in the House and fixing them.

The reason these mistakes are made in the first place is because of the deeply flawed process surrounding omnibus legislation.

I would like to talk a bit today about tax policy, GST, EI, and the income-splitting proposal that the Conservatives had in their last platform.

Bill C-43 actually adds GST to some goods and services that are used by or provided by non-profit organizations operating health care facilities. When we asked officials for an example of what kinds of service might get caught up in this GST hike, the example they provided was of a health care facility that also runs a residential apartment building, such as an old age home. Adding GST to services purchased by or provided by old age homes means one of two things: either it will cut into the bottom line of the health care facility, or the old age home will have no choice but to pass the tax hike on to the people they serve. In the case of an old age home, it means that the government is getting ready to hike the GST and punish Canadian seniors, who are already struggling to get by on a fixed income.

In terms of employment insurance, Bill C-43 also gets it wrong. Bill C-43 offers a small EI tax cut to employers, but only if they agree to stay small. Instead of creating real jobs and growth, Bill C-43 would actually encourage businesses to stay small and would punish them if they grow and become more successful. Due to a design flaw in Bill C-43, the so-called small business job credit creates an incentive for some businesses to fire workers. That is why economist Jack Mintz has called it "a disincentive to growth" and why economist Mike Moffatt said "...the proposed 'Small Business

Job Credit' has major structural flaws that, in many cases, give firms an incentive to fire workers and cut salaries."

Even Finance Canada officials last night acknowledged that this tax credit creates a disincentive for some employers to hire.

Last month the PBO looked at this tax credit and found that it will only create 800 jobs over the next two years, at a cost of \$550 million. That means it will cost taxpayers almost \$700,000 per job.

In response to the need to encourage businesses to hire and to reduce EI premiums for businesses that do that or reward businesses that hire, the Liberals have proposed an EI holiday for new hires. This plan would only reward businesses that actually create jobs. The Liberal plan has been endorsed by Canadian job creators, including the Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters, which has said that the Liberal plan for an EI exemption for new hires "would create jobs". The Restaurants Canada organization, representing restaurants across the country, said "This...proposal for an EI exemption for new hires would help restaurants create jobs." The CFIB said it loves the Liberal plan to exempt small business from EI premiums for new hires, which has lots of job potential.

The same PBO report that looked at the Conservatives' tax credit and identified the flawed program that would cost \$700,000 per job also identified that the Conservatives are collecting billions of dollars in excess of taxes in EI over the next two years and that the Conservatives actually have the capacity to cut EI premiums significantly.

The PBO estimates that artificially high EI rates under the Conservatives will cost the Canadian economy 10,000 jobs over the next two years. That is 10,000 more Canadians who will be out of work over the next two years because the Conservatives are using artificially high EI premiums to pad the books to fund pre-election spending. The Conservatives are ignoring the evidence and putting Conservative politics ahead of the Canadian economy and ahead of the interests of Canadian workers and employers.

Speaking of ignoring the evidence, the Conservatives appear ready to go ahead with their flawed income-splitting scheme that was introduced in their last platform. The idea that the Conservatives were putting forth in their last platform has been panned by everyone from the C.D. Howe Institute and the Canadian Taxpayers Federation to the Mowat Centre and the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. It was even panned by the late Jim Flaherty himself.

Government Orders

•(1630)

It is being panned because, as articulated in their platform, fewer than 15% of Canadian households would benefit, most of them high-income households, at a cost of \$3 billion per year to the federal treasury and another \$2 billion per year to provincial governments. Provincial governments, as we know, are facing deficits and huge fiscal challenges.

Under the Conservatives' scheme, the Prime Minister, earning \$320,000 a year and with a stay-at-home spouse, would save about \$6,500 per year. Meanwhile, a Canadian earning the average industrial wage and with a stay-at-home spouse would save less than \$10 per week, and most households would get no benefit whatsoever.

We have a different approach. The Liberal approach is that we need to build a plan for 2015 that would be focused on creating jobs and growth to strengthen the Canadian middle class. The status quo is not working. The current federal government is so preoccupied with day-to-day politics that it has lost track of and is out of touch with the challenges and opportunities facing Canadian families. Those are challenges such as aging demographics and a slow-growth economy, which some refer to as secular stagnation. Baby boomers are rapidly approaching retirement age, and as they exit the workforce, they will leave a shrinking tax base and labour shortages in their wake. They will also place a greater strain on health care systems as they age. We will end up with more Canadians using the social safety net and fewer Canadians paying into it. These demographic pressures are leading economists to predict that slow economic growth could become the new normal.

The Canadian economy, frankly, is already sputtering under the Conservatives. Job growth over the last two years has been extremely weak, consumer debt is high, infrastructure is in disrepair, and housing prices in our cities are inflated. Last year the Canadian economy created a paltry 5,300 net new full-time jobs across the country. The percentage of Canadians working today is still two full points lower than before the downturn. There are 200,000 more jobless Canadians today than before the downturn, and the number of Canadians who are considered long-term unemployed is twice that of 2008. More than 150,000 Canadians are unemployed and have been searching for work for a year or longer. As we all know, the longer they are out of the workforce, the harder it is for them to get back in.

On the other end of the spectrum, we have young Canadians who simply cannot get their foot in the door of the Canadian labour market. Recent grads are facing huge challenges. There are 200,000 fewer jobs for young Canadians today than before the downturn, before 2008. Persistently high youth unemployment and under-employment is robbing a generation of people of opportunities they need to succeed. TD economist Craig Alexander and CIBC economist Benjamin Tal describe a scenario of a lost generation of Canadian youth and a lost generation of potential for all Canadians.

This is despite the fact that this generation is the most technologically adept, most educated generation in our nation's history, and therein lies the challenge we face. There is a gap between the education they have and the job market. We have people without jobs and jobs without people.

Too many Canadians in their twenties are left saddled with big student loans and are unable to make ends meet. All too often, it is their middle-class parents and grandparents who are footing the bill. Among the hardest hit are Canadians who are actually squeezed between helping their adult children pay the bills and taking care of their aging parents at the same time, the sandwich generation. In many cases these parents in their forties, fifties, and sixties are taking on additional debt or dipping into their retirement savings. In fact, this is one of the things that is driving record levels of personal debt, which is about \$1.65 for every dollar of annual income. According to the Canadian Financial Monitor, Canadians who are 55 years of age or older are two and a half times more likely to refinance their mortgage if they have children than if they do not have children. Their average household debt is twice that of their childless peers.

•(1635)

Meanwhile, many younger families do not actually have a mortgage to refinance. Instead, they are being priced out of the housing market altogether.

On this front, the Conservative government must share at least part of the blame for the high housing prices in Canada and commensurate personal debt. It was the Conservative government, in budget 2006, that brought in 40-year mortgages with no down payment. It introduced them for the first time in Canada. It had an effect, because in the first half of 2008, more than half of all new mortgages in Canada were 40-year mortgages, and 10% of those had zero down payment.

The Conservatives shifted Canada's borrowing culture and lending culture, and that shift has helped fuel record levels of housing prices commensurate with that household debt. They have since reversed course and returned to the norm that was the case under Liberal governments in the past, meaning 25-year mortgages with at least 5% down. However, it is important to recognize the Conservatives' culpability in bringing 40-year mortgages with no down payments into Canada and helping fuel record levels of personal debt related to skyrocketing housing prices.

From the OECD and the IMF to the Bank of Canada, one thing on which Canadian and international economists agree is that elevated housing prices and household debt pose a big domestic threat to our economy. These elevated housing prices have helped widen the generational divide between those on the one hand who have watched the value of their house appreciate and in some cases have tapped into that equity to help fund consumption, and those on the other hand who cannot afford to even enter the housing market.

Government Orders

We are seeing greater income inequality in Canada, and fewer Canadians now think of themselves as being middle class. In fact, the number of Canadians who self-identify as middle class has dropped from 64% in 2009 to 47% in 2014. Even more troubling is that for the first time in recent history, more Canadians now believe that the next generation, their children and grandchildren, will be worse off, not better off, than they are today. That is the first time this has happened in Canada.

What we need is a federal government that will rise to meet these big challenges facing our country: aging demographics, slow growth, soft job market, and high levels of youth unemployment and underemployment. These are all challenges, but they also represent opportunities. I will give one specific challenge to our country that is a big social and economic challenge but that also represents an opportunity if we can get it right.

Over the next 10 years, there will be about 400,000 young aboriginal and first nation Canadians who will be of workforce age. If they have the skills they need for the jobs of today, that would be really good for our economy. If they do not, it represents a demographic, economic, and social time bomb for our country.

The reality is that we have failed collectively as governments at all levels to address this challenge. If we take it seriously, young aboriginal workers can be part of a Canadian growth and economic success story. We have to get it right. We have to take these issues seriously.

Liberals believe that sustainable growth and a focus on creating jobs, growth, and opportunities is the best way to benefit Canadian middle-class families and to restore hope to them. We believe we need to invest in infrastructure, training, innovation, and trade, and we believe that we need to keep our competitive tax rates.

Bill C-43 does nothing to grow the Canadian economy, and it ignores the very real challenges of the middle class and of young Canadians.

In a very short period of time, potentially within days, we will be seeing a fall economic statement. We hope the government chooses to invest in the future by investing in infrastructure, in training, and in young Canadians. We need the government to do so, and if this government does not, a future Liberal government will.

• (1640)

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I was reminded by a colleague, just recently, it is the 30-year anniversary of the Thrilla in Manila, the fight between Ali and Frazier—

Mr. Charlie Angus: The Rumble in the Jungle.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: The Rumble in the Jungle, excuse me.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Foreman.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I will get it right. I got my year wrong. Against Foreman, there was a technique used by Ali that was later called rope-a-dope. I do not think he fixed the fight but the rope-a-dope idea is to just sort of lay back and let the opponents swing wildly away, burning themselves out.

