



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 147 • NUMBER 169 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, February 4, 2015**

---

**Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer**

## **CONTENTS**

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, February 4, 2015

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

• (1405)

[English]

**The Speaker:** It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem led by the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

*[Members sang the national anthem]*

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to share with you and all of my colleagues a brief report on the events in Lima, Peru, in December 2014 at the 20th Conference of the Parties on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

I know all members will be very concerned about the results of the conference since the Government of Canada and all parties in this place adhere to at least the same goal: to ensure that we have a legally binding, comprehensive treaty by December 2015 at the next conference, which will be the 21st Conference of the Parties.

All countries around the world and all parties in this place are also, at least on paper, committed to ensuring that the levels of greenhouse gases be brought down sufficiently to ensure that the planet not experience as much as a 2°C global average temperature increase.

We have a long way to go to make the treaty work in December 2015. We need to work together. The results from Lima were not encouraging. In fact, we need Canada to show leadership.

\* \* \*

### PUBLIC SAFETY

**Mr. Costas Menegakis (Richmond Hill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I was privileged to welcome to Richmond Hill the right hon. Prime Minister for a historic anti-terrorism announcement to help protect Canadians here at home.

The anti-terrorism act, 2015, further exemplifies our government's commitment to keep our streets and communities safe, including from those who would perpetrate terror on the Canadian people. With this legislation, law enforcement agencies would have additional tools to detect and apprehend terrorists and to keep pace with evolving threats.

My constituents congratulate this government for taking such strong action. Carol Jean, from Richmond Hill, wrote that “Our PM is courageous.... He will not let Canadians down and this [legislation] is needed to protect innocent lives”. Shawn said, “On anti-terrorism, we finally have a PM that gets it, and does what he says”.

I am proud to be part of a government that is committed to protecting the safety and security of all Canadians.

\* \* \*

### WORLD CANCER DAY

**Mr. Wayne Marston (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, “Not Beyond Us” is the theme of this year's World Cancer Day. This is a message the global community needs to hear.

Currently, 7.6 million people die from cancer worldwide every year. Currently, the Canadian Cancer Society has stated that over 76,000 Canadians died from cancer in the year 2014.

Clearly, there must be a global commitment to drive advancements in policy and implementation of comprehensive national cancer control plans. To succeed in this endeavour, we must share a collective responsibility to support low and middle-income countries.

Ensuring the availability of, and access to, early detection programs for cancer will significantly reduce the cancer burden in all countries. We must stand, nation alongside nation, to ensure that one day, the World Cancer Day theme changes from “Not Beyond Us” to “Now Behind Us”.

\* \* \*

### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, after decades of drug-running, extortion and prostitution by the mafia, it appears the mob has found a racket even more profitable: wind turbine subsidies. In Ontario, these subsidies are disguised as a carbon tax on electricity bills called the global adjustment. For those on fixed incomes, they either pay up or are threatened with having their power cut. It is called energy poverty.

*Statements by Members*

FIT subsidies were dreamed up in Toronto by the same individuals who now surround the green leader of the Liberal Party in Ottawa. This is not about renewable energy projects or who cares more about the environment.

This is about a few Liberal Party insiders collecting huge sums of money at the expense of the environment and people who can least afford it. The greed energy act is bankrupting Ontario and will bankrupt Canada when Toronto Liberal advisers impose their radical extremist policies on all Canadians.

Rather than be lost at sea with a party adrift with extremist policies, Canadians will continue to benefit from the strong, steady hand of a Conservative government.

\* \* \*

**AMATEUR WEATHERMAN**

**Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize weatherman extraordinaire, Mr. Frankie MacDonald, of Whitney Pier, Nova Scotia.

Frankie the weatherman, as he has come to be known, has taken the Internet by storm, making international headlines for his weather reports. He creates his forecast after monitoring weather on his television and computer, and then takes it to the Internet, with his knowledge and enthusiasm to let us know what type of weather we can expect and how best to prepare.

Since he was a young boy, Frankie has always been interested in the weather. His commitment and dedication to further his passion has led to his videos being viewed by millions around the world, turning his hobby into a career.

I ask all members of the House curious of their weather forecast to visit Frankie MacDonald's Facebook page for informative, up-to-date reports. We, as Cape Bretoners, are very proud of Frankie the weatherman and wish him all the best as he continues to keep us safe from mother nature.

Canadians are deep in winter. As Frankie says, "Stay safe, stay warm and good luck".

\* \* \*

• (1410)

**VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY**

**Mr. Mark Adler (York Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, for people of Vietnamese heritage living in Canada, Tet is a time of rebirth and renewal, a time to let go of the difficulties of the past year and look forward to the promise of a new beginning.

This year is particularly poignant for Canada's Vietnamese community, many of whom make York Centre their home. It marks the 40th anniversary of the fall of Saigon to the Communist forces from the north. To commemorate this anniversary, I along with Senator Thanh Hai Ngo, are co-sponsoring Bill S-219, the journey to freedom day act.

