



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 147 • NUMBER 228 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

—

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

● (1400)

[*English*]

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

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

AHUNTSIC YOUTH HOCKEY

Mrs. Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, I am wearing a Braves d'Ahuntsic jersey, not a Boston Bruins one, with the number 9 and Maurice Richard's name. This is because I want to salute an association that, for 60 years, has been dedicated to youth and our national sport, hockey.

Beginning in 1957, Maurice "Rocket" Richard was one of the Braves' dedicated volunteers who watched his sons from the sidelines at outdoor rinks, transported players to practices and refereed games. He also generously contributed his services and leveraged his fame for this amateur hockey association.

Let us hope that someday, the wishes of the Richard family and the Braves d'Ahuntsic will come true and the Ahuntsic arena will bear the name of an exceptional man and sportsman who left his mark on the history of Quebec, Canada and our part of the country.

* * *

[*English*]

MEMBER FOR DAUPHIN—SWAN RIVER—MARQUETTE

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have represented the great people of Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette for the past four and a half years.

Their work ethic is exemplary, whether it is on the many farms, small businesses, our forestry industry or the agricultural value

chain. These natural resource industries are the backbone of a beautiful and diverse constituency.

My constituents are proud to come from the Parkland region of Western Manitoba where the many beautiful lakes, rivers and fisheries contribute to a vibrant tourism industry. The crown jewel of western Manitoba is our remarkable Riding Mountain National Park that attracts visitors from across Canada and around the world.

I have spent these last few years dedicated to protecting and defending our rural way of life. I look forward to continuing this important work and to building on the expanding opportunities for my constituents in my many growing communities.

Our government is leading this economic turnaround in my riding, with a balanced budget, and a low-tax plan for jobs, growth and security.

* * *

● (1405)

2015 PAN AM GAMES

Mr. Malcolm Allen (Welland, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this July, as part of the 2015 Pan American Games being held in Toronto, the international canoe-kayak competition will be held in my riding of Welland.

We are excited to host 120 athletes from all over the Americas eager to try and take home the gold. We are welcoming athletes and spectators alike to our great city, and Welland is very proud to be a host for the prestigious Pan Am Games.

Along with recognizing this honour, I would like to congratulate a member of our community, Brian Thorne, who in 1987 along with his teammate were awarded gold medals in the lightweight double sculls category in rowing. We will get to honour Brian once more as he has been selected as one of the carriers for the Pan American torch relay. Brian will get to carry the torch through the streets of Welland, as a symbol of an important journey in the start of the games and to welcome a new generation of outstanding athletes.

On behalf of myself and the constituents of my riding, I would like to give a heartfelt congratulations to Brian, the city of Welland and the countless volunteers who will make these games great. Best of luck to all the athletes, go Canada go!

*Statements by Members***MEMBER FOR KILDONAN—ST. PAUL**

Mrs. Joy Smith (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the 41st Parliament will soon draw to a close. The daily spin will end, the thumping of desks will cease and this room will grow silent.

It has been a pleasure to work with such highly intelligent and dedicated staff as Joel Oosterman, Marian Jaworski, and of course the most brilliant young woman, Evann Goltz.

Under the leadership of our Prime Minister, Canada has the strongest economy in the G7 and a balanced budget. Our anti-human trafficking laws have been strengthened, support for NGOs has been increased, and survivors have been given dignity and justice. However across our nation, human trafficking will continue to occur, in cities, small towns and on reserves. Men and women, boys and girls, will still be bought, sold and exploited. We must continue to seek to abolish it in our generation. We can do it. We must do it.

As I close the door on this chapter of my life, I thank God for his grace. I thank my precious family for sticking with me. I am ready for the next exciting chapter.

* * *

RELAY FOR LIFE

Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Canadian Cancer Society's Relay for Life that was held in my riding over the weekend. This was the 13th year it has been held in Cape Breton.

Relay for Life brings Canadians together from across this great country to join in the fight against cancer. It is an opportunity for communities to celebrate survivors and remember loved ones lost to the disease, all while raising funds. The relay is the largest cancer fundraiser in Canada with more than 500 communities taking part each year. In Sydney, Saturday night, I participated with 350 participants, 100 volunteers and 95 survivors, all helping raise \$60,000. Throughout Cape Breton over the last week, there were four fundraisers raising \$170,000.

It was great to be joined Saturday night by former MLA Gordie Gosse who has been courageously battling cancer over the last year.

Congratulations to all volunteers and all those who came out to show their support. I invite everyone in this House to visit the site cancer.ca to find a relay happening in their area and join the fight against this illness that affects all of us.

* * *

MEMBER FOR CALGARY NORTHEAST

Mr. Devinder Shory (Calgary Northeast, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to thank the residents of Calgary Northeast for giving me the honour of representing them for the past seven years. I also want to thank my parliamentary colleagues who are not seeking re-election for their public service.

Throughout this time our Conservative government has accomplished a great number of things, like lowering taxes, balancing the budget, opening new markets, strengthening the immigration system, protecting the value of Canadian citizenship by stripping it from convicted terrorists, investing in infrastructure, expanding the universal child care benefit, and the list goes on.

However, it would not be possible without the feedback, support, passion and dedication from community leaders and members.

As the Conservative candidate for the new riding of Calgary Skyview, I look forward to receiving the continued support from the community in upcoming election and I will definitely miss my brother from another mother, the member for Medicine Hat.

* * *

● (1410)

SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

Mr. Alex Atamanenko (British Columbia Southern Interior, NDP): Mr. Speaker, our supply management sector is under threat at the current secretive negotiations on the trans-Pacific partnership. Countries such as the U.S. and New Zealand are applying tremendous pressure on Canada to put supply management on the chopping block.

Most recently, the Conservatives buckled under European pressure to allow an additional 17,000 tonnes of subsidized European artisan cheese to flood our markets. Our farmers are taking a direct hit as a result of this CETA sell-out.

Unlike other agricultural sectors, farmers in the supply management sector have been able to survive in difficult times over the years without any government subsidies. Prices to consumers have remained constant and competitive. The price of chicken, for example, has risen by only 3.5% over the past two years, while non-supply managed pork and beef have risen by over 20%, and supply management contributes \$20 billion to our gross domestic product.

I call on the Conservatives not to give any additional duty-free access for imported dairy, egg and poultry products. The system is working for Canadians. No further concessions.

* * *

STOMPING OUT STIGMA

Mrs. Pat Perkins (Whitby—Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to congratulate All Saints Catholic Secondary School teacher Pam Garant who was honoured with the Durham Catholic School Board Award of Merit for her successful efforts to raise awareness of mental illness, an issue that affects 20% of Canadians at some point in their lifetime.

Six years ago, a conference at the Ontario Shores for Mental Health Sciences facility inspired Pam and some of her students to start a club called "Stomping Out Stigma".

Statements by Members

Today, the club is thriving with nearly 80 members who work to reduce the stigma that can be associated with mental health issues and they continue discussions about coping strategies and resilience outside of the school walls.

Pam has helped these students become leaders in our community. I know all members will join me in congratulating the Stomping Out Stigma club for their very important work.

* * *

POLICE SERVICES

Hon. Laurie Hawn (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the following comments or thoughts could have been made by thousands of people we know.

While people sleep, we are out there. While people are sitting down at Thanksgiving or Christmas, we are out there. When it is raining and cold and people are glad to be home with their families, we are out there. When it is people's children's birthday, we are out there. When it is our children's birthday, we are still out there. When people are scared, they call us; when we are scared, we carry on. While people are asleep with their spouse, ours sleep alone. When people tell their families "see you tonight" as they leave for work, they mean it. When we tell our families that, we pray that we will.

Therefore, the next time we are out with our families or friends and we see a patrol car go by, let us remember the incredible sacrifice made by those officers every day. Inside that car is a person who sacrifices his or her life, both professionally and personally, every day.

God bless the soul of Constable Daniel Woodall; God bless his family in their time of tragedy; God bless the recovery of Sergeant Jason Harley; and God bless all members of the Edmonton Police Service and all police forces.

* * *

[Translation]

SAINT-BRUNO—SAINT-HUBERT VOLUNTEERS

Mrs. Djaouida Sellah (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to dedicate my final member's statement of this 41st Parliament to all the volunteers who have made a difference in Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert this year. We are fortunate to be able to count on the Centre de soutien entr'Aidants, Au Second Lieu, the Maison des Tournesols, the Association Sclérose en Plaques Rive-Sud, the Maison de la famille La Parentr'aide, the Centre d'action bénévole de Saint-Hubert, the Centre d'action bénévole "Les P'tits bonheurs", the Fondation du Mont-Saint-Bruno, the Mont-Bruno and Lafleche Optimist Clubs, the Maison des jeunes de Saint-Bruno, the Groupe d'entraide G.E.M.E., and Minta Saint-Bruno.

They all make our community a better place to live and I thank them very much for that.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. John Carmichael (Don Valley West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of our Prime Minister, we have consistently

lowered taxes and created voluntary options for Canadians to save, which include: pension income splitting, pooled registered pension plans, and the landmark tax-free savings account.

By contrast, the Liberal leader would raise taxes and force a mandatory payroll tax increase on every employee and employer in Canada, whether they like it or not.

The Liberal leader's mandatory \$1,000 tax hike would be forced onto middle-class workers, and his payroll tax increase would force small businesses to cut hours, jobs and wages.

Now is not the time for these risky schemes and untested leadership.

* * *

●(1415)

[Translation]

GENDER PARITY

Mrs. Anne-Marie Day (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, women in Canada have never been more educated. They hold the majority of positions in fields such as business administration, law and health.

However, women are still under-represented in senior management positions. It does not make sense to me that in 2015, being a woman is an obstacle to career advancement.

I was embarrassed for Canadian women when every member of the Conservative Party voted against Bill C-473, which called for gender parity in federal crown corporations.

If this trend holds, gender parity in senior management positions in Canada will not be achieved until 2097. That is shameful. I am ashamed of the Conservative government for refusing to launch an investigation into the murder and disappearance of more than 1,000 aboriginal women.

Canadians deserve better. The NDP will promote women in leadership and call a commission of inquiry into the missing and murdered aboriginal women.

* * *

[English]

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Mrs. Susan Truppe (London North Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last year, our government secured the largest advanced manufacturing export contract in Canadian history. The multi-billion dollar contract for GDLS Canada will create and sustain thousands of jobs in London and across Canada.

Shamefully, the NDP member for London—Fanshawe has remained silent, while her Liberal colleague from Westmount—Ville-Marie attacked our government's support of these high paying union jobs.

What is worse is that the Liberal leader was actually in London when he said that Ontario should transition away from manufacturing-based jobs.

Oral Questions

Our Conservative government will not turn its back on the thousands of workers who depend on manufacturing to put food on the table for their families.

While we remain focused on creating jobs, the Liberals and the NDP are pushing a high-tax, high-debt agenda that would threaten jobs and set working families back.

* * *

MULTICULTURAL PROGRAMMING

Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Conservatives talk a big game when it comes to supporting multiculturalism, yet the policies of the government have allowed the telecom sector to end local multicultural offerings. Case in point, when Rogers slashed OMNI TV's multilingual services, the government closed its eyes and hoped no one would notice.

Despite building a company on the backs of ethnic communities, Rogers has clearly abandoned its roots.

With the help of the government, Rogers ended Portuguese and South Asian newscasts, 21 programs in 12 different languages, and replaced daily OMNI newscasts with current affairs programming without original reporting and, now, the newscasts in Punjabi, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Italian have also been cancelled.

Governments must create a climate where multicultural programming can flourish. It is time for the government and Rogers to take their responsibilities seriously. It is not always about money; it is about identity.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Royal Galipeau (Ottawa—Orléans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, though separated for a time by the Iron Curtain of the Soviet era, Canada and Poland again have an increasingly strong defence relationship.

In fact, Canada was the first country to ratify Polish accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

[Translation]

Yesterday, Canada and Poland signed a declaration of intent to cement their commitment to strengthen their defence co-operation, promote security and contribute to international peace.

[English]

This follows last year's declaration of intent signed with Ukraine, exploring opportunities to conduct joint military training and capacity building in response to the Putin regime's aggression toward Ukraine.

[Translation]

On behalf of the good people of Orléans, I am pleased that Canada continues to stand united with its allies.

ETHICS

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General's report on the Senate expense scandal reads like the script for a bad soap opera.

Apparently, Liberal and Conservative senators believe it is acceptable for our taxes to pay for fishing trips, golf games, a second house, family dinners, personal events such as wedding anniversaries, and vacations because we all know that senators have a tough life. From time to time, they need a break from the cold Camembert. Poor dears.

For goodness' sake. Those are not parliamentary duties. They have been caught with their hands in the cookie jar. Nothing is too good for them. Meanwhile, the Conservatives have the audacity to ask Canadians to tighten their belts.

We have had enough of being ripped off and paying for senators' golf games. This fall, all Quebeckers and Canadians can vote with confidence for the NDP because they know that it is the only party that will clean up this mess and get rid of the Senate.

* * *

• (1420)

TAXATION

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my constituents do not want anything to do with the Liberal leader's plan, which involves raising taxes and forcing Canadians to pay another mandatory tax of \$1,000.

The only thing his increase in payroll taxes will do for small businesses is reduce their employees' take-home pay. It will force employers to cut jobs. Rather than proposing risky plans based on tax hikes, our government believes it is better to put money directly back into seniors' and retirees' pockets and let Canadians choose their own way of saving.

This year, we cut the average family's taxes by \$6,600 a year. We increased the limit for tax-free savings accounts so that Canadians can save more without paying more taxes. Meanwhile, the Liberal leader plans to do away with these accounts and raise taxes. This is no time for the Liberals' risky tax and spend strategy or for untested leadership.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

ETHICS

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General has referred nine more senators to the RCMP. There are 34 senators with illegal expenses, with 13 charged, under investigation or on trial for fraud, many appointed by the current Prime Minister: six Conservatives, seven Liberals.

The Prime Minister used to rail against this type of ingrained institutional corruption. What has happened to the Prime Minister's principles?

Oral Questions

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, it was the Senate that invited the Auditor General to examine senatorial expenses. As we know, the Auditor General has highlighted some 30 senators who have some issues with expenses.

At the same time, the House administration has identified some 68 members of the NDP caucus who have issues with respect to their expenses. The Auditor General identified a little less than \$1 million in the Senate.

The House administration has identified that NDP members owe \$2.7 million. The leader of the opposition himself owes \$400,000. I certainly hope he will do the right thing and repay that money as well.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would be nostalgic for Dean Del Mastro.

These are the Prime Minister's very own nominations. He owns them.

The Auditor General found that his senators were charging for everything from \$200 for a hockey game to over \$11,000 in trips to play golf, visit their tailor or go fishing.

Are Canadians supposed to be glad that they did not take a government helicopter, like the Minister of Justice did on his fishing trip?

Will the Prime Minister stand up, assume his responsibility and answer for the actions of the people that he named? He is the only person responsible here.

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was the Senate that invited the Auditor General and we welcome the report of the Auditor General.

At the same time, Canadians do not differentiate. When elected officials, or any parliamentarians, have issues with expenses, they expect them to pay them back. That is why the leader of the opposition should pay back the \$400,000 that he owes as part of a \$2.7 million scheme that he hatched in his office to take money away from ridings and funnel it to a partisan office in Montreal.

The leader of the opposition would be well-advised to take care and watch out for his ever-growing proboscis as he climbs down off of his high horse.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Marjory LeBreton, the former leader of the Conservative government in the Senate, had to resign—brace yourselves—for altering the Duffy report in response to orders from the Prime Minister's Office.

Her replacement, Claude Carignan, also chosen by the Prime Minister, has now also been singled out by the Auditor General for inappropriate expenses. The Prime Minister's judgment is in question here.

Does the Prime Minister still have confidence in his leader in the Senate? Why is Claude Carignan still a member of the Conservative government?

• (1425)

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was the Senate that invited the Auditor General to review its expenses. The Auditor General presented a report yesterday and we expect that all senators will co-operate with that report.

At the same time, we know that there are some 68 members of the NDP caucus who owe taxpayers \$2.7 million. For instance, the member for Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher owes \$14,911 and is refusing to pay it back. The member for Scarborough Southwest owes \$141,000. The member for Parkdale—High Park owes over \$1,000. The member for Vaudreuil—Soulanges owes \$30,740. The member for Laval owes—

The Speaker: Order. The hon. leader of the opposition.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that the expense audit does not include the senators who repaid their fraudulent expenses before June 2013.

Another person appointed by the Prime Minister, Carolyn Stewart Olsen, who was involved in the attempts to cover up the Mike Duffy scandal, said that she repaid her fraudulent expenses in order to escape the audit and avoid getting caught.

How many other senators appointed by the Prime Minister used this scheme to cover up and conceal their fraudulent expenses before the audit even started?

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we trust the work of the Auditor General. He presented a number of recommendations. We hope, and of course insist, that all of the senators follow the process and work with the Auditor General.

Again, the Leader of the Opposition seems to think that Canadians look at things differently when there are 68 members of the NDP caucus who were identified for misusing \$2.7 million of taxpayer resources. The Leader of the Opposition himself sits in this place owing the taxpayers \$400,000 as part of a \$2.7 million scheme that the New Democrats all owe the taxpayers. They should do the right thing and pay it back.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is going to meet the Pope at the Vatican tomorrow. Will he ask Pope Francis to apologize for the church's involvement in the horrors of residential schools?

Oral Questions

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, we want to thank all of the survivors for their courage and for sharing their experiences with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada and all Canadians.

When the Prime Minister made a historic apology on behalf of all Canadians in 2008, the government recognized that the policy of assimilation and residential schools caused great harm and that the schools had no place in Canada. I have personally written to the provinces, the territories, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Vatican to inform them of the commission's report and recommendations.

* * *

[English]

THE SENATE

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Senate needs real change. The current government has offered none. The Prime Minister instead appointed 57 senators who take orders from him. His ministers caucused with them this morning.

Duffy. Wallin. Brazeau. How can ministers in the government defend their Prime Minister's status quo decade of patronage appointments?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as members know, we have brought forward a number of recommendations with respect to reforming the Senate. The Supreme Court, in its wisdom, has suggested that unanimity is required from all of the provinces.

The Liberal Party's position on this makes no sense whatsoever. The Liberal leader wants to appoint Liberals who would then appoint non-partisan people to fill the Senate, so it would be unelected Liberals appointing unelected Liberals to sit in the Senate. That is the Liberals' idea of reform. That is not what Canadians want.

We are fighting to bring accountability to the Senate. We have made a lot of progress. We welcome the Auditor General's report.

We will continue to focus on jobs and economic growth.

• (1430)

[Translation]

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has been promising to reform the Senate for over 10 years now, but he chose to appoint 57 senators. The Leader of the Opposition also makes a lot of promises, but the fact is that he wants to lead Canada back into a constitutional saga.

The Senate needs real change. Only the Liberal Party has a plan to make that happen.

Why is this government refusing to take action and bring real change to the Senate?

[English]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians waited and waited and waited, and the leader of the

Liberal Party came forward with his plan. His plan was to not call his senators Liberals any more but to call them Senate Liberals. They have been alleviated of the responsibility of attending the weekly caucus meeting with the Liberals—I know there are a lot of people who would welcome that—but they still call themselves Liberals, they fundraise for the Liberal Party, and they campaign for the Liberal Party.

His idea of reform is to have an unelected group of Liberals appointing an unelected group of Liberal senators. We can do better, and we will.

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, removing senators from his caucus is something the Prime Minister could do today. Ending partisan appointments to the Senate is something the Prime Minister could do today. That is what real change would actually look like.

After a decade, Canadians do not want excuses. They want to know why Conservatives have done nothing for real, meaningful Senate reform.

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have waited and waited and waited, and that member comes here with a policy of unelected Liberals nominating unelected Liberal senators. His great policy is to not call them Liberals but to call them Senate Liberals.

On top of his other great economic policy of legalizing marijuana, the great Liberals have come up with great policies: tax Canadians more, take away the universal child care benefit, and increase mandatory pension contributions. Tax more, spend more, change the name of the party; anything to try to get re-elected.

That member is in way over his head. Canadians deserve better.

* * *

ETHICS

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General's report stated oversight, accountability and transparency of senators' expenses—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. We have to get back to order. The hon. member for London—Fanshawe now has the floor, and I would like to hear the question.

Ms. Irene Mathysen: They are so badly behaved, Mr. Speaker.

The Auditor General's report stated that oversight, accountability and transparency of senators' expenses was quite simply not adequate. He said it is time for transformational change and independent oversight. The Prime Minister's hand-picked Senate Speaker disagreed with the Auditor General. He said senators can still handle their own oversight and defended using a secretive Senate committee.

Oral Questions

Do Conservatives really think accountability means using secretive Senate committees and senators and MPs all policing themselves?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is not what the senators have suggested. They welcome the Auditor General's report and will look at implementing the recommendations.

The Auditor General found 30 senators with problems. House administration found 68 members of Parliament with problems with their expenses. They all happen to be NDP members of Parliament.

I do not know how that member can sit in the House and claim all kinds of things against senators, when she sits in a caucus of 68 members of Parliament who owe \$2.7 million to Canadians, which they refuse to pay back. Her own leader owes \$400,000. Help him repay that \$400,000.

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Still living in fantasy, Mr. Speaker.

The Conservatives once promised to fight for change in Ottawa. Now they fight to defend unelected and unaccountable senators. Just look at what they have become. Fifty-nine senators have been appointed by a Prime Minister who promised he would never appoint a single one. They use the Senate as a slush fund for party fundraising. The Prime Minister's Office was caught orchestrating a cover-up to help Mike Duffy.

Is this the reason Conservatives now oppose the Auditor General's call for independent oversight in the Senate?

•(1435)

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): That is obviously completely wrong, Mr. Speaker. That is not at all what the Senate has suggested. The Senate welcomes the report of the Auditor General and is looking at implementing the recommendations.

At the same time, what the NDP does not seem to understand is that there is only one taxpayer. When they deliberately abuse their money, Canadians want it back, at the very least. The NDP owes \$2.7 million to the people of Canada. The former NDP member for Montcalm owes \$22,000. The member for Laval—Les Îles owes \$31,874 and is refusing to pay that back. I hope those members will do the right thing and pay it back.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Ève Pécelet (La Pointe-de-l'Île, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have a right to know how much the Prime Minister's Office knew about the Senate expense scandal. Senator Tkachuk was reimbursed for a trip that he and his wife took to attend the 50th wedding anniversary of another senator. The Speaker of the Senate was reimbursed for expenses related to organizing a Valentine's Day ball. I do not think that really falls within the scope of his official duties.

Does the Prime Minister agree with the Auditor General that the Senate needs an independent oversight body to keep an eye on its expenses? It is simple.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is up to the Senate. It is its responsibility to respond to the court. We welcome the recommendations of the Auditor General, and we already suggested yesterday in the House that we look forward to the Senate implementing the suggestions of the Auditor General.

However, this member can also help the taxpayers of Canada by repaying the \$27,144 she owes the people of her riding as part of the \$2.7 million scheme hatched by the Leader of the Opposition to defraud Canadians of the money they sent to this place.

Whether it is a senator or a member of Parliament, they owe them the money. Pay it back.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Ève Pécelet (La Pointe-de-l'Île, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that someone, somewhere in the Prime Minister's Office saw those expenses and decided that the situation absolutely had to be covered up, because it was not right.

Senator Zimmer and his wife claimed over \$100,000 in Senate expenses for personal travel, including over \$2,000 in personal taxi fares. They enjoyed an open bar at taxpayers' expense. It is shameful.

Will the Prime Minister do the right thing, take charge and support the creation of an independent oversight body for the Senate once and for all?

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that on a number of occasions. We welcome the report of the Auditor General. He has made a number of important recommendations, and we expect that the Senate will follow those recommendations.

At the same time, it is incumbent upon the NDP to do the right thing as well. There are some 68 members of that caucus who owe \$2.7 million. The member for Compton—Stanstead owes \$142,548 and is refusing to pay it back. The member for Toronto—Danforth funnelled money to an illegal office in Montreal for some reason. He spent \$1,288.

They should all pay that back.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when he was a member of the opposition, the Prime Minister stated loud and clear that he would reform the Senate and clean house.

Once he came to power, he did exactly what the Liberals did. He appointed his cronies, who, according to the Auditor General, could not care less about wasting taxpayers' money: business class travel, fishing trips, golf games, hockey tickets, the list goes on. There is nothing too good for the upper class.

Senators have no qualms about making other people pay for their luxurious lifestyles. We propose abolishing the Senate. However, in the meantime, what are the Conservatives going to do to clean house?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is a member who owes the taxpayers \$122,000, because he supported an illegal office in Montreal. We know that he knows how to write cheques. We know that because he wrote 29 separate cheques to the separatist party in Quebec.

He can do the right thing by saving one of those cheques and writing it for \$122,000 to the Receiver General of Canada for his portion of the \$2.7 million the NDP owes the taxpayer. I am not sure if the Receiver General takes a credit card or PayPal, but he should pay back all of the money he owes.

● (1440)

[Translation]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is such a delight when the best attack one's adversary can dish out is nothing but a dud.

The Senate is just another broken and empty Conservative promise. The Senate is fraught with scandal, and the Conservatives' solution is to allow senators to self-inspect. This happens in other sectors too, and no one seems to have a problem with that. The Auditor General is calling for sweeping changes and an independent oversight body.