While that is an amusing pugilistic tactic, what we are worried about in this particular budget is that if the government continues to

swing wildly away with these very expensive schemes, the effect would not only be burning through a great deal of actual capital, and real and perceived political capital, but it would hurt Canadians in the long term.

What we have heard from small businesses and the business community at large is that merchant fees, in particular, are a grave concern, that restaurants and small businesses across the country are getting hit with higher and higher fees when customers use these credit cards, and that there is a voluntary but useless program that has been invoked by the Conservative government.

Would my friend join with me in suggesting that we need to begin to have mandatory rules set out for credit card companies and banks to restrict these abusive practices that hurt small—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Order, please. The hon. member for Kings—Hants.

Hon. Scott Brison: Mr. Speaker, my colleague is right. The voluntary approach has not worked. When we talk to the restaurant association or the retailers or the CFIB, they acknowledge that more needs to be done. Some of them point us toward the Australian model and potentially capping rates.

Just to show how perverse the current system is, if a person goes into a store in Windsor, Nova Scotia, and buys a pair of shoes with a credit card, the merchant can be dinged with a 3% charge upon the sale of those shoes. The person takes the shoes home, finds out his spouse does not like them, brings them back and exchanges them. There is another 3% charge for the merchant. The merchant has been hit by a 6% charge and has not sold a pair of shoes yet. That is one of the best ways to illustrate how ludicrous the current situation is and how important addressing it is for the engine of Canadian economic growth: small business.

A mandatory approach may be the best way, but ignoring it with a voluntary approach certainly has not worked.

• (1645)

Mr. Massimo Pacetti (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for a good speech. I know he only had a 20-minute opportunity to speak.

He talked about the lack of infrastructure investment the government has made and continues to make. In his conversations during the pre-budget consultations, did he consult his own mayors and the premier in his own province? What is their input? What are the discussions involving infrastructure?

Every time I talk to a local mayor or a local politician or somebody at the provincial level, it is always about lack of infrastructure. Whether it is in my province of Quebec or not, I hear that the Canadian government is not in partnership in any projects and that it is reducing investments in programs.

I wonder what the member thinks about the lack of money in infrastructure.

Hon. Scott Brison: Mr. Speaker, when I spoke recently with Mayor David Corkum, the mayor of Kentville in my riding, he stressed the need for infrastructure investment. He also stressed the need for us to take investing in social infrastructure, such as housing, seriously.

Government Orders

There is a strong role for the federal government. This is certainly not the time for the federal government to cut by 89% planned infrastructure spending for next year. It is doing that, again, to pad the books on the eve of an election. It may be good politics. It is bad economics.

The reality is that, if we listen to David Dodge or the OECD or the IMF, with bond yields at historic lows, with real interest rates actually negative, we have an historic opportunity to invest in Canadian infrastructure, to create jobs today and to improve Canada's competitiveness tomorrow. We heard that from the former deputy minister of finance yesterday, Scott Clark, at committee.

Beyond that, we have the greatest concentration of expertise in the design, construction, and financing of infrastructure in the world resident in Canada in our pension funds. Let us work with them to invest in fixing Canada's infrastructure and create good jobs here in Canada.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Mr. Speaker, there was some debate before my colleague spoke about the changes to the temporary foreign worker program that exist within this omnibus bill. The reason I raise it is that there has been some dispute as to whose fault this all is between my Liberal and Conservative colleagues.

It was a program started by the Liberals some years ago. It was somewhat limited. It started to grow a little. There were some scandals with its use and application for professional dancers, exotic dancers, at one point under the Liberals that got some attention, if I recall correctly. Then the program was expanded massively under the Conservatives.

My question is from the briefing we had last night and from the speech earlier that said the new changes will make it so that the temporary foreign worker program is not a first option program for Canadian employers. There were some other revisions as well, a reporting mechanism, an outing and naming of those employers who chose to abuse the program.

It is not as if these concerns are new. We had concerns, particularly across the west but also in other parts of the country, that this had become a program of first resort rather than last resort for many employers. How could we have designed it this way?

I assume that is what the changes are meant to fix. There are design flaws in the DNA of the temporary foreign worker program. Were those flaws inherent in the program that was established by the Liberals? Were they newly incorporated when the Conservatives took over?

I want to understand when it was that the temporary foreign worker program became a first option for too many employers. The minister mentioned that it was 2002, when those changes came in. Perhaps my colleague, the member for Kings—Hants, can allow the minister some time to answer a similar question with some accuracy as to who was the most abusive of the temporary foreign worker program.

• (1650)

Hon. Scott Brison: Mr. Speaker, if the temporary foreign worker program were ever being used to bring in professional dancers, I would certainly express concern, particularly if there was a lack of gender balance.

Beyond that, let us be very clear. The temporary foreign worker program, on a limited basis, worked quite well for a long period of time. It has grown massively under the current government and is being used in areas where it was never intended to be used. Historically, if we look at temporary foreign workers in the horticulture or agriculture side, it is something where everyone acknowledges, and not just in Canada but elsewhere, there is a legitimate role for temporary foreign workers.

What we have been troubled by and what makes no sense is the skyrocketing of the use of temporary foreign workers in areas of high unemployment, for example, in the Windsor, Ontario area, and the threat and the very real risk of it depressing wages in those areas. What we believe ought to happen is that we consider temporary foreign workers policy as part of an overall immigration strategy, and we restore the opportunity and the linkage between people who come here to work as part of our production chain of products, goods and services, with immigration.

If we look at Manitoba, it has done a great job of immigration. There were approximately 16,000 new Canadians who moved to Manitoba last year, compared to the 2,000 in my province of Nova Scotia. Manitoba has a whole-of-government approach. One of the things they do there is streamline the process and make it easier for people who come here to work to move on to permanent residency and then on to immigrate to Canada.

As a country, we ought to look at the Manitoba model. We need more new Canadians. We need to attract them, not just to work on a temporary basis but to become full partners in progress and citizens of this country.

Mrs. Joy Smith (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am sharing my time with the member for Vancouver South.

I listened this afternoon to all the speeches. The job of members opposite is to be the opposition. I listened to some of the speeches from the NDP side and I know it has never been in government, so it can pretty well say anything. As far as the Liberal side is concerned, it too is in the same position.

When in government we have to make sure everything is in balance. We expect criticism, which is fine. However, let us look at the global picture. Nearly 1.2 million net new jobs have been created in Canada. That is over 82% full-time jobs and 80% in the private sector since the end of the recession in July 2009.

When we look at our country, Canada is the envy of the world because Canadians as a whole live well, and as a whole we are safe. It is the best country in the world in which to live.

Government Orders

As parliamentarians and members on this side of the House know, as we went into the recession, the most important thing was to ensure that our country's economy was balanced so that there were jobs, so that people could live in their homes and buy their food. In any country, nothing is perfect. There are housing problems and other issues in all countries. However, in Canada, we have a lot to be proud of. Canada has one of the strongest job growth performances in the entire G7. That is quite incredible looking at the global economic problems that the world has faced. Canadians have also enjoyed one of the strongest income growth performances in the G7 and Canada's business investment performance has been the strongest in the G7 over the recovery. This is very important. Why? It is because this gives a sense of security to Canadians.

Since 2004 Canadians have put our government into power because they had the confidence that the economic part of their lives would be secure. That does not mean to say every single Canadian is secure. It means that we are the best country compared to others. Canada has a AAA rating in this economic environment worldwide. We also know that the middle class in Canada lives better than in the U.S. and many other countries. Also, we now have 180,000 children who are now out of poverty.

There is a lot to be proud of. For the sixth straight year the World Economic Forum has ranked Canada's banking system the soundest in the world. This means something. With all due respect, even though there are always things to improve and do better, this is indicative of Canada's standing on the world stage and indicative of its very sound economic planning and practices. Does that mean everyone is going to get everything they want, daily? No, that does not mean that. It means that the economy within the country is sound, jobs are growing, people can go to work, children can go to school, and our country is the best country in the world in which to live.

I listen to all these criticisms and all the hyperbole. In Parliament, hyperbole is something that we hear every single day on probably every single topic.

• (1655)

When Canada is leading the global economic recovery, that is something to be proud of. There needs to be a recognition that Canada and this government are doing something right. When we listen to members opposite, we hear all the talk of gloom and doom. They think they can do things better. The fact of the matter is that this is not what the Canadian public thought, because those members are not sitting on this side of the House.

Canada has the lowest overall tax rate in the G7 on new business investment. That is a red flag right there. It shows that this government is creating new business.

Canada is one of only two G7 countries to have a rock solid AAA rating, with a stable outlook, from all the major credit rating agencies, such as Moody's, Fitch, and Standard & Poor's. That is important. A lot of countries cannot claim that, because they have no plan in place. War-torn countries have not had the opportunity to put a plan in place. It is impossible for them to do that. This government has been able to meet that high standard.

There is a reason our government's top priorities are job creation, economic growth, and long-term prosperity. It is so people can have families, work, prosper, and have a future.

Our government has become aware of many issues that have presented themselves through businesses. For instance, small business is the engine of this country. It pushes out so much of the economy. Women are some of the top small-business owners, and that is a real change from 20 years ago.

More small business opportunities have been created through the small business job credit, and that has been a real asset to those women who want to start businesses. That is not often spoken about in the House. Some of these businesses are run out of the home. Some are run out of small offices. These businesses are providing income for families.

The budget implementation bill will make life more affordable for Canadian families. What is important to a family? A lot of children participate in sports. It was presented to our government that a lot of families could not afford to pay the registration fees for sports, such as soccer and other kinds of sports, so in this particular budget, our government has doubled the children's fitness tax credit to \$1,000 and has made it refundable.

Paying attention to individual families has made a huge difference in balancing Canada's economy. We have heard today many instances of how families have been impacted. Unfortunately, because I only have 10 minutes to speak, I cannot list them, but they were listed earlier.

We should work collaboratively to give suggestions. When the bill goes to committee, amendments can be made, if need be. We should look at how we can build together and recognize the fact that this government has put in a strong economic plan.