This bill will establish April 30 as the day to commemorate the exodus of Vietnamese refugees and recognize Canada's role in welcoming so many. This bill also pays homage to the boat people's

perilous journey in search of freedom, many of whom lost their lives at sea.

Although a sad anniversary, the journey to freedom day act will serve as a reminder of both the boat people's hazardous journey but also a celebration of their arrival in Canada.

As we celebrate the year of the goat, which symbolizes co-operation, peace and harmony, I say to all Canadians of Vietnamese origin, "*Chuc mung nam moi*".

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**EMPLOYMENT**

**Ms. Hélène LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, we recently found out that LaSalle will lose 300 jobs because the Target store is closing. This is the latest in a long line of business and industry closures in the Montreal area.

The retail sector is booming in Canada, but most of the jobs being created are precarious and poorly paid. We are losing jobs, and the Conservatives are placing the blame elsewhere.

It is time to elect a New Democratic government that will step up to its responsibilities, fight for the middle class by protecting jobs here at home and ensure that people get adequate support if they lose their jobs. The NDP wants to create long-term jobs in growth sectors by supporting Canadian businesses that will not turn their backs on employees.

We have put forward concrete measures to get Canada on the right track and protect Canadian jobs and investment.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**NACH BALLIYE**

**Mr. Parm Gill (Brampton—Springdale, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great honour that I stand before you today to recognize the Nach Balliye organization, which comprises a strong, passionate and talented group of young women who are determined to empower girls and break the gender discrimination in the South Asian community.

Last week, I was privileged to attend the Lohri for Her 2015 event organized by Nach Balliye. Lohri is a festival that marks new beginnings and celebrates the gift of life traditionally for newborn boys.

Since December 2011, Nach Balliye has hosted annual Lohri for Her events which have received enormous encouragement and involvement from the community.

On the international day of the girl, I had an opportunity to participate in a Pink Ladoos event organized by Nach Balliye where we greeted parents of newborn babies and celebrated the birth of baby girls with Pink Ladoos at the Brampton Civic Hospital.

*Statements by Members*

I want to congratulate the entire Nach Balliye team on the wonderful work they do to create more gender equality through their initiatives and I encourage them to continue being a great inspiration for girls around the world.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN FLAG**

**Mr. Royal Galipeau (Ottawa—Orléans, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, in 11 days we will celebrate an important milestone in our history, the 50th anniversary of Canada's distinctive flag.

Getting a flag approved by Parliament was no mean feat. The search for a new flag began in 1925, following a Privy Council initiative.

[*Translation*]

In 1946, the search was renewed with the creation of a select parliamentary committee.

In 1964, a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons was established, and it approved the proposal brought forward by Canadian historian Colonel George Stanley and parliamentarian and jurist John Matheson.

[*English*]

The Canadian flag was raised by Governor General Georges Vanier on February 15, 1965, under the watchful eye of Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson.

The blood of our troops was spilled in order to keep this flag flying high, this symbol of our values of freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law.

[*Translation*]

Let us celebrate it.

\* \* \*

•(1415)

[*English*]

**THE ECONOMY**

**Mr. Matthew Kellway (Beaches—East York, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, years ago at Danforth and Vic Park, Ford then Nash Motors and finally American Motors churned out cars for the Canadian market and provided good jobs for Toronto.

That old auto plant now houses, but just for a few more weeks, a Target store. That tells a story about the failed economic management of successive Liberal and Conservative governments.

In just a few weeks dozens of part-time employees will lose their jobs at that store. Many will not be eligible for EI, yet another indictment of Liberal and Conservative governments.

Many come from the Crescent Town community, a community with double Toronto's unemployment rate, double Toronto's poverty rate, where too many work long and hard but continue to struggle. This is the urban economy created by successive Liberal and Conservative governments.

Earlier this month, the Minister of Finance promised these employees every assistance to find new employment. These

employees want to know when that is coming and where that is. If it is for real, it cannot come soon enough.

\* \* \*

**TAXATION**

**Mr. Devinder Shory (Calgary Northeast, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, since coming to office, our government has made it a duty to ensure that Canadian families have the support they need to grow and thrive. This is why our Prime Minister announced that we would be putting hard-earned money back into the pockets of Canadian moms and dads with our family tax cut plan and the enhanced child care benefit.

Soon, families in my riding of Calgary Northeast will receive just under \$2,000 annually per child under the age of six. When it is added up, a family with five children will receive nearly \$60,000 by the time their children turn six years old.

However, notwithstanding his lack of experience, the Liberal leader has shown that same old Liberal Party arrogance by pledging to reverse our tax breaks. The Liberals would take this money away from Canadian families.

Unlike the members on that side of the House, we will continue to stand up for hard-working Canadian families.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**EATING DISORDER AWARENESS WEEK**

**Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, during this Eating Disorder Awareness Week, it is important to remember that the images the media force on us are often modified to the extreme, portraying ideals of beauty based on extreme thinness.