Did being drunk on power get the better of the Conservatives and their determination to clean up the Senate? I think so.

[English]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that on a number of occasions. The Auditor General made some important recommendations. We expect that the Senate will follow those recommendations, and it has indicated that it will do that.

At the same time, Canadians work very hard for the money they make and the money they send to this place and to the other place. When that money is deliberately abused, I am not going to stand up and defend that, nor should that member. He should work with the other 67 members of his caucus to repay the \$2.7 million they owe instead of spending the entire summer squished into the defendant's box trying to argue with Canadians about why they refuse to pay it back. Pay back the money you owe.

The Speaker: I want to remind the hon. parliamentary secretary to address his comments to the Chair and not directly at his colleagues.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister used to say that senators do not represent anybody but the prime minister who appointed them, and the current Prime Minister has been found doing damage control for the Senate scandal every step of the way.

How does he feel now that we have found out that his hand-picked Senate speaker was billing taxpayers for a St. Valentine's ball in Montreal and that his previous Senate leader flew to Vancouver for a wedding anniversary on the taxpayers' dime?

These senators are refusing to show any contrition, and the government is refusing to show any responsibility. When will it stop defending its friends in the Senate and start defending the Canadian taxpayer?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the absolute nerve of that member to get up and talk about defending the Canadian taxpayer when there are 68 members of his caucus who owe the Canadian taxpayer three times as much as has been identified in the auditor's report.

I will not stand up to try to protect anybody who has deliberately used taxpayers' money inappropriately, and I certainly will not defend the members of the NDP caucus who owe \$2.7 million to taxpayers.

It is up to you to tell Canadian taxpayers why you refuse—

The Speaker: Order, please. I ask the hon. member to address his comments to the Chair. He will do well to do that in future.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that was certainly pitiful: a once-proud government that will say anything and do anything in its dying days as it is tied to the corruption in the Senate. No wonder the Prime Minister has gone to ground.

Let us get back to reality. Let us talk about the former president of the Liberal Party, Senator Poulin, who refused to even co-operate with the Auditor General. Her case has been referred to the RCMP.

Canadians are sick of this sense of entitlement. Why does the Prime Minister refuse to show any leadership, and let that member defend the indefensible? Why are the Conservatives defending corruption in the Senate rather than standing up for the Canadian taxpayer?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are standing up for Canadian taxpayers every single day. I will not defend people who deliberately misuse taxpayers dollars, whether they are a member of the Senate or whether they are a member of the House of Commons.

Canadians deserve better, and with this government they always get better. However, it is up to that member and that caucus to explain why, when specifically asked on September 22 where these offices would be, whether they would be in Ottawa in Montreal, they said, specifically, that they would be in Ottawa, but instead funnelled it to the illegal office in Montreal.

Canadians deserve better from everybody, including those 68 members who owe money.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Craig Scott (Toronto—Danforth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is not only about abusing public money for fishing trips and wedding anniversaries. The Senate is also an undemocratic institution that has blocked important legislation passed by elected members of the House.

Oral Questions

The Senate killed Jack Layton's climate change accountability act. It is quietly doing away with a bill to bring equality to transgendered people.

Last night it passed Bill C-51 with no sober second thought whatsoever, despite overwhelming public opposition. Not a single amendment was proposed.

Why are Conservatives defending this illegitimate institution that rejects the democratic will of Canadians?

• (1445)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that for the entire session the NDP has been complacent and not taken terrorism seriously. This has been their attitude with respect to all the measures our government has put in place to protect Canadians. Whether it was our counter-terrorism strategy, the revocation of passports or the revocation of citizenship, the NDP did not back practical measures to support Canadians.

Fortunately, I was able to count on the support of Conservative members and senators. I thank them because their support means that Canada will have better protection against terrorists.

* * *

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Chrystia Freeland (Toronto Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the formal trade deal between Europe and Ukraine goes into force at the beginning of 2016, but the EU actually understands Ukraine's pivotal role and has therefore pre-emptively and unilaterally lifted tariffs for Ukrainian companies.

In contrast, despite much rhetoric about Ukraine, Canada has held back, awaiting the completion of inevitably time-consuming, formal, bilateral trade talks.

Why does the Prime Minister not do as much for Ukraine on trade right now as Angela Merkel has already done?

Hon. Ed Fast (Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, no one has done more for Ukraine than this Conservative government.

The Prime Minister has visited Ukraine on a number of occasions. We have hosted President Poroshenko here in the House. I have been to Ukraine on two occasions to see for myself the situation on the ground.

It is this government that began free trade negotiations with the Ukrainian government. We continue to pursue those negotiations. Our negotiators are at the table, hoping to complete negotiations in the short term so Ukrainians can benefit from more open markets.

In the meantime, we are also stepping in, supporting democracy, transparency and governance within that country.

[*Translation*]

PENSIONS

Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has finally admitted it: Canada pension plan contributions are not taxes. Thank goodness.

Just because the Conservatives keep repeating falsehoods does not all of a sudden turn them into the truth. Pension income is money that always goes into the pockets of retirees. In the private sector, 75% of workers do not have a company pension plan.

Why does the government not work with the provinces to establish a better pension plan for all Canadians?

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, again, the Liberal plan has a plan for all Canadians. It is higher taxes. In fact, the Liberal leader has confirmed that he would implement the Ontario Liberal payroll tax on every worker and every small businessman and woman in Canada. For workers earning \$60,000 a year, the Liberal policy means they would lose \$1,000 in take-home pay. That is a \$1,000 tax hike. This mandatory payroll tax increase would kill jobs and force small businesses to cut hours and wages.

By contrast, under the strong leadership of our Prime Minister, we have lowered taxes, created new options for Canadians—

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Wascana.

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the late Jim Flaherty said “the Canada Pension Plan plays a central role in our government-supported retirement system”, and should be “enhanced”.

The current Minister of Finance has confirmed that CPP premiums are not payroll taxes. He says that the money always belongs to individual pensioners, and the CPP Investment Board gets impressive results.

Fragmented schemes in bits and pieces here and there do not cover most Canadians and they are not portable. Therefore, why not work with the provinces and a strong majority of Canadians to expand the CPP?

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the strong leadership of our Prime Minister, our government has lowered taxes and created new voluntary opportunities for Canadians to save. Consistent with our record of creating voluntary options for Canadians to save their own money, we are open to giving Canadians the option to contribute more to the Canada pension plan on a voluntary basis.

By contrast, we know that, given the chance, both the Liberals and the NDP would take away pension income splitting and shut down tax-free savings account.

The Liberal plan is that for someone earning \$60,000 a year, it would impose another \$1,000 of taxes on it. Canadians cannot afford that.

Oral Questions

●(1450)

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, two new Swiss banks are now facing fines from the United States for helping wealthy clients evade taxes. Still there is no action from the Conservatives to actually charge Canadians found to be stashing millions overseas.

We are losing up to \$8 billion a year to tax havens. That money could help pay for child care, health care, transit or boosting economic innovation. However, the Conservatives have totally failed to get serious on cracking down on tax havens. Why do they keep letting the wealthy and well connected avoid paying their fair share?

Mr. Gerald Keddy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that question is absolute nonsense. Our government has always had zero tolerance for tax evasion.

Let the numbers and the record speak for themselves. From 2006 to March 31, 2014, CRA audited over 8,600 international tax cases, identified over \$5.6 billion in additional taxes, taxes that are being collected.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Dionne Labelle (Rivière-du-Nord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the United States has just imposed hefty fines on two Swiss banks that were helping American taxpayers hide more than \$660 million from the taxman. Here, people in the middle class are working harder and harder to make ends meet and are paying their taxes in Canada. However, Canadian corporations have sheltered almost \$200 billion in tax havens.

When will the Conservatives take action to ensure that corporations pay their fair share here?

[English]

Mr. Gerald Keddy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, CPC): Mr. Speaker, CRA and our government expect all Canadians and all corporations to pay their fair share of Canadian tax.

What the hon. member is talking about is again sheer nonsense. We have more international auditors. We have a greater effort to catch tax evaders, not just individuals but companies as well, who are using offshore shelters to protect themselves from paying Canadian tax.

We expect everyone to pay their fair share of tax and we intend to ensure that happens.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, farmers no longer know who to believe in the Conservative Party when it comes to the future of supply management in Canada. The member for Edmonton Centre called supply management an anachronism that needs to disappear. The Prime Minister said that

Canada would have to make difficult choices, and his Quebec lieutenant has already talked about compensating Canadian producers for the losses they will sustain as a result of the trans-Pacific partnership.

Will the Conservatives protect supply management, yes or no?

Hon. Maxime Bernier (Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism, and Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government has signed free trade agreements with nearly 37 countries and we have always protected the supply management system.

It is also important to point out that we signed those agreements because they were good for consumers, small businesses and families, in other words, for all Canadians. We will continue to apply that same logic in the future.

We are going to continue to sign free trade agreements that are good for all Canadians and all industrial sectors.

[English]

Mr. Malcolm Allen (Welland, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it seems that the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing in that caucus over there. Out of one side of its mouth, it says yes. The member for Edmonton Centre was clear. He said that it was an "anachronism that needs to disappear" when he was talking about supply management. Even the Prime Minister, when he was referring to supply management, said that Canada would face difficult decisions when it ratified the trans-Pacific partnership. Down in the corner we have prominent Liberals who say that we need to end supply management. One wonders why farmers in the country are nervous.

Why is there so much doublespeak from the Conservative benches when it comes to protecting supply management? The Conservatives are either for it or they are against it.

Hon. Ed Fast (Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only doublespeak is from the NDP. Our government will continue to promote Canadian trade interests across all sectors of our economy, including supply management. That has never prevented us from successfully concluding trade agreements with countries like the United States, with the European Union, with South Korea.

We make no apologies for ensuring that any deal reached must be in Canada's best interests. That is the standard we have set and we will only sign a trade agreement if it significantly benefits Canadian workers and families.

* * *

TAXATION

Ms. Joan Crockatt (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government has consistently lowered taxes. In fact, as a result, we have the lowest personal tax burden than we have had in 50 years, and that is more money in the pockets of families.

Meanwhile, the Liberal leader keeps pushing reckless spending, which we know would actually kill jobs and take money out of the pockets of people. It is clear that the Liberals have only one plan for the economy, and that is to raise taxes.

Will the Minister of Finance please tell the House and Canadians what our government is doing to deliver on our promise to make life more affordable for Canadians?

• (1455)

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today, Canadians are celebrating tax freedom day, when families start working for themselves, not the government. We are helping by cutting taxes to where they were almost 50 years ago by doubling the TFSA and increasing benefits for families.

We have been delivering on our promises to make life more affordable, while balancing the budget. Tax freedom day is proof that now is not the time for the Liberal leader's plan for reckless spending and tax hikes.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is the worst economic performance Canada has seen outside of a recession in three decades. Some 200 workers have been laid off at the Davie shipyard in Lévis.

In the past year, Montreal has lost thousands of jobs: 1,000 at Bombardier, 3,000 at Target and 430 at Energizer, not to mention the 300 workers who have lost their jobs at Bell Helicopter.

When will the Conservatives finally do their job and create jobs for the middle class?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only plan that the Liberals and the New Democrats have for jobs is to raise taxes for job creators.

What is more, both parties are saying they will support Kathleen Wynne's plan to impose a new \$1,000 payroll tax on workers and the small businesses that employ them across the country.

We are doing the opposite. By lowering taxes, we have created 1.2 million new jobs. We are going to continue with that approach.

[English]

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are losing their jobs because the Conservatives cannot be bothered to do theirs.

Major layoffs have hit Canadians from coast to coast: 485 jobs at Blacks, 1,000 at GM Oshawa, 1,500 at Future Shop, nearly 18,000 laid off at Target, Sony, Mexx, Smart Set. The list goes on. This is the worst economic performance Canada has seen outside of a recession in more than three decades.

When will the Conservatives stop their self-congratulations and bring forward a real plan to put people back to work?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the NDP's only plan for jobs is to tax people who create them. New Democrats, along with the Liberals, propose a new \$1,000 payroll tax on workers and on the small businesses that employ them. The Canadian Federation of Independent Business

Oral Questions

says that would force the majority of employers to cut wages, jobs and hours.

Our approach is to lower taxes and to expand trade and training. That has helped to create 1.2 million net new jobs, 80% of them full time and two-thirds in high-wage sectors.

* * *

LABOUR

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in 2009, Peter Kennedy went to work and did not come home. He was killed in an explosion right here, right next to Parliament Hill. Public Works was found guilty of violating health and safety laws. The court ordered safety inspections to ensure that these problems would be fixed.

Now we learn that not a single inspection has taken place as per the orders. We have seen the tragedy that can result when the government ignores health and safety laws.

The simple question is this: why did the Conservatives put workers at risk by failing to comply with the court's order?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, CPC): Mr. Speaker, of course our sympathies rest with Mr. Kennedy's family. I can assure members that in fact regular inspections have been done. The Technical Standards and Safety Authority completed an inspection in May and said that "No non-compliance issues were noted...and...no further actions are required...."

[Translation]

Mr. Mathieu Ravignat (Pontiac, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we learned today that no labour inspections have been conducted at the Cliff Street central heating plant, even though an inspection was ordered by the court last year. All members of the House remember the tragic accident at this plant that led to the death of engineer Peter Kennedy.

How can the Minister of Labour justify the lack of inspection? Does the minister not care about the safety of federal employees and buildings?

• (1500)

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our sympathies remain with Mr. Kennedy's family. I can assure the House that inspections are still being conducted because we make workers' safety a priority.

[English]

The workplace health and safety committee has been conducting monthly inspections. As well, the Technical Standards and Safety Authority gave an all-clear in May of this year, and I have the report.

*Oral Questions***NATIONAL DEFENCE**

Ms. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, defence budget cuts and future plans will reduce defence funding to its lowest percentage of GDP since the 1930s. The Conservatives' military procurement strategy is a failure of titanic proportions.

The Conservatives do not deliver, but they certainly know how to posture. The Prime Minister exploited special forces members in Iraq with vanity videos, and now he has cooked up another photo opportunity, this time with the Royal Canadian Navy in Poland.

How cynical. Why does he constantly put his own partisan interests above the needs of Canadian Armed Forces members?

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that question gives me an opportunity, as someone who flew on the Sea King helicopter, to rise in this House and say that the gall of the Liberal Party to even talk about defence spending in this House after the decade of darkness when they took our men and women in the Canadian Armed Forces and whittled them down to a voluntary force is shameful.

Over the course of our government, there has been \$6 billion in new spending. We have provided needed equipment and uniforms and training, and morale is up as a result.

We will never let the Liberals do that again.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, back in 2011, the Manitoba government intentionally flooded out over 5,000 first nations people living downstream from the Fairford Dam.

This was not a natural flood. Lake St. Martin First Nation was 100% displaced. Many are homeless and are ending up on the streets in Winnipeg and elsewhere. Their economic and traditional livelihoods have been destroyed.

We have looked to the federal government for leadership and we have found it to be wanting. My question to the minister is this: what has he done to assist the people of Lake St. Martin First Nation to have their reserve back?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we understand that this is a difficult situation for those first nations individuals and families who remain evacuated from their homes, and of course our thoughts are with them.

We have concluded an agreement with the Canadian Red Cross to deliver evacuation and emergency services to first nations in Manitoba. We have announced plans to advance negotiations that would, if finalized, see the flood evacuees from the Lake St. Martin area first nation return to their home communities. In addition, we are continuing to work with the province to achieve this.

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Mrs. Anne-Marie Day (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canada Post has announced that a number of post offices in Ontario, New Brunswick and Manitoba will no longer provide services in both official languages. There will now be even fewer services for francophones. The future of francophone minorities depends on having access to services in French. There have been nothing but setbacks for official language under the Conservatives.

What will the minister do to ensure that francophones continue to receive postal services in their language?

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we take the allegation very seriously, and I will ensure that we discuss the matter with Canada Post.

[Translation]

Mr. Claude Gravelle (Nickel Belt, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government needs to stop claiming all is well with official languages.

Francophones in Winnipeg, Miramichi and Kirkland Lake, Ontario, will lose access to postal services in French. Not only is Canada Post unable to deliver the mail, but it is now turning its back on francophones.

Does the minister have a plan to stop the erosion of French-language services across Canada?

• (1505)

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, we take the matter of the provision of services in both official languages very seriously, and I will bring up the matter with Canada Post.

* * *

INDUSTRY

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West—Glanbrook, CPC): Mr. Speaker, trade and the free movement of goods between the provinces that make up this great nation are a pillar of Canada's Constitution and its history.

This government strongly supports the reduction of internal trade barriers between the provinces and territories. We believe in jobs, prosperity, and growth.

Can the Minister of Industry please update this House on the status of the agreement on internal trade?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 20 years of starts of stops and failing, yesterday I was pleased to join with all 13 out of 13 provinces and territories as they sat down with the federal government and agreed to have a brand new free trade deal for all of Canada.

Canada is a global free trade leader. We are the only country in the world with free trade access to more than 52% of the global economy. However, having a free trade deal within Canada that works has been a struggle for Canada for over 20 years. We agreed yesterday—these are Conservative, NDP, and Liberal provincial governments agreeing unanimously—to have a comprehensive free trade deal for Canada. All provinces are on side, and it will be delivered to all the provinces and to all Canadians by March of 2016. This is an historic day for Canada.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, StatsCan confirmed that Muslims are the only group to face an increase in hate crimes. This week alone, Ahmadi Muslims in Woodbridge were victimized when their residence and mosque were vandalized.

The National Council of Muslims blames this increase on toxic political rhetoric. Leaders of many faiths agree, and urge governments to tone down the rhetoric, as it creates fear and mistrust.

Will the government tone down its anti-Muslim rhetoric and work to make all Canadians safe from discrimination, regardless of faith?

[Translation]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government takes terrorist threats seriously.

That is why we aim to protect all Canadians. That is also why we appreciated the comments in support of the measures we are taking to protect the Canadian public, including the support from members of the Muslim community.

I encourage the member to show a little respect in a debate on national security.

* * *

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Lebanese singer Mohamed Eskandar has three concerts planned in Canada over the next few days.

However, his songs clearly incite violence against women and homosexuals. We simply cannot tolerate these kinds of messages, which fly in the face of our values. Back in 2012, the government denied him a visa.

Can the minister confirm whether a visa was granted to Mr. Eskandar, and if so, why was it granted, when it was denied in 2012?

Hon. Chris Alexander (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yes, it is true, anyone who holds a Canadian visa must meet all of the visa requirements.

We will continue to uphold Canada's laws.

Oral Questions

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that between 6% and 15% of seniors aged 65 and older are living with some form of dementia. The number of Canadians living with dementia is expected to double by 2031. That is why I am proud that my motion supporting the strong action our government is taking will be discussed again tomorrow in the House.

Could the Minister of Health update the House on the latest action to address dementia?

Hon. Rona Ambrose (Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to announce the launch of Dementia Friends Canada with the Canadian Alzheimer Society. This is going to improve awareness and understanding for those who are living with dementia in Canada, and it builds on our government's work to create a national strategy with provinces as well as to find a cure for dementia by 2025.

I invite all colleagues on all sides of the House to please join myself and you, Mr. Speaker, in the Speaker's lounge to become a Dementia Friend. We have a selfie booth set up. It takes 30 seconds to sign up. We are trying to sign up one million Canadians to become Dementia Friends to show those who are suffering with dementia and their caregivers that we support them.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Ms. Isabelle Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the cities of Dorval, Pointe-Claire, Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue and Kirkland have joined the class action lawsuit against Canada Post. The government continues to stonewall and is allowing Canada Post to install community mailboxes without consulting the municipalities.

Why does the government refuse to listen to the cities, the municipalities and the people of the West Island who oppose the end of home mail delivery?

● (1510)

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada Post is suffering from the fact that people are simply not utilizing mail in the traditional way. They are utilizing other ways. As a result, Canada Post is facing an issue of not being able to be self-sustaining, which it must be under legislation.

It has developed a five-point plan. In that five-point plan it is converting the remaining one-third of Canadian households to be like the other two-thirds of Canadian households by receiving mail at a community mailbox, not at their door. We support Canada Post in its plan to become self-sufficient.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Veterans Affairs, who is taking defence questions today.

Routine Proceedings

While I was very honoured to participate at the official opening of 443 Maritime Helicopter Squadron in my riding in April, there are a lot of local concerns about the potential for increased noise as four out of the six aging Sea Kings are retired and nine Cyclone helicopters take over. I wonder if the hon. minister has had an opportunity to look into this matter, which is of grave local concern.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question and assure her that the Department of National Defence has consulted with the municipality and with first nations on environmental compliance. The Cyclone helicopter will meet civil aviation requirements for noise.

It does give me an opportunity to thank the men and women of 443 Squadron, some of them my old comrades, for their tremendous service flying the Sea King helicopter for our Pacific navy. After the decade of darkness I referred to earlier, the Cyclone is on the horizon, and fair winds and following seas are coming for the Pacific navy and our air force.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Honourable Herb Cox, Minister of Environment for the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: I understand the hon. member for Sydney—Victoria has a point of order.

Hon. Mark Eyking: Mr. Speaker, the member for Welland made a statement on supply management and about the Liberals which was not true. Could he retract those comments that he made today in the House?

The Speaker: That sounds like a matter for debate.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS[*English*]**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 response to 15 petitions.

* * *

PENALTIES FOR THE CRIMINAL POSSESSION OF FIREARMS ACT

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-69, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in response to the Supreme Court of Canada decision in *R. v. Nur*.

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

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Ms. Wai Young (Vancouver South, 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 Canadian delegation of the Canada-China Legislative Association, respecting its participation at the 17th bilateral meeting in Hong Kong, Beijing, Shanghai, People's Republic of China, from November 9-17, 2013.

[*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 report of the delegation of the Canadian branch of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie concerning its participation at the meeting of the parliamentary affairs committee of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie, which was held in Antananarivo, Madagascar, from April 15 to 17, 2015.

* * *

[*English*]**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Gordon Brown (Leeds—Grenville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 15th report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage entitled "Review of Dance in Canada". Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

[*Translation*]

I would like to take this opportunity to move:

That the House do now proceed to orders of the day.

● (1515)

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

I declare the motion carried.

Government Orders

(Motion agreed to)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ECONOMIC ACTION PLAN 2015 ACT, NO. 1

BILL C-59—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): I move:

That in relation to Bill C-59, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 21, 2015 and other measures, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill; and

That fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provide provided for Government Orders on the day allotted to the consideration of the report stage and on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put, forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

The Speaker: The hon. opposition House leader is rising on a point of order?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, as you know, in this place, the tradition is that the mover and the seconder have to be in the House when the motion is being read.

The Speaker: I see the hon. member for Central Nova now. I assume he was here when the government House leader was moving the motion—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Sorry. I was trying to be diplomatic. I did not just assume that, I saw him. He was there while the member was moving it.

I will take this opportunity to remind members that it would be helpful for the Chair and, I think, all members if they waited until the procedure that they were involved in was completed before they left the chamber. It would certainly make for less confusion.

We will now have a 30-minute question period. I will ask members to keep their questions or comments to about a minute and responses to a similar length of time.

The hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have made a bit of anti-democratic history today by passing a motion to shut down debate in the House of Commons 100 times now since they have formed government, and they cheer.

However, when they were in opposition, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Industry, and the Prime Minister himself said that this very tactic was offensive to democratic principles when the Liberals used it. They have moved closure and shut down debate three times more than any other government in Canadian history.

That is the Conservative legacy; that is the Conservative record. In the irony of ironys, what is the government shutting down debate on? It is the budget. It wants to shut down debate on the conversation

around its terrible plan and its terrible record for Canada's economy, experiencing the worst growth outside of a recession in more than three decades. That is its legacy. That is why it wants to shut down debate in the House of Commons.

However, Canadians are watching. They know the NDP has a plan to get Canada back on track, not just economically but democratically as well, by shutting down the Senate and giving this place the life that it needs again.

Hon. Peter Van Loan: Mr. Speaker, as members know, Canadians gave our government a strong mandate to focus on job creation and economic growth, and to deliver both. They expect their parliamentarians to make decisions. When this government uses time allocation, it does so in a fashion that is designed for scheduling, to allow certainty of debate and certainty for members, but most importantly, to allow members to make decisions. I know that some in the opposition are skeptical about that, but the proof is in the numbers.

I know many of them hold out the British Parliament, the mother Parliament, as the model of how things should be done. Compared with the British Parliament, we in this Parliament, compared with the parallel one that just finished off in Britain, have had more than twice as much debate on every bill that we have passed.

In fact, we have had the same amount of debate at second reading alone than the British Parliament has had for all three stages. We have had 3.3 days at second reading whereas it had one. We have had 1.6 days longer at report stage than its 1.1 day. Again, at third reading, we have had double the amount of debate that the British Parliament has had, which is two days versus its one day.

That goes to show the House that not only have we allowed considerable and substantial debate here, we have also been able to make decisions and get things done for Canadians on what matters to them most, which is making Canadians safe, and delivering economic results and job creation for Canada.

• (1520)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative reform majority government and its attitude toward democracy inside the House has been simply disgusting as it does not demonstrate any true respect for proper procedures with respect to passing both budgets and legislation.