• (1700)

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I gather from the member's speech that she wants us to cut through the hyperbole and the usual rhetoric, so I will get right down to it.

One of the things that concerns us on this side of the House is that this is an omnibus bill. When the member sat in opposition, she had the same concerns about omnibus bills.

We are particularly concerned about refugee issues. We have seen cuts to refugee health. There is a notion that this would help out the provinces. I wonder if the member could name the provinces that requested this.

With regard to the bill itself, would she not agree with us that if there is a need for debate, amendments, and careful study, as she has suggested, we should not have an omnibus package in front of us? We should actually have these things separated and actually have a budget bill, not something of this nature.

Mrs. Joy Smith: Mr. Speaker, first of all, this particular bill is not unusual. I keep hearing that it is an omnibus bill, a great big bill with a lot of pages. That said, it is not unusual when we compare it to other budget implementation bills that have come forward over the years.

Government Orders

SECOND READING

Also, we have had this bill for over eight months. I think it has been eight months and twelve days, actually, so there has been a lot of time to go through it. It does not take that long.

Provinces all across this country have had challenges in that the temporary foreign worker issue has been abused. Jobs for Canadians come first. Having had that collaboration across the country, we have had to look at putting Canadians first, jobs first for Canadians, and at the checks and balances that are long overdue in the temporary foreign worker program.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I get a little nervous when I notice the government House leader. I am thinking of the potential for time allocation.

That said, my question is for the member for Kildonan—St. Paul.

In terms of co-operation, we made the suggestion that the government consider EI premium breaks for all new hires. We have had many third-party stakeholders who have commented on just how valuable this recommendation is. It is an idea that would create thousands of jobs.

If we want to fight for the middle class when debating the proposed legislation, I think a big part of that would be fighting for jobs. Allowing EI premium breaks for new hires would go a long way.

Would the member not support initiatives that would cause employers to create literally thousands of new jobs at a relatively marginal cost? I would be interested in her thoughts on that.

• (1705)

Mrs. Joy Smith: Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, the bill does go through committee. It is at committee where those suggestions are made and brought back.

That said, the whole bill is about creating jobs. The whole bill is about building business. The whole bill is about making the lives of families and business people better in this country.

I have to say that I look forward to the member for Winnipeg North sitting on committee and bringing those suggestions forward for an extensive conversation.

BILL C-43—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise that an agreement has not been reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the second reading stage of Bill C-43, a second act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 11, 2014 and other measures. 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 consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage.

I might add that it is my intention to propose an additional three days to the second reading debate for a total of four days for that debate.

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-43, A Second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 11, 2014 and other measures be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Ms. Wai Young (Vancouver South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak to this budget implementation bill. This bill would put some of the measures contained within the 2014 federal budget into practice in Canada.

Before I address some of the specific measures in this bill, I would like to give an overview of what the international community is saying about Canada's economy and the success we have seen since the global recession in 2008.

Both the IMF and the OECD have stated that they expect Canada to be among the strongest-growing economies in the G7 over this year and the next. *The New York Times* conducted an analysis and concluded that after-tax middle-class incomes in Canada, which were substantially behind in the year 2000, now appear to be higher than in the United States.

Finally, with nearly 1.2 million jobs created since July 2009, the Canadian economy has had one of the strongest job-creation records in the G7 since the recession. As we move forward with this legislation, the international community can look forward to Canada continuing its role as a global leader with a successful economic record.

One of the reasons Canada has had such great economic success is that we recognize that the challenges we face in the global economy are not simple or straightforward. They are complex challenges that affect every sector in the Canadian economy. This is why I am pleased to see that this bill encompasses a broad approach to addressing the many problems we still face in the fragile global economy.

I know that the term “omnibus” does not sit well with some. However, we have to be realistic. Canada exists within a global economy, and because it is comprehensive, this bill would ensure that we address as many issues as possible to maintain our outstanding economic recovery and growth. Since Canada has had to move quickly to meet the challenges of the economic recession, Canadians have experienced that these bills have in fact been working very well for our economy. Furthermore, historically, it has been common practice to include various measures across many sectors in a budget and then in the budget implementation bills to follow. Ultimately, it reflects the central role a budget plays in addressing the wide range of issues Canadians need addressed.

Now I would like to highlight some of the measures contained within this bill that will be important to the residents in my riding of Vancouver South, and indeed to all Canadians.

Government Orders

The first measure I feel would greatly benefit the people of my riding, and particularly small-business owners in my riding, is the small-business job credit. Over the next two years, this credit would lower the payroll taxes of small businesses by 15%. It is estimated that this would result in savings of approximately \$550 million for small businesses over these two years. As a previous small-business owner myself, I fully understand the importance small businesses play in driving the local economy. I know that this credit would go a long way in supporting the many small businesses in my riding and would promote job creation throughout Vancouver and Canada.

Another measure I was pleased to see in this implementation bill was the extension of the tax credit that currently exists for interest paid on government-sponsored student loans to include interest paid on Canada apprenticeship loans. As we know, apprenticeships are a vital link between high school and the workplace. Many students in my riding and across Canada take part in apprenticeship programs to gain the skills they need to be successful in the workforce. Furthermore, these apprenticeships can usually lead directly to full-time employment. I have met many constituents enrolled in apprenticeship programs who share how they thoroughly enjoyed learning their trades through hands-on experience and direct training from an employer. I am therefore very pleased to see that the government would extend the existing credit to loans students can take out to participate in apprenticeship programs. This would certainly encourage students to take part in these programs, which will contribute to a strong and skilled workforce.

Another tax credit I am pleased would be implemented as part of this bill is the doubling of the children's fitness tax credit. In 2006, the government introduced a non-refundable tax credit of up to \$500 annually for fees related to the registration of a child under the age of 16 in an eligible program of physical activity.

• (1710)

This bill would act on an announcement that the Prime Minister made this month that would double this tax credit as well as make it refundable.

I know that many people in my riding and across Canada widely support this credit as it would enable children to enrol in sports like hockey, baseball and soccer, when they otherwise might not be able to afford it. As a previous soccer mom of twins, and recognizing that many families, like mine, have more than one child, I know how quickly fees can add up.

That is why I am very pleased to see the doubling of this tax credit in this implementation bill as it would help Canadian families support sport and activity for their children. This measure would ensure that parents can take advantage of this credit when they file their taxes for the 2014 tax year.

Finally, I was pleased to see that this implementation bill would end pay-to-pay billing practices in the telecommunications sector. This would ensure that those who prefer to or must receive their bills in the mail are not forced to pay additional fees just because they receive their bills in the mail.

This commitment was made as part of the government's 2013 Speech from the Throne. I am very pleased to see that it would now be implemented. Many seniors in my riding, as well as those who do

not have access to high speed or any type of Internet, have been frustrated with these unnecessary fees. I know that they will certainly be pleased to see this practice end.

In closing, I would like to share that when I am in my constituency in Vancouver, I consistently hear from my constituents about how happy they are with the work of the Minister of Finance and what he has been doing to ensure that we will return to a balanced budget by 2015. Hearing from my constituents about how pleased they are has certainly made this a priority for the government and a priority for all Canadians.

I therefore urge the opposition to support economic growth, lower taxes and the many positive measures in Bill C-43.

• (1715)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague's speech.

She does not seem to realize that columnists, editorial writers and even journalists—whether they lean to the left, right or centre—all seem to agree. They are opposed to omnibus bills that distort the parliamentary process when they include measures that have nothing to do with the budget. I have a simple and clear question for the member, in the hopes of getting a clear answer.

The member is bragging about a measure to eliminate pay-to-pay billing practices in the telecommunications sector that require consumers to pay to get their bills. However, consumers will still have to pay to get a bank statement.

If she is so proud of this bill, why did she not insist that her government include this measure to fully protect consumers against this practice?

[*English*]

Ms. Wai Young: Mr. Speaker, as we noted earlier, this bill was tabled in February, so members have had more than eight months to review it and talk about it. It has been debated in the House for a long time, so I do not think that omnibus is the word for it. Comprehensive, broad and meeting the needs of diverse Canadians are other great words for it.

As I said earlier in my speech, and to reference my constituents, whenever I see them in my riding of Vancouver South they are really happy with the Conservative government, with its strong economic performance and with the fact that it is balancing the budget by 2015.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise today to speak to this omnibus budget bill and I thank the member for Vancouver South.

However, I do need to correct the record. Omnibus budget bills are not something of long-standing or habitual use in this place. Up until 2005, the longest omnibus budget bill was a little over 100 pages. I think that it was in 2009 that the current administration put forward an omnibus budget bill of 900 pages.

Government Orders

My first question in this place, when I was elected, was asking the Minister of Finance if an omnibus budget bill was planned for 2011 because I had become so alarmed by them. There was not one in 2011, but we have seen, ever since 2012 and 2013, a spring omnibus budget bill and a fall omnibus budget bill.

My hon. colleague from Kildonan—St. Paul, who preceded my friend from Vancouver South, told us that we had months to study this but, in fact, we had days and it is over 400 pages.

Omnibus budget bills are an affront to democracy in this place and should not be allowed unless they pertain to the same purpose and the same effort. These are all over the map. They do not aid our economy or our democracy.

Ms. Wai Young: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the hon. member across the way is using the word omnibus because that is her word. It is certainly not my word.

Bill C-43 supports our low-tax plan for jobs and growth. I would like to note, if she is so inclined, that parts 1 to 3 are all tax-related, 281 pages are all tax-related. Part 4 contains the rest of the measures, 31 tax measures that we are giving to Canadian families, so that they will have this money in their pockets.

Some of the measures in part 4 are lengthy, such as the intellectual property changes that needed to be ratified, encompassing international treaties and such, so 35 pages.

Basically, the bill is related directly to a budget implementation bill, which is what is up for discussion here, and it is completely related to the budget.

Mr. Mike Wallace (Burlington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on that point, this budget bill is 400 and some-odd pages, half in French, half in English.

The previous questioner has written a few books. They are likely over 200 pages. That member likely expects people to read her books, so I am expecting members of Parliament to read 200 pages.