That is why I launched the "Let's be real" campaign, calling on the media to promote a healthy body image and body diversity. It also calls on the federal government to immediately implement a national strategy for eating disorders. I invite everyone to go to the website [berealcanada.ca](http://berealcanada.ca) and sign the petition.

Many people are already taking action to promote body diversity, including Boisbriand resident Lysa Jobin, owner of Alysé & Collections, a boutique that showcases clothing for women of all sizes, and Marie-Christine Boyte, a student at Collège Boisbriand who won a literary competition whose theme was body diversity.

Let us start the conversation, let us be real, and together we can change attitudes.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF CANADA**

**Mrs. Kelly Block (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday we found out that the NDP members had yet again abused taxpayer dollars when they funnelled \$2.7 million from their House of Commons office budgets to pay for so-called satellite offices in Quebec.

### Oral Questions

Once again, the NDP continues to defend its illegal satellite offices and to deny any wrongdoing. My constituents think this is unacceptable.

The rules have always been clear: it is not acceptable to use House of Commons resources to fund party offices. Unlike the NDP, we believe political parties should pay for their own campaign offices, using their own funds.

It is sad that the NDP has demonstrated a pattern of abuse of taxpayer dollars. On this side of the House, we believe it should repay these funds immediately.

\* \* \*

### CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

**Mr. Frank Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, against tremendous odds, a unique group of Canadians and Americans were called upon to perform some of the most difficult tasks of the Second World War.

Yesterday, for their achievements and their sacrifices, members of the Devil's Brigade were awarded the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest civilian honour the United States Congress can bestow.

The first special service force was an elite group made up of soldiers from both sides of the border who were trained to jump out of planes, climb mountains, sneak behind enemy lines and fight hand-to-hand if need be.

I want to congratulate Canadians John Callowhill, James Summersides, Vernon Doucette, Herb Peppard, Arthur Pottle, Wilfred Paquette, George Wright, Donald Ballantyne, Morris Lazarus, H.R. Hawkyard, Charles Mann, Ralph Mayville, Leonard Corbet and Maurice White.

I also want to honour veterans like Bernard Cooper who could not travel to the ceremony, and like Al Wilson who sadly passed away the day before.

Lest we never forget these men and the men who went before them.

\* \* \*

• (1420)

### TAXATION

**Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon (Mississauga East—Cooksville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, while Canada's economy is better than many, we still remain on the road to recovery. A carbon tax is not a way to deal with economic issues in our country.

Bringing in higher taxes and higher debt is not the path on which we believe Canadians want to be. Canadians cannot afford more of the NDP and Liberals' risky tax hike schemes.

Our government believes in the importance of a strong economy and refuses to weigh it down with another tax on Canadian families. Bringing in a job-killing carbon tax is reckless.

Our Conservative government is lowering taxes for families and putting more money back into their pockets. Keeping taxes low and creating jobs are essential to keeping this economy on the right track. We will never punish Canadians with a job-killing carbon tax.

### EMPLOYMENT

**Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, there is more bad news about jobs this week and still no plan from the Conservatives.

Today, 383 workers at Wrigley Canada in Toronto found out they were losing their jobs. After 52 years, production is going to shift to Gainesville, Georgia.

This comes right on the heels of other hard-working Canadians losing their jobs in retail: 17,600 families got hit by Target's closure, because a foreign company bought out their stores and then shut them down; 400 jobs lost from Tim Hortons corporate offices, along with Sony closing 14 stores and Mexx closing 95 stores. In total, 16 different chains have shut down or pulled out of Canada.

What do we get from the Conservatives? They are playing politics with the legitimate concerns of Canadians about safety from terrorism. They are planning tax cuts for the most well-off. They are delaying their budget.

Canadians deserve better, and this year they will get better when the NDP forms government.

\* \* \*

### TAXATION

**Mr. Joe Daniel (Don Valley East, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our family tax cut helps 100% of families with kids. Families in Don Valley East and all families with kids across Canada will benefit from our new family tax cut. Every family in my riding and across Canada will benefit by an average of over \$1,100 per year, with parents receiving almost \$2,000 per child.

The NDP has never met a tax it did not like and the Liberals have never seen a tax they would not hike. The Liberal leader has even pledged to reverse our tax cuts and has threatened to do exactly what the Liberal Party elites always do: raise taxes on ordinary Canadians to put into the hands of bureaucrats.

Only this Conservative government can be trusted to put more money back into the pockets of the people of Canada.

---

## ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

### EMPLOYMENT

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, every day now there is news of more job losses in Canada on the Prime Minister's watch, the latest being 400 people laid off from the Wrigley plant in Toronto.

What is the Prime Minister doing to help these laid-off workers and to help the tens of thousands of others who have lost their jobs in just the last month? What specifically is he doing for these laid-off workers in Toronto and their families?

*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, obviously no one ever likes to see a Canadian lose a job, although these have to do with particular business decisions of particular companies.