As has been noted, this is the 100th time that time allocation has been brought in on legislation which we are seeing today, the budget implementation bill. We can also talk about the Canada Wheat Board, the pooled pensions, copyright legislation, back-to-work legislation with Canada Post and Air Canada, the first nations, the free trade agreements, and the list goes on.

The only way in which the government has been able to deal with the legislative agenda as opposed to working with the opposition is to ram it through the House of Commons in an undemocratic fashion.

Government Orders

Why has the government been a total and absolute failure in not recognizing the importance of working in negotiation with the opposition and ensuring that Canada is served better through the normal process of thorough debate?

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member is wrong. Certainly, I disagree with his question.

Bill C-59 supports this balanced budget that our government has brought forward. Our government has brought forward a low tax plan for Canadians. It is a road map to understand where we are going as a country.

We have a balanced budget, a plan for jobs, a plan for growth, and a plan for security. All of those are part of the budget, our economic action plan 2015. All of the measures in the budget implementation bill were in economic action plan 2015. Many of the measures are tax related and accomplish one main goal: to make certain that we can afford Canadians the prosperity they deserve.

We want to keep money in the pockets of Canadians, seniors, the middle class, all Canadians. The Liberal opposition makes it very clear that it wants to take more in taxes from Canadians. This budget makes it clear that we are continuing down a low tax plan for Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague across the way. Many groups that appeared before the Standing Committee on Finance condemned the government's tactics for achieving a so-called "new balanced budget". The way it has been used is disgraceful. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation and others condemned this tactic.

Today we are up against another time allocation motion—the 100th. This is a real shame. Once again, this is an omnibus bill that amends a lot of laws, and we have not had enough time to study it.

The Standing Committee on Finance was flooded with letters from bar associations in provinces across Canada. Among other things, they want the government to withdraw amendments to three major acts affecting the Patent Act and other similar acts.

Unfortunately, the government is ignoring us and bowing to pressure from a single group. We have not had an adversarial debate or heard divergent opinions on this part of the omnibus bill, not to mention many other parts that amend other pieces of legislation, including the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act.

Frankly, how can the government House leader crow about us having enough time? That is completely false.

• (1525)

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, again, I reject the premise of most of what the member said in his question.

As far as the size of this budget bill, it has been common practice in this Parliament to include various measures in a budget bill and subsequently in budget implementation bills.

I appreciate the House leader's opening answer to the questions from the opposition where he clearly laid out for Canadians the

opportunities that members have at every phase to debate measures. The opposition can stand at second reading, they can be in committee, there is third reading, and then the Senate. There is ample debate.

One of the hallmarks of our Parliament and of our democracy is the ability to bring forward legislation, so that Canadians can see the direction in which we are going.

In what direction are we going? We are going in the direction of growing the economy, making certain that taxes stay low, and making certain that Canadians are safe at home and abroad. This budget is clear. It is good for families, it keeps taxes low, and also, through universal child care benefits and others, puts money into Canadians' pockets.

NDP members say they want more debate, but we know that at every stage they get up with the same speeches, with the same talking points, that the NDP House leader rolls out for them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today is truly a very sad, very anti-democratic day. The government is imposing closure for the 100th time. It is imposing closure not only on us in the opposition, but on the people of Drummond as well.

The people of Drummond elected me as their representative to speak on their behalf here in the House of Commons and to discuss the budget. The people of Drummond certainly want to know what is in the budget for fighting climate change.

What does this budget include for the environment? Nothing. It needs to be said. There is nothing for the environment, nothing for dealing with climate change, nothing for the economy of the future, and nothing for transitioning to green energy. I wanted to mention that in my speech, but I might not get to that because of this new closure motion.

The government is preventing me from having a say and preventing the people of Drummond from having a voice here in the House of Commons. That is very serious.

What is more, this comes on the heels of the Prime Minister's trip to the G7, where he once again undermined discussions to reach an iron-clad agreement to fight climate change. The G7 members in Europe wanted an agreement to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050.

Of course the Conservative Prime Minister undermined that effort and now the timeframe has been extended to 2100, which is the same as putting it off indefinitely.

The government needs to respect democracy as well as the people of Drummond and all the other ridings, who also have the right to express themselves.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, again, I am very proud of our government's record in the past on all of the different items that he has brought forward.

Government Orders

This budget gives us an idea of where we are going in the future and where we are going over the next number of years. The government has laid out a very clear road map that shows that we are going to continue to see the economy in Canada grow. That means that we will have more jobs.

Month after month, we see more and more jobs being rolled out. In spite of an oil patch that we know is under stress, we know that more and more jobs are being created across this country. In manufacturing, we see a real optimism among those that the Liberal leader has basically given up on in Ontario.

Again, this budget lays out that we are going to watch the economy grow. Here is how we are going to do it. We are going to continue to cut taxes for those who are creating jobs. We are going to continue to put money into the pockets of Canadian families. We are going to make sure that Canadians are safe at home and abroad. We are going to put resources into our national defence, into our military, and into the RCMP, CSIS and those who look after us here in Canada.

We have the greatest country in the world. Provinces that have ever experimented with the NDP know that they cannot ever again afford the economic policies of any New Democratic—

• (1530)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I would like to remind hon. members to keep their questions and comments to approximately one minute so that more members have the opportunity to speak.

The hon. member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue.

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is the 100th gag order, and it is completely shameful. It does not make any sense.

The people of my riding are being insulted. Even my baby is feeling insulted. It has kicked at least 100 times since the government announced this 100th gag order.

What is more, they are imposing a gag order on a budget bill. We are talking about the budget that the Conservatives were two months late in tabling. They did not want to table the budget for two months. They needed more time. Finally, they balanced the budget, but do you know how, Mr. Speaker? They did so by selling the GM shares and by dipping into the contingency and employment insurance funds. If more time was needed to debate the budget bill, then why did they not table the budget two months earlier rather than imposing a gag order, which is a slap in the face to Canadians?

I simply hope that Canadians will remember this 100th gag order and that they will get the Conservatives the hell out of here for at least 100 years.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, I want to wish the hon. member all the best as she is preparing to deliver another healthy child. I would just ask that she does not get too worked up here in the House until after that happens.

I know that the opposition does not like the fact that we have such an ambitious and robust agenda to strengthen the economy and to create jobs. The opposition does not like the idea that the government is doing its job. Again, we have seen, time after time—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): The hon. member for Newton—North Delta on a point of order.

Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims: Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that I heard my colleague across the way make such a personal comment about my colleague on this side. I am really quite disturbed that a parliamentarian would make that kind of comment. It was not only demeaning, but very condescending.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I appreciate the intervention by the hon. member for Newton—North Delta. I did not hear anything unparliamentary in the remarks of the hon. minister of state. I am not sure specifically what she is referring to, but we will carry on.

The hon. minister of state.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, between the two of us, the hon. member, and her question, I do not know if the hon. member heard the question from the NDP. She talked about the fact that her unborn child was kicking inside her as we have gone through this debate. I simply stood and wished her all the best in her pregnancy. I certainly did not mean any offence by it, and I wish her all the best.

In answer to her question, we know that the opposition does not like the fact that we have an ambitious plan for Canada. The high-tax, no development party across the way does not like that fact that we are a government that is saying that we have confidence in the Canadian people. We have confidence in Canadian small- and medium-sized businessmen and women who are out there and making a go of it, putting food on their table and making sure that they employ other Canadians.

We know that that party opposes low taxes because every time we bring forward policy and legislation to lower taxes, it votes against it.

Shame on the opposition for bringing forward ideas that would only cost jobs here in Canada. That is why Canadians know that they are better off with this Conservative government.

• (1535)

Mr. Dave Van Kesteren (Chatham-Kent—Essex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is only our Conservative government that supports the agriculture sector and recognizes the immense contribution of hard-working farmers to the Canadian economy. For instance, economic action plan 2015 will provide an additional \$12 million to the agri-marketing program to promote high quality Canadian agriculture and agri-food products around the world. As well, the budget also commits an additional \$18 million to expand market access so that agricultural industries can have open access to new markets and take advantage of many new trade opportunities.

I wonder if the Minister of State for Finance could please further expand on some of the other great things that our government is doing to support farming in this country.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Finally we have a good question, Mr. Speaker.

Government Orders

I want to thank that member for his hard work on finance committee—

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): The hon. member for Gatineau on a point of order.

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker. The minister of state probably thinks that is a good question because it avoids the real matter currently before the House, namely the time allocation motion.

The question was on the content of Bill C-59.

[*English*]

The Chair always gives leeway but at the same time, this is a blatant direct content of the bill question and not a time allocation question.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I appreciate the intervention by the hon. member for Gatineau.

Once again, it is probably not a point of order, but rather a matter for debate about the difference between the questions from the two sides.

[*English*]

I am aware that we are within a 30-minute time period here so we are going to try and continue on and make sure that enough time is available and ask members to concentrate their questions and responses in respect to the question that is in front of the House.

The hon. Minister of State for Finance.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for ruling on both points that were not points of order.

We have brought forward the measures that we have in this budget for many reasons. They help Canadians in all careers, in all businesses, in all walks of life.

For generations our farmers have fed Canadians and people around the world. We have also done more than that, not just in what we produce, but also in providing jobs and opportunities

I represent a rural constituency where agriculture is important. That is why it is important for us to move on—

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): The hon. member for LaSalle—Émard on a point of order.

Ms. Hélène LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, I am rising on a point of order.

I will not have the opportunity to debate this bill because a gag order has just been imposed, but the Minister of State for Finance will have 30 minutes more than I will to debate this issue.

We are supposed to be asking questions only about the gag order. Does he agree with this 100th gag order? It does not necessarily affect him because he has been given an additional 30 minutes to debate this bill and say everything he wants. However, his colleagues behind him are just as penalized by this gag order as

we are. I would like him to talk about the unfairness of this 100th gag order and how it affects his colleagues.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I will address the point of order. Members will know that it is not the ability of the Chair to adjudicate the responses that come when questions are posed in the House. The exchange that I heard this afternoon is certainly in order. As we have seen in previous 30-minute question and answer periods around the issue of time allocation, the subject of the bill is quite often very much a part of the debate and really cannot be separated from the issues around the relevance of the time allocation question itself. We understand this to be true and it is left to the minister or parliamentary secretary, in this case the Minister of State for Finance, to respond in a way that he sees fit.

I see the hon. Minister of State for Finance rising. Is it on the point of order or are we continuing the questions? The hon. Minister of State for Finance.

● (1540)

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, we have had three frivolous points of order now that have taken time from the House. The only comment that the member has given was when she stretched out her point of order. As you have so clearly said, Mr. Speaker, when we do time allocation, when we speak about the budget, we speak about measures in the budget.

My hon. friend brought forward a question on agriculture. Only our Conservative government here in the House understands that family farms are the backbone of our country. That is why I was pleased to join our Minister of Agriculture in Regina to announce more support for our farmers. To allow farm business owners to maintain more of their capital for retirement, economic action plan 2015 would provide funding to increase the lifetime capital gains exemption to \$1 million for farmers and fishermen. These are measures that matter to Canadians in the budget, in economic action plan 2015.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I regret that it is the Minister of State for Finance who has to answer questions for what is really a move by the Prime Minister's Office and the government House leader to, for the 100th time in this Parliament, shut down debate prematurely. It is particularly egregious when it is done in the case of an omnibus budget bill with many separate sections, none of which received adequate study in committee and now will be rushed through this place.

I think very highly of my hon. friend, and the Minister of State for Finance is a friend. I would not want to assume that he had anything to do with wanting to shut down debate and deprive members of Parliament, like myself, of an opportunity to adequately debate and study the bill.

I will put to him that I do not think it had anything whatsoever to do with the budget to decide to imagine away the access to information law, which currently stands as law of the land, to remove it at a time when the information commissioner had already put the Minister of Public Safety on notice that she believed a crime had been committed and required investigation. Now the substance of that criminal act is to be erased retroactively.

Government Orders

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, we have mentioned a number of times that every single measure in Bill C-59 was referenced in the budget. We are very proud of the steps that we are taking to support the economy in economic action plan 2015.

Her question was more specific to the access to information. For Canadians who may be watching, and for people in my constituency who may be watching, the main thrust of her question was why we are going the extra measure to get rid of the long gun registry. It was a commitment that our government fulfilled. It was a commitment we made to end the wasteful, ineffective long gun registry once and for all. Measures in the budget allow us to do that. It was still possible to access the outdated registry through access to information.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Moore: Mr. Speaker, in the last part of my comment I used language that was unparliamentary. I should have said that I hope we will throw them out for the next 100 years.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I thank the member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue for her clarification.

[*English*]

We will just let the hon. Minister of State finish up and then we are going to go to questions, to the hon. member for Cape Breton—Canso.

The hon. Minister of State.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, for Canadians who are wondering what the NDP is doing here, we have had four individuals stand on points of order that were not points of order. NDP members are concerned that they do not have the ability to debate, but they are not asking the questions. They are just throwing frivolous points of order around.

Going back to the question, the will of Parliament was made very clear when it came to the long gun registry. The clarity was that all copies of the registry were to be destroyed. The technical amendment that we are proposing in the budget addresses this problem and it solves it.

Our Conservative government was pleased to end the wasteful and ineffective long gun registry once and for all. We know that the opposition parties would want to bring it back.

• (1545)

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a lot of respect for my colleague, the Minister of State for Finance. In holding that lofty position with the government, I am sure he is pretty good with math. I know math is hard. We saw that in the Alberta election. I will ask him to help me and in turn help Canadians with this one.

When public servants are making \$60,000 a year and, let us say, they miss three or four days of work, those jobs are not filled. No replacements come in. Those days are paid for as part of their salary, yet the government has come up with the number, \$900 million in saving, by stealing back sick time from the public servants.

How do we not have any additional costs on those sick days, but still put together what I and I think most Canadians think is a phony

revenue line in the budget of \$900 million. Could he help us through that math?

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, my friend mentioned that math is difficult. Obviously, from a party whose leader thinks that budgets balance themselves, it would be very difficult to explain all that to him. However, I can guarantee that budgets take discipline, hard work and they do not balance themselves.

Economic action plan 2015 reaffirms the government's commitment to pursuing a new disability and sick leave management system. The 40-year-old sick leave accumulation system is antiquated and not responsive to the needs of the majority of our employees.

Over 60% of the employees in the public service do not have enough banked sick leave to cover the waiting period before assessing long-term disability benefits, and 25% have less than 10 days banked sick leave. This places them at risk of income loss.

A modernized system would provide adequate support for all employees, regardless of age, medical history and service of years. It is fair. Canadians expect us to bring forward a system that would be fair for all, and we intend to do that.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): The hon. member for Gatineau, for one last question.

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak, since we will not have the opportunity to ask many more questions about Bill C-59.

With regard to this bill, the national media have accused members of all parties of not spending enough time doing the job we were all elected to do in this House. What job would that be? Ensuring that the money we receive from taxpayers across this country is properly spent.

What is sad about the government's approach, with its 100th gag order, is that it undermines what should be our most important job. I am talking about conducting in-depth analyses of legislation and being able to hear from different groups.

I heard a number of my colleagues talk about the Privacy Commissioner or about public servants, who negotiated over the years and are going to unilaterally and illegally lose benefits to which they are entitled and for which they made other concessions. There is something obscene about this whole thing, and it seems as though the whole budget process is taken lightly and is carried out behind closed doors. Could my colleague speak to that?

Government Orders

[English]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, on the member's final point on whether the budget was drafted behind doors, the answer is no.

The finance minister, the parliamentary secretary, myself and a number of others did consultations all across the country, right from the east coast to the west coast. We listened to moms and dads, businessmen and women, first nations groups, those in post-secondary education, and a good balance of Canadians. They brought forward ideas, like lowering taxes for small business. Small businessmen and women would said that as much as the government was already doing, they were still finding it difficult to really prosper and to hire more.

Again, we brought forward measures like lowering those taxes, the accelerated capital cost allowance for manufacturers so they could invest back into their own companies and invest in innovation. We have put money into research so they can succeed. That is the way these budgets are drawn up.

We waited for our budget until April because we saw a drop in the oil sector. The finance minister wanted to be certain that the budget we were bringing forward would clearly show where we were and where we would be going.

In the rollout of this budget, Canadians know we got it right. We have kept taxes low. We have helped families. We have helped their security. We got it right.

• (1550)

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith the question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.

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 Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Call in the members.

• (1630)

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

(Division No. 436)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adler
Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambler	Ambrose
Anders	Anderson
Armstrong	Ashfield
Aspin	Barlow
Bateman	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brunoogee
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Crockatt
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Eglinski	Falk
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Galipeau	Gallant
Gill	Glover
Goguen	Goldring
Goodyear	Gourde
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kent	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lauzon
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	O'Toole
Paradis	Payne
Perkins	Poilievre
Preston	Raitt
Rajotte	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rickford	Saxton
Schellenberger	Seeback
Shory	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Toet
Trost	Trottier
Truppe	Uppal
Valcourt	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 141	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allen (Welland)
-------	-----------------

Government Orders

Andrews	Angus
Ashton	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Bélangier	Bellavance
Bennett	Benskin
Bevington	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Brahmi	Brisson
Byrne	Casey
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseau	Easter
Eyking	Footé
Freeland	Freeman
Garneau	Garrison
Giguère	Godin
Goodale	Gravelle
Groguhé	Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu	Hughes
Julian	Kellway
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Latendresse	Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu	MacAulay
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nash	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Péclet	Perreault
Pilon	Plamondon
Quach	Rafferty
Rankin	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Saganash	Sandhu
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	St-Denis
Sitsabaiesan	Stoffer
Stewart	Toone
Sullivan	Trudeau
Tremblay	Vaughan— 122
Valeriotte	

PAIRED

Nil

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

I wish to inform the House that because of the proceedings on the time allocation motion, government orders will be extended by 30 minutes.

The hon. government House leader.

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, documents containing the government's responses to order paper Questions Nos. 1,187 to 1,193, and 1,195 to 1,205.

● (1635)

[*Translation*]

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from June 9 consideration of Bill C-59, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 21, 2015 and other measures, as reported (without amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today is a sad day, for it is the 100th time the Conservative government has put a gag order on members. We must not forget that the role of members in this House is to represent our constituents and stand up for their ideas and their aspirations.

I represent the people of the riding of Drummond, and they want me to be able to have my say on this bill to implement certain provisions of the budget. The bill is extremely important, because it will have a significant impact on their lives. Unfortunately, the Conservatives have imposed a 100th gag order, which is a new record. It is completely shameful. On top of that, we are nearing the end of this term. Fortunately, we will have the chance to get rid of this Conservative government in the upcoming election.

I am very pleased nonetheless to have this tremendous opportunity to speak to this bad bill, an opportunity that some of my colleagues will unfortunately not have. Once again, the Conservatives have introduced an omnibus budget implementation bill. This mammoth bill was drafted in order to ram through—to say nothing of the gag order—hundreds of changes to a number of laws, without any study or scrutiny.

Let us talk about the Conservatives' bad ideas that are going to hurt the middle class. On the weekend, I attended half a dozen events where I met with people from Drummond's middle class and those who aspire to be part of the middle class. They told me that the NDP's measures would encourage the middle class and that the Conservatives' measures, such as income splitting, would certainly not help them. That measure will benefit only the wealthiest 15% of our society. It is not going to help the people who truly need help in the riding of Drummond, and it will cost taxpayers billions of dollars.

Canadians need our help. They need us to set a \$15 an hour national minimum wage and implement a national child care program. With that improvement, Quebec would have a better-quality child care system. Canadians need us to cancel the \$36 billion in cuts to health care that the Conservatives are planning to make over the next decade. These are bad decisions the Conservative government is making.

The Conservatives are also increasing the TFSA contribution limit. This will also benefit the wealthiest in our society, but there is nothing for the middle class or the people in Drummond who aspire to be part of it.

Government Orders

Families in Drummondville and the greater Drummond area want a responsible government that will address the challenges of this decade and this century, such as the fight against climate change. There is nothing in this budget implementation bill about the environment or the fight against climate change. We need to stimulate the economy, but we need an economy that is in line with the three pillars of sustainable development.

I do not need to remind the House that the leader of the NDP, the member for Outremont, is the one who implemented the Sustainable Development Act in Quebec. He is the father of sustainable development. He is very familiar with the three pillars of sustainable development, whether we are talking about the economy or respect for the environment. Of course we need to stimulate the economy, but in doing so we need to be respectful of the environment and workers. Unfortunately, there is nothing about that in this budget.

• (1640)

It was not surprising to see that on his recent trip to Europe for the G7 summit, the Prime Minister sabotaged the efforts of the heads of state in this organization. They wanted to reach an agreement, to take a strong stand by limiting climate change and achieving carbon neutrality or no carbon emissions by 2050.

Unfortunately, the Conservative government, led by this Prime Minister, sabotaged the G7's vision by extending that timeframe far into the future. He said that our goal should be 2100. Once again, this government is passing problems on to future generations. As his Minister of Finance said, the Prime Minister's grandchildren will have to deal with this problem. That does not make any sense. It is a total lack of responsibility.

Canada definitely needs an NDP government because the NDP is the only party that can replace this tired, irresponsible government that does not care about future generations. An NDP government will make these kinds of changes.

There is no mention in this budget of programs to transition to green energy sources. As I mentioned, the government shows no desire to do so. Its weak Copenhagen target will not even be reached. This Conservative government was the only government in the world to withdraw from Kyoto. They are really out to lunch when they talk about the economy of the future. What, exactly, does that mean? It means an economy that will transition to green energy sources. The Conservative government has no plan to invest in green energy sources in its budget. It has no plan to stop subsidizing fossil fuels. Every year, Canada's fossil fuel industry receives some \$1.3 billion in subsidies and all kinds of assistance. That is a huge amount of money that goes to companies that do not need it. Oil and gas companies, as well as companies in the coal industry, do not represent the economy of the future. The economy of the future involves transitioning towards green energy sources and energy efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I see that I have just two minutes left. Time flies. That is why, as I said, it does not make sense to have a gag order.

A few months ago, I moved a motion on energy efficiency. Unfortunately, the Conservatives opposed it.

I would like to refer to some other reports, but since I do not have much time left, I will conclude with a few words about a report

entitled "Acting on Climate Change". This is a solution proposed by 60 Canadian scholars. These scientists from across Canada have proposed solutions to address climate change. The government could have found some inspiration there. The report is non-partisan and unbiased.

According to the report, the first thing we need to do is put a price on carbon. We need a national emissions cap and trade system like the one that Quebec and California belong to. The NDP's proposals are similar. The report also calls for the elimination of fossil fuel industry subsidies. The \$1.3 billion I mentioned could be allocated to green solutions. That would create 10 times more jobs. There would be 10 times more jobs for the people of Drummond if the government took that money and invested it in green energy. In addition, investments in building and maintaining infrastructure would have to tie in to a long-term decarbonization goal. There are so many economic measures the Conservative government could have taken to turn our economy into a low-carbon-emissions economy, but it did not. It is not doing anything for the environment and has no vision for the future in that regard.

• (1645)

The only party that has a vision for the future and can replace the Conservative government is the NDP, and that is what we will do on October 19. We will propose a comprehensive vision that integrates sustainable development, and we will grow the economy while respecting the environment and social issues.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budgets are about priorities and the Liberal Party would argue that the government has its priorities all wrong. They are not the priorities of Canadians. It is important to recognize that under the the current government, middle-class Canadians have had to work longer and harder just to make ends meet. That is not right.

We are months away from an election and the budget debate provides us the opportunity to show some contrast. I would like to present some contrast and see if the member would like to do likewise for the NDP.

Government Orders

A Liberal government, for example, would make the tax system fairer and cut the middle-class tax rate by 7%. That is a \$3 billion tax cut for those who need it the most. The Liberal plan would also provide one bigger, fairer tax-free monthly cheque to help families with the high costs of raising their kids. We would also ask the wealthiest Canadians to pay a little more so the middle-class can pay less. The Liberals would cancel the Prime Minister's income splitting and other tax breaks for the wealthy. We would introduce a new tax bracket for the top 1% of incomes over \$200,000.

Would the member not agree that giving strength to Canada's middle class would give strength to Canada's economy, and that it is the way of the future?

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Winnipeg North. I agree that the Conservatives have made some poor choices, and that is why I am mentioning it. People need to understand that the only party that is ready to replace the Conservatives is the NDP.

We need to get rid of income splitting and the increase in the TFSA limit, because those measures help only the richest 15%.

People in my riding tell me that we need to look after the middle class first, because members of the middle class are the ones who are having a hard time making ends meet. We also need to look after those who aspire to join the middle class. That is why we have a plan for small businesses.

Drummond has a long list of examples of successful small and medium-sized businesses that were set up by innovative, creative people. Those are the people we need to help, so that they can create jobs. Eighty per cent of new jobs are created by SMEs, and the NDP government will support SMEs to help create jobs.

Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Drummond for his speech.

I would like to pick up on what he said about the new economy and the extraordinary opportunities that come with protecting the environment. There is a very telling statistic about the Conservative reign. In 2006, the employment rate was 62.8% and in 2014 it was only 61.4%, which is a rather shameful statistic considering the economic recovery that followed the crisis.