The change to the child tax credit for physical fitness is becoming refundable. Since November is financial literacy month, there are only three other refundable tax credits. Refundable means that if individuals are not paying taxes, they still get their money back for that.

Why is that important to poor families who have kids in physical fitness programs in this country?

• (1720)

Ms. Wai Young: Mr. Speaker, that is an extremely good point. It is so necessary to put money back into Canadian families, so that they can afford to support their children in sports activities that are so important to Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since my time is limited and I will have to continue my speech tomorrow, I will split it into two parts. The first part will deal with the history of the government's budget bills, which are massive, mammoth omnibus bills. That is very disappointing, because all opposition parties feel that these bills

are contrary to the spirit of Parliament and to the spirit of democracy that we should embody.

We do not have a problem with the tax measures, which make up the first three parts of this bill. These tax provisions implement the measures that were announced in the budget. We may or may not like these measures, but it makes sense for them to be included in a budget bill.

The other measures are the ones we have a major problem with. For example, how can they justify including changes to the electoral process in the Northwest Territories? What is that doing in a budget bill? Why would a budget bill include a measure enabling provinces to establish a mandatory residency period for refugee claimants applying for welfare? There would be no change to federal transfers one way or the other. Nothing justifies putting these measures in a budget bill.

I am outraged and offended that government members who want to be part of the government are not saying a word and are refusing to ask the government to be accountable to its citizens. The government, the executive, is made up of cabinet. The backbenchers and the rest of the Conservative caucus are not part of government.

When they stand up and say that their government did such-and-such a thing, they are failing to fulfill their duty as parliamentarians and MPs to demand accountability from their government about deeply undemocratic measures. I am not the only one saying that. Yesterday's *Globe and Mail* editorial perfectly summarized the unfairness and irregularity of these omnibus bills.

I truly hope that this bill gives them a chance to search their conscience regarding their own duty in terms of government accountability and transparency, which are essential to the work we need to accomplish here.

Bill C-43 is the federal government's second budget implementation bill. When we were studying the last omnibus budget implementation bill, I talked about a trend that seemed to be emerging in these omnibus bills. Indeed, I have noticed eight basic criteria that the government routinely adheres to when drafting these bills, and this trend continues in this bill.

The first criterion the government seems to adhere to concerns the huge size of the bills. This one is 460 pages long in English and in French. The bills introduced before 2009 that my colleague from Saanich—Gulf Islands was talking about were 100 pages in both languages. The Conservatives need to stop comparing by using the pretext that it is in both languages. We are comparing apples to apples.

Business of Supply

We are therefore being asked to hastily review for adoption 460 pages and 401 clauses at the Standing Committee on Finance. This leads to many mistakes that later have to be corrected. Sometimes they are corrected in subsequent bills. In fact, this bill includes changes and corrections for mistakes that were made in previous bills. Sometimes these changes or corrections are made through the Senate.

These are mistakes that we pointed out in committee. We told them they would regret heading in this direction. I am thinking specifically about the bill that amended the process for appointing Quebec judges to the Supreme Court. We warned the government a number of times that it was heading in the wrong direction with this measure, which it tried to make retroactive in order to cover for the massive blunder it made in appointing Justice Nadon. The Conservatives did not listen.

● (1725)

This is the fifth budget bill that I have had the honour of studying and contributing to at the Standing Committee on Finance. We have studied more than 2,000 pages to date. We have moved hundreds of amendments, which were often constructive, but only one was adopted by the committee. Even then, the Conservative members made an amendment to the amendment.

This approach does not make sense. With such mammoth bills, which is the first criterion I mentioned, we cannot give every clause and every element of the bill the attention it requires, although that is a fundamental principle of how our government works.

The government's second criterion when drafting bills such as this one is that the bill amends at least a dozen laws. In this case, there are about 40 laws that are being created, eliminated or amended.

The third criterion consists of dealing with many subjects that have absolutely nothing to do with the budget process. This bill goes from the Judges Act to the Industrial Design Act to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, and even amends the Criminal Code and the electoral process in the Northwest Territories, as I mentioned. That has nothing to do with the budget. These measures could have been introduced separately. Some of the measures are not being challenged at all and could very easily have been passed by the House and, subsequently, perhaps even by the Senate. However, the government has decided to bring together these bills, which adds to the confusion that can arise when studying other provisions that are more directly related to the budget process.

The fourth criterion is that a Conservative omnibus bill must create new laws that once again have nothing to do with the budget process. In this case, a law is being created to establish a high Arctic research station. Why did the government not make the effort to sit down and draft a proper bill to create this station? Furthermore, this bill corrects another Conservative government decision to close a similar station located even further north in the Arctic. We suspect that the station was closed for ideological reasons and in order to deny the scientific truth. The Conservative government did not seem to like that research station's findings, many of which had to do with climate change.

The fifth criterion is that a Conservative omnibus bill must include provisions that concentrate power in the hands of a minister. That has

been the case in every omnibus bill passed, and it is also true of Bill C-43. In this case, the Aeronautics Act will give more power to cabinet. The provisions of the new Extractive Sector Transparency Measures Act will also give more power to cabinet. Once again, it seems as though these bills must include provisions that give a great deal more discretionary power to cabinet ministers.

One of the last three criteria for a Conservative omnibus budget bill is that the bill needs at least one legislative amendment to restrict workers' rights. This bill has one such amendment. To qualify, the bill also needs measures to restrict the rights of unions and immigrants, and lastly it needs a law and order measure. This bill has them all. All of these criteria are met. The government has created a model that prevents us from doing the job our constituents elected us to do. Our job is to provide oversight and hold the government accountable through one of the most fundamental acts of our Parliament: approving the budget.

Once again, I do not understand how members of Parliament who are not members of cabinet but are on the Conservative side can allow this nonsense, which is condemned throughout Canada's political society. I hope that those members will think about this. I will stop there and resume my speech tomorrow.

* * *

● (1730)

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—EBOLA

The House resumed from October 23 consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): It being 5:30 p.m., pursuant to order made Thursday, October 23, 2014, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment to the motion relating to the business of supply.

Call in the members.

● (1810)

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

(Division No. 257)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
Angus	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélanger
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Brisson	Brosseau
Byrne	Caron
Casey	Cash
Chan	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm

Business of Supply

Choquette	Christopherson	Galipeau	Gallant
Cleary	Côté	Gill	Glover
Cullen	Cuzner	Goguen	Goldring
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)	Goodyear	Gourde
Day	Dewar	Grewal	Harper
Dion	Dionne Labelle	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre	Hayes	Hiebert
Dubé	Dubourg	Hillyer	Hoback
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Holder	James
Dusseault	Easter	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Eyking	Footé	Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Fortin	Freeland	Kerr	Komarnicki
Freeman	Fry	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Garneau	Garrison	Lauson	Lebel
Giguère	Godin	Leaf	Leitch
Goodale	Gravelle	Lemieux	Leung
Grogohé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Lobb	Lukowski
Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu	Lunney	MacKay (Central Nova)
Hughes	Hyer	MacKenzie	Maguire
Julian	Kellway	Mayes	McColeman
Lamoureux	Lapointe	McLeod	Menegakis
Latendresse	Laverdière	Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Moore (Fundy Royal)	Nicholson
Leslie	Liu	Norlock	Obhrai
MacAulay	Mai	O'Connor	Oliver
Marston	Martin	O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
Masse	Mathysen	O'Toole	Paradis
May	McCallum	Payne	Poillievre
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Preston	Raitt
Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Rajotte	Reid
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Rempel	Richards
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani	Rickford	Ritz
Mulcair	Murray	Saxton	Schellenberger
Nantel	Nash	Seeback	Shea
Nicholls	Nunez-Melo	Shiple	Shory
Pacetti	Papillon	Smith	Sopuck
Patry	Péclet	Sorenson	Stanton
Perreault	Pilon	Storseth	Strahl
Plamondon	Rafferty	Sweet	Tilson
Rankin	Rathgeber	Toet	Trost
Ravignat	Raynault	Trottier	Truppe
Rousseau	Saganash	Valcourt	Van Kesteren
Sandhu	Scarpaleggia	Van Loan	Wallace
Scott	Sellah	Warawa	Warkentin
Sgro	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind- sor)	Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan	Sky Country)	Wilks
St-Denis	Stoffer	Weston (Saint John)	Wong
Sullivan	Thibeault	Williamson	Yelich
Toone	Tremblay	Woodworth	Young (Vancouver South)
Trudeau	Turmel	Young (Oakville)	Zimmer — 154
Valerioté	Vaughan — 130	Yurdiga	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Armstrong	Aspin
Baird	Barlow
Bateman	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Bezan	Blaney
Block	Boughen
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinooge
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chisu	Chong
Clarke	Clement
Crockatt	Daniel
Davidson	Dechert
Devolin	Dreeschen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Falk	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.*[English]*

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.**Some hon. members:** No.**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.**Some hon. members:** Yea.**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.**Some hon. members:** Nay.**The Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.*And five or more members having risen:**Before the clerk announced the results of the vote:*

Business of Supply

● (1820)

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Montcalm voting for or against the motion?