What I do know is that, following our economic action plan of low taxes and balanced budgets, we have created 1.2 million more new jobs than have been lost. That is 1.2 million additional people working.

It is important that we continue to focus on the needs of Canadian families by lowering their taxes and creating a good business environment so we continue to have the kind of superior record we have had as an economy during the post-recession.

• (1425)

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, yes, that was part-time precarious work in the service sector, and let us look at the record there.

[*Translation*]

Some 1,500 jobs were lost at Jacob, 1,800 at Mexx, 2,200 at Sears, and 17,000 at Target.

Does the Prime Minister regret completely abandoning the manufacturing and retail sectors and putting all our economic eggs in the resource extraction basket, especially oil and gas?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the manufacturing sector has been very supportive of this government's policies for that sector, and it has criticized the NDP's opposition to those policies. It has also criticized the NDP's policies to increase taxes and the deficit.

More than 80% of the 1.2 million net new jobs are full-time, and 80% are in the private sector. Two-thirds of those jobs are well paid. The numbers speak for themselves.

\* \* \*

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians know the real answer, and it is not what the Prime Minister just said.

Does the Prime Minister believe that the Security Intelligence Review Committee, which was created 30 years ago, is fully equipped today to properly oversee the operations of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service?

Does this committee have what it takes today to do its job properly, if it was created 30 years ago?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we have a robust oversight system for our security agencies. Our laws also require judicial authorization for the use of specific powers.

Our system is very robust. Our job here is to go after terrorists and jihadists, not our police and security agencies.

[*English*]

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Arthur Porter, come on down.

Mr. Speaker, the Security Intelligence Review Committee is the same body that said in its last report that CSIS "seriously misled" it in one of its investigations, and that was just last year.

How can the Prime Minister contemplate radically expanding the powers of CSIS without equally expanding oversight? Is it because the Prime Minister believes, just like his minister, that the oversight that protects Canadians from abuse of power is just red tape?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, the example the Leader of the Opposition cites indicates that in fact the system works, that SIRC does take its responsibilities very seriously, provides robust oversight, and has noted that these agencies operate within the law.

On top of that, there are additional clauses in this law that require additional powers to be used to seek judicial authorization.

The oversight is there. The oversight is strong. What we need to do is ensure our police and security agencies have the tools they need—that is the real job here—and ensure we are not going after them but we are going after terrorists and jihadists.

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister should know that freedom and safety go hand in hand, and it is the duty of any responsible government to promote and protect both. It has to do both at the same time. Instead of that, the Prime Minister has adopted divisive language, attacked anyone who has raised questions, and failed to adopt even the most basic recommendations to improve oversight.

Will the Prime Minister agree to amend this bill to enhance oversight, yes or no?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the bill already enhances oversight.

Obviously, we agree on this side that freedom and security go hand in hand, which is why on this side we support some security measures. How does the leader of the NDP, if he thinks they go hand in hand, explain his opposition to every single security measure we ever put forward? That is not responsible. That is the kind of approach we expect from a party that takes public funds and uses them for party offices.

\* \* \*

• (1430)

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, infrastructure investment creates the jobs—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Speaker:** Order. We are on to the next question. The hon. member for Papineau.

**Mr. Justin Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, infrastructure investment creates the jobs and growth we need to build a stronger middle class. Canada's premiers and mayors are asking for more federal investment, but instead, the building Canada fund was cut by 90%.

*Oral Questions*

Will the government scrap its tax break for the wealthy and restore funding for job-creating infrastructure?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we obviously agree that infrastructure is important for economic development. That is why we are running the largest, longest, biggest infrastructure program in Canadian history. Just within the last few weeks I announced additional funds at the federal level to make sure we eliminate the infrastructure deficit.

Unlike the Liberal Party, we do not believe it is necessary to hike taxes on families in order to fund infrastructure. We can have lower taxes, balanced budgets, and investments that will grow our economy—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Papineau.

**Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last year the building Canada fund was cut from over \$2 billion to only \$210 million for the entire country—nearly 90%. This year, as our economy faces new challenges, the fund is still only at \$210 million. An April budget means a missed construction season.

Will the government step up and be the partner the provinces and municipalities need it to be?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. Two years ago, the government announced a program of over \$70 billion in infrastructure investments over the next 10 years. Just in the last few weeks I announced an additional \$6 billion going into just federal infrastructure, most of that to be spent over the next three years. Those are big numbers. Those are the real numbers. I urge the leader of the Liberal Party to familiarize himself with that basic arithmetic. [Translation]

**Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister insists on giving tax breaks to the rich rather than investing in infrastructure. That is the wrong priority.

The provincial premiers have called for such investments. Canadians need them. Investments in infrastructure would promote job creation and economic growth.

Instead of giving to the rich, will the Prime Minister reverse the 90% cut he is making to infrastructure funding?

**Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we agree that it is important to invest in our infrastructure.

That is why we have a program of \$75 billion of infrastructure investments over the next 10 years. It is the largest infrastructure program in Canadian history.