It also stands to reason that with the upheaval related to the drop in the price of oil, the employment rate fell further in 2015. It really is too bad that we did not take up the challenge and start transitioning to a new economy, one that is more respectful and that gives people more autonomy in order to reduce their dependence on oil.

Would my colleague like to elaborate on the benefits of creating good-quality, well-paying jobs for middle-class families?

Mr. François Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague from Beauport—Limoilou, who is doing excellent work on environmental concerns at the Port of Québec. I am very proud because we cannot move the economy into the future in any old way.

There has to be a vision for sustainable development. I am so proud to be a member of the New Democratic Party, whose leader is the author of Quebec's Sustainable Development Act. He knows

exactly what it means to move the economy forward while respecting the environment and the social concerns of workers and people.

When the people of Drummond hear about sustainable development and support for SMEs, they are truly happy because they know that is the way of the future. They know that 80% of new jobs are created by SMEs and that we need to give SMEs the opportunity to grow.

That is why we have a plan that will not only let SMEs grow and develop, but will help them to create jobs and hire people.

We also want to take back the \$1.3 billion in subsidies to oil and gas companies. It is shameful that this money is used for that when it should be used to create the sustainable economies of the future.

We must not pass problems on to our grandchildren or, as the Minister of Finance said, pass the problems on to the Prime Minister's grandchildren. That makes no sense.

• (1650)

[*English*]

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have kept our promise to Canadians, and the budget is balanced. Some underestimate the discipline involved. It was widely reported that there were some in the House that believed budgets magically balanced themselves. However, nothing could be further from the truth.

Let me state for the record and the benefit of all members that magic cannot be counted on to balance the budget, and Hogwarts is not the London School of Economics. Our budget is balanced due to the fiscal responsibility of our government, not by waiving the magic wand. While the Liberals and the NDP are making billions of dollars in new political promises, I encourage both of those parties to dust off their calculators as their numbers do not add up. In fact, their budgetary plans have more holes in them than Swiss cheese.

Balanced budgets are the only way to ensure long-term prosperity in our economy. It allows for further tax relief for hard-working families and for our seniors. It bolsters our top credit rating, supports lower interest payments and protects health care transfers to the provinces. We cannot borrow our way to prosperity, no matter what some of our opposition colleagues might say. Now is not the time to spend money we do not have, which, if done, would only lead to massive deficits and larger debt payments.

For generations, Westman families have understood the path to prosperity and that we must not compromise tomorrow by spending recklessly today or pile on debt that we cannot afford. Rather, we must invest sensibly for a financially secure future.

Government Orders

My approach of standing up for hard-working taxpayers has been clear and consistent: take as little as possible and give back as much as we can. That is why I am pleased to stand and voice my support for this budget implementation act, as federal taxes are now the lowest they have been in 50 years. Countless seniors from my constituency of Brandon—Souris, and from across the country, have been taken off the tax rolls completely. Benefits are going directly to families, and we have reduced numerous taxes rather than funding an over-burgeoning and inefficient bureaucracy that can help few.

I also support this budget implementation act and budget 2015 because our Conservative government is supporting the good people of Manitoba like never before. Since 2006, under the leadership of our Prime Minister, health care transfers have risen by 57%. Unlike the previous Liberal government that drastically cut and slashed vital health care funding to Manitoba and other provinces to balance its federal budget, we took a much different approach. In fact, federal support has never been higher.

I am also pleased that the new building Canada plan is making critical infrastructure investments to grow Westman's economy, such as tripling the size of Manitoba's regional airport terminal at McGill Field, expanding the town of Deloraine's water treatment plant, and ensuring more homes and farms have access to clean drinking water in the rural municipality of Elton.

I would be remiss not to point out that the opposition voted against the funding of all these projects. The people of Westman are not pleased that every time the NDP and the Liberals have a chance to stand up for Brandon—Souris, they have sat on their hands. While the Liberals like to crow about infrastructure funding, they forget that their record of investing in Manitoba is abysmal. We only have to look at their lackluster infrastructure record of only investing \$370 million in Manitoba over 12 years. In comparison, our Conservative government has already invested \$1.2 billion into Manitoba's infrastructure, and we are well on our way to investing another \$1.2 billion in the coming years.

Since the first day I had the honour of being elected as the member for Brandon—Souris in Parliament, I have reached out and consulted widely with local residents on ways we can continue to grow our economy and enhance our quality of life. I would like to briefly touch on the new measures contained in budget 2015 that support our seniors, reduce taxes for small business owners, and assist Westman farmers under initiatives that will close the skills gap and lead to the creation of new high-paying jobs.

Budget 2015 builds on our record of supporting seniors whose efforts have helped to make Canada the strong and prosperous country that it is today. We will reduce the minimum withdrawals for registered retirement income funds that will allow seniors to preserve more of their retirement savings to better support their current income needs.

Budget 2015 also introduces a new home accessibility tax credit for seniors and persons with disabilities to help with the costs of renovating their home so they can remain safe, secure and accessible.

• (1655)

There has been much hoopla from the opposition, which has something against Canadians putting more of their hard-earned

money into a tax-free savings account. Without a doubt, the TFSA is the most important tax saving vehicle since the introduction of RRSPs. Providing Canadians a further incentive to save and invest is not only sound economic policy, it encourages future growth. The TFSA provides the flexibility of such things as saving for a new home and paying for their children's education. It is there for those who have an unexpected expense and need to quickly draw on their investments.

While our Conservative government will enhance the TFSA, the Liberals want to claw back this enhancement and, in turn, force Canadians into a mandated and compulsory increase in the CPP rather than trust Canadians to make investment decisions with their own money.

It should be noted for the record that regardless of what the Liberals may say about the tax-free savings account, 60% of those who have opened a TFSA make under \$60,000 and close to half of those people with TFSAs are seniors. I can think of no greater example that highlights the difference between our government's economic agenda and the Liberal plan to force Canadians into larger, forced, mandatory CPP contributions.

While our plan allows Canadians the option of where they want to invest their money, the Liberal plan says that it knows what is best for them and while it is at it, it will take thousands of dollars out of the pockets of their employers as well.

Speaking of job creators, budget 2015 will help Westman's small business grow and create jobs. While we have already reduced the small business tax rate to 11% and increased the amount of income eligible from \$300,000 to \$500,000, this budget will further reduce the small business tax rate to 9%. This is in addition to the small business job credit that is providing relief for EI premiums.

As well, many Westman farmers will welcome the increase in the lifetime capital gains exemption to \$1 million, which will allow them to retain more of their capital for retirement.

While our government's approach is to allow small businesses to keep more of their money to reinvest and hire even more employees, all of our hard work could be reversed if the Liberal CPP tax hike took effect.

Make no mistake, the Liberal, job-killing plan will hurt Westman's small business owners. While our government is investing in skills training and education for future growth, the Liberal tax plan will dampen the confidence of the private sector. Many in the House have raised the issue of the skills gap and how it affects their local economy. In many Westman communities, small business owners are having a hard time filling job openings.

The skills gap is an impediment and barrier not only to our local economy, but also to the national economy. That is why I am pleased our budget financially supports harmonizing apprenticeship training and certification requirements to targeted Red Seal trades.

Government Orders

I am also pleased that our government has made historic investments in apprenticeship training. We have supported post-secondary institutions, such as the Assiniboine Community College, so it can provide the skills and knowledge to meet local demands. Through programs such as the apprenticeship incentive and completion grants, we are providing young people with necessary financial assistance to finish their training. In addition to these, the tradesperson tool deduction and apprenticeship job creation tax credit and the Canada job grant are having a real world effect on our economy.

While there are those who have voted against some or all of these measures in the past, I encourage all colleagues in the House to support this legislation in front of us today. We cannot grow the Canadian economy if our workforce does not have the skills to fulfill the jobs of tomorrow.

I ask all of my colleagues, particularly those in the opposition, to join our government and stand up in favour of this budget implementation act. I ask that they stand up for hard-working taxpayers, seniors, students and for the long-term prosperity of our country. As I have said repeatedly, we must all work together to build a stronger Canada than we inherited, and this budget implementation act would do just that.

• (1700)

[Translation]

Mrs. Anne-Marie Day (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the member's speech and I was truly astonished by what I heard.

We know full well that the provinces will not be receiving \$36 billion in health transfers. We also know that the government took \$2 billion from the employment insurance fund, money that employers and employees paid out of their own pockets. Finally, we also know that a \$3 billion reserve has disappeared because the government wanted to balance the budget. As for the TFSA, which is a disaster, the banks are even charging fees if people make several deposits or withdrawals in the same month.

Can the member elaborate on these points?

[English]

Mr. Larry Maguire: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to those points and I thank my colleague for those comments.

We have balanced the budget, and that is a key for the economy in Canada. It gives our industries and our families confidence in being able to invest in their own livelihoods and in their own businesses, and that makes a stronger country.

We have put forward a plan that is balanced, but also a plan that is fiscally responsible. Unlike the high tax increase programs of the NDP and the Liberals, programs that have not proven to be funded out yet, we have put forth a plan that is funded and certainly will help families in the future.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate a number of the comments from the member, even though I do not necessarily agree with them all.

I have an issue about which the Liberal Party has been talking a great deal, and that is in regard to Canada's safety net, our national

pension programs. We disagree with the government's plan to increase the age of retirement, or OAS, from 65 to 67. A Liberal government would reverse that decision.

We have real concern about the CPP approach. The Prime Minister has refused to meet with the premiers, refused to recognize this is a valuable program that Canadians believe in and that they want the federal government to show some stronger leadership on the issue.

Can the member explain to the House and to viewers why it is that the current Prime Minister, who at one time suggested abolishing the CPP, that there was no need for a CPP, does not support the CPP? A vast majority of Canadians support it.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Mr. Speaker, the premise of the question is wrong. The Canada pension plan is there, it is viable and we are offering a voluntary mechanism for citizens in Canada to contribute to more on a voluntary basis.

Unlike the Kathleen Wynne program that the Liberals have put forward in regard to a forced mandatory inclusion of CPP contributions that would end up costing not just \$1,000, for an individual who is making \$60,000, but also \$1,000 for the employer as well.

This plan has been well planned out in our Conservative announcements. I just have to say that the member's question is very well received, but I am surprised that he is the one who asked it, given the fact that the Liberals have a shortfall in the funding of that program.

• (1705)

Hon. Steven Fletcher (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Brandon—Souris is a very experienced public servant in legislature, and now a fantastic MP. I found it very interesting that the incredible statistic that the Brandon Airport Terminal has tripled in size due to federal investments. That is simply outstanding and indicative of the booming economy of the area.

I wonder if the member could tell us more specific examples of federal investment in his riding. There is a reason I ask this question. In today's *Brandon Sun*, the member was criticized for making too many announcements, for having been too available to constituents and for having been around the entire constituency.

I wonder if the member could react to this criticism.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia for the excellent work he has done and he is so well respected across the country, never mind just in his constituency.

I thank him for the question regarding the expansion of the Brandon Airport. One of the reasons it was needed was because of the growing economy in our region that my colleague has referred to. We have had flood mitigation needs in the last few years from the excessive moisture we have had, so we have projects to enhance the dikes in the city of Brandon. Melita and Souris have been done, Wawanesa has been finished. There is small one in Reston and there is more to come.

Government Orders

In regard to being criticized for working too hard, I take that with a grain of salt. I would far sooner be criticized for doing too much than doing too little.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I did not get the opportunity to ask my colleague from Brandon—Souris a question. I wanted to ask him about the budget that was tabled by the Minister of Finance a few weeks ago. I wanted to show him chart 2.16, which compares Canada's unemployment rate to that of the United States. I wanted to help him escape from his fantasy world. He thinks that balancing the budget will solve all our problems. Unfortunately, that is not necessarily true, unless there is some sort of secret I am not in on.

The unemployment rate in the United States dropped from 10% in 2009, at the height of the economic crisis, to just 5.5% in January 2015. Meanwhile, in Canada, the unemployment rate went from about 8.7% to 6.8%. We all know that for years, the United States has been dealing with recurring deficits that it is quite unable to get out of and that it has a higher accumulated public debt than Canada. The government needs to back up its claim that a balanced budget will solve all our problems. We know what happens when a government gets bogged down in ideology. It is very difficult to reason, see clearly and put things in perspective.

That said, the government has imposed the 100th gag order, the 100th time allocation motion. When I was elected on May 2, 2011, I never could have imagined that I would see 100 gag orders, 100 refusals to give a voice to millions of Canadians across the country. A gag order is one thing, and it has been used for a number of different bills, real bills that addressed specific problems or specific topics. However, ironically, the 100th one is being used for an omnibus bill, yet one more hodgepodge of legislative measures that amend a huge variety of laws, including the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, the Patent Act and even the act pertaining to the federal public service. This is the same kind of nonsense we have been seeing all along, and it unfortunately prevents us from seriously studying the legislative measures that are being imposed, not proposed, by the government. That is the reality.

This is the sign of a worn-out government: it is still imposing its will despite its growing list of failures and the opposition of a huge majority of the people on issues as significant as the anti-terrorism bill, Bill C-51. Unfortunately, the bill was passed by the Conservative majority, which, just like the government, is running away and trying to escape its own corruption under the vigilant eye of the Auditor General. The real pity is that the government is missing yet another opportunity to work with the opposition parties and the other parties represented in the House.

At least there is one good thing about the Minister of Finance's budget: it includes some NDP measures. We see it as "friendly theft". We are not going to complain about them stealing our good ideas. The really funny thing, though, is that the Conservatives do not want to give the NDP any credit. Everyone knows what I am talking about. I am talking about the measures for small businesses: lowering the tax rate from 11% to 9% and the accelerated capital cost allowance.

● (1710)

Those are obvious ways to help small businesses, which often operate on very tight budgets. Sometimes their budgets are so tight that the owners cannot even pay themselves a salary.

It is a great privilege for me, as a member of Parliament, to meet so many business owners in my riding. Furthermore, Beauport—Limoilou is a riding that is home to many small businesses made up of just a few employees who are valiantly supported by the business owners. Those individuals have so much faith that they often work very long hours in conditions that are much worse than those of their employees. Every bit of help is important.

It is too bad, because those are the kinds of measures we could have supported wholeheartedly. However, instead of playing fair and having the courage to debate and discuss only the budget by introducing a coherent budget implementation bill that allows for a full debate, the Conservatives buried everything in this unpalatable jumble of an omnibus bill, which includes things that have nothing to do with the budget.

My colleagues have talked about that. Unfortunately, too few of my colleagues from all political parties will be able to speak to this omnibus bill. It is important to do so, because this bill will drastically change many aspects of our society, including good faith negotiations, which have been completely scrapped at the stroke of a pen, or respect for foreign visitors, who will be subjected to biometric screening. That last measure should have been the subject of a full debate to determine what limits should have been applied. Instead, the government prefers to short-circuit the debate. It is going to rush this through and we will have to live with the consequences. Judges are going to have to do the work of parliamentarians, once again, by perhaps striking down some of the abusive provisions that do not comply with our basic laws.

I think it is very important to go over the sorry record of nine very long years. It has been nine and a half years, actually, since the Conservative Party came to power. It was my first campaign, in 2006, on January 23. In 2006, as I said, the employment rate was 62.8% in the Canadian workforce. Last year, that rate fell to 61.4%, and I can assure the House that it has continued to drop given the turmoil caused by the drop in the price of oil. Given that the government increased development of our natural resources, especially oil and gas, we have reached a level of dependence that is forcing us to deal with a much harsher reality than we would have liked.

TD Bank's former chief economist, Craig Alexander, testified at the Standing Committee on Finance a few times and talked about this. His contribution is highly valued. He said that in the long term we need to build a knowledge economy that is globally competitive, productive and innovative and does not depend on speculation or fluctuating commodity prices.

For a government that ignored knowledge, innovation and the vibrancy of a talented pool of young people in favour of the massive export of raw, unprocessed resources, the judgment is particularly harsh. As Mr. Alexander said, the priority should have been the other way around, but the Conservatives forced us down a road that seems to be a dead end, and we do not know the way out yet.

Government Orders

• (1715)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the member about health care, which we know is of great concern to all Canadians. The government lost the opportunity back in 2014 to achieve another health care accord. In 2004, Prime Minister Paul Martin, at the time, recognized the importance of working with the provinces in order to deliver a service which was of critical importance to all Canadians. We believe and trust that health care will not only be here for us today but also into the future.

When we look at today's budget implementation bill, one thing that is really lacking is any sense of commitment toward health care going into the future. This is something that I suspect would disappoint many Canadians. I am wondering if the member might want to provide his thoughts on the lost opportunity of not having a long-term health care accord with the premiers and that the Prime Minister should have done something a couple of years back.

[Translation]

Mr. Raymond Côté: Mr. Speaker, Lester B. Pearson's government listened to the NDP, but those days are long gone.

The provinces adopted Paul Martin's famous accord with a gun to their heads, an old Liberal practice that goes back to the days of Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the rounds of negotiations with the provinces in the early 1970s and 1980s. This is the last chapter in the saga of this famous accord; the government is drastically reducing the health transfers to the provinces.

The initial accord guaranteed that the federal government would pay 50% of provincial health care costs. It was a very clear and very simple accord, and this new program was the envy of the world. The Liberals began dismantling it and the Conservatives continued the job.

My dear colleague cannot be proud of the 20 years spent tearing apart the fabric of this country.

• (1720)

Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Conservative government raided the employment insurance fund to balance the budget. The budget contains some good measures, such as cutting the tax rate for SMEs from 11% to 9%, which is an NDP idea. However, it also contains bad measures, bad initiatives and bad programs.

I am going to ask a question about unemployment. Given that there are 1,310,000 unemployed workers in Canada, what would an NDP government have done better in terms of creating jobs and ensuring that people can earn a higher salary and improve their quality of life, and also to help unemployed workers who have lost their jobs?

We see that the Conservatives prefer, unfortunately, to restrict access to employment insurance and then raid the fund. Some might even talk about theft. However, I will not do so in the House because that would be unparliamentary language.

What does my NDP colleague think about that?

Mr. Raymond Côté: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, who has witnessed first-hand

the impact that the dismantling of the employment insurance program has had. The people in his region have been particularly affected by this.

The fact that the government is using the employment insurance surplus to balance the budget is likely not the most shocking aspect of this budget. It is actually a hidden deficit. What is more, we are strongly opposed to two measures: the increased TFSA contribution limit and income splitting. Basically, were it not for these two measures, the government would have a surplus without having to resort to such manipulation.

The other really shocking aspect of the budget is that the government is actually hampering job creation and interfering with job mobility and economic activity by limiting access to employment insurance. I have provided statistics on the employment rate to prove it. This has forced millions of people across the country to put up with jobs that make them unhappy, jobs where they have no hope of getting ahead and jobs that do not meet their needs. This leaves the door wide open to abuse and often results in extremely unfortunate consequences.

At the same time, it is rather ironic to see the government implementing employment insurance measures to allow people who are sick to receive benefits for a longer period of time, but that may be the result of accumulated problems with and failures of the basic employment insurance program.

[English]

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch (Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise in the House today to support the budget implementation act.

As Minister of Labour and Minister of Status of Women, I am proud that our budget will improve health and safety in the workplace, strengthen protections for interns and provide added support for employees who are caring for their gravely ill family members.

[Translation]

The Government of Canada understands very well that a safe, fair and productive workplace is an important part of creating jobs, stimulating growth and ensuring long-term prosperity. That has always been a priority.

We know that a strong and healthy economy relies on a workforce that is also strong and healthy.

[English]

That workforce includes interns. Internships have generated significant debate and discussion over the past year, and for good reason. Internships play an essential role when it comes to providing Canadians with opportunities to gain skills and experience that they need to join and succeed in the workforce.

Whether paid or unpaid, internships are an important way to improve employment prospects. In fact, a November 2014 survey by the Association of Universities and Colleges found that four out of five employers say that internships provide students added value as well as for their companies. They bring new talent into their organizations and the benefits go both ways.

Government Orders

• (1725)

[Translation]

Internships give students an opportunity to acquire the skills they need to participate in the workforce. It is estimated that there are currently hundreds of thousands of interns in workplaces across Canada.

[English]

Many of them are working toward degrees or diplomas through secondary or post-secondary educational institutions, or through vocational schools, but not all of them. There are also recent graduates, new Canadians, people pursuing career changes and those looking to return to the workforce after a period absence, among others, who are also engaging in internships.

[Translation]

Internships make it possible to acquire valuable knowledge and experience. However, it is also important for interns, regardless of pay, to be protected by the Canadian Labour Code.

[English]

Members may remember Andy Ferguson, a young student who died in November 2011 after an overnight shift at an Alberta radio station where he had been an intern. His brother believes he fell asleep at the wheel after working 16 hours in a 24-hour period. Since Andy passed away, his family has been pushing for labour protection for interns. When the budget was introduced, Matthew Ferguson, his brother, responded by saying, "I didn't expect it at this scale, or this quickly, but it's still very exciting that it has come out today".

[Translation]

This clearly shows that the government took the necessary measures to ensure that interns are properly protected. Occupational health and safety are extremely important. We take our mandate very seriously.

[English]

The budget implementation act would amend the Canada Labour Code to ensure that all interns under federal jurisdiction, regardless of pay, would receive occupational health and safety protection. This would include the right to refuse dangerous work.

The code would also be amended to clarify the circumstances when unpaid internships could be offered. In addition, the code would be amended to allow labour standards protection to apply and to be adapted to unpaid interns. That way we would ensure that all interns are protected appropriately in the workplace without discouraging employers from offering unpaid internships should they wish to do so.

As we heard in committee from Mr. John Farrell, the executive director of the Federally Regulated Employers - Transportation and Communications Group, interns are not employees, but they have the right to be treated fairly and an appropriate balance is required.

[Translation]

Our government listened to what Canadians had to say about this and we acted quickly. Our government is also concerned about job

security for employees who have to stop working to take care of a sick loved one and about the income assistance they receive.

[English]

Our government will also be introducing an extension to the compassionate care benefits under the federal employment insurance program. We will be investing up to \$37 million annually to extend the duration of compassionate care benefits, from the current six weeks to six months.

We are also extending the time period within which claimants can receive those benefits, from 26 weeks to 52 weeks. In addition, we are amending the Canada Labour Code to ensure that employees in federally regulated workplaces have their jobs protected when they access these increased benefits. We expect these changes to come into force in January 2016.

We heard from Canadians that the existing program parameters did not reflect the financial hardship and emotional stress that people providing end of life care often face. I can say from first-hand experience, working with individuals within my own riding, and I am sure other members have experienced the same, that the issue of making sure individuals can be with their loved one at the most valuable time they can be when they require them, especially at an end of life experience, and that having this extension of compassionate care leave from six weeks to six months is being viewed extremely well.

[Translation]

That is why the government will support Canadian workers during the most difficult times of their lives. That is why these changes are so important.

[English]

Ensuring that Canadians are well protected and can pursue their own personal economic prosperity is something that our government is determined to do.

This bill would put our budget measures into action. It would strengthen workplace protections for interns and ensure job security for employees who are caring for their loved ones.

[Translation]

Budget 2015 is proof of our commitment to create a strong and healthy workforce that will, in turn, create a strong and healthy economy.

• (1730)

[English]

Budget 2015 is good for all Canadians. I would urge hon. members in the House to vote in favour of the bill and give their support to a stronger workforce and a stronger economy.

[Translation]

Mrs. Anne-Marie Day (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the member for her speech. It is quite clear that her background is in health care. She put particular emphasis on benefits for people who take care of their loved ones and on the occupational health and safety of interns.

Government Orders

I have two questions. Why did the government cut \$36 billion in health transfers to the provinces?

My second question has to do with interns. Why did the government not agree to the NDP's proposal to require that interns be paid?

[*English*]

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch: Mr. Speaker, there are two things. First, with respect to transfer payments, they are on an escalator and will continue to be so, both the social transfer tax as well as the health transfer tax.

With respect to interns, as I mentioned in my speech, it is about coming to a balance. It is extremely appropriate to the point that the member made that individuals do receive payment once they have reached a tipping point.

The budget is very clear. We have a new six-point plan. Individuals who are at school and receiving vocational training would continue as they have in the past, but now would have all the additional protections. They would remain unpaid because that is part of their educational process.

For those who enter the workplace, we are setting a maximum of four months of unpaid internship and then an employer must move forward ensuring that those individuals receive a salary.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, as members in this place will know, I am deeply disturbed by the number of measures buried in Bill C-59 that are dangerous for this country and that are extremely anti-democratic, particularly the changes being made post facto, retroactively, to access to information.

I had initially welcomed the changes to protect interns, until I saw the submission from the Canadian Intern Association and realized how much we are failing interns. I asked the hon. minister if she had reviewed the testimony from this organization. Its members certainly are very concerned. I will just quote from their brief:

We submit that the amendments to the Canada Labour Code proposed in Division 7 offer inadequate workplace rights to students, interns, unpaid persons and entry-level employees working for federally regulated employers.

These are some of our most vulnerable and precarious workers, and we are not protecting them.

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch: Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned before in this place, it is extremely important for all Canadians to look at what we have put forward in the budget. All portions of part 2 of the Canada Labour Code, that is, occupational health and safety coverage for any employee, are now being extended to interns.

With respect to part 3 of the code, labour standards, that is being reviewed, as requested, by individuals across the country to make sure that we cover all the labour standards that would be appropriate for interns. Obviously, people who are not being paid do not require paid leave, and we do not include that.