Ms. Manon Perreault: Mr. Speaker, I vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

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

(Division No. 258)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
Angus	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Brison	Brosseau
Byrne	Caron
Casey	Cash
Chan	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Côté
Cullen	Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dubé	Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseauit	Easter
Eyking	Footo
Fortin	Freeland
Freeman	Fry
Garneau	Garrison
Giguère	Godin
Goodale	Gravelle
Groguhé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu
Hughes	Hyer
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 (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Patry	Péclet
Perreault	Pilon
Plamondon	Rafferty
Rankin	Rathgeber
Ravignat	Raynault
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Scarpaleggia
Scott	Sellah
Sgro	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
St-Denis	Stoffer

Sullivan
Toone
Trudeau
Valeriotte

Thibeault
Tremblay
Turnel
Vaughan— 130

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Armstrong	Aspin
Baird	Barlow
Bateman	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Bezan	Blaney
Block	Boughen
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Brunnooge
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chisu	Chong
Clarke	Clement
Crockatt	Daniel
Davidson	Dechert
Devolin	Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Falk	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Galpeau	Gallant
Gill	Glover
Goguen	Goldring
Goodyear	Gourde
Grewal	Harper
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
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	Lebel
Leaf	Leitch
Lemieux	Leung
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	Oliver
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
O'Toole	Paradis
Payne	Poilievre
Preston	Raitt
Rajotte	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rickford	Ritz
Saxton	Schellenberger
Seeback	Shea
Shipley	Shory
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Tilson
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Truppe
Valcourt	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Sky Country)	Weston (Saint John)
Weston (Saint John)	Williamson
Williamson	Wilks
	Wong

Government Orders

Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Yurdiga

Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)
Zimmer — 154

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

**CANADA-KOREA ECONOMIC GROWTH AND
PROSPERITY ACT**

The House resumed from October 28 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 third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-41.

• (1830)

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

(Division No. 259)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anders
Angus
Ashton
Atamanenko
Ayala
Barlow
Bélanger
Bennett
Benskin
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney
Boivin
Boughen
Boutin-Sweet
Braid
Brison
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Barrie)
Butt
Calandra
Cannan
Caron
Casey
Chan
Chicoine
Chisu
Choquette
Clarke
Clement
Crockatt
Cuzner
Davidson
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dechert
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Dubé
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Welland)
Allison
Ambrose
Andrews
Armstrong
Aspin
Aubin
Baird
Bateman
Bellavance
Benoit
Bergen
Bevington
Blanchette
Block
Borg
Boulerice
Brahmi
Breitkreuz
Brosseau
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Bruinooge
Byrne
Calkins
Carmichael
Carrie
Cash
Charlton
Chisholm
Chong
Christopherson
Cleary
Côté
Cullen
Daniel
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Devolin
Dion
Donnelly
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseau

Dykstra
Eyking
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Fletcher
Fortin
Freeman
Galipeau
Gameau
Giguère
Glover
Goguen
Goodale
Gourde
Grewal
Harper
Harris (St. John's East)
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
Hsu
James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kellway
Kent
Komarnicki
Lake
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebel
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leitch
Leslie
Liu
Lukiwski
MacAulay
MacKenzie
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McGuinity
McLeod
Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Murray
Nash
Nicholson
Nunez-Melo
O'Connor
O'Neill Gordon
O'Toole
Papillon
Patry
Péclet
Pilon
Poilievre
Rafferty
Rajotte
Rathgeber
Raynault
Rempel
Rickford
Rousseau
Sandhu
Scarpaleggia
Scott
Sellah
Shea
Shory
sor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Smith
Sorenson
St-Denis
Storseth
Sullivan
Thibeault
Toet
Tremblay
Trottier

Easter
Falk
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Foote
Freeland
Fry
Gallant
Garrison
Gill
Godin
Goldring
Goodyear
Gravelle
Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes
Hillyer
Holder
Hughes
Julian
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lamoureux
Latendresse
Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leaf
Lemieux
Leung
Lobb
Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)
Maguire
Marston
Masse
Mayes
McColeman
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Menegakis
Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagog)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Norlock
Obhrai
Oliver
Opitz
Pacetti
Paradis
Payne
Perreault
Plamondon
Preston
Raitt
Rankin
Ravignat
Reid
Richards
Ritz
Saganash
Saxton
Schellenberger
Seeback
Sgro
Shipley
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
Sitsabaiesan
Sopuck
Stanton
Stoffer
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Toone
Trout
Trudeau

Private Members' Business

Truppe	Turmel
Valcourt	Valeriote
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vaughan	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 282

NAYS

Members

Hyer

May — 2

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS***[English]***SUPPORTING NON-PARTISAN AGENTS OF PARLIAMENT ACT**

The House resumed from October 9 consideration of Bill C-520, An Act supporting non-partisan agents of Parliament, as reported with amendments from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Thursday, October 23, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the motions at report stage of Bill C-520.

The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2-7 and 9-11. A negative vote on Motion No. 1 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 8.

● (1840)

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 260)***YEAS**

Members

Allen (Weland)	Andrews
Angus	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélanger
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Brisson	Brosseau
Byrne	Caron
Casey	Cash
Chan	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary
Côté	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé

Dubourg
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Easter
Foote
Freeland
Fry
Garrison
Godin
Gravelle
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hsu
Hyer
Kellway
Lapointe
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Murray
Nash
Nunez-Melo
Papillon
Péclet
Pilon
Rafferty
Rathgeber
Raynault
Saganash
Scarpaleggia
Sellah
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan
Stoffer
Thibeault
Tremblay
Turmel
Vaughan — 131

Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Eyking
Fortin
Freeman
Garneau
Giguère
Goodale
Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)
Hughes
Julian
Lamoureux
Latendresse
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leslie
MacAulay
Marston
Masse
May
McGuinty
Michaud
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Pacetti
Patry
Perreault
Plamondon
Rankin
Ravignat
Rousseau
Sandhu
Scott
Sgro
St-Denis
Sullivan
Toone
Trudeau
Valeriote

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Armstrong	Aspin
Baird	Barlow
Bateman	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Bezan	Blaney
Block	Boughen
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinooze
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chisu	Clarke
Clement	Crockatt
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Devolin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodyear
Gourde	Grewal
Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer

*Private Members' Business**(Division No. 261)*

Hoback	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
Lebel	Leef
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	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
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Paradis	Payne
Poillievre	Preston
Raitt	Rajotte
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Rickford
Ritz	Saxton
Schellenberger	Shea
Shipley	Shory
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Tilson
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Truppe
Valcourt	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 152

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 2 to 7 and 9 to 11 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

● (1850)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was agreed to on the following division:)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambler	Ambrose
Anders	Angus
Armstrong	Ashton
Aspin	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Baird	Barlow
Bateman	Benoit
Benskin	Bergen
Bernier	Bevington
Bezan	Blanchette
Blaney	Block
Boivin	Borg
Boughen	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brousseau	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinooge	Butt
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Caron	Carrie
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Chisu	Chong
Choquette	Christopherson
Clarke	Cleary
Clement	Côté
Crockatt	Cullen
Daniel	Davidson
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dechert
Devolin	Dewar
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dreshen
Dubé	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Dykstra	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Fortin
Freeman	Galipeau
Gallant	Garrison
Giguère	Gill
Glover	Godin
Goguen	Goldring
Goodyear	Gourde
Gravelle	Grewal
Groguhé	Harper
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	Hughes
James	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	Lapointe
Latendresse	Lauzon
Laverdière	Lebel
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leef
Leitch	Lemieux
Leslie	Leung
Liu	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Maguire	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
Mayes	McColeman
McLeod	Menegakis
Michaud	Miller

Private Members' Business

Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
 Moore (Fundy Royal)
 Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
 Mourani
 Nantel
 Nicholls
 Norlock
 Obhrai
 Oliver
 Opitz
 Papillon
 Payne
 Perreault
 Poilievre
 Rafferty
 Rajotte
 Rathgeber
 Raynault
 Rempel
 Ritz
 Saganash
 Saxton
 Scott
 Sellah
 Shipley
 Sims (Newton—North Delta)
 Smith
 Sorenson
 Stoffer
 Strahl
 Sweet
 Tilson
 Toone
 Trost
 Truppe
 Valcourt
 Van Loan
 Warawa
 Watson
 Sky Country)
 Weston (Saint John)
 Williamson
 Woodworth
 Young (Oakville)
 Yurdiga

Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
 Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
 Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
 Mulcair
 Nash
 Nicholson
 Nunez-Melo
 O'Connor
 O'Neill Gordon
 O'Toole
 Paradis
 Pécelet
 Pilon
 Preston
 Raitt
 Rankin
 Ravignat
 Reid
 Richards
 Rousseau
 Sandhu
 Schellenberger
 Seeback
 Shea
 Shory
 Sitsabaiesan
 Sopuck
 Stanton
 Storseth
 Sullivan
 Thibeault
 Toet
 Tremblay
 Trotter
 Turmel
 Van Kesteren
 Wallace
 Warkentin
 Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to

Wilks
 Wong
 Yelich
 Young (Vancouver South)
 Zimmer — 244

NAYS**Members**

Andrews
 Bellavance
 Brison
 Casey
 Cuzner
 Dubourg
 Easter
 Foote
 Fry
 Goodale
 Hyer
 LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
 May
 McGuinty
 Pacetti
 Plamondon
 Sgro
 St-Denis
 Valeriotte

Bélanger
 Bennett
 Byrne
 Chan
 Dion
 Duncan (Etobicoke North)
 Eyking
 Freeland
 Garneau
 Hsu
 Lamoureux
 MacAulay
 McCallum
 Murray
 Patry
 Scarpaleggia
 Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
 sors)
 Trudeau
 Vaughan — 38

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 carried.