However, unlike the Liberal Party, we do not believe it is necessary to hike taxes on families in order to fund infrastructure.

Our policy involves a balanced budget, lower taxes and targeted investments in areas such as infrastructure in order to promote economic growth.

\* \* \*

**EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the closure of Target in Canada represents a loss of 17,000 jobs in 133 municipalities. It also affects 1,800

suppliers who are owed over \$5 billion by Target. The list of creditors is 44 pages long. Some suppliers will not recover.

The Conservatives have failed to diversify our economy, and Canadians are paying the price.

I will ask the government once again: where is the plan to fight the downturn and stimulate job creation?

**Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we are obviously all worried about the number of people who have lost their jobs with Target after two years of failure by this American company in Canada.

We have contacted employees to provide all the services they need, including employment insurance, obviously, training programs and job notifications.

We will continue to help unemployed workers while creating jobs with our low-tax policy.

• (1435)

**Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the retail sector has often served as a lifeline for workers in other sectors who lose their jobs. However, even these jobs are disappearing.

Furthermore, January and February are not good months to be looking for a job in the retail sector.

Where is the government's plan for all these people looking for work who must continue to pay their bills?

**Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as I said, we obviously continue to provide access to the employment insurance program and the training programs that we have enhanced.

We will soon be launching a new job bank that will better match unemployed workers with employers who are hiring. We are working with the provinces to ensure that training programs are better aligned with the labour market.

Ultimately, we must continue to reduce taxes in order to create jobs and stimulate economic growth.

[English]

**Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, a lot of these workers are part-time, and they do not qualify for EI. That is the problem they have created.

*Oral Questions*

Job losses are mounting, retail stores are closing, and the Conservatives have no plan and no budget. A hundred and thirty-three Target stores start liquidation tomorrow. Seventeen thousand, six hundred people are losing their jobs. Hundreds of other retail stores are closing, thousands more jobs will be lost, and the minister thinks if he just ignores it, it will go away. Well, it will not.

Canadians need a plan. Where is their plan?

**Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our plan has resulted in one of the best job creation records. We have developed, with the creation of 1.2 million net new jobs, one of the best economic growth records of any of the major developed economies.

I do not know what the NDP is suggesting. Obviously we are all concerned for the employees of Target, but is the NDP suggesting that the taxpayers should subsidize this failed American retail outlet in Canada? We do not believe so. To the contrary, we believe we should continue reducing taxes to create economic growth and to create jobs rather than adopting the NDP approach of higher taxes, reckless spending, and bigger debts.

**Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, that plan is not working. The job losses are piling up, and middle-class families are falling further behind.

On top of thousands of jobs lost in retail, 383 workers at Wrigley Canada just found out that the Wrigley manufacturing plant in Toronto is closing. They are losing their jobs, and the Conservatives have no budget and no plan to fix the damage they have done. When will they do the right thing and agree to the NDP's plan to kick-start manufacturing and job creation?

**Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters, actual people who work in manufacturing in Canada, looked at the NDP plan that my colleague is talking about, and they said that the NDP plan will put investment and jobs at risk. By contrast, here is what they said about the Conservative approach.

...the programs the Conservative government has put in place do support manufacturing, and do it very well.

We have had the misfortune in this country, in British Columbia and Nova Scotia, a couple of places that have had an NDP government, and we know what the NDP plan and approach is for small business. If someone wants to create a small business under an NDP government, it is quite easy: start a large business and just wait.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, despite the Prime Minister's claims, the mayors of Canada's major cities are speaking with one voice, and their demands echo those of the provinces.

We have a serious infrastructure deficit. The municipalities need the federal government to invest in infrastructure and affordable social housing. We need to catch up, and this will create more jobs.

Why is the government incapable of working with other levels of government to stimulate job growth and infrastructure development?

[*English*]

**Mr. Peter Braid (Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our government has introduced the largest and the longest infrastructure plan in Canada's history, with \$75 billion over the next 10 years. This includes the \$53-billion new building Canada plan for municipal, provincial, and territorial infrastructure.

We are making record investments and are keeping taxes low. The NDP, in addition to needing to mortgage its own party, it would appear, would also mortgage the future of our kids and our grandkids.

• (1440)

**Mr. Matthew Kellway (Beaches—East York, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's big city mayors are calling for an urban agenda. They are looking for collaboration with the federal government to address crumbling infrastructure, a crisis in affordable housing, and funding for public transit, but the Conservatives govern as though cities do not exist, as if 80% of Canadians do not live in urban communities.

Why are they leaving cities to fend for themselves? Why will they not support the infrastructure necessary to build more competitive and livable cities?

**Mr. Peter Braid (Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our Conservative government is making record investments in infrastructure. This includes public transit. In fact, public transit is an eligible category under every component of the new building Canada plan. What is more, we respect the jurisdiction of municipalities and provinces. They choose, they identify, their infrastructure project priorities.