Those are the types of things we are looking forward to discussing with respect to labour standards to make sure that they are all-inclusive.

As I have mentioned before, we encourage the internship association to please read the bill and look at it. We did extensive consultations all over the country. The parliamentary secretary from British Columbia did an outstanding job of speaking to young Canadians, to older individuals who are transitioning in work, and to new Canadians about how important internships are. That is what this bill encompasses to make sure that all of those protections that have to be afforded, all occupational health and safety coverage in part 2 of the code, cover all interns in the country.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question in regard to the myth that the Conservatives have a balanced budget. In fact, when they first took office, they inherited a surplus, and they turned that surplus into a deficit within two years, prior to the recession. Ever since then, the Conservatives have not had a balanced budget. They have added billions of dollars to Canada's debt. Here we are months away from the election, the magic wand goes, and now they have a balanced budget. We will not know whether it is actually balanced until next year.

Does the minister believe that she is going to be able to fool Canadians by selling wholesale GM shares for \$2 billion and going into the contingency fund and saying that they have a balanced budget? Does she believe that this is something Canadians are actually going to believe?

• (1735)

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch: Mr. Speaker, the budget is balanced. The member opposite seems to believe that the Liberal Party would be able to deal with the economy of the country. This is a group that wants to raise taxes, and we are lowering them. These people want to eliminate jobs by raising taxes, and we are creating them.

The budget is balanced. It is that simple.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to have the opportunity this afternoon to speak to the 2015 budget. There is consensus that this budget is less than stellar. It is not future-oriented. It does not attempt to make the investments needed to improve our economic productivity for the long term, nor does it make the necessary long-term investments to keep our health care system viable.

Before I address these two points, I would like to comment on the government's plans in the budget for targeted benefit pension plans. The government intends to create a legislative and regulatory framework to impose this pension model on private businesses under federal jurisdiction, including airlines, telecommunications companies and banks.

A few weeks ago, some Air Canada retirees came to see me in my riding office. They are very worried about this Conservative government plan. If it goes through, people who currently collect defined benefits through their pension plan could be subject to this new pension model under which benefits may vary depending on the financial state of the pension plan. I am against that idea.

As I said, many of my constituents worked for banks, telecommunications companies such as Bell Canada and airlines such as Air Canada, and they are very concerned about the government's plan.

Government Orders

[English]

I really think the government is making a grave error in trying to impose a model for target benefit plans on private sector companies in federal jurisdiction. As we know, these plans would involve benefits that could vary, depending on the state of the pension plan.

Many of my constituents receive pensions from companies like Air Canada. These pensions are not indexed. They have been receiving these pensions, in many cases, for 20 years. They retired 20 years ago. They have seen their purchasing power erode, and now they are worried that their pension benefits, which they had assumed would be stable, could fluctuate up and down.

I do not know why the government wants to impose this model on private sector companies in federal jurisdiction. They are companies that are quite solid, like banks and telecommunications firms, like Bell. Even the airlines are doing well.

I would note that some provinces are looking at target benefit plans because they make life easier for companies that are in financial trouble and that have pension plan deficits. However, I would note that in the province of Quebec, the government is imposing this model only on firms in the pulp and paper industry, which we know is an industry that is going through hard times. In addition, it imposes the model only on companies in that industry that are subject to an order under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.

• (1740)

I understand the benefit of this model for a company that is in financial trouble, like a company in the pulp and paper industry, for example, that is in such trouble that it is under some kind of bankruptcy protection, but I do not see the logic of imposing this model on companies like banks, telecommunication companies, and companies like Air Canada that are doing very well. I do not think this is a good initiative on the part of the government, and that is one reason I am voting against this budget.

On the subject of TFSA's, we know that they are good vehicles for saving for retirement. They make a lot of sense, but as I was listening to the government's proposal for increasing the contribution ceiling, I thought back to my constituents. Many of them have teenagers in high school. They are thinking about their children's education. Some of them are struggling with debt, and if they got any extra money, say for example if we had a Liberal government and parents received enhanced child benefit payments because of our very wise and creative plan, what would they do with that money? It would make more sense for them to invest that money in an RESP than in a TFSA, and I will explain why.

If they put the money in an RESP, they get a higher rate of return. They get a 30% rate of return the first year, because they get a cash grant from the federal government, instituted by the Paul Martin government, of 20% on every dollar invested in an RESP, and they get an additional cash grant from the Quebec government of 10%. If parents have a teenager aged 16 or 17 who is about to enter university, and the parents get some extra cash because of the Liberal tax cut, then it makes more economic sense to put it in an RESP than in a TFSA. Even if it were in the RESP for two years, the annual rate

of return would be 15%, which I would say is quite good under those circumstances.

These are just some of the thoughts I have had in reaction to this budget, and I appreciate having had the opportunity to address the matter.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: It being 5:45 p.m., pursuant to an order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 3.

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:

The Deputy Speaker: The division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 3.

The question now is on Motion No. 2. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 10 and 148.

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.

I declare Motion No. 2 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 10 and 148 defeated.

(Motions Nos. 2, 10 and 148 negatived)

• (1745)

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 4. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 5 to 9.

Government Orders

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:

The Deputy Speaker: The division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 5 to 9.

[*English*]

The question is now on Motion No. 11. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 12.

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.

An hon. member: 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. I declare Motion No. 11 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 12 defeated. (Motions Nos. 11 and 12 negated)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 13. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 14 to 41.

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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 14 to 41.

[*English*]

The question is now on Motion No. 42. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 43.

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.

An hon. member: 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. I declare the motion defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 43 also defeated. (Motions Nos. 42 and 43 negated)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 44. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 45 to 47.

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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 45 to 47.

• (1750)

[*English*]

The question is now on Motion No. 48. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 50 to 55.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

An hon. member: 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. I declare the motion defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 50 to 55 also defeated.

(Motions Nos. 48 and 50 to 55 negatived)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 56.

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 nays have it.

I declare the motion defeated.

(Motion No. 56 negatived)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 57. A vote on this motion applies to Motions Nos. 58 to 111.

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:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 58 to 111.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 112. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 113, 114 and 149.

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.

I declare the motion defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 113, 114 and 149 defeated.

(Motions Nos. 112 to 114 and 149 negatived)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 115. A vote on this motion applies to Motions Nos. 117 to 124.

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:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 117 to 124.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 125. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 126.

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:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 126. [*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 127. A vote on this motion applies also to Motions Nos. 128 to 147.

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:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 128 to 147.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of the bill.

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

• (1825)

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 3.

• (1835)

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

(*Division No. 437*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allen (Weland)
Andrews	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Boivin	Borg
Boulerice	Brahmi
Brison	Brosseau
Byrne	Casey
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault	Easter

Eyking
Freeland
Gameau
Genest
Godin
Gravelle
Harris (St. John's East)
Hughes
Kellway
Lapointe
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nunez-Melo
Papillon
Perreault
Plamondon
Rafferty
Ravignat
Regan
Sandhu
Scott
Sgro
sor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
St-Denis
Stoffer
Toone
Trudeau
Vaughan— 123

Government Orders

Foote
Freeman
Garrison
Giguère
Goodale
Groguhé
Hsu
Julian
Lamoureux
Latendresse
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leslie
MacAulay
Marston
Masse
May
McGuinity
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Nash
Pacetti
Pécelet
Pilon
Quach
Rankin
Raynault
Saganash
Scarpaleggia
Sellah
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
Sitsabaiesan
Stewart
Sullivan
Tremblay
Valeriote

NAYS

Members

Adler
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anders
Armstrong
Aspin
Bateman
Bergen
Blaney
Boughen
Breitkreuz
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Chong
Clement
Daniel
Dechert
Dreeschen
Dykstra
Falk
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Fletcher
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Gourde
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
James
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lauzon
Leitch
Leung
Lukiwski

Government Orders

Lunney	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mayer	McColeman
McLeod	Menegakis
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Nicholson
Norlock	Obhrai
O'Connor	Oliver
O'Neill Gordon	O'Toole
Paradis	Payne
Perkins	Poilievre
Preston	Raitt
Rajotte	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saxton	Schellenberger
Seeback	Shory
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Toet
Trost	Trottier
Truppe	Uppal
Valcourt	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 143	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 3 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 4. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 5 to 9.

[*English*]

Hon. John Duncan: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Conservative members voting no. I would like to add that the member for Okanagan—Coquihalla missed the first vote.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and we will vote yes.

[*English*]

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply the vote and will be voting no, together with the member for Vancouver Quadra.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Massimo Pacetti: Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with proceeding in this manner and I vote yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Scott Andrews: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Bellavance: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes.

Mr. Louis Plamondon: The Bloc is in favour, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote, and the Green Party votes yes.

Ms. Manon Perreault: Mr. Speaker, I will vote yes.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes.

● (1840)

[*English*]

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Speaker, I wish my vote to be recorded as no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 438*)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
Ashton	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Bellavance	Benskin
Bevington	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Brahmi	Brousseau
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Comartin
Côté	Crowder
Cullen	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault	Freeman
Garrison	Genest
Giguère	Godin
Gravelle	Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)	Hughes
Julian	Kellway
Lapointe	Latendresse
Laverdière	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leslie	Liu
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mourani	Mulcair
Nash	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Pécelet	Perreault
Pilon	Plamondon
Quach	Rafferty
Rankin	Ravignat
Raynault	Saganash
Sandhu	Scott
Sellah	Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaesan	Stewart
Stoffer	Sullivan
Toone	Tremblay — 92

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Ashfield	Aspin

Government Orders

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 5 to 9 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 13. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 14 to 41.

Hon. John Duncan: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find agreement to apply the results from the previous vote to the current vote, with Conservative members voting no.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and we will vote yes.

[*English*]

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply the vote and are voting yes.

Mr. Massimo Pacetti: Mr. Speaker, I have no problem applying the vote and I will be voting in favour.

Mr. Scott Andrews: Mr. Speaker, I agree to applying the vote and I am voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Speaker, I will vote no.

Mr. André Bellavance: Mr. Speaker, I vote in favour of the motion.

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois votes in favour of this motion.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes.

[*English*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to register that I vote in favour of my amendment.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 439*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Andrews
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bellavance
Benskin
Blanchette
Boivin
Boulerice
Brisson
Byrne
Cash
Chicoine

Allen (Welland)
Ashton
Aubin
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevington
Blanchette-Lamothe
Borg
Brahmi
Brosseau
Casey
Charlton
Chisholm

Barlow	Bateman
Bélangier	Bennett
Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Blaney
Block	Boughen
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brisson	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Bruinooge
Butt	Byrne
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Casey
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Cotler
Crockatt	Cuzner
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Devolin
Dion	Dreeshen
Dubourg	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Easter
Eglinski	Eyking
Falk	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Foote
Freeland	Galipeau
Gallant	Garneau
Gill	Glover
Goguen	Goldring
Goodale	Goodyear
Gourde	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer
Hoback	Holder
Hsu	James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kent	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lamoureux
Lauzon	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leef	Leitch
Lemieux	Leung
Lobb	Lukiwski
Lunney	MacAulay
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Maguire	Mayes
McCallum	McColeman
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McLeod	Menegakis
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Murray
Nicholson	Norlock
Obhrai	O'Connor
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
O'Toole	Paradis
Payne	Perkins
Poillievre	Preston
Raith	Rajotte
Regan	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Seeback
Sgro	Shory
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Smith	
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	St-Denis
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Toet
Trost	Trottier
Trudeau	Truppe
Uppal	Valcourt
Valeriotte	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vaughan
Vellacott	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)	
Williamson	Wilks
Woodworth	Wong
Young (Oakville)	Yelich
Yurdiga	Young (Vancouver South)
	Zimmer — 176

Government Orders

Choquette	Christopherson	Gourde	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Cleary	Comartin	Hawn	Hayes
Côté	Cotler	Hiebert	Hilyer
Crowder	Cullen	Hoback	Holder
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	James	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kent
Dewar	Dion	Kerr	Komarnicki
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé	Lauzon	Leaf
Dubourg	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Leitch	Lemieux
Dusseault	Easter	Leung	Lobb
Eyking	Foote	Lukiwski	Lunney
Freeland	Freeman	MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Garneau	Garrison	Maguire	Mayes
Genest	Giguère	McColeman	McLeod
Godin	Goodale	Menegakis	Miller
Gravelle	Groguhé	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu	Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Hughes	Julian	Nicholson	Norlock
Kellway	Lamoureux	Obhrai	O'Connor
Lapointe	Latendresse	Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	O'Toole	Paradis
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie	Payne	Perkins
Liu	MacAulay	Poilievre	Preston
Mai	Marston	Raiit	Rajotte
Martin	Masse	Reid	Rempel
Mathyssen	May	Richards	Saxton
McCallum	McGuinty	Schellenberger	Seeback
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud	Shory	Smith
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Sopuck	Sorenson
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Stanton	Storseth
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani	Strahl	Sweet
Mulcair	Murray	Toet	Trost
Nash	Nunez-Melo	Trottier	Truppe
Pacetti	Papillon	Uppal	Valcourt
Péclet	Perreault	Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Pilon	Plamondon	Vellacott	Wallace
Quach	Rafferty	Warawa	Warkentin
Rankin	Ravnignat	Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Raynault	Regan	Sky Country)	
Saganash	Sandhu	Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Scarpaleggia	Scott	Williamson	Wong
Sellah	Sgro	Woodworth	Yelich
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	St-Denis	Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Stoffer	Yurdiga	Zimmer — 144
Sitsabaiesan	Toone		
Stewart	Trudeau		
Sullivan	Vaughan — 124		
Tremblay			
Valeriotte			

PAIRED

Nil

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adler
Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambler	Ambrose
Anders	Anderson
Armstrong	Ashfield
Aspin	Barlow
Bateman	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Bruinooge
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Crockatt
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Devolin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Egliniski
Falk	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodyear

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 14 to 41 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 44. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 45 to 47.

Hon. John Duncan: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find agreement to apply the results from the previous vote to the current vote, with Conservative members voting no.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé: Mr. Speaker, the official opposition agrees to apply the vote and we are voting yes.

[English]

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply the vote and we vote no.

[Translation]

Mr. Massimo Pacetti: Mr. Speaker, I agree to proceed in this fashion and I am voting yes.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Scott Andrews: Mr. Speaker, I agree on applying the vote and I vote no.

[Translation]

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Speaker, I agree to proceed in this way, but I am voting no.

Mr. André Bellavance: Mr. Speaker, I vote in favour of the motion.

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is in favour of the motion.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and the Green party votes yes.

[Translation]

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

● (1845)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 440)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bellavance
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Boivin	Borg
Boulerice	Brahmi
Brosseau	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary
Comartin	Côté
Crowder	Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dewar
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Freeman	Garrison
Genest	Giguère
Godin	Gravelle
Groguhé	Harris (St. John's East)
Hughes	Julian
Kellway	Lapointe
Latendresse	Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
May	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Nash
Nunez-Melo	Pacetti
Papillon	Péclet
Perreault	Pilon
Plamondon	Quach
Rafferty	Rankin
Ravignat	Raynault
Saganash	Sandhu

Scott
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Stewart
Sullivan
Tremblay— 91

Sellah
Sitsabaesan
Stoffer
Toone

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Armstrong	Ashfield
Aspin	Barlow
Bateman	Bélangier
Bennett	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brison
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Bruinooge	Butt
Byrne	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Casey	Chong
Clarke	Clement
Cotler	Crockatt
Cuzner	Daniel
Davidson	Dechert
Devolin	Dion
Dreeshen	Dubourg
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Easter	Eglinski
Eyking	Falk
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Foote	Freeland
Galipeau	Gallant
Gameau	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodale
Goodyear	Gourde
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	Hsu
James	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lamoureux	Lauzon
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	McLeod
Menegakis	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Murray	Nicholson
Norlock	Obhrai
O'Connor	Oliver
O'Neill Gordon	O'Toole
Paradis	Payne
Perkins	Poillievre
Preston	Raitt
Rajotte	Regan
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saxton
Scarpaleggia	Schellenberger
Seeback	Sgro
Shory	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind- sor)
Smith	Sopuck

Government Orders

Sorenson	Stanton
St-Denis	Storseth
Strahl	Sweet
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Trudeau
Truppe	Uppal
Valcourt	Valeriotte
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vaughan	Vellacott
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 — 177	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 44 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 45 to 47 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 57. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 58 to 111.

[*English*]

Hon. John Duncan: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to the current vote, with Conservative members voting no.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé: Mr. Speaker, the official opposition agrees to apply the vote and we will vote yes.

[*English*]

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply the vote and will vote against.

Mr. Massimo Pacetti: Mr. Speaker, I have no problem to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Scott Andrews: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the motion.

Mr. André Bellavance: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting in favour of this motion.

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is in favour of the motion.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Speaker, I am voting for the motion.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party is also in favour of this motion.

Ms. Manon Perreault: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 57, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 441)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bellavance
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Boivin	Borg
Boulerice	Brahmi
Brousseau	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary
Comartin	Côté
Crowder	Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dewar
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Freeman	Garrison
Genest	Giguère
Godin	Gravelle
Groguhé	Harris (St. John's East)
Hughes	Julian
Kellway	Lapointe
Latendresse	Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Énard)	Leslie
Liu	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
May	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Nash
Nunez-Melo	Pacetti
Papillon	Pécllet
Perreault	Pilon
Plamondon	Quach
Rafferty	Rankin
Ravignat	Raynault
Saganash	Sandhu
Scott	Sellah
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaesan
Stewart	Stoffer
Sullivan	Toone
Tremblay — 91	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Armstrong	Ashfield
Aspin	Barlow
Bateman	Bélangier
Bennett	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brisson
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Bruinoogee	Butt
Byrne	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Casey	Chong

Government Orders

Clarke	Clement
Cotler	Crockatt
Cuzner	Daniel
Davidson	Dechert
Devolin	Dion
Dreeshen	Dubourg
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Easter	Eglinski
Eyking	Falk
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Foote	Freeland
Galipeau	Gallant
Garneau	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodale
Goodyear	Gourde
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	Hsu
James	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lamoureux	Lauzon
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	McLeod
Menegakis	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Nicholson
Murray	Obhrai
Norlock	Oliver
O'Connor	O'Toole
O'Neill Gordon	Payne
Paradis	Poilievre
Perkins	Raït
Preston	Regan
Rajotte	Rempel
Reid	Saxton
Richards	Schellenberger
Scarpaleggia	Sgro
Seeback	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind- sor)
Shory	Sopuck
Smith	Stanton
Sorenson	Storseth
St-Denis	Sweet
Strahl	Trost
Toet	Trudeau
Trottier	Uppal
Truppe	Valeriotte
Valcourt	Van Loan
Van Kesteren	Vellacott
Vaughan	Warawa
Wallace	Watson
Warkentin	
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	Williamson
Weston (Saint John)	Woodworth
Wilks	Young (Oakville)
Wong	Yurdiga
Yelich	
Young (Vancouver South)	
Zimmer— 177	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 57 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 58 to 111 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 115. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 117 to 124.

Hon. John Duncan: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to the current vote, with the Conservatives members voting no.

The Speaker: Shall we proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé: Mr. Speaker, the official opposition agrees to apply the vote and we will vote yes.

[*English*]

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals will apply the vote and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Massimo Pacetti: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Scott Andrews: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply to vote and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the motion.

Mr. André Bellavance: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of the motion.

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is in favour of the motion.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Speaker, I am voting for the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party once again votes for our amendment.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Manon Perreault: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting for this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 115, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 442*)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bellavance
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Boivin	Borg
Boulerice	Brahmi
Brousseau	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary
Comartin	Côté
Crowder	Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dewar
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseau
Freeman	Garrison

Government Orders

Genest
 Godin
 Groguhé
 Hughes
 Kellway
 Latendresse
 LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
 Liu
 Marston
 Masse
 May
 Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
 Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
 Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
 Mulcair
 Nunez-Melo
 Papillon
 Perreault
 Plamondon
 Rafferty
 Ravignat
 Saganash
 Scott
 Sims (Newton—North Delta)
 Stewart
 Sullivan
 Tremblay — 91

Giguère
 Gravelle
 Harris (St. John's East)
 Julian
 Lapointe
 Laverdière
 Leslie
 Mai
 Martin
 Mathysen
 Michaud
 Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
 Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
 Mourani
 Nash
 Pacetti
 Pécelet
 Pilon
 Quach
 Rankin
 Raynault
 Sandhu
 Sellah
 Sitsabaiesan
 Stoffer
 Toone

MacKenzie
 Mayes
 McColeman
 McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
 Menegakis
 Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
 Moore (Fundy Royal)
 Murray
 Norlock
 O'Connor
 O'Neill Gordon
 Paradis
 Perkins
 Preston
 Rajotte
 Reid
 Richards
 Scarpaleggia
 Seeback
 Shory
 Smith
 Sorenson
 St-Denis
 Strahl
 Toet
 Trottier
 Truppe
 Valcourt
 Van Kesteren
 Vaughan
 Wallace
 Warkentin
 Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
 Weston (Saint John)
 Wilks
 Wong
 Yelich
 Young (Vancouver South)
 Zimmer — 177

Maguire
 McCallum
 McQuinty
 McLeod
 Miller
 Nicholson
 Obhrai
 Oliver
 O'Toole
 Payne
 Poilievre
 Raitt
 Regan
 Rempel
 Saxton
 Schellenberger
 Sgro
 Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
 sor)
 Sopuck
 Stanton
 Storseth
 Sweet
 Trost
 Trudeau
 Uppal
 Valeriote
 Van Loan
 Vellacott
 Warawa
 Watson
 Williamson
 Woodworth
 Young (Oakville)
 Yurdiga

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
 Adler
 Albas
 Alexander
 Allison
 Ambrose
 Anderson
 Armstrong
 Aspin
 Bateman
 Bennett
 Bergen
 Blaney
 Boughen
 Breitzkreuz
 Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
 Bruinooge
 Byrne
 Calkins
 Carmichael
 Casey
 Clarke
 Cotler
 Cuzner
 Davidson
 Devolin
 Dreeshen
 Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
 Easter
 Eyking
 Fast
 Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Foote
 Galipeau
 Garneau
 Glover
 Goldring
 Goodyear
 Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
 Hayes
 Hillyer
 Holder
 James
 Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
 Kerr
 Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
 Lamoureux
 LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
 Leitch
 Leung
 Lukiwski
 MacAulay

Adams
 Aglukkaq
 Albrecht
 Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Ambler
 Anders
 Andrews
 Ashfield
 Barlow
 Bélanger
 Benoit
 Bernier
 Block
 Braid
 Brison
 Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
 Butt
 Calandra
 Cannan
 Carrie
 Chong
 Clement
 Crockatt
 Daniel
 Dechert
 Dion
 Dubourg
 Dykstra
 Eglinski
 Falk
 Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
 Fletcher
 Freeland
 Gallant
 Gill
 Goguen
 Goodale
 Gourde
 Hawn
 Hiebert
 Hoback
 Hsu
 Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
 Kent
 Komarnicki
 Lake
 Lauzon
 Leef
 Lemieux
 Lobb
 Lunney
 MacKay (Central Nova)

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 115 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 117 to 124 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 125. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 126.

[*English*]

Hon. John Duncan: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to the current vote, with Conservative members voting no.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé: Mr. Speaker, the official opposition agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply the vote and will vote yes.

Mr. Massimo Pacetti: Mr. Speaker, being a big fan of applying the vote, I will be voting in favour.

● (1850)

Mr. Scott Andrews: Mr. Speaker, I too agree to apply the vote and I will be voting in favour.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Speaker, I am voting against the motion.

Mr. André Bellavance: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of the motion.

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is in favour of the motion.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Elizabeth May: I am voting yes, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

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

(The House divided on Motion No. 125, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 443)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allen (Welland)
Andrews	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Boivin	Borg
Boulerice	Brahmi
Brisson	Brosseau
Byrne	Casey
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault	Easter
Eyking	Foote
Freeland	Freeman
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Giguère
Godin	Goodale
Gravelle	Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu
Hughes	Julian
Kellway	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Latendresse
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	MacAulay
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nash	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Péclet	Perreault
Pilon	Plamondon
Quach	Rafferty
Rankin	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan

Saganash	Sandhu
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaiesan	St-Denis
Stewart	Stoffer
Sullivan	Toone
Tremblay	Trudeau
Valeriote	Vaughan— 124

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adler
Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambler	Ambrose
Anders	Anderson
Armstrong	Ashfield
Aspin	Barlow
Bateman	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Breitreuz	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brunoogoe
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Crockatt
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Devolin
Dreeschen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Egliniski
Falk	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodyear
Gourde	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer
Hoback	Holder
James	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	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
O'Toole	Paradis
Payne	Perkins
Poilievre	Preston
Raiitt	Rajotte
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saxton
Schellenberger	Seeback
Shory	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Storseth
Strahl	Sweet
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Truppe
Uppal	Valcourt
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vellacott	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)

Government Orders

Weston (Saint John)
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Yurdiga

Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)
Zimmer — 144

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 125 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 126 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 127. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 128 to 147.

[English]

Hon. John Duncan: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find agreement to apply the results from the former vote to the current vote, with Conservative members voting no.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé: Mr. Speaker, the official opposition agrees to apply the vote and is voting yes.

[English]

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply, and we are voting yes.