Mr. Mark Adler (York Centre, CPC) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

● (1855)

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

(Division No. 262)

YEAS**Members**

Ablonczy
 Adler
 Albas
 Alexander
 Allison
 Ambrose
 Armstrong
 Baird
 Bateman
 Bergen
 Bezan
 Block
 Braid
 Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
 Brown (Barrie)
 Butt
 Calkins
 Carmichael
 Chisu
 Clement
 Daniel
 Dechert
 Dreeschen
 Dykstra
 Fantino
 Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
 Fletcher
 Gallant
 Glover
 Goldring
 Gourde
 Harper
 Hawn
 Hiebert
 Hoback
 James
 Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
 Kent
 Komarnicki
 Lake
 Lebel
 Leitch
 Leung
 Lukiwski
 MacKay (Central Nova)
 Maguire
 McColeman
 Menegakis
 Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
 Moore (Fundy Royal)
 Nicholson
 Obhrai
 O'Neill Gordon
 O'Toole
 Payne

Adams
 Aglukkaq
 Albrecht
 Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Ambler
 Anders
 Aspin
 Barlow
 Benoit
 Bernier
 Blaney
 Boughen
 Breitreuz
 Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
 Bruinooog
 Calandra
 Cannan
 Carrie
 Clarke
 Crockatt
 Davidson
 Devolin
 Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
 Falk
 Fast
 Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Galipeau
 Gill
 Goguen
 Goodyear
 Grewal
 Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
 Hayes
 Hillyer
 Holder
 Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Kerr
 Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
 Lauzon
 Leef
 Lemieux
 Lobb
 Lunney
 MacKenzie
 Mayes
 McLeod
 Miller
 Norlock
 Oliver
 Opitz
 Paradis
 Poilievre

Preston
Rajotte
Rempel
Rickford
Saxton
Shea
Shory
Sopuck
Stanton
Tilson
Trost
Truppe
Van Kesteren
Wallace
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)
Zimmer— 149

Raitt
Reid
Richards
Ritz
Schellenberger
Shiple
Smith
Sorenson
Sweet
Toet
Trotier
Valcourt
Van Loan
Warawa
Watson
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Yurdiga

Scott
Sgro
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
St-Denis
Sullivan
Toone
Trudeau
Valeriote

Sellah
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
sor)
Sitsabaiesan
Stoffer
Thibeault
Tremblay
Turnel
Vaughan— 130

Private Members' Business

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

When shall the bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

● (1900)

Mr. Mark Adler moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

● (1905)

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

(Division No. 263)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allison
Ambrose
Armstrong
Baird
Bateman
Bergen
Bezan
Block
Braid
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Barrie)
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Chisu
Clement
Daniel
Dechert
Dreeschen
Dykstra
Fantino

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anders
Aspin
Barlow
Benoit
Bernier
Blaney
Boughen
Breitkreuz
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Bruinooge
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Clarke
Crockatt
Davidson
Devolin
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Falk
Fast

NAYS

Members

Allen (Welland)
Angus
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bellavance
Benskin
Blanchette
Borg
Boutin-Sweet
Brison
Byrne
Casey
Chan
Chicoine
Chong
Christopherson
Côté
Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Dubourg
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Easter
Foote
Freeland
Fry
Garrison
Godin
Gravelle
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hsu
Hyer
Kellway
Lapointe
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
Michaud
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Pacetti
Patry
Perreault
Plamondon
Rankin
Ravignat
Rousseau
Sandhu

Andrews
Ashton
Aubin
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevington
Boivin
Boulerice
Brahmi
Brosseau
Caron
Cash
Charlton
Chisholm
Choquette
Cleary
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Dion
Donnelly
Dubé
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Eyking
Fortin
Freeman
Garneau
Giguère
Goodale
Grogulé
Harris (St. John's East)
Hughes
Julian
Lamoureux
Latendresse
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leslie
MacAulay
Marston
Masse
May
McGuinty
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Murray
Nash
Nunez-Melo
Papillon
Péclet
Pilon
Rafferty
Rathgeber
Raynault
Saganash
Scarpaleggia

Private Members' Business

Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fry	Garneau
Fletcher	Galipeau	Garrison	Giguère
Gallant	Gill	Godin	Goodale
Glover	Goguen	Gravelle	Grogné
Goldring	Goodyear	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Gourde	Grewal	Hsu	Hughes
Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hyer	Julian
Hawn	Hayes	Kellway	Lamoureux
Hiebert	Hillyer	Lapointe	Latendresse
Hoback	Holder	Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
James	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Liu	MacAulay
Kent	Kerr	Mai	Marston
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Martin	Masse
Lake	Lauzon	Mathysen	May
Lebel	Leaf	McCallum	McGuinty
Leitch	Lemieux	Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Leung	Lobb	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Lukiwski	Lunney	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie	Mulcair	Murray
Maguire	Mayes	Nantel	Nash
McColeman	McLeod	Nicholls	Nunez-Melo
Menegakis	Miller	Pacetti	Papillon
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)		Patry	Péclet
Moore (Fundy Royal)		Perreault	Pilon
Nicholson	Norlock	Plamondon	Rafferty
Obhrai	Oliver	Rankin	Rathgeber
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz	Ravignat	Raynault
O'Toole	Paradis	Rousseau	Saganash
Payne	Poilievre	Sandhu	Scarpaleggia
Preston	Raitt	Scott	Sellah
Rajotte	Reid	Sgro	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
Rempel	Richards	sor)	
Rickford	Ritz	Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Saxton	Schellenberger	St-Denis	Stoffer
Shea	Shiple	Sullivan	Thibeault
Shory	Smith	Toone	Tremblay
Sopuck	Sorenson	Trudeau	Turmel
Stanton	Sweet	Valériote	Vaughan— 130
Tilson	Toet		
Trost	Trottier		
Truppe	Valcourt		
Van Kesteren	Van Loan		
Wallace	Warawa		
Warkentin	Watson		
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)			
Weston (Saint John)			
Wilks	Williamson		
Wong	Woodworth		
Yelich	Young (Oakville)		
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga		
Zimmer— 149			

NAYS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
Angus	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Brisson	Brosseau
Byrne	Caron
Casey	Cash
Chan	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary
Côté	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Easter	Eyking
Foote	Fortin
Freeland	Freeman

Fry	Garneau
Garrison	Giguère
Godin	Goodale
Gravelle	Grogné
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu	Hughes
Hyer	Julian
Kellway	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Latendresse
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	MacAulay
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
McCallum	McGuinty
Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Patry	Péclet
Perreault	Pilon
Plamondon	Rafferty
Rankin	Rathgeber
Ravignat	Raynault
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Scarpaleggia
Scott	Sellah
Sgro	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
sor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
St-Denis	Stoffer
Sullivan	Thibeault
Toone	Tremblay
Trudeau	Turmel
Valériote	Vaughan— 130

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

[Translation]

ASSAULTS AGAINST PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS

The House resumed from October 10, 2014, consideration of the motion that Bill S-221, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (assaults against public transit operators), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Thursday, October 23, 2014, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill S-221 under private members' business.

● (1915)

[English]

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

(Division No. 264)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison

Private Members' Business

Ambler	Ambrose	McGuinty	McLeod
Anders	Andrews	Menegakis	Michaud
Angus	Armstrong	Miller	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Ashton	Aspin	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Atamanenko	Aubin	Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Ayala	Baird	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Barlow	Bateman	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Bélanger	Bellavance	Mulcair	Murray
Bennett	Benoit	Nantel	Nash
Benskin	Bergen	Nicholls	Nicholson
Bernier	Bevington	Norlock	Nunez-Melo
Bezan	Blanchette	Obhrai	O'Connor
Blaney	Block	Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
Boivin	Borg	Opitz	O'Toole
Boughen	Boulerice	Pacetti	Papillon
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi	Paradis	Patry
Braid	Breitkreuz	Payne	Pécelet
Brison	Brosseau	Perreault	Pilon
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Plamondon	Poilievre
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinooge	Preston	Rafferty
Butt	Byrne	Raitt	Rajotte
Calandra	Calkins	Rankin	Rathgeber
Cannan	Carmichael	Ravignat	Raynault
Caron	Carrie	Reid	Rempel
Casey	Cash	Richards	Rickford
Chan	Charlton	Ritz	Rousseau
Chicoine	Chisholm	Saganash	Sandhu
Chisu	Chong	Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Choquette	Christopherson	Schellenberger	Scott
Clarke	Cleary	Seeback	Sellah
Clement	Côté	Sgro	Shea
Crockatt	Cullen	ShIPLEY	Shory
Cuzner	Daniel	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Davidson	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day	Sitsabaiesan	Smith
Dechert	Devolin	Sopuck	Sorenson
Dewar	Dion	Stanton	St-Denis
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly	Stoffler	Storseth
Doré Lefebvre	Dreeshen	Strahl	Sullivan
Dubé	Dubourg	Sweet	Thibeault
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Tilson	Toet
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseau	Toone	Tremblay
Dykstra	Easter	Trost	Trottier
Eyking	Falk	Trudeau	Truppe
Fantino	Fast	Turnel	Valcourt
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Valeriotte	Van Kesteren
Fletcher	Foote	Van Loan	Vaughan
Fortin	Freeland	Wallace	Warawa
Freeman	Fry	Warkentin	Watson
Galipeau	Gallant	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Garneau	Garrison	Weston (Saint John)	
Giguère	Gill	Wilks	Williamson
Glover	Godin	Wong	Woodworth
Goguen	Goldring	Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Goodale	Goodyear	Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga
Gourde	Gravelle	Zimmer — 283	
Grewal	Groguhé		
Harper	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)		
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)		
Hawn	Hayes		
Hiebert	Hillyer		
Hoback	Holder	Nil	NAYS
Hsu	Hughes		
Hyer	James		
Julian	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Nil	PAIRED
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kellway		
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Kent		
Kerr	Komarnicki		
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake		
Lamoureux	Lapointe		
Latendresse	Laizon		
Laverdière	Lebel		
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)		
Leef	Leitch		
Lemieux	Leslie		
Leung	Liu		
Lobb	Lukiwski		
Lunney	MacAulay		
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie		
Maguire	Mai		
Marston	Martin		
Masse	Mathyssen		
May	Mayes		
McCallum	McColeman		

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 committee.)

* * *

● (1920)

NATIONAL HEALTH AND FITNESS DAY ACT

The House resumed from October 21 consideration of the motion that Bill S-211, An Act to establish a national day to promote health and fitness for all Canadians, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Private Members' Business

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Thursday, October 23, 2014, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill S-211 under private members' business.