We look forward to continuing to work with our partners.

\* \* \*

**EMPLOYMENT**

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, as job losses mount in Alberta, the Conservatives are busy making it easier for employers to hire temporary foreign workers.

Today we learned that they secretly made a deal with Alberta to allow employers there to exceed the 30% cap. Just like they have so many times before, the Conservatives made a big splashy announcement about cracking down, and now they are quietly creating loopholes.

When are the Conservatives finally going to get serious about protecting Canadian jobs?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, sometimes the NDP's hypocrisy really is breathtaking. This is the party that demanded that we give permanent residency to every single temporary foreign worker in Canada, which would imply, by the way, doubling Canadian immigration levels. Canadians do not support that.

However, there are about 1,000 temporary foreign workers in Alberta with pending permanent residency applications who are about to fall out of status. We are just going to allow them to stay in Canada until a decision is made on their permanent residency applications, which is exactly what the NDP asked us to do.

Why can the socialists never take yes for an answer?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, while we are losing jobs by the thousands, the Conservatives continue to cave in to blackmail from Alberta industries. Last year they made a whole show of saying that they had finally fixed the problems with the temporary foreign worker program. However, we have now learned that they flouted the rules once again, allowing employers in Alberta to exceed and circumvent the cap on the number of foreign workers hired, at the expense of Canadians.

When will the Conservatives get serious about protecting Canadians and creating jobs for Canadians?

**Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the NDP's comments are embarrassing. The NDP is the one that demanded the government allow 100% of temporary foreign workers to remain in Canada permanently. That is not what Canadians or this government want.

One thousand workers in Alberta applied to remain in Canada permanently. There is a good chance that these applications will be approved by the Alberta government. They will be allowed to remain here a few months until their applications are finalized. It is the compassionate thing to do and it is exactly what the NDP originally asked for.

[*English*]

**Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, job growth is at its lowest level in five years. Some 200,000 jobs that were in the economy before the recession are gone and have not come back, and the Conservatives are panicking with no budget and no plan.

Does anyone else notice how desperate the Conservatives have become to talk about anything other than the economy? But it is their mismanagement that has led to 1.3 million Canadians being out of a job. New Democrats will keep putting forward solutions to help Canadians and the manufacturing sector.

However, when will we see this Minister of Finance stand up with some of his own solutions, with his own budget perhaps? When will we see a plan to get Canadians back to work? Why will he not answer a simple question?

• (1445)

**Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the NDP sees a plan, but voted against every single element of it.

They voted against cutting taxes for small businesses. They voted against cutting income taxes. They voted against cutting the GST. They voted against increased investments in job training. They have voted against every constructive measure: the Canada apprenticeship loan, the Canada job grant, and the incentive grant for new apprentices.

Everything that has helped this country have one of the best job creation records in the developed world has been opposed by the NDP, and their only solution is higher taxes, reckless spending, and more debt. That would lead to more jobs being lost.

\* \* \*

**VETERANS AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Frank Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Veterans Ombudsman states that he is "...disappointed that the update provides no details on how the substantive deficiencies with the New Veterans Charter (NVC) are to be addressed." He continues that "...we're not starting from scratch. Much research has been done and many reports have focussed on them."

Now VAC needs to act. The Royal Canadian Legion has said that the government had plenty of time to make changes, but lacked the willingness to look after our veterans.

The minister thinks veterans can be satisfied with a late Friday night tweet. What happened to his new approach? Is he really any different from the predecessor?

**Hon. Erin O'Toole (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as that member knows, I was in Hamilton on Friday where I spoke directly with Canadian Forces members and veterans on the new veterans charter, while opening an operational stress injury clinic that will serve veterans in Guelph.

In addition to that, the report was filed with the committee, and I will not apologize for engaging and talking with veterans wherever they are, in our legions or online. I am listening and acting, and I hope he would get on board.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**STATISTICS CANADA**

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, eliminating the mandatory long form census is perhaps not the worst thing the Conservatives have done—competition for that title is fierce—but it is certainly the stupidest. This move has been widely condemned.

I would like to quote Paul Jacobson, president of the Canadian Association for Business Economics:

...it has become all but impossible to draw intelligent—or even accurate—conclusions about...critical aspects of economic policy.

*Oral Questions*

To clean up the mess it has made of our economy, will the government support the excellent bill introduced by the member for Kingston and the Islands?

**Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, if my colleague wants to support an excellent bill on this matter, he should support the bill introduced by my colleague from Elgin—Middlesex—London.

With regard to the census, we are confident that in 2016, as was the case in 2011, the government will get plenty of quality information on each region so that it can implement all the requisite systems and programs to meet the needs of Canadians.

[*English*]

**Ms. Chrystia Freeland (Toronto Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that is simply not true. Everyone in business knows that we live in the age of big data. That is why Canada's leading economists and the CFIB are united in calling for the return of the long form census. As Roger Martin of the University of Toronto said, in direct contradiction of what we just heard, "It is just disinformation to say the current survey works".