[Translation]

Mr. Massimo Pacetti: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Mr. Scott Andrews: Mr. Speaker, I will be voting yes.

[Translation]

Mr. James Lunney: Mr. Speaker, I am against the motion.

Mr. André Bellavance: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of the motion.

Mr. Louis Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is in favour of the motion.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the motion.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party is in favour of the motion.

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

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 127, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 444)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Andrews
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bellavance
Benskin

Allen (Welland)
Ashton
Aubin
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevington

Blanchette
Boivin
Boulerice
Brison
Byrne
Cash
Chicoine
Choquette
Cleary
Côté
Crowder
Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Dubourg
Dusseault
Eyking
Freeland
Gameau
Genest
Godin
Gravelle
Harris (St. John's East)
Hughes
Kellway
Lapointe
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nash
Pacetti
Péclet
Pilon
Quach
Rankin
Raynault
Saganash
Scarpaleggia
Sellah
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan
Stewart
Sullivan
Tremblay
Valériote

Blanchette-Lamothe
Borg
Brahm
Brousseau
Casey
Charlton
Chisholm
Christopherson
Comartin
Cotler
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Dion
Donnelly
Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Easter
Foote
Freeman
Garrison
Giguère
Goodale
Groguhé
Hsu
Julian
Lamoureux
Latendresse
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leslie
MacAulay
Marston
Masse
May
McGuinty
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Murray
Nunez-Melo
Papillon
Perreault
Plamondon
Rafferty
Ravignat
Regan
Sandhu
Scott
Sgro
St-Denis
Stoffer
Toone
Trudeau
Vaughan — 124

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anders
Armstrong
Aspin
Bateman
Bergen
Blaney
Boughen
Breitkreuz
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Chong
Clement
Daniel
Dechert
Dreesen

Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allison
Ambrose
Anderson
Ashfield
Barlow
Benoit
Bernier
Block
Braid
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Bruinooge
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Clarke
Crockatt
Davidson
Devolin
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)

*Government Orders**And five or more members having risen:*

● (1900)

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

(Division No. 445)

YEAS

Members

Dykstra	Eglinski
Falk	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodyear
Gourde	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer
Hoback	Holder
James	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	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
O'Toole	Paradis
Payne	Perkins
Poilievre	Preston
Raith	Rajotte
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saxton
Schellenberger	Seeback
Shory	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Storseth
Strahl	Sweet
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Truppe
Uppal	Valcourt
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vellacott	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 144

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 127 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 128 to 147 defeated.

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Ablonczy	Adler
Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambler	Ambrose
Anders	Anderson
Armstrong	Ashfield
Aspin	Barlow
Bateman	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Bruinooge
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Crockatt
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Devolin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Eglinski
Falk	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodyear
Gourde	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer
Hoback	Holder
James	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	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
O'Toole	Paradis
Payne	Perkins
Poilievre	Preston
Raith	Rajotte
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saxton
Schellenberger	Seeback
Shory	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Storseth
Strahl	Sweet
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Truppe
Uppal	Valcourt
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vellacott	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Sky Country)	Weston (Saint John)
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks

Private Members' Business

Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga	Zimmer— 144

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allen (Welland)
Andrews	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Boivin	Borg
Boulerice	Brahmi
Brison	Brosseau
Byrne	Casey
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault	Easter
Eyking	Foote
Freeland	Freeman
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Giguère
Godin	Goodale
Gravelle	Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu
Hughes	Julian
Kellway	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Latendresse
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	MacAulay
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nash	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Péclet	Perreault
Pilon	Plamondon
Quach	Rafferty
Rankin	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Saganash	Sandhu
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	St-Denis
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Stoffer
Sitsabaiesan	Toone
Stewart	Trudeau
Sullivan	Vaughan— 124
Tremblay	
Valeriotte	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
(Motion agreed to)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

FERRY SERVICES TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

The House resumed from June 4 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 591, under private members' business.

● (1905)

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

(Division No. 446)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allen (Welland)
Andrews	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Boivin	Borg
Boulerice	Brahmi
Brison	Brosseau
Byrne	Casey
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault	Easter
Eyking	Foote
Freeland	Freeman
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Giguère
Godin	Goodale
Gravelle	Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu
Hughes	Julian
Kellway	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Latendresse
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	MacAulay
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nash	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Péclet	Perreault
Pilon	Plamondon
Quach	Rafferty
Rankin	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Saganash	Sandhu
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	St-Denis
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaiesan	

Private Members' Business

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

[*Translation*]**CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT**

The House resumed from June 3, 2015, consideration of the motion that Bill C-642, An Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (high profile offender), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-642, under private members' business.

● (1915)

[*English*]

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

(Division No. 447)

YEAS

Members

Stewart
Sullivan
Tremblay
ValeriotteStoffer
Toone
Trudeau
Vaughan— 124

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anders
Armstrong
Aspin
Bateman
Bergen
Blaney
Boughen
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Chong
Clement
Daniel
Dechert
Dreeshen
Dykstra
Falk
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Fletcher
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Gourde
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
James
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lauzon
Leitch
Leung
Lukiwski
MacKay (Central Nova)
Maguire
McColeman
Menegakis
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Nicholson
Obhrai
Oliver
O'Toole
Payne
Poilievre
Raitt
Reid
Richards
Schellenberger
Shory
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Toet
Trottier
Uppal
Van Kesteren
Vellacott
Warawa
Watson
Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Yurdiga

Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allison
Ambrose
Anderson
Ashfield
Barlow
Benoit
Bernier
Block
Braid
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Clarke
Crockatt
Davidson
Devolin
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Eglinski
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Galipeau
Gill
Goguen
Goodyear
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes
Hillyer
Holder
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kent
Komarnicki
Lake
Leef
Lemieux
Lobb
Lunney
MacKenzie
Mayes
McLeod
Miller
Norlock
O'Connor
O'Neill Gordon
Paradis
Perkins
Preston
Rajotte
Rempel
Saxton
Seeback
Smith
Sorenson
Storseth
Sweet
Trost
Truppe
Valcourt
Van Loan
Wallace
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)
Zimmer— 142

Ablonczy
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anders
Andrews
Ashfield
Barlow
Benoit
Bernier
Block
Braid
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Chong
Clement
Daniel
Dechert
Dreeshen
Dykstra
Falk
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Fletcher
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Gourde
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
James
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lauzon
Leitch
Leung
Lukiwski
MacKay (Central Nova)
Maguire
McColeman
Menegakis
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Nicholson

Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allison
Ambrose
Anderson
Armstrong
Aspin
Bateman
Bergen
Blaney
Boughen
Breitkreuz
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Clarke
Crockatt
Davidson
Devolin
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Eglinski
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Galipeau
Gill
Goguen
Goodyear
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes
Hillyer
Holder
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kent
Komarnicki
Lake
Leef
Lemieux
Lobb
Lunney
MacKenzie
Mayes
McLeod
Miller
Norlock

Private Members' Business

Obhrai	O'Connor
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
O'Toole	Pacetti
Paradis	Payne
Perkins	Poilievre
Preston	Raitt
Rajotte	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saxton	Schellenberger
Seeback	Shory
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Toet
Trost	Trottier
Truppe	Uppal
Valcourt	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 145	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allen (Welland)
Ashton	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Bélanger	Bellavance
Bennett	Benskin
Bevington	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Brahmi	Brisson
Brosseau	Byrne
Casey	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary
Comartin	Côté
Cotler	Crowder
Cullen	Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dubé	Dubourg
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Easter	Eyking
Foote	Freeland
Freeman	Garneau
Garrison	Genest
Giguère	Godin
Goodale	Gravelle
Groguhé	Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu	Hughes
Julian	Kellway
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Latendresse	Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leslie	Liu
MacAulay	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathyssen
May	McCallum
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mourani	Mulcair
Murray	Nash
Nunez-Melo	Papillon
Péclet	Perreault
Pilon	Plamondon
Quach	Rafferty
Rankin	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan

Saganash	Sandhu
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaesan	St-Denis
Stewart	Stoffer
Sullivan	Toone
Tremblay	Trudeau
Valeriote	Vaughan — 122

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security.

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

* * *

HERITAGE LIGHTHOUSE PROTECTION ACT

The House resumed from June 9 consideration of the motion that Bill C-588, An Act to amend the Heritage Lighthouse Protection Act (Sambro Island Lighthouse), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-588 under private member's business.

● (1920)

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

*(Division No. 448)***YEAS**

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambler	Ambrose
Anders	Anderson
Andrews	Armstrong
Ashfield	Ashton
Aspin	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Barlow	Bateman
Bélanger	Bellavance
Bennett	Benoit
Benskin	Bergen
Bernier	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Blaney	Block
Boivin	Borg
Boughen	Boulerice
Brahmi	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brisson
Brosseau	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Butt
Byrne	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Casey	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Chong
Choquette	Christopherson
Clarke	Cleary
Clement	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crockatt	Crowder
Cullen	Cuzner

Government Orders

Daniel	Davidson	Sweet	Toet
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)	Toone	Tremblay
Day	Dechert	Trost	Trottier
Devolin	Dewar	Trudeau	Truppe
Dion	Dionne Labelle	Uppal	Valcourt
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre	Valeriotte	Van Kesteren
Dreeshen	Dubé	Van Loan	Vaughan
Dubourg	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Vellacott	Wallace
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseau	Warawa	Warkentin
Dykstra	Easter	Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Egliniski	Eyking	Sky Country)	Wilks
Falk	Fast	Weston (Saint John)	Wong
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Williamson	Yelich
Fletcher	Foote	Woodworth	Young (Vancouver South)
Freeland	Freeman	Young (Oakville)	Zimmer— 266
Galipeau	Gallant	Yurdiga	
Garneau	Garrison		
Genest	Giguère		
Gill	Glover		
Godin	Goguen		
Goldring	Goodale		
Goodyear	Gourde		
Gravelle	Grogulé		
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	O'Connor— 1	
Hawn	Hayes		
Hiebert	Hillyer		
Hoback	Holder		
Hsu	Hughes		
James	Julian		
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)		
Kellway	Kent		
Kerr	Komarnicki		
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake		
Lamoureux	Lapointe		
Latendresse	Lauzon		
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)		
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leaf		
Leitch	Lemieux		
Leslie	Leung		
Liu	Lobb		
Lukiwski	Lunney		
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)		
MacKenzie	Maguire		
Mai	Marston		
Martin	Masse		
Mathysen	May		
Mayes	McCallum		
McColeman	McGuinty		
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	McLeod		
Menegakis	Michaud		
Miller	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)		
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)			
Moore (Fundy Royal)			
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)		
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)		
Mourani	Mulcair		
Murray	Nash		
Nicholson	Norlock		
Nunez-Melo	Obhrai		
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon		
O'Toole	Pacetti		
Papillon	Paradis		
Payne	Péclet		
Perkins	Perreault		
Pilon	Plamondon		
Poilievre	Preston		
Quach	Rafferty		
Raitt	Rajotte		
Rankin	Ravignat		
Raynault	Regan		
Reid	Rempel		
Richards	Saganash		
Sandhu	Saxton		
Scarpaleggia	Schellenberger		
Scott	Seeback		
Sellah	Sgro		
Shory	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-		
Shor)	son)		
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan		
Smith	Sopuck		
Sorenson	Stanton		
St-Denis	Stewart		
Stoffer	Storseth		
Strahl	Sullivan		

NAYS

Members

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

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

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the delay, there will be no private members' business hour today. Accordingly, the order will be rescheduled for another sitting.

Pursuant to an order made on Wednesday, May 27, 2015, the House shall now resolve itself into committee of the whole to consider Motion No. 21 under government business.

I do now leave the chair for the House to go into committee of the whole.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

●(1925)

[*English*]**MEMBERS NOT SEEKING RE-ELECTION TO THE 42ND PARLIAMENT**

The House resumed from June 9 consideration of Government Business No. 21 in committee of the whole, Mr. Joe Comartin in the chair.

The Chair: We are in committee of the whole pursuant to a motion that will resume debate on speeches and addresses by members of Parliament who are not seeking re-election in the 42nd Parliament.

I would note that members may sit where they wish in the chamber. All speeches will be 10 minutes, with no questions or comments.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Alexandrine Latendresse (Louis-Saint-Laurent, NDP): Mr. Chair, I am truly honoured to be here today to give my farewell speech in this wonderful House of Commons that I have been a part of for the past four years.

Government Orders

In the fall of 2008, when my friend Christopher Young asked me if I wanted to be an NDP candidate, I never really expected to be here today, having completed a term in office, saying my goodbyes. It would never have occurred to me.

When the same thing happened in 2011 and I was asked to run, even then I did not think I would be so amazingly lucky as to be part of this wonderful team.

Four years ago, almost to the day, I spoke for the first time in the House of Commons. I had just been made the critic for democratic reform, and of course I asked a question about the Senate. It is crazy how some things in life change and others stay exactly the same.

In my four years as the member for Louis-Saint-Laurent, I had the opportunity to be a member of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. I will cherish wonderful memories of the work we did in that committee, and I would like to say that the committee chair, the member for Elgin—Middlesex—London, did an excellent job and always did his best to be fair.

● (1930)

[*English*]

He always did his best. It was an honour to be his vice-chair and to work with him. I will probably think about him for the rest of my life, especially when I am having an egg sandwich.

[*Translation*]

I would also like to salute my two NDP colleagues who are also members of the committee. I really enjoyed working with the fiery member for Hamilton Centre, famous for his filibusters, and the member for Toronto—Danforth, whom I worked with on the democratic reform file. It was a privilege to work with such brilliant and dedicated people.

[*English*]

I say thanks to both of my friends. It was really wonderful.

[*Translation*]

I must also wholeheartedly thank my entire team: Marilyne and Nathalie, who work very hard to meet all the needs of my riding of Louis-Saint-Laurent, as well as Myriam and Jean-François, my dear friends who are here in Ottawa. I also want to salute Yves, Boris and Antonin, who no longer work for me, but who have been a tremendous source of support throughout my term. Thank you to everyone.

I have had the opportunity to form friendships with many people from all the parties over the past four years. Whether it was on parliamentary trips or during our prayer breakfasts, I was able to learn more about my colleagues from all parties. I think it is important to recognize that although we may disagree on many things, we all came here with a desire to make our country a better place. We may not always agree on what path to take to get there, but the only way to get there is by working together.

Speaking of working together, I would like to thank all the members who supported my bill on bilingualism for officers of Parliament. I am very proud to have contributed to the enhancement and promotion of bilingualism and the French fact in this country.

It was a rather extraordinary experience to see my bill go from a draft through each parliamentary stage and to know that that bill is now the Language Skills Act. For that I want to commend and thank my colleague from Acadie—Bathurst for all his support. We will continue to hope that one day, similar legislation can be passed for Supreme Court justices. I know that the hon. member is not seeking re-election either, but I am sure that he will keep working on this cause because he is a caring man. We will all miss him very much.

As hon. members know, I had some wonderful times during my term here. However, to be honest, it was not always easy. I also had to deal with some very dark sides of politics. I went through some very tough times. I saw how complicated being a young female member of Parliament can be. I saw how partisan politics could become harmful and toxic. There were days when things were not really easy. However I was able to remain hopeful and persevere thanks to the love and support of my gang here.

First and foremost there was my leader, who was always there when I needed him and who always gave me his support. I sincerely believe that he is an extraordinary man who has his heart in the right place. I really hope that he will be our prime minister one day.

I am addressing my entire team, each of my colleagues. I have had some truly special moments with many of you, and you know who you are. I have had an extraordinary opportunity to be part of the NDP team and to represent the riding of Louis-Saint-Laurent for the past four years.

I know that we will all continue to do our best to make Canada a better country. We will all continue to give it our all so we can be proud of our work and the country in which we will continue to live.

I would like to say to all my colleagues that I love you. As they say, this is farewell and not goodbye.

● (1935)

[*English*]

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Chair, it was an accident. That will be my defence at the pearly gates when I, a 22-year politician, am making my pitch for entry, but I will not be lying, because it was an accident. I never intended to get into politics. It just kind of happened.

I was not from a political family. My mom and dad always took the responsibility to vote seriously, but other than that, there was no political background, no heavy political involvement. What they did is instill in all of their 17 children, of which I was one, an idea that voting was important. They gave us that.

I first realized the importance of politics when I worked as a farm economist for Alberta Agriculture. One of my duties was to interpret policy changes, and those policy changes included budgets, both provincial and federal. I interpreted what these changes actually meant to farmers and what they meant to their farm operations. I came to realize very quickly that whether one likes politics or not, it is important.

Government Orders

In 1988, when Preston Manning held a meeting in Lloydminster, I attended that meeting. There were about 40 or 50 people there. After listening to Preston, a few of us decided we should build this political party, so about 10 of us came together and started the first constituency association for the Reform Party in the Vegreville constituency. This was a constituency that was represented by the deputy prime minister at the time, Don Mazankowski.

In 1992, when the constituency association was holding its first nomination process, I helped to organize it. Later, when encouraged by quite a number of people, I got involved, and I won the nomination, although it obviously was not for my speaking prowess.

By the way, when I told my wife that I was considering a run in politics, her response was, “You? You’re going to be an MP? Who is going to vote for you?” Well it was not quite like that, but I read between the lines. We know how it is with our wives; we can kind of tell. I really appreciate her support. I did then, and I still do.

Then in 1993, I was part of that first wave of Reformers to sweep into Ottawa. Getting elected, we all in this place know, does not just happen. It took a lot of work by a lot of people over a long period of time. Many of those people started by helping to build this new political party from the ground up. From the very start, there was nothing there, and they built it into an organization that actually successfully elected a member of Parliament in its first real try at it.

Many of that first board of directors who started this political party back in 1988 went on to be key players in my first campaign. They were people like Connie Kempton, Dave Clements, Morgan Day, Dave Dibben, Andy Cameron, Les Mitchell, Gordon Kyle, Allan Murray, and Ralph Sorenson, who actually is the father of our current Minister of State for Finance.

This group was led by a great Canadian, Sam Herman. Starting with nothing and starting from nowhere, with a brand new party and no organization at any level, Sam took it on, and he led this group. He was an organizer, he was a leader, and he was a fundraiser, and he taught us all a lot about how to do these things.

Let me tell everyone a little about Sam. Sam led our group from nothing, as I said, a non-existent organization, to being as strong a constituency association as I have ever seen. He organized us and he led by example. He encouraged us, and he reminded us why we were doing all of this work. It cost each of us a lot of time, a lot of effort, and a lot of our own money.

• (1940)

When I won the nomination in June of 1992, Sam went on the road with me for over a year. It was practically a full-time job. He had just sold his farm equipment business and was starting a new personal financial planning business with two other partners. In spite of that, he went on the road with me for over a year.

As I said, campaigning was almost like a full-time job, going to town to town, business to business, having coffee parties and building this organization from the ground up. It was like a full-time job, except there was no pay, and this at a time when Sam could ill afford the time. This incredible commitment and sacrifice is truly something I marvel at to this day. He then became my campaign manager in 1993 when the election was called.

As members know, in 1993 I was one of the first group of 52 Reform MPs who stormed Ottawa. We brought about a lot of positive change. I would argue that we continue to do that through this new Conservative Party of Canada, a brand new party started in 2003. I believe this new party is carrying on down the path that was started by that Reform Party of Canada, and of course down the path of the other parent party, the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada.

I am so proud of my colleagues and friends in this place. We are a great team. I also believe that our Prime Minister will go down in history as one of the greatest prime ministers this country has ever known. With his long-term planning, he has led our team to reduce taxes and make an average Canadian family of four more than \$6,000 better off than they were when we took office 10 years ago, and this is nothing to sneeze at.

Think of the difference that \$6,000 a year can make for an average of family four. They can use it to invest and build for retirement, to spend on something they need or something special or in some cases just to get by, or to pay for education and so on for their children. This does make a real difference, and it is something I am very proud of.

I am proud of the work that this team, my colleagues, have done in the areas of justice, in ending the Wheat Board monopoly, in ending the long gun registry, and in making our streets safer.

I want to recognize that the opposition has played a role in this as well. I am not one—at least not now, after 22 years—to believe that any one party has all the answers, and I respect my colleagues across the floor. I want to thank all of them for their contribution to making this government a better government.

Finally, I want to say how proud I am of my wife and our children and our grandchildren. I cannot express how much I appreciate what Linda has done for me and our family over these very difficult years. I am so much in love with her, and I look forward in the years ahead to spending more time with her. I am hoping we can find a way to make that work, because as all members of parliament know, we really do not get as much time with our spouses and families and we would like, and she has done a great job.

I am so proud of all of my family. I have five children, married, who have produced eight grandchildren. It is just so wonderful to go home and enjoy the grandchildren and see the fruits of the labour that Linda has put in.

• (1945)

I want to end by thanking all of my constituents for allowing me these seven opportunities to represent them. There was stronger support every time. It was over 80% the last time. I want to say what an honour and what a privilege it has been to represent them. Thirty years ago, I could not have imagined that I would be given that incredible honour and privilege. I thank each one of them from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Chair, I am thankful for this opportunity to make some parting remarks.

Government Orders

When I was a 14-year-old boy travelling with a group of young people on a student exchange program between Saskatchewan and Newcastle, New Brunswick, we stopped to do some sightseeing in Ottawa. We went to the ByWard Market, we went sightseeing on the Ottawa River, and we stopped at the Parliament Hill Centre Block. As a 14-year-old boy, I stood in the foyer entrance in this House and gazed at the magnificence of the chamber, the ceiling, and the interior. I wondered what kind of person it would take to sit in this House and what kind of people the occupants might be. I do not recall if I had any aspirations then. I may have, but 40 years later, I myself was elected to sit in the House.

I thank the constituents of Souris—Moose Mountain for the confidence they have placed in me by electing me not only in 2004 but then again in 2006, 2008, and 2011.

Of course, I first and foremost have to express my deepest thanks and my profound gratitude to my wife, Sally, who shared equally in the joys and triumphs as well as the low points and the difficult times of a decade-long journey. I met this young lady in the small town of Alvena, Saskatchewan. She captured my full attention and my heart. Who would have thought that the two of us would one day find ourselves in Ottawa. She finished raising our family, endured long periods of separation while I was here in Ottawa, and then endured the travel and lengthy stays in Ottawa to be here with me. What a journey. Thank you, Sally.

I would also like to thank our children Jennifer, Jessica, JoDee, Joleen, and JoAnna, who shared a good part of my time in Ottawa, a time when both of us got to know each other far more personally than we otherwise would have. It was a time we will always treasure and share into the future, I am sure.

I would also like to thank my daughter Jamie, who wrote my early press releases, and my sons Bill and Nick, who helped during the campaign and at times were my sign crew. I would also like to thank their spouses and their children. Without them this journey would not have been worthwhile. They have all paid a price of some measure, and I certainly appreciate that and want to thank them.

As I have said many times, if I knew everything I know now, I would not have run for office, yet how could I not have? What an experience. At times it was thrilling, exhilarating, at times it was intimidating, and at times I was wondering what I was doing here. I can say, however, I have met some interesting people, made some friends, had some interesting and satisfying work to do, and had an opportunity to see some interesting places.

I would like to acknowledge some key people who got me here.

My son-in-law, Jason Fleury, worked tirelessly and under a great deal of pressure and stress in rather difficult circumstances during my nomination. My friend Ken Sholter was always there and was a great support and encourager, as was his wife Debbie and their son Doug.

Susan Thompson, at a private meeting in our home, gave herself wholeheartedly to my campaign and proved to be a most valuable person at the times we needed her most. She also proved to be a very valuable and capable employee. Her mother Shirley was an inspiration as well.

Each of these individuals I have noted will know personal details regarding my nomination that I will not go into, but that will always be in our collective memories.

Many on the board were personal friends who made sure I would have this political experience at personal cost to them. I think of Bob Burns, who travelled many miles with me; Al Dougherty, who did my sign work in the southeast part of the riding; president Lyndon Dayman, who had to be persuaded to get involved later to become the president; and, more recently, Calvin Johnson.

I think of Bill Baryluk, who sold many tickets with me; Alydon King, who drove countless miles; Al Larson, Cam Weber, Joe Widdup, Larry and Connie Wingert, Robert Kitchen, Brad Kearns, Marge Young, Ken Stelnicki, Brad Denoulden, James Trobert, and many others.

I also would like to thank Pat Gervais, who ran our office and decorated it during our Christmas election, as well as Evelyn Sandquist and Audrey Meckling. I want to thank our financial agent, Tom Schuck, who stuck it out to the end with me and is now retired.

Also a great help, both during the elections and afterward with EDA filings and much more, was my friend Alf Tide. I thank them all very much.

There were a number of memorable and touching moments that I recall in the House. One was speaking in the definition of marriage debate when I was first elected. That was my first major speech, and I spoke in favour of defining marriage as one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others. It was just before the vote when it was my time to speak, and the House was packed. I had a sense of the importance and gravity of that vote and a sense that history was being made, and indeed it was.

● (1950)

Being here during the apologies to the Chinese community for the wrongs endured as a result of the head tax was another moment.

I found it very emotional and touching when we had the aboriginal community on the floor of the House of Commons when the Prime Minister offered an official apology for the damage done by the residential school system through its policy of assimilation and all that it represented. He said:

The Government of Canada sincerely apologizes and asks the forgiveness of the Aboriginal peoples of this country for failing them so profoundly. We are sorry.