• (1925)

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

(Division No. 265)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambler	Ambrose
Anders	Andrews
Angus	Armstrong
Ashton	Aspin
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Baird
Barlow	Bateman
Bélanger	Bellavance
Bennett	Benoit
Benskin	Bergen
Bernier	Bevington
Bezan	Blanchette
Blaney	Block
Boivin	Borg
Boughen	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brison	Brosseau
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Butt
Byrne	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Caron
Carrie	Casey
Cash	Chan
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Chisu
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Clarke
Cleary	Clement
Côté	Crockatt
Cullen	Cuzner
Daniel	Davidson
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dechert
Devolin	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dreeshen	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Falk	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Foote	Fortin
Freeland	Freeman
Fry	Galipeau
Gallant	Garneau
Garrison	Giguère
Gill	Glover
Godin	Goguen
Goldring	Goodale
Goodyear	Gourde
Gravelle	Grewal
Groguhé	Harper
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hilyer	Hoback

Holder	Hsu
Hughes	Hyer
James	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	Laverdière
Lebel	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leef
Leitch	Lemieux
Leslie	Leung
Liu	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinity
McLeod	Menegakis
Michaud	Miller
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagog)
Mourani	Mulcair
Murray	Nantel
Nash	Nicholls
Nicholson	Norlock
Nunez-Melo	Obhrai
O'Connor	Oliver
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
O'Toole	Pacetti
Papillon	Paradis
Patry	Payne
Péclét	Perreault
Pilon	Plamondon
Poilievre	Preston
Rafferty	Raitt
Rajotte	Rankin
Rathgeber	Ravignat
Raynault	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rickford	Ritz
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Saxton
Scarpaleggia	Schellenberger
Scott	Seeback
Sellah	Sgro
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Sims (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
sor)	Sims (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
St-Denis	Stoffer
Storseth	Strahl
Sullivan	Sweet
Thibeault	Tilson
Toet	Toone
Tremblay	Trost
Trottier	Trudeau
Truppe	Turmel
Valcourt	Valeriote
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vaughan	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga	Zimmer— 282

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

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)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the late hour, there will be no private members' business today. The order is therefore deferred to a future sitting.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

• (1930)

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. François Lapointe (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise in the House today to revisit a question I asked on September 24. I will remind the public of what that question was about.

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 requested from the Science, Oceans and Environment Branch at Fisheries and Oceans Canada. 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 were drilling in beluga habitat without knowing what beluga experts thought of the undertaking. Will the minister finally let the experts speak and will she provide the scientific opinions?

A lot has happened since I asked that question. Many things directly related to this file have happened since then. Let us have a look back at those events.

There was drilling at the time. In mid-September, drilling had begun off the coast of Cacouna and a large number of experts pointed out that the decision to authorize those activities was made by the provincial government. This was test drilling ahead of planning for the construction of a potential oil terminal off the coast of Cacouna. Many experts said that authorization was given without the backing of any credible scientific expertise, in other words, advice from Fisheries and Oceans Canada experts in marine mammals and species at risk.

Something rather uncommon in the history of our environmental obligations in Canada happened here. A group brought this matter all the way to the Quebec Superior Court, which is the highest court in Quebec. The group demonstrated that, despite repeated requests for months by the biologist in charge of the project at the provincial level to obtain credible scientific opinions, the Fisheries and Oceans Canada administration acted in such a way that a scientific opinion was never submitted. Something was submitted, namely some sort of briefing that was one and a half pages long, which is not considered to be a credible scientific opinion by any expert whatsoever. That is what was used as grounds to authorize the drilling. Nonetheless, the

Adjournment Proceedings

Superior Court decided to prohibit the drilling and issued an injunction.

That was the context for my question. Nevertheless, the minister replied—and I will give the broad strokes—that the ruling had to do with the provincial government, as though Fisheries and Oceans Canada was not a key player and the source of the problem.

Had Fisheries and Oceans Canada done its job, had it fulfilled its responsibility with respect to international agreements on species at risk, had it provided the necessary information, the Superior Court would never have been involved. The problem is the fault of Fisheries and Oceans Canada alone, but the minister is telling us that it is the fault of the provincial government.

With her incredible ignorance of the file—which continues because the problems have been compounded and she repeats the same empty answers every time—she told me that Fisheries and Oceans Canada had conducted a review of the project and approved it based on scientific evidence. The government cannot say that the day after the Superior Court imposes an injunction on a project because the judge realized that the scientific advice had not been provided.

That is just not good enough, and that is why I asked for an adjournment debate. I hope we will start to get answers that, at the very least, will suggest to Canadians and Quebecers that someone in government is starting to understand the fundamental problem with Fisheries and Oceans Canada and this file.

[*English*]

Mr. Randy Kamp (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the interest of the member opposite on this issue, I think the minister has been quite clear on this. She has said at every opportunity, as have I, that projects will only move forward if they are safe for Canadians and safe for the environment. We are committed to the protection of species at risk, and we take this responsibility very seriously. Science is an integral part of this responsibility and is in fact the backbone of all our decision-making processes.

As the member said, and as we are all aware, on September 23, the Quebec Superior Court granted an interlocutory injunction against TransCanada's exploratory work off the coast of Cacouna. It is important to understand, and I think the minister was clear about this, that the object of the ruling was a review and issuance of a certificate of authorization by the Quebec provincial government under provincial laws in Quebec. The Quebec Superior Court's decision did not deal with the federal government process, federal laws, or federal officials.

As explained before, DFO conducted its own careful review of TransCanada's exploratory work. The departmental experts concluded that the work could proceed, contingent on strict conditions.

Adjournment Proceedings

TransCanada submitted a proposal to conduct an exploratory program, which in addition to seismic testing included drilling and standard penetration tests, to define the geological structure at the proposed terminal site near Cacouna. The department reviewed the proposal to determine whether it would adversely impact listed aquatic species at risk and whether it was likely to cause serious harm to fish, which is prohibited under the Fisheries Act.

These reviews are undertaken by the department in accordance with well-established processes and rely on scientific information. A review of the information provided is undertaken by experts to determine whether additional information is needed to make a determination as to whether serious harm to fish is likely. As well, it must be determined whether there are potential impacts to species at risk. This involves consultation among expert sectors in the department. This is followed by an analysis of potential impacts, means to mitigate those impacts, and consideration of whether an authorization under the Fisheries Act or a permit under the Species at Risk Act is required, and if so, if it should be issued.

Following the review of the proposed exploratory work, Fisheries and Oceans Canada experts provided a letter to TransCanada indicating that mitigation measures, as included in the amended project proposal, had to be implemented to avoid potential impacts on the St. Lawrence beluga and their habitat. These measures included the presence of a marine mammal observer, ongoing monitoring of beluga presence, and the creation of a protection zone around the work site such that if belugas were observed within the zone, work would stop.

DFO advised TransCanada that provided these mitigation measures were implemented, DFO was of the view that the exploratory work would not result in serious harm to fish, nor would it contravene the Species at Risk Act.

We are committed to working with our provincial partners. In response to a request from the provincial ministry of Sustainable Development, Environment and the Fight against Climate Change, DFO provided copies of a number of existing scientific reports and analyses. These reports included a publicly available Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Science response entitled “The Impacts of Geophysical Surveys at the Cacouna Harbour on the St. Lawrence Beluga”.

We remain confident in the steps taken during the review of this proposal and the subsequent issuance of our letter of advice.

• (1935)

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where to start. Members opposite spend a lot of time hiding behind the fact that there were strict conditions.

First of all, the strict conditions were set out by a signatory who was not even a marine mammal specialist at the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and they were not supported by any scientists in the field.

What is more, if the Conservatives were up to date on this matter, they would know more about these so-called strict conditions. We now know that the noise from the drilling exceeded 120 decibels. We know that, even though the company was only authorized to conduct

drilling, it was doing other exploratory work that exceeded the noise limit of 120 decibels at a distance of 540 metres by five times. The 120-decibel noise carried over an area five times larger than what was authorized. Has the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans not been following this issue?

Furthermore, we know that three boats were being used at the same time, when the company had been limited to one vessel.

Even the unsatisfactory strict conditions were not met. The Conservatives need to come up to speed and get their heads out of the oil sands because, in this case, the strict conditions were not met. None of them were met.

[*English*]

Mr. Randy Kamp: Mr. Speaker, with respect to my colleague, and my colleague on the fisheries committee as well, I am inclined to take the advice of experts. Many of them are Ph.D. scientists who are experts on beluga whales. They did the review of the proposal. They concluded that given the strict conditions this work could go ahead.

Our department's mandate is to ensure that activities that proponents propose to undertake do not contravene the Species at Risk Act, and that if permits are needed, specific criteria for the protection and recovery of species at risk are respected. This is the case with this particular review conducted by the department, and as I said, we remain confident in the steps that were taken for the issuance of the letter of advice.

• (1940)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it was my honour to ask a question in the House about Environment Canada's National Pollutant Release Inventory.

The inventory tracks polluters in Canada. It lists a number of facilities in Beauport—Limoilou, such as the Quebec City incinerator and the White Birch Paper mill in Stadacona. It also lists the IMTT-Québec liquid bulk terminal at the Port of Quebec, which releases volatile pollutants, and the Bunge grain storage facilities, which are not in the riding of Beauport—Limoilou, but are nearby and can have an impact.

I was therefore surprised to see that Quebec Stevedoring was not in the inventory. Quebec Stevedoring handles tens of millions of tonnes of bulk solids that are exposed to the open air. It is hard to imagine that the warehousing and operational activities do not release pollutants.

This inventory is very important because it serves as a benchmark across the country. It is even used by the three trade partners—the United States, Mexico and Canada—to understand the impact of pollutants released by industrial, mining, and other facilities.

I would like to thank the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment for promising to get back to me. I received an answer in a letter. I have a copy of it here. It clearly indicates that Quebec Stevedoring is not included in the National Pollutant Release Inventory, but that Environment Canada officials have contacted the company.

Adjournment Proceedings

At present, Quebec Stevedoring's activities may not strictly require the company to report to the inventory. However, given the volume of its operations and the pollutants that could be released, including particulate matter, dust and nickel, Quebec Stevedoring could have to submit a report and be included in this famous inventory.

Now that I have gotten this very interesting answer from the office of the Minister of the Environment, I would like to know what will require Quebec Stevedoring to comply and report to the inventory. How and when will it happen? Clearly, measures and benchmarks will have to be established.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

[*English*]

This government is playing a leadership role when it comes to protecting our environment.