Will the government finally reverse its anti-science, anti-business, and antediluvian policy and return the long form census as my colleague's bill calls for?

**Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC):** It is quite ridiculous, of course, Mr. Speaker, as Wayne Smith, the CEO of Stats Canada, has testified before the industry committee and said quite clearly to Canadians that the 2011 census provided Canadians with the data that we require as a government and all levels of government require in order to provide the necessary services to Canadians.

The 2016 census will yield quality data for all Canadians that they can rely on as we move forward.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

#### DEMOCRATIC REFORM

**Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, nearly a year ago, we asked the Minister of State for Democratic Reform if he had consulted the Chief Electoral Officer about his unfair elections act.

He said he did, but he did not. Now we have another bill before us that is violating Canadians' right to vote.

Did the minister actually consult Elections Canada this time?

• (1450)

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of State (Democratic Reform), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada's position.

The purpose of this bill is to ensure that everyone who votes is a citizen. It requires people to show identification before voting. That applies to Canadians living here in Canada, and once the House of Commons passes this bill, it will apply to all Canadians living abroad.

[*English*]

**Mr. Craig Scott (Toronto—Danforth, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the minister keeps spinning this new bill as somehow being about preventing fraudulent voting from abroad. We have seen this movie before. The reality is that the minister is creating new obstacles and new hoops to jump through that would make it exceptionally difficult for all Canadians abroad to vote in our elections, for no reason at all.

Can the minister provide a single scrap of evidence that Canadians voting from abroad are engaging in any form of cheating whatsoever?

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of State (Democratic Reform), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, 87% of Canadians believe that when they vote, it is reasonable to expect them to bring some ID. Obviously, when people from outside the country vote, they do not present that ID in person. That is why the bill before the House would allow them to do so, by scanning the documents, emailing them in, and requesting that the ballot be sent to them by mail, which they can send back. The timelines work out for them to do that.

The bottom line is this. The bill would ensure that those people who vote are citizens and that they have identification to prove they are eligible to vote in the riding in which their vote would be counted.

\* \* \*

#### PUBLIC SAFETY

**Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the current government does not seem to get the message. More powers for CSIS means a need for better oversight. In case the minister missed it, let me quote the latest annual report from the Security Intelligence Review Committee. This report said that "...it seems reasonable for Canadians to ask whether the intelligence accountability framework that was designed 30 years ago is still appropriate to deal with the realities of contemporary intelligence work." That is what the SIRC annual report says.

The Conservatives agree that the intelligence environment has changed, so why are they so opposed to better oversight?

**Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there is oversight. We believe that the oversight in place is consistent. It is third-party, non-partisan, independent expert oversight that is required in this instance. Those key powers that exist in the legislation are subject to that oversight, in addition to the judicial oversight and the oversight of the Attorney General or prosecutors working with the police. We believe that is sufficient. We believe that is the way this bill would protect Canadians and, as the Leader of the Opposition said, strike that balance between security and the need to protect Canadians' rights.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the minister went on at length about the program to counter violent extremism.

*Oral Questions*

However, he never said a word about any new funding even though the program has been in place since 2013. The minister said that urgent measures must be taken to protect Canadians.

If that is the case, why is he dragging his feet when it comes to funding the fight against radicalization?

[English]

**Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this legislation does include tools that would allow the authorities to take practical action regarding radicalization. That includes, of course, the take-down of material that might be seen as promoting or actively engaging terrorists.

In addition, there are already in place abilities for our security forces to engage with the public, with groups that might be subject or prone to radicalization. We have cultural round tables. There are a number of ways in which outreach helps us in this regard.

With respect to resources, we have consistently increased resources, while members of the NDP have consistently opposed those increases.

\* \* \*

**SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Ms. Joan Crockatt (Calgary Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, families in Calgary Centre have told me that what they really want from their federal government is tax relief. They also want direct support, money in their pockets they can use as they see fit to help with the costs of raising their kids. What families do not want is big government bureaucracy and waste.

Can the Minister of State for Social Development please tell us and Canadian families what our government is doing for them.

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Minister of State (Social Development), CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member for Calgary Centre is right: parents with children need support. They need lower taxes. That is exactly what we are delivering with our family tax cut, which would benefit close to two million families with children; and the expansion of our universal child care benefit, which would benefit every family in Canada with children.

Families that I have spoken to are excited. They are looking forward to this benefit and the tax cut. What they need to know, and what they do know, is that the Liberals and the New Democrats would take that away. Instead, they would introduce reckless spending, higher taxes, and more debt. This Prime Minister and this government will not let that happen.

\* \* \*

• (1455)

[Translation]

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

**Ms. Isabelle Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's firefighters are very concerned, and for good reason. They are asking the government to take concrete action to improve Canadians' safety and especially to save lives.

Our firefighters are on the front lines every day, and they know what makes the difference between life and death. We have to listen

to them. They gave the government a detailed plan to, for example, make seniors' residences safer.