To hear those words was truly a historic moment and was in and of itself therapeutic. It was definitely a time when I felt proud to be a Canadian.

It was a great experience to be the critic for housing and labour, then the parliamentary secretary to the minister of human resources and skills development, to the minister of labour, and to the minister of citizenship and immigration. Having the opportunity to serve with these four ministers was something that I will always remember and cherish. Working with and for the members for Halton, Edmonton—Spruce Grove, Medicine Hat, and Haldimand—Norfolk is something that I will never forget.

Government Orders

I am certain that my grandfather, Nicholas, and in fact both sets of grandparents who immigrated to Canada would have been very proud to know that their grandson would one day be a parliamentary secretary to the minister of immigration. One regret is that both of my parents and my mother and father-in-law passed away before I was elected as a member of Parliament.

I can say, though, that my sister, Elaine, and my two brothers, Alex and Larry, as well as my sister and brother-in-law, Elsie and Lorne Korpan, have more than made up for this by being there to support me and by always being present.

I have met many fine people in the membership of committees, both when I was a parliamentary secretary and chair. I found the analysts and the clerks to be very capable, proficient, and unbiased in their work. Names that come to mind are clerks Evelyn Lukyniuk and Caroline Bosc, as well as analysts from the Parliamentary Information and Research Service, Chantal Collin, Sandra Gruescu and André Léonard. What a fine group of quality people.

There were a host of parliamentary secretary assistants who made my life so much easier: Christine Albee, Denis Laurie, Fred Delorey, Andrea Montenegro and Anna Curic. All of these individuals moved up in their careers and I want them to know that I appreciated them very much.

I wish to acknowledge and thank my staff who really made a huge difference in my career, many of whom will remain friends. I mention specifically Doug Sholter, Doug Smith and Doug Cryer. It seemed that people could not work in my office unless their first name was Doug.

I give special thanks to Carol Somerville, who has been with me through thick and thin; to a very competent and capable Tracey Schiestel, who has done much of my constituency immigration work; to Sherri Friess Smith, who made sure that I did not miss any social note or graduation certificate for graduates in Souris—Moose Mountain; and Charlene Easton, who generally takes matters into her own hands and ran the best passport clinics ever.

To my two ladies in Ottawa, Bailey Dennis and Michelle Newman, both very clever, efficient and capable young people, thanks very much for making the work pleasant and enjoyable, and that notwithstanding the many idiosyncrasies and doing my correspondence, even if they did not always agree with my positions. The same applies to all of my staff in the riding. They have been a pleasure to work with. May they all do well in their future careers. Many thanks.

Having the Prime Minister attend in Estevan and Weyburn in my time, as well as six ministers and one minister of state, is something else that I will remember. In addition to holding a round table with the now Minister of National Defence, we also had the first ever House of Commons Standing Committee on Human Resources and Skills Development hold a committee meeting in Estevan, which was a first and historic moment for Souris—Moose Mountain for sure.

To the many fine people in this House, my colleagues and members from various parties that I have come to know, thanks for making my time here so special.

Finally, to my constituents and those who have put me here, it has been an honour and a privilege to have represented and served them over the years. Our office and I have done our utmost to represent them and to attempt to resolve issues that they have had to face. This, perhaps, has been the most rewarding part of my stay in Ottawa.

Finally, I finish with Motion No. 590, my private member's motion, that calls for a free vote on matters of conscience and a call to deal with hard moral and conscience decisions on matters like physician-assisted death and protecting the rights of the unborn here in the House of Commons. It is something that everyone, especially parliamentarians, should be free to debate on and legislate. I hope that this motion will be debated and voted upon before the House adjourns and before I leave this great and wonderful place.

• (1955)

Mr. Ryan Leef: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, I would first like to thank you for your judicious oversight of all these important and interesting speeches. I was just wondering if you could confirm the allocation of time that the House has tonight to continue to hear all of these amazing tributes and references by our outgoing members.

The Acting Chair (Hon. Steven Fletcher): I am not sure that is a point of order. The member for Yukon will know well that there are strange things done under the midnight sun by the people who moil in politics.

This will go on until midnight or in 10-minute intervals until the speakers list is exhausted.

The hon. member for Mount Royal.

Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I am pleased to participate in this rather bittersweet retrospective. I want to commend my colleagues on all sides of the House for their reflective and, indeed, moving comments.

I recall fondly my first-ever visit to and encounter with this House. It was 1951. I was 11 years old. My late father took me here to visit the House of Commons. He looked up at the House and said, "Son, this is the Parliament of Canada. This is vox populi, the voice of the people".

Today such sentiments might invite a certain cynical rejoinder, particularly as one observes the sometimes cacophony of question period or the toxicity in the political arena. Certainly and fortunately, I still retain that great respect and reverence for this institution, which I regard as the centrepiece of our democracy, the cradle, the nurturer for the pursuit of justice.

In this, I am reminded and, indeed, inspired by another set of teachings on the pursuit of justice from my late parents, a blessed memory. For it is my father who taught me before I could understand the profundity of his words. As he put it, the pursuit of justice is equal to all the other commandments combined. As he said, "This, you must teach unto your children".

Government Orders

It was my mother who, when she heard my father say this, would say to me, “If you want to pursue justice, you have to understand, you have to feel the injustice about you. You have to go in and about your community and beyond, and feel the injustice and combat the injustice. Otherwise, the pursuit of justice remains a theoretical construct”.

As a result of my parents' teachings, I got involved in the two great human rights struggles of the second half of the 20th century, the struggle for human rights in the former Soviet Union and the struggle against apartheid in South Africa. I got involved with those who were the faces and voices of those struggles, and the defence of the political prisoners, Anatoly Sharansky in the former Soviet Union and Nelson Mandela in South Africa.

I got involved in the struggle for peace in the Middle East because as my mother, an authentic peace advocate, would say, “The struggle for peace is bound up in the pursuit of justice”. That same teaching about justice also underpinned my work as minister of justice and attorney general of Canada, as well as my work as an MP.

Indeed, when I was first sworn in as minister, I said at the time that I would be guided in my work by one overarching principle, the pursuit of justice, and I had my father's teachings in my mind, and within that, the promotion and protection of equality, not just as a centrepiece of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms but as an organizing principle for the building of a just society, and for the promotion and protection of human dignity, for the building of a society that was not only just but one that was also compassionate and humane.

• (2000)

[*Translation*]

These were my guiding principles during almost 16 years that I spent as the member for Mount Royal, a great riding, a rainbow riding, where I grew up and where I have lived for almost 60 years.

[*English*]

Mount Royal is a riding that I love living in. It has been a privilege and pleasure to represent my constituents while engaged in the multi-layered, multi-faceted role and responsibilities of an MP including: first, the MP as ombudsperson for individuals and groups in the riding, petitioning government and Parliament for redress of grievance on behalf of constituents.

In that regard, I have been the beneficiary of a wonderful set of assistants in the riding, including my first head, Sabina Schmidman, Louise O'Neill, Diane Du Sablon, Isabelle Casanova, and Howard Liebman, a former law student of mine who headed up my office for close to 12 years. All of them have served the people of Mount Royal, and even beyond, with understanding, empathy and wisdom and in the process have transformed the lives of people in the riding and beyond.

Second, the MP as a representative of riding-wide concerns. Here, I have been engaged in the whole gamut of cross-cutting concerns that reflect my riding on the domestic front: health, environment, child care, anti-poverty, veterans' affairs, and le devoir de mémoire, the recognition and respect for our heritage. On the international front, we pursued a humanitarian and human rights based foreign policy, in particular, among others, the responsibility to protect.

Third is the MP as policy maker and legislator. Here I was pleased as minister of justice to introduce Canada's first-ever law against human trafficking, the contemporary global slave trade; to craft a civil marriage act anchored in two fundamental principles, the equality principle and freedom of religion; to initiate with the assistance of colleagues from all parties in the justice committee, including the member for Central Nova, now the Minister of Justice, Canada's first-ever inclusive, representative, transparent and accountable appointment process for the Supreme Court, which led to the most gender-equitable Supreme Court in the world, and the appointment of the first-ever aboriginal and visible minority persons to appellate courts; and to review and participate in the reversal of wrongful convictions.

As an MP, again with all-party co-operation, I was able to shepherd through the House Canada's first-ever Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act and, ultimately, as minister, ended up initiating the first-ever prosecution under that act. As an opposition MP, as we have all done, I have sought to make use of the parliamentary instruments at our disposal, such as private members' bills, motions, petitions, order paper questions and the like to help advance the public good.

This leads me to the other several roles of the MP.

The MP as overseer reflects our responsibility as representatives of the public trust and overseers of the public purse to help secure the public good. The MP as public advocate takes up cases and causes and brings them to the attention of Parliament, the government and the people of Canada, for example, to stand in solidarity with political prisoners, to let them know that they are not alone, that we will never relent in our advocacy until we secure their freedom. The MP as communicator participates in press briefings and engages with constituents, stakeholders, NGOs and civil society generally. The MP as educator, as when we meet with students from our riding and others and find that we end up learning from these students and they become our teachers. The MP as global ambassador for Canada, as in our international representations and delegations.

In all of those capacities, I have found that some of our most important and impactful work is a result of cross-party collaboration and co-operation. It has been my pleasure to work with colleagues from all parties in this chamber and in the Senate on matters such as advocating for the release of political prisoners and holding, as we did recently, human rights violators to account, notably during our annual Iran Accountability Week.

In particular, I must highlight the co-operative and constructive work of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Human Rights, which operates almost exclusively by consensus. I trust that my colleagues on that subcommittee will continue that work in the same collegial and serious manner after the next election.

Government Orders

Of course, none of this parliamentary work would have been possible without the commitment and care of those who headed up and guided my parliamentary office: Judith Abitan, Michael Milech, David Grossman, Jacob Binder, Matt Biderman, as well as Charles Feldman, who headed up my office for seven years and whose expertise became indispensable not only to my work but to the effective functioning of Parliament as a whole.

Moreover, as minister, I was privileged to work with exemplary senior officials and civil servants in the Department of Justice, too numerous to mention.

As well, we have all been the beneficiaries of the professional and personable House of Commons personnel, from security guards to technical staff, to pages, to legislative drafters, to House and committee clerks.

In particular, I must also thank my own inspiring party leader, the member for Papineau, the staff in the party leader's office, the party's House leader, the member for Beauséjour, with his irrepressible sense of humour, our exemplary whip, the member for Random—Burin—St. George's, all the people in the House leaders and whip's offices and, indeed, I commend them all for their support, flexibility, patience and good humour, particularly when I am not always onside. I also include my wonderful caucus colleagues. I have had the privilege to serve in the government of the Right Honourable Paul Martin. He was a great prime minister we did not have sufficient time to experience. He was the best finance minister the country ever had.

Finally, a word about family, with which I will close, who are first in my heart and mind. I began by speaking about my parents and I will conclude with speaking about the care, contribution and commitment of my wife Ariela, who is in the chamber this evening, and has been in the political trenches with me all these years, though, admittedly, sometimes not on the same side. I thank my children, Michal, Gila, Tanya and Yoni, who have been the source of many a humbling and healthy riposte, my grandchildren, who seem to have inherited that same quality with an even more mocking humour, and my children's spouses. I thank them all for their support and their love. They certainly have mine in return.

• (2005)

For me, Parliament is not just a place where I went to work; it has been my home. My colleagues have become my family. It has been a privilege to serve in this chamber, to serve alongside all my colleagues, to serve the people of Mount Royal and to help in the best way I can to advance the cause of justice for all.

Hon. Laurie Hawn (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to reflect on my time as a parliamentarian.

This is not something that I ever aspired to, going through my air force career or during most of my financial services career. I did enjoy writing to cabinet ministers and occasionally poking them in the eye with a sharp stick, primarily over issues like, in my opinion, flawed defence and foreign affairs policy and decisions.

One of my more colourful letters actually earned me a CRA audit, which I am sure was random, when I wrote to the then foreign affairs minister and explained why I thought he was the buns of a jennet. I

think what annoyed him most was that he had to go to the dictionary to figure out what a jennet was. A jennet is a small Spanish horse.

I was happy to volunteer for and sit on the board of my then and still MP, the hon. member for Edmonton—Leduc. As I became more frustrated with what I viewed as Canada losing its way in the world, the idea of throwing my hat in the ring was being urged upon me by others, specifically to take on the then deputy prime minister.

My wife was dead set against the idea for all the right reasons, so I had some convincing to do. My clever and very transparent plan was to host a single malt and stinky cheese party, where I would supply the goodies, while friends like the hon. members for Edmonton—Leduc, Edmonton—Spruce Grove, then Edmonton—Strathcona, and others worked on Judy to convince her that the team needed me. She saw through my clever little plan of course, and we had a conversation a couple of days later about how badly did I want to do this.

My response was that if I did not do it soon, it would not happen, but most important, I did not want to look back in 20 years and regret not giving it a shot. She succumbed to my whining and allowed as how we could take one shot at this, but that we were not going to tilt at a windmill forever.

It was game on and through two nominations, one for the Canadian Alliance and one for the Conservative Party of Canada, we fought the campaign in June 2004. We had a terrific team and a great campaign with lots of fun and excitement, and lost very narrowly to the lady who had become affectionately known as "Landslide Annie".

I was prepared for that to be my one shot, but all our volunteers, actually led by my wife, said that we had to do that again. As always, I obeyed my wife and we simply carried on campaigning, knowing that, with a Liberal minority, another election opportunity would present itself. Sure enough, round two happened and on January 23, 2006, after another great campaign effort by a fabulous team, we convinced 25,805 of my closest friends that I deserved their trust.

I am very grateful to every one of those people and to the 46,186 people who sent me back here in 2008 and 2011. I have done my best to serve them, and all those who voted for someone else or, shamefully, did not vote at all.

At this point, I want to thank the many people who helped put me here, and who have helped keep me here.

First and foremost, I have to thank my wife of almost 47 years, the beautiful, brilliant and extremely tolerant Judy. Without her and Jennifer and Robb in my corner, nothing that I may have received credit for could have happened, and I love them all very much.

Government Orders

There are too many to mention by name and I apologize to those I will miss, but I do need to single out a few key people: Richard and Marion Lotnick for my first nomination win; my campaign managers, Vitor Marciano and Peter Watson; and key team leaders like Nancy Strand, William McBeath, William Lo and Marnie Simpson, and a recently deceased very dear friend, Mary Delaney, who was the door knocker at the age of 96. We had complaints from the others door knocking with her who, only in their seventies and eighties, did not want to go out there any more because they could not keep up.

Teams need leaders and foot soldiers, and I want to sincerely thank the hundreds of volunteers who did the myriad things that made for a successful campaign, and three out of four is not bad.

EDA boards are also critical to electing a member of Parliament and keeping him or her there, and I have been blessed with very active and very dedicated boards.

My first experience on Parliament Hill set a very positive tone for my time here. In February 2006, when I walked in under the Peace Tower for the first time, the very first security guard that I met said, and please forgive this small indiscretion, Mr. Chair, "Good morning, Mr. Hawn, welcome to Ottawa". I was very impressed and that impression about the people who work here has not changed. Their dedication and professionalism in everything that they do make it possible for us to do our jobs is incredibly well appreciated.

Regardless of who we are or where we have come from, we all come to this place for the right reason, and that is to make a positive difference for our constituents and for our country. I believe we all want basically the same things, like financial and personal security, good education and health care, a sustainable and healthy environment, a respected place in the world community, and pride in ourselves and pride in our country. What we argue about is the road that we are on to get there. As difficult as it is around here, if we could spend just a bit more time on each other's road, we might all get a little closer to our common destinations. When I have had the opportunity to do that, it has been a very satisfying experience, and I want to cite one example.

● (2010)

I have great respect for Bob Rae as a brilliant parliamentarian, and despite our ideological differences, we could work together behind the scenes on things like the mission extension in Afghanistan. I do not say this with malice at all, but Bob made it clear that if there were political advantage, he would stab me in the heart, and I would stab him in the right circumstances too. However, we would stab each other in the chest, eye to eye, and not in the back. I can certainly respect that.

I want to go back to Landslide Annie for a minute. We had two very hard-fought campaigns, but we never trashed each other personally, and each of us visited the other's successful campaign on election night to offer sincere congratulations. To this day, we still say kind things about each other in public.

We can be political adversaries, but we certainly do not have to be enemies. We should, and we do, take our jobs very seriously, but we should not take ourselves too seriously.

I have been very fortunate in my nine-plus years here and I want to sincerely thank all of my colleagues on all sides of the House for the honour and privilege and, mostly, pleasure of working with them.

I want to especially thank the Prime Minister for his strong and principled leadership at home and abroad, many times taking some unpopular decisions if that was what needed to be done.

I want to thank him for the confidence he showed in me and the assignments that he gave me. My favourite position was as parliamentary secretary for three and a half years, under someone whom I consider to be the hands down best minister of national defence of the 27 ministers of national defence that I have known since I enrolled in the air force 51 years ago, and whose helicopter flight, by the way, did not actually cost the taxpayer a single penny.

I am grateful for the honour of being called "Honourable" as a Privy Councillor for the rest of my life and for the roles on cabinet committees such as Treasury Board and the deficit reduction action plan subcommittee.

I do joke about the Prime Minister being a very practical man for giving me cabinet-level duties without cabinet-level pay, but it has been a great honour and I would not have missed it. However, I did spend several months being secluded with the hon. member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, poring over 20,000 pages of Taliban detainee documents looking for a smoking gun that did not exist.

There have been some memorable moments in this place, and I want to highlight only two.

I believe that the most critical challenge that we need to solve nationally and rationally is the future of Canada's aboriginal peoples as full participants in the great opportunity that is Canada. That will take work on all sides, and one of the great moments here was the Prime Minister's apology for the tragedy that was residential schools.

The other great moment for me was last October 23, when this House sat the day after the terrorist attack on this place. We cannot and will not allow our democracy and its institutions to be threatened in any way.

I have certainly enjoyed working in this place on many issues, such as military and veterans affairs and as Canadian co-chair of the Canada-U.S. Permanent Joint Board on Defence, but some of my favourite moments as an MP have been spent away from this place.

Probably at the top of that list would be the opportunity to spend time in Afghanistan on seven occasions. There was something very special about serving Christmas dinner to troops in the field, and especially about waking up five Christmas mornings in a row at a forward operating base in the Panjwai with the exceptional Canadians who were there serving and sacrificing.

Government Orders

Colleagues, we are part of a very exclusive club. According to the Library of Parliament, there have been 4,216 members of Parliament in Canada's history. According to Don Cherry, there have been over 7,000 players in the history of the NHL.

We all work hard to get here and we all work hard to stay here. Public service is honourable and we all play an important role, so if someone sneers that any of us are mere backbenchers, ask them which bench they have sat on and how many years of their life have they devoted to the welfare of others.

It has been a slice, and I am grateful to my staff for their tremendous work in trying their best to make me look good. I could do nothing without such people as Oula Sanduga, Lindo Lo, Jen Gray, Jordan Fraser, Rachel Petrenko, Averil Grant, and all my earlier staff and interns.

So why am I leaving now? There are several reasons.

When we got into this, my wife and I said we wanted to serve for eight to ten years. It will have been nine years and nine months, and that is in the window. Not to ever compare myself to the Great One, but 99 is always a good Edmonton number.

Together my wife and I have worked for more than a century, and 100 years is certainly a big enough round number.

● (2015)

People often stop me and say that they are sorry I am leaving. My reply is that that is why I am leaving, because people will not say that forever, and I do not want to be there when that happens.

My final reason for leaving is that I want a life back. To use a football analogy, I know that I am in the fourth quarter and that I cannot count on overtime, and I want to get some stuff done before the two-minute warning. We all have something ticking inside us, and we do not know when the two-minute warning or the final whistle will sound.

Jim Flaherty's situation did not drive my decision, because it was already made, but it certainly reinforced my decision. Whatever may be any of our reasons, my sincere wish and advice to colleagues is to not leave it too late.

I plan to stay busy in retirement and continue to serve my community in a variety of ways, or I may just wear my pants up around my nipples and complain about the government full time.

I think it was either our colleague Chuck Strahl or Stockwell Day who said that if you can leave this place with your reputation and integrity intact and with the same family that you arrived with, you have been successful.

It is time to bid adieu to this place and get my life back in 130 days, but who is counting? Judy will get a husband back. Jennifer and Robb will get a dad back. Jeff and Kiran will get a father-in-law back, and most importantly, for Tyler and Raiya Lily, Grampa will be all theirs.

● (2020)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Massimo Pacetti (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Ind.): Mr. Chair, over 13 years ago, I answered the call and agreed to run in

the byelection in the riding of Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel. With the support of my family, friends and constituents, I managed to get elected and then re-elected for five consecutive terms.

As one of the rare MPs who was born in his riding and has always lived there, I was very proud and humbled to agree to represent my riding here in Ottawa. I was very touched that my peers would entrust me with this great responsibility.

Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel is one of the most diverse ridings in Canada. Although that diversity presents some challenges, I have always considered it to be a great source of strength and vitality. Since I was first elected in 2002, I have sought to advance the issues that are important to our community, but always with a view to improving our country.

It would be hard to list every single thing that I accomplished in these 13 years. However, having served under two Liberal prime ministers, I had the opportunity to support a number of very important decisions—both national and international ones—that benefited Canada. In this time I also had the opportunity to help my community more directly by playing a role in ensuring that the Canadian Grand Prix would remain in Montreal, under the right hon. Jean Chrétien. Then, under the right hon. Paul Martin, I am proud to have helped the Italian channel RAI International obtain a broadcasting licence in Canada.

Other moments in my career as a member of Parliament that come to mind are when I was elected chair of the Standing Committee on Finance in 2004, after less than two years as a member of Parliament; when the House of Commons passed my private member's bill, Bill C-302, the Italian-Canadian Recognition and Restitution Act, on April 28, 2010; and when I worked with representatives from the Department of Finance to amend the regulations to make it easier for the people who need it most to access the registered disability savings plan.

However, the most rewarding part of my work here was when I was able to help people deal with issues that did not fall under my direct mandate. What I will remember most about my time as a member of Parliament is the opportunity to have a direct impact on another person's life, since the main reason I decided to run for public office was to help others.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Meeting Canadians from all over our great country and visiting their communities has also been an extraordinary experience for me. We live in a big, beautiful, eclectic country. I had opportunities before being a member of Parliament to travel this country, but as MPs, we are inspired by how amazing Canada is, which is why I was motivated to introduce a private member's bill called the discover your Canada act. The goal was to facilitate and encourage all Canadians to travel in Canada to get to know this country. Unfortunately, the House was not as enthusiastic about my idea as I was, and the bill did not pass, which is one of the disappointments of being a member of Parliament.

We all come here thinking we are going to change the world, and sometimes we succeed, even if it is in a small way. There are also times when we come up short, and for one reason or another, moments like that can be frustrating. In those times, I have always remembered that the most important thing is to never stop listening and to never stop trying to help people.

As many members know, being a member of Parliament is an extraordinary experience and privilege that gives us an opportunity to take action that can improve the lives of our fellow Canadians. When we see something that needs to be changed, that is a priceless gift I have appreciated immensely.

As well, I am grateful that this job has allowed me to cultivate a closer relationship with my community. Whether as a school trustee, a volunteer soccer coach for my daughter or hockey coach for my son, or a member of various community-based organizations, I have always been active in my community, before and during my tenure as a member of Parliament. As an MP, I have learned to be much more, because my constituents shared their concerns, their hopes, their frustrations, and their opinions with me on a daily basis in one way or another. This job has given me a perspective few people have the privilege to experience, and that will stay with me for the rest of my life.

I would be remiss if I did not take a moment to thank all the people who have walked this journey with me or simply made doing this job possible. I salute the staff of the House of Commons and the Parliament of Canada for their dedication and professionalism. This place could not function without the support of clerks, librarians, assistants, pages, support staff, maintenance workers, IT specialists, shuttle bus drivers, and of course, security staff, and many who are the engine of our democracy.

I thank my own staff, past and present, for giving 120% when I needed them to go above and beyond, and for not giving less than 80% even on those long summer days when Montrealers are more interested in spending time on terraces than in calling their local MP.

I say a special thanks to my employees who spent more than five years working for me. I actually have more employees who have worked more than five years than who have worked less: Sylvie Vogels, five years; Adele Cifelli, six years; Ben Niro, seven years; Pina Frangella, 12 years; and Suzanne Bertrand, more than 12 years.

To my constituents, it was an absolute honour to serve them. We come from a very special place, where in spite of all our differences, we never forget that we are all in this together and that our ability to

show compassion and understanding is the truest measure of our community's success.

This kindness we have in Saint-Léonard Saint-Michel has sustained me during these last few months, which have been the most trying of my career. I can wish no person what I have gone through over this trying time, but good and bad things happen, especially in politics, and we must always be ready to deal with them. I remain positive and look forward to the future with my head held high, knowing that I have done no wrong and have represented my constituents honourably.

To my friends, who are too many to name, I thank them so much for their unwavering support. Of course, I thank my family for their love—my wife, Danielle; my son, Carlo; my daughter, Briana; my parents, Alessandro and Filomena; and my sister, Silvana, and brother, Franco, and their families. Without them, these last 13 years would not have been possible. I got to live out a dream because I had them all backing me up, and words cannot begin to express the depth of my gratitude to all of them.