The National Pollutant Release Inventory is a key tool for the Government of Canada to identify and monitor sources of pollution in Canada and to provide information to Canadians on sources of pollution in their local communities. In place since 1993, it has resulted in mandatory annual reporting on pollutant releases and disposals to Environment Canada and publication of this information for all Canadians.

It is important to remember that it is not a list of all companies operating in Canada; rather, it is an inventory of pollutant releases and disposals reported by industrial facilities that meet specific reporting requirements as issued under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

Quebec Stevedoring has not reported to the National Pollutant Release Inventory in the past; however, Environment Canada officials are following up with the company to provide additional information on the reporting requirements. If Environment Canada officials determine that Quebec Stevedoring meets the reporting requirements, then they will be required to submit an annual report to Environment Canada.

To determine whether they are required to report to the National Pollutant Release Inventory, companies must take into account the types of activities that take place at their facilities as well as the number of employees who work there. If the threshold is exceeded for one of the over 300 substances listed on the inventory, reporting is then required on releases and disposals of that substance.

The primary activity at the Quebec Stevedoring facility in the port of Quebec appears to be the transfer of bulk materials containing nickel, a substance listed on the National Pollutant Release Inventory and a potential concern in the environment.

If the facility is only unloading and loading this material and is not releasing dust into the air or spilling material into the port, then they would likely not meet the criteria for reporting to the inventory. If, on the other hand, the total quantity of nickel released to the

environment or disposed of by the facility is greater than 10 tonnes per year, a report would be required for nickel. Reporting could also be required for particulate matter, a key air pollutant, or other listed substances.

On an annual basis, Environment Canada publishes the information collected under the National Pollutant Release Inventory. Canadians access the information through a variety of mechanisms, including an online search of the data. For the latest reporting year, over 7,500 industrial facilities across Canada reported on over 300 substances.

I want to thank my colleague for bringing this to my attention.

• (1945)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Côté: Mr. Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary for his answer.

I cannot say that I learned much more than what was in the letter I received.

I will not hide the fact that I am frustrated, since the inventory has been around since 1993 and Quebec Stevedoring has been in operation for about 30 years.

Twenty years ago, when the inventory was created, around 15 million tonnes of mostly dry bulk materials were being transferred. Now, that figure is 30 million tonnes. Environment Canada should already have been following up, monitoring and requiring that Quebec Stevedoring report to the inventory.

Why was Quebec Stevedoring not required to report pollutant releases and disposals up to now?

[*English*]

Mr. Colin Carrie: Mr. Speaker, the National Pollutant Release Inventory represents over 20 years of reporting from industrial facilities across Canada.

As part of ongoing efforts to improve the completeness of the National Pollutant Release Inventory and achieve and maintain a high level of data quality, Environment Canada routinely contacts facilities across Canada to provide information about the requirements for reporting. These efforts help to ensure that companies are meeting their reporting obligations.

Information collected through this program is used to support the department's chemicals regulatory program and is made publicly available to Canadians each year.

[*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 7:49 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, October 29, 2014

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Public Safety	
Mr. Obhrai	8915
Bernadette Laflamme	
Mr. Dubé	8915
Rod Love	
Ms. Crockatt	8915
Brain Tumour Awareness Month	
Ms. Freeland	8916
Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder	
Mr. Clarke	8916
Litterless Lunch Challenge	
Mr. Donnelly	8916
Canadian Heavyweight Boxing Title	
Mr. Kramp	8916
Bill Diachuk	
Mr. Goldring	8916
Ceremonial Guard	
Mr. Martin	8917
Nathan Cirillo and Patrice Vincent	
Mrs. Gallant	8917
Persons Case	
Ms. Leslie	8917
Afghanistan Memorial Vigil	
Mr. Chisu	8917
Mark Dunn	
Mr. Dion	8917
Islamic State	
Mr. Leef	8918
Nathan Cirillo	
Mr. Marston	8918
Nathan Cirillo and Patrice Vincent	
Mr. Sweet	8918

ORAL QUESTIONS

Public Safety	
Mr. Mulcair	8918
Mr. Harper	8918
Mr. Mulcair	8919
Mr. Harper	8919
Mr. Mulcair	8919
Mr. Harper	8919
Mr. Mulcair	8919
Mr. Harper	8919
Mr. Mulcair	8919
Mr. Harper	8919
Mr. Trudeau	8919

Mr. Harper	8919
Mr. Trudeau	8919
Mr. Harper	8919
Mr. Trudeau	8920
Mr. Harper	8920
Mr. Garrison	8920
Mr. Blaney	8920
Ms. Doré Lefebvre	8920
Mr. Blaney	8920

Rail Transportation

Mr. Mai	8920
Ms. Raitt	8920
Mr. Mai	8920
Ms. Raitt	8920
Mr. Kellway	8921
Ms. Raitt	8921

Manufacturing Industry

Ms. Nash	8921
Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	8921
Ms. Quach	8921
Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	8921

The Budget

Mr. Caron	8921
Mr. Oliver	8921
Mr. Cullen	8922
Mr. Oliver	8922

Employment Insurance

Ms. Freeland	8922
Mr. Oliver	8922

Citizenship and Immigration

Mr. McCallum	8922
Mr. Alexander	8922

Employment Insurance

Mr. Brison	8922
Mr. Oliver	8922

Employment

Mrs. Groguhé	8923
Mr. Kenney	8923
Ms. Sims	8923
Mr. Kenney	8923

Canada Post

Ms. Leslie	8923
Ms. Raitt	8923
Mr. Boulerice	8923
Ms. Raitt	8923

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Shory	8923
Mr. Baird	8924

Consumer Protection	
Mr. Thibeault	8924
Mr. Oliver	8924
Ms. Papillon	8924
Mr. Oliver	8924
Canada Revenue Agency	
Ms. Papillon	8924
Ms. Findlay	8924
Mr. Rankin	8924
Ms. Findlay	8924
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Valeriotte	8924
Mr. Fantino	8925
Seniors	
Ms. Sgro	8925
Mr. Oliver	8925
Housing	
Ms. Boutin-Sweet	8925
Ms. Bergen	8925
Mr. Sullivan	8925
Ms. Bergen	8925
Public Safety	
Mr. Carmichael	8925
Mr. Alexander	8925
Housing	
Mr. Vaughan	8926
Ms. Bergen	8926
Marine Transportation	
Mr. Nantel	8926
Ms. Raitt	8926
Social Development	
Mr. Brown (Barrie)	8926
Ms. Bergen	8926
Rail Transportation	
Ms. Laverdière	8926
Ms. Raitt	8926
Mrs. Mourani	8926
Ms. Raitt	8927
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	8927

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Public Accounts of Canada	
Mr. Clement	8927
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Lukiwski	8927
Interparliamentary Delegations	
Mr. Allison	8927
Mr. Aubin	8927
Mr. Goguen	8927
Canadian Environmental Bill of Rights	
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	8927

Bill C-634. Introduction and first reading	8927
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	8928
Committees of the House	
Natural Resources	
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	8928
Motion for concurrence	8928
(Motion agreed to)	8928
Petitions	
Sex Selection	
Mr. Benoit	8928
Impaired Driving	
Mr. Benoit	8928
Canada Post	
Mr. Tremblay	8928
The Senate	
Mr. Tremblay	8928
Mining Industry	
Mr. Tremblay	8928
Environmental Lakes Area	
Mr. Goodale	8928
The Environment	
Mr. Chisholm	8928
Canada Post	
Mr. Chisholm	8928
Autism Spectrum Disorders	
Ms. Duncan (Etobicoke North)	8928
Canada Post	
Mrs. Hughes	8929
The Environment	
Mr. Choquette	8929
Canada Post	
Mr. Choquette	8929
CBC/Radio-Canada	
Mr. Choquette	8929
Canada Post	
Mr. Mai	8929
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lukiwski	8929
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
Mr. Lukiwski	8930
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Lukiwski	8932

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Economic Action Plan 2014 Act, No. 2	
Mr. Oliver	8932
Bill C-43. Second reading	8932
Mr. Saxton	8932
Mr. Cullen	8934
Mr. Lamoureux	8935
Mr. Nicholls	8935
Mr. Toone	8936
Mr. Cullen	8936
Amendment	8939

Mr. Lamoureux.....	8939
Mr. Nicholls.....	8940
Mr. Brison.....	8940
Mr. Brison.....	8941
Mr. Cullen.....	8944
Mr. Pacetti.....	8944
Mrs. Smith.....	8945
Mr. Dewar.....	8946
Mr. Lamoureux.....	8947
Bill C-43—Notice of time allocation motion	
Mr. Van Loan.....	8947
Second Reading	
Ms. Young (Vancouver South).....	8947
Mr. Caron.....	8948
Ms. May.....	8948
Mr. Wallace.....	8949
Mr. Caron.....	8949
Business of Supply	
Opposition Motion—Ebola	
Motion.....	8950
Amendment negatived on division.....	8951
Motion negatived.....	8953
Canada-Korea Economic Growth and Prosperity Act	
Bill C-41. Third reading.....	8953
Motion agreed to.....	8954

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Supporting Non-Partisan Agents of Parliament Act

Bill C-520. Report Stage.....	8954
Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 negatived.....	8955
Motion No. 8 agreed to.....	8956
Mr. Adler.....	8956
Motion for concurrence.....	8956
Motion agreed to.....	8957
Third reading.....	8957
Motion agreed to.....	8958
(Bill read the third time and passed).....	8958

Assaults Against Public Transit Operators

Bill S-221. Second reading.....	8958
Motion agreed to.....	8959
(Bill read the second time and referred to committee).....	8959

National Health and Fitness Day Act

Bill S-211. Second reading.....	8959
Motion agreed to.....	8961
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee).....	8961

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

The Environment

Mr. Lapointe.....	8961
Mr. Kamp.....	8961
Mr. Côté.....	8962
Mr. Carrie.....	8963

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>