Will the government agree to work with firefighters, the provinces and municipalities to better protect public safety?

[English]

**Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is fully aware, firefighters across this country do not fall under federal jurisdiction.

I will let members know that I am married to a firefighter, and when it comes to issues concerning keeping Canadians safe and putting out fires, I am very supportive of the work that my husband does to keep the residents of Toronto safe.

\* \* \*

**RAIL TRANSPORTATION**

**Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan (Scarborough—Rouge River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, recent train derailments in Lac Mégantic; Plaster Rock, New Brunswick; and Clair, Saskatchewan have demonstrated the threats that first responders face when trains with dangerous goods derail. Yet, too many have to face these dangers without adequate training in hazardous materials.

The Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs has long called for special training to deal with derailments specifically. It calls for this training to be provided in co-operation with the rail companies.

When will the government finally put into a place a comprehensive plan to get firefighters the training they need?

**Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs for being such a great resource. They make sure that, on the advisory council associated with the transportation of dangerous goods, they give the input that is needed.

We work very closely with firefighters and fire chiefs to ensure that they have the information and the ability to inform the people they work with of the dangers associated with the transportation of dangerous goods. We will continue to work with them, we value their advice, and we will make sure that we keep them as safe as we can.

*Oral Questions***TRANSPORT**

**Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, as a city councillor and MP, I have been advocating for a new border crossing for the Windsor-Detroit corridor. This is crucial for the economy and prosperity of both Canada and the United States, but the current government has negotiated such a poor deal, Canada has to front nearly \$1 billion and pay for both countries. Despite a U.S. federal budget of roughly \$3.5 trillion, the Conservatives could not even get the United States to pay for their own customs plaza, leaving it all up to Canadians.

This is more ongoing infrastructure incompetence. How did it come to this?

**Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, if the member actually wants to support the Detroit River International Crossing, he should try voting for it for once in the house. We have put forward appropriation after appropriation to make this project a reality, to create 10,000 construction jobs, to use Canadian steel in this project, and the member has stood every time to oppose it.

He should get on board and should be ashamed of his record.

**Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my record, because I voted against bad budgets that left Canadians behind.

The government is making it up as it goes along. The member said, "We're not building a U.S. customs plaza". Those are his own words—he can eat them now.

The Prime Minister's press release said that the U.S. plaza is "...the responsibility of the U.S. government."

Since Canadians have become the sole financier of the project, will the minister come clean and tell Canadians how this will affect tolls. Will Canadians get their money back with interest, and how long will that take?

**Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member knows that discussions continue with our American partners on their investment in this border crossing.

But make no mistake about it. In response to every single budget we have put forward with investments to create 10,000 construction jobs, to move the auto industry forward, to ensure that the steel industry gets its steel used in this particular project, everything supporting support jobs and growth in Windsor, that member has voted against. He should be ashamed and voters will tell him so in the next election.

\* \* \*

• (1500)

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for foreign affairs.

Ukraine is currently facing significant challenges and requires continued international support. Has the government discussed with the United States or our allies about whether further military support for Ukraine is in fact required?

**Mr. David Anderson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada supports the ambitions of Ukrainians for a free, democratic and prosperous country. We have been supporting them in these efforts.

We have imposed a broad range of political and economic sanctions, pledging support to help Ukraine stabilize its economy and to promote economic and social development. We have been providing non-lethal security assistance and training for members of the Ukrainian military.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN HERITAGE**

**Hon. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, whether flying over a school or a town hall, an embassy abroad or a Canadian Forces base, Canada's flag and the maple leaf are recognized worldwide as the distinctive symbols of Canada's sovereignty and are a source of pride to Canadians.

As we prepare for the upcoming 50th anniversary of our flag, I stand among numerous members who have been active in promoting, in a non-partisan manner, the fundamental role the maple leaf plays in our history.

Would the government inform members of the House of its plans for the promotion of our pennant's upcoming 50th anniversary?

**Hon. Shelly Glover (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, please allow me to thank the member for his devotion to this very important event.

The 50th anniversary of the national flag of Canada will be celebrated across the country. We will have flag-raising ceremonies in schools in municipalities across the country. The Royal Canadian Mint will be introducing a collectible coin and Canada Post will be introducing special stamps.

We have also partnered with great organizations, like the Girl Guides of Canada, Scouts Canada and the Royal Canadian Legion, to promote this milestone to thousands of Canadians. There is a CFL partnership coming. There is more to come.

I hope everyone will celebrate the flag and celebrate who we are as Canadians.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CANADA POST**

**Mr. Marc-André Morin (Laurentides—Labelle, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, is there anyone responsible for Canada Post in the House?

In mid-December, the municipality of Lac-Saint-Paul lost its post office. A municipal councillor has to travel 16 kilometres back and forth every day to get the municipal mail. His neighbour gets his mail from a community mailbox located at the end of a logging road. Every time he gets out of his vehicle in his wheelchair, he is worried that a loaded truck will