• (2025)

[Translation]

I leave here with a sense of accomplishment.

[Member spoke in Italian as follows:]

Grazie. Buonasera.

[English]

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Chair, I have not prepared a speech. I was walking down the aisle for our votes yesterday and it struck me how much I am going to miss the people that I am working with. I want to stand and thank them so much for the wonderful opportunities they have given me, the colleagues on my side, the colleagues on the other side that I have worked with. It has been just a tremendous experience.

I see some of my good friends sitting over on the other side and I appreciate some of the fond memories I have of being with them. I will have huge withdrawal symptoms. It is going to be a very difficult adjustment for me after 22 years to leave this place because I have so many memories. I have listened to the speeches here and they bring back so many memories, I cannot recount them all.

I will give members an idea of what has moulded my career here. I became a Christian when I was in university. It was a huge struggle for me. I was challenged to scratch below the surface on issues and I dabbled in many faiths. Finally, I had to make a decision. Scratching below the surface has defined my career here.

Government Orders

I was challenged shortly after I was elected by my constituents on the gun control issue. Some know my nickname is “Mr. Gun”, but I was challenged to scratch below the surface on that issue and the rest is history. I had never planned on that. I know very little about firearms and yet by scratching below the surface, I realized that \$2 billion would be much better spent by putting 10,000 more policemen on the street if we are going to improve public safety. That is just the bird's-eye view of what has become almost a defining part of my career here.

I worked a lot on the abortion issue and again, I had to scratch below the surface. What is it that is in the womb of a woman? I had to look at that very carefully. There are so many other things that I have worked on and I always tried to take a principled approach. Many people have helped me in that and I want to thank them very, very much.

The opposition members are a key part of that because they challenge our thinking.

When I sat with the Prime Minister from 1993-97, we would be on duty and duty was not his favourite time, I must say. He was also one of those people who would really scratch below the surface. He is very intellectual. When he was trying to determine whether to run for the leadership of the party, he called me. I did not know what to advise him because, I have to be careful what I say here, but I did not know that he would be that good a Prime Minister at that point. He has turned out to be phenomenal from the person I did duty with way back then.

I want to conclude by thanking so many people. I thanked all of my colleagues here and all of the staff. I already rose on a statement a while back and thanked them. But I must emphasize that my wife, Lydia, needs so much thanks, and sympathy as well. I have been in almost every constituency in the country speaking on that issue and some constituencies on the east and west coasts more than once. She has been a political widow. For her to stay with me, I appreciate that more than she will probably ever know.

My family were all teenagers when I first started and we have one perk. That perk was free telephone calls home. I became closer to my children by that 10-minute call every evening. It was a huge commitment on my part, but it actually was a good thing. My wife has suggested that when I retire we should put a phone on her side of the bed and one on my side of the bed because we have talked more than we normally would have. I probably would not have talked to my children either as much as I did once I became an MP.

I have had terrific staff. The right people came and sought a job with me. Dennis Young and Elizabeth Nye were the first, but Sandy is one of the last ones now. They have made me look good and I really appreciate that. There was tremendous support there.

● (2030)

I must also thank my constituents and all the people who have worked on my campaigns over the years. Some of them are no longer on this earth, but they really have given me strong support. With every election my plurality has increased and after seven elections that is quite amazing, so I want to thank them for the wonderful faith they have shown in me.

I am starting to break up, so I think maybe that is a good time to conclude. I thank everyone so very much.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc-André Morin (Laurentides—Labelle, NDP): Mr. Chair, I thank all of my colleagues in the House for giving me this opportunity to share my experience and explain my motivations.

I do not want to talk too much about the friendships I have built and the admiration I have developed for my colleagues, because I am a little too emotional and I have a hard time with that. I have discovered that I have a second family in my caucus. I found myself admiring people who are young enough to be my children. I realized that they were surpassing me, in terms of capabilities. I will now return to my prepared text, which is a little more pragmatic.

First of all, I want to thank the people of Laurentides—Labelle for giving me this honour and choosing me to represent them for the past four years. I also thank my staff, who helped me accomplish this work and who were dedicated to me and the people of our riding. I want to thank my wife, my family and my friends, whose support allowed me to carry out my duties.

I also want to take this opportunity to express my admiration for the Parliament Hill staff, and particularly for our security staff, who make us feel safe and secure when we come to work.

The day after the 2011 election, everyone wondered what had happened. We need to go back a bit for the answer to that. For several decades, Quebec and Canada were at a constitutional and political dead end. Throughout that dark period of history, much of the political class exploited that divide, some to stay in power and others simply to prove that Canada was dysfunctional and that they were right. In the meantime, we longed for better days and the situation continued to get worse for everyone. Like most Quebecers, I was fed up with that impasse. Listening to Jack Layton, we believed it was possible to unite the progressive forces across the country and make Canada a more just country where no one is left behind.

Locally, I tried to perform my duties with as much dignity and professionalism as possible to show people the usefulness and value of my role. My colleagues were faced with the same challenge: replace incumbents who, with the help of the old parties, wanted to prove that the institution they were part of was dysfunctional. We succeeded in proving our relevance, and people showed us a great deal of respect and offered us a great deal of encouragement.

I really enjoyed my parliamentary experience. For all those who are passionate about politics, it is a privilege and an achievement to represent the people of a riding and others across the country with similar interests. No matter where they live in Canada, workers, retirees and families have more in common than the differences that separate them. To build a better world, that is what we should focus on.

Government Orders

The negative aspect of the experience—we cannot ignore it if we want to move forward as a nation—is the extreme partisanship. Partisanship leads us to make assumptions about our adversaries' opinions. It makes debate sterile, and the value of the individual is lost. We end up by looking at one another through the lens of prejudice. One side sees people wearing cowboy hats who enjoy shooting at coyotes on the prairies; the other side sees the granola crowd sitting on a patio in a big city, criticizing the oil industry.

My knowledge of Canada prevents me from seeing the world like that. I like the member for Prince Albert. I actually think that if we were sitting in a boat on Baker Lake with our fishing rods, we could even have an intelligent conversation.

• (2035)

The biggest challenge for Canada is to overcome its prejudices. I am very proud of my Algonquin ancestors who hunted on the other side of the river, not far from here. Having lived on a reserve for a few years, I am all too familiar with the meaning of the word “prejudice”. The aboriginal values of solidarity, sharing and the constant desire to come to a consensus before making a decision are part of who I am. If we do not manage to overcome these prejudices, we will never be able to correct past injustices, and that does not bode well for how we will handle mistakes that we may make in the future.

We all share a passion for history. We are here to try to humbly change the course of that history. The thing we need to remember is that we cannot change the past, only the future.

Thank you all for this unique experience.

• (2040)

Ms. Marie-Claude Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Chair, two weeks ago, I made my last member's statement. I admit that I was very emotional. I did not think that I would have another chance to rise in the House to speak. I would therefore like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to have more than one minute to thank everyone properly.

I rise today with a voice filled with emotion. I do not want to talk about everything I have done during my time here; I would rather remember how lucky I am to have had the opportunity to be a member of Parliament for four years, four years in which I found extraordinary colleagues with whom I shared good times and some not so good times.

Together, we were elected in 2011. Together, we dealt with the death of our leader, the late Jack Layton. Together, with party members, we chose the member for Outremont as the leader of our party, and I know that we made the right choice. Together, we stood up to the government, which—let us be honest—was not always easy. All joking aside, it is important to mention the cordiality that exists here in this Parliament between the members of all parties.

Over the past four years I have gotten to know all of the dedicated people who work in the House of Commons.

The Speaker and deputy speakers do not have an easy job, and I commend them. The clerks are procedural wizards, and we could not do without their expertise. The analysts make our research much easier.

The members of the security team and the RCMP are always smiling. I must also point out that they did an excellent job during the tragic events of October 22, 2014. The pages make our lives in the House much easier.

Despite my loquaciousness, the translators have always rendered me so well in English.

Although we truly appreciate the bus drivers in the middle of January or in the driving rain, we appreciate them every day of the year.

The food service team brightens my mornings and ensures that my day ends well. The maintenance team ensures that our work environment is always clean and pleasant.

The mail team always gives me my mail with a big smile, no matter how many times I forget my keys.

I am sure that I am missing some, but I hope everyone knows that life on Parliament Hill would be quite dull and dysfunctional if not for you.

I would also like to thank everyone in the whip's office, the house leader's office and the leader's office. Your work is essential to ours. Thank you.

I also feel it is important to salute my team's work. In all humility, an MP cannot do much without a team.

Thanks to Yvon for making sure that people who come to my office with a problem leave with a solution. Thanks to Vicky for warmly welcoming all of the people who come to our office. Thanks to Pierre for doing such a great job of representing me in my riding while I am in Ottawa. Thanks to Yanéric for all of the research and answers you give me.

Garanké, Stéphanie, Geneviève, Sarah and Philippe, you spent some time in my office, and you certainly left your mark. My work would not have been the same without the work you did for the people of Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot.

I am proud of the work I did during my term. Being the housing critic gave me a chance to raise awareness of certain problems and talk about them with local and national stakeholders.

I also had an opportunity to introduce a bill on a national housing strategy. It was not passed, but I believe there is always next time.

I also had the opportunity to chair the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. It was an enriching experience where I learned to work effectively with several parties.

I was also a member of a few committees of the House, including the Standing Committee on Official Languages and the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

In my riding, I had the honour of being named the honorary patron of various causes, including homelessness and mental health.

I also had the chance to work on various files with top-notch people in my riding, including in agriculture. We did an agricultural tour where we met a number of stakeholders.

During my term, we also did two tours of municipalities during which we discussed infrastructure, local development and other very interesting topics, and everything that goes on in the municipalities in my riding.

● (2045)

I had the chance to work in immigration, by providing help and information. I had the chance to tour businesses to discuss employment insurance. I had the chance to raise awareness about homelessness and mental health and to hold public consultations.

I attended a number of diverse activities in my region from Saint-Hyacinthe and Acton Vale to Saint-Jude and Sainte-Christine, and I am delighted. I was always happy to meet my constituents and listen to their concerns, and hear about their interests and passions. It is often said that a region can be judged by the people who live there. Well, I am here to say that Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot is a great riding. The people there are welcoming, kind, vibrant, innovative and lively.

“Welcoming” is exemplified by Acton Vale, which is part of the Villages-relais tourism route and which, I have to say, is a town that is growing and where young families want to live. The term “innovative” applies to Saint-Hyacinthe. Its Cité de la biotechnologie agroalimentaire, vétérinaire et agroenvironnementale was deemed the top emerging technology park in the world. And how about “lively”? There is no time to be bored in Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot with the Show de la rentrée Desjardins in Acton Vale, the Expo de Saint-Hyacinthe, the Festival de musique traditionnelle in St-Bernard-de-Michaudville, the Festival de l'accordéon et du folklore québécois in Saint-Marcel, the Festival du porc in Saint-Nazaire and the Festival du maïs in Saint-Damase.

Dear constituents, I cannot thank you enough for having me serve as the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot for the past four years. As I already said, I worked for you and with you. Thank you for your trust. You can be sure of one thing: I put my heart and soul into my work and I was always mindful of my values. It was a great privilege to serve you.

I would also like to acknowledge the tremendous work done by the people of the Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot Federal NDP Riding Association. They are among the builders that our country needs so much. It is thanks to people like them that the NDP continues to grow in Quebec.

I would also like to talk about someone very important, Brigitte Sansoucy, whom I have had the privilege of knowing for many years. Brigitte, I am especially excited that you are going to be an NDP candidate in the next election. You have my full support, and I would be honoured to see you as a member of the first NDP government in Canada's history. I wish you the best of luck.

I want to conclude with one very important point. As members of Parliament, we sometimes make work the most important part of our lives, even at the risk of neglecting other areas. I became quite ill during my mandate, and I managed to get through it thanks to the love of my partner, my family and my friends. It is important for me to underscore everything they have done.

J-F, thank you for being by my side over the past four years. I am so happy to be sharing my life with you. Mom, thank you for always believing in me and for instilling in me the values that I espoused as

Government Orders

an MP. You were never far from my thoughts. Michel, thank you for taking care of my mother during my many absences, and above all, thank you for making me feel like part of your family. Dad, thank you for all the wonderful discussions we shared, and thank you for teaching me to walk with my head held high, in spite of everything.

To my in-laws, thank you for accepting me and always making me feel at home. Hélène and Gilbert, my second parents, thank you for being in my life for so long and always being there for me. Seb and Alex, I love you like brothers. Thank you for always accepting me as I am. Sarah, Jacinthe and Marie-Claude, thank you for always treating me like a friend, and not like an MP. Thanks, also, for your sweet and silly side, one of the things I love most about our friendship.

As we can see, MPs are never alone. If not, it would be impossible for them to do their job. I was lucky to have a lot of support during my time here, and I still have a lot of support as I leave my position with no regrets and with peace of mind. I have a lot of plans, but the first thing I want to do is to take care of the people that took care of me over the past four years. They certainly deserve it.

● (2050)

[*English*]

Mr. Ted Hsu (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I am grateful to be allowed to speak tonight on the eve of my departure from the House. Before I leave the House of Commons, I want to talk about some ideals that have guided me in politics.

Interestingly, I was never involved in politics before age 40, and I was never asked to join a party. Nor was I recruited to run for office. I chose to do these things on my own when I had to face the importance of politics in dealing with the problems of the world. I knew enough to know that politics and government should not be idealized. However, I also believed that politicians should not be without ideals, so I would like to share some of my ideals today.

First, I have always felt that everything I have ever accomplished in life is only partially attributable to my own efforts. My accomplishments must also be attributed to good fortune. I am fortunate to have had health, a strong and supportive family, friends and a solid education. Most of all, I am fortunate to have grown up in Canada. Therefore, while I believe in promoting individual liberty and the social and economic advantages that result from it, I also believe in communal responsibility, in caring for fellow Canadians, in making the sacrifices needed to ensure equality of opportunity to achieve an enduring and shared prosperity.

Government Orders

Second, as a scientist, I believe in the value of individual and independent thought, rigour, empiricism and in intellectual humility: think for ourselves; collect, observe and discern the facts; be open to criticism; defend our point of view; never believe that we understand everything or have a complete picture of things; and, change our opinion when the facts change. History has shown that science has succeeded beyond all expectation by working in that way, and I sincerely believed five years ago, and still believe now, that one can succeed in politics with the same approach. These ideals and beliefs are what led me, before I sought election as a member of Parliament, to choose the Liberal Party of Canada.

I want to encourage all Canadians, and especially young Canadians, to consider participating in a political party, something which has, unfortunately, become less popular these days. Choosing a political party should not be about shopping until one finds a set of policies that one agrees with. One will never be able to find a party where one agrees with every single policy put forward because we have a diversity of views across Canada.

Political parties have the purpose of taking that diversity, sorting through policies and priorities in order to build a broad consensus within the party, and then translating that into an electoral mandate to actually implement the consensus. This essential part of democracy is a messy and unpredictable process, and everyone will disagree with his or her party some of the time.

However, for each person there will be a party where he or she will be most comfortable with the process, its results, and the kindred spirits who inhabit that party. I encourage young Canadians to not give up hope in our democratic institutions, like Parliament and political parties. Instead, I encourage young Canadians to articulate their ideals, to join parties, to work with kindred spirits, and to respectfully oppose others when appropriate in order to build a better future today.

I would now like to express my gratitude to a host of people who have made my time as a parliamentarian a success.

I thank the people of Kingston and the Islands who chose me as their federal representative. I have been proud to be Kingston's representative in Ottawa. I have tried to do my work in a way that ensured other MPs would know who I represented.

In 2013, I was delighted to be voted by MPs from all parties as the Parliamentarian of the Year who best represented his constituents. It has been a great privilege and honour to serve the people of Kingston and the Islands, and to serve Canada. After my announcement to not seek re-election, many constituents have thanked me for my service. However, I want them to know that everything I have accomplished has been accomplished through the efforts of hundreds of others around me.

I wish to first thank the people who are most responsible for making it possible for me to do the work of a member of Parliament, my family: my immediate family in Kingston, my wife Tara, my daughters Ella and Vera-Claire, my parents James and Marjorie, my uncle Ta-Fang and my aunts Linda and Josephine, my extended

family, my brothers Bobby and Leon, and others who live elsewhere. These are the ones who deserve the most thanks for being a source of values, strength, help and motivation.

● (2055)

I want to also thank the many people who gave me their unwavering support throughout the past five years: friends; neighbours; campaign workers John Clements, Catherine Milks, and Adrian Brett; benefactors; kindred spirits; supporters from across the nation; and the strongest Liberal riding association in the country. I thank Ron Hartling, Ann Hutka, Hans Vorster, Alice Gazeley, and many others.

Special recognition should go to all of my dedicated staff and volunteers who have worked so hard, with care, discretion, and loyalty. Let me try to mention some of their names: Emily Trogen, Beth Palmer, Sophie Kiwala, Mary Davis Little, Dianne Johnston, David Yateman, Fred Faust, Ruth McKinney, Brian Evoy, Nicole Honderich, Ann Parker, Jenn Strychasz, Jane Latimer, and many students and volunteers and past staff members.

What I will miss most on Parliament Hill are my Liberal Party colleagues and their encouragement, their sharing of experience and perspective, their criticism, and their advice, mentorship, and generosity of spirit. I have felt part of, and supported by, a strong team.

During my tenure here, I have always loved working as an MP, but as a husband and father of two young daughters, I am especially sensitive to the sacrifices my own family would be making if I were to pursue another four years of political life at this time, so I have chosen not to run for re-election this year. In so doing, my desire is to remain faithful to my original reason for seeking elected office. It is what I said when I launched my nomination campaign in 2010: our children deserve to inherit our world without the troubles we have created.

When my children are older, and if there is a good reason to do so, I would happily seek elected office again. In the meantime, I will continue to work on many of the concerns that inspired me to enter politics. I will just do it closer to home for now.

The Deputy Chair: Resuming debate?

Several members have not participated yet in this debate, if anyone would care to make a surprise announcement this evening. The only requirement to speak this evening is to not seek re-election.

There being no further members rising, pursuant to an order made Wednesday May 27, 2015, the committee will rise, and I will leave the chair.

(Government Business No. 21 reported)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 8:59 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Ahuntsic Youth Hockey	
Mrs. Mourani	14865
Member for Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette	
Mr. Sopuck	14865
2015 Pan Am Games	
Mr. Allen (Welland)	14865
Member for Kildonan—St. Paul	
Mrs. Smith	14866
Relay for Life	
Mr. Eyking	14866
Member for Calgary Northeast	
Mr. Shory	14866
Supply Management	
Mr. Atamanenko	14866
Stomping Out Stigma	
Mrs. Perkins	14866
Police Services	
Mr. Hawn	14867
Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert Volunteers	
Mrs. Sellah	14867
Taxation	
Mr. Carmichael	14867
Gender Parity	
Mrs. Day	14867
Manufacturing Industry	
Mrs. Truppe	14867
Multicultural Programming	
Ms. Sgro	14868
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Galipeau	14868
Ethics	
Mr. Nantel	14868
Taxation	
Mr. Gourde	14868

ORAL QUESTIONS

Ethics	
Mr. Mulcair	14868
Mr. Calandra	14869
Mr. Mulcair	14869
Mr. Calandra	14869
Mr. Mulcair	14869
Mr. Calandra	14869
Mr. Mulcair	14869
Mr. Calandra	14869

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Mulcair	14869
Mr. Valcourt	14870

The Senate

Mr. Trudeau	14870
Mr. Calandra	14870
Mr. Trudeau	14870
Mr. Calandra	14870
Mr. Trudeau	14870
Mr. Calandra	14870

Ethics

Ms. Mathysen	14870
Mr. Calandra	14871
Ms. Mathysen	14871
Mr. Calandra	14871
Ms. Péclet	14871
Mr. Calandra	14871
Ms. Péclet	14871
Mr. Calandra	14871
Mr. Boulerice	14871
Mr. Calandra	14872
Mr. Boulerice	14872
Mr. Calandra	14872
Mr. Angus	14872
Mr. Calandra	14872
Mr. Angus	14872
Mr. Calandra	14872

Public Safety

Mr. Scott	14872
Mr. Blaney	14873

International Trade

Ms. Freeland	14873
Mr. Fast	14873

Pensions

Mr. Dubourg	14873
Mr. Sorenson	14873
Mr. Goodale	14873
Mr. Sorenson	14873

Canada Revenue Agency

Mr. Rankin	14874
Mr. Keddy	14874
Mr. Dionne Labelle	14874
Mr. Keddy	14874

International Trade

Ms. Liu	14874
Mr. Bernier	14874
Mr. Allen (Welland)	14874
Mr. Fast	14874

Taxation

Ms. Crockatt	14874
--------------------	-------

Mr. Oliver	14875
Employment	
Ms. Nash	14875
Mr. Poilievre	14875
Ms. Nash	14875
Mr. Poilievre	14875
Labour	
Mr. Dewar	14875
Ms. Finley	14875
Mr. Ravignat	14875
Ms. Finley	14875
National Defence	
Ms. Murray	14876
Mr. O'Toole	14876
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Lamoureux	14876
Mr. Valcourt	14876
Canada Post	
Mrs. Day	14876
Ms. Raitt	14876
Mr. Gravelle	14876
Ms. Raitt	14876
Industry	
Mr. Allison	14876
Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	14876
Public Safety	
Ms. Sgro	14877
Mr. Blaney	14877
Citizenship and Immigration	
Ms. Laverdière	14877
Mr. Alexander	14877
Health	
Mr. Lobb	14877
Ms. Ambrose	14877
Canada Post	
Ms. Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	14877
Ms. Raitt	14877
National Defence	
Ms. May	14877
Mr. O'Toole	14878
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	14878

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Lukiwski	14878
Penalties for the Criminal Possession of Firearms Act	
Mr. MacKay	14878
Bill C-69. Introduction and first reading	14878
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	14878

Interparliamentary Delegations	
Ms. Young (Vancouver South)	14878
Mr. Aubin	14878

Committees of the House	
Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	14878
Motion	14878
(Motion agreed to)	14879

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Economic Action Plan 2015 Act, No. 1	
Bill C-59—Time Allocation Motion	
Mr. Van Loan	14879
Mr. Cullen	14879
Mr. Lamoureux	14879
Mr. Sorenson	14880
Mr. Côté	14880
Mr. Choquette	14880
Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	14881
Mr. Van Kesteren	14881
Ms. May	14882
Mr. Cuzner	14883
Ms. Boivin	14883
Motion agreed to	14885
Mr. Van Loan	14885
Report Stage	
Bill C-59. Report stage	14885
Mr. Choquette	14885
Mr. Lamoureux	14886
Mr. Côté	14887
Mr. Maguire	14887
Mrs. Day	14889
Mr. Lamoureux	14889
Mr. Fletcher	14889
Mr. Côté	14890
Mr. Lamoureux	14891
Mr. Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	14891
Ms. Leitch	14891
Mrs. Day	14892
Ms. May	14893
Mr. Lamoureux	14893
Mr. Scarpaleggia	14893
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	14894
(Motions Nos. 2, 10 and 148 negated)	14894
Division on Motion No. 4 deferred	14895
(Motions Nos. 11 and 12 negated)	14895
Division on Motion No. 13 deferred	14895
(Motions Nos. 42 and 43 negated)	14895
Division on Motion No. 44 deferred	14895
(Motions Nos. 48 and 50 to 55 negated)	14896
(Motion No. 56 negated)	14896
Motion No. 57 and Motions Nos. 58 to 111 deferred ...	14896
(Motions Nos. 112 to 114 and 149 negated)	14896
Division on Motion No. 115 and Motions Nos. 117 to 124 deferred	14896
Division on Motions Nos. 125 and 126 deferred	14897
Division on Motions Nos. 127 and 128 to 147 deferred	14897

Motions Nos. 1 and 3 negatived.....	14898
Motions Nos. 4 to 9 negatived.....	14899
Motions Nos. 13 to 41 negatived.....	14900
Motions Nos. 44 to 47 negatived.....	14902
Motions Nos. 57 to 111 negatived.....	14903
Motions Nos. 115, 117 to124 negatived.....	14904
Motions No. 125 and 126 negatived.....	14906
Motions Nos. 127-147 negatived.....	14907
Mr. Oliver.....	14907
Motion for concurrence.....	14907
Motion agreed to.....	14908
(Motion agreed to).....	14908

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Ferry Services to Prince Edward Island

Motion.....	14908
Motion negatived.....	14909

Corrections and Conditional Release Act

Bill C-642. Second reading.....	14909
Motion agreed to.....	14910

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee).....	14910
--	-------

Heritage Lighthouse Protection Act

Bill C-588. Second reading.....	14910
Motion agreed to.....	14911
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee).....	14911

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Members not seeking re-election to the 42nd Parliament

Ms. Latendresse.....	14911
Mr. Benoit.....	14912
Mr. Komarnicki.....	14913
Mr. Cotler.....	14915
Mr. Hawn.....	14917
Mr. Pacetti.....	14919
Mr. Breitzkreuz.....	14920
Mr. Morin (Laurentides—Labelle).....	14921
Ms. Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot).....	14922
Mr. Hsu.....	14923
(Government Business No. 21 reported).....	14924

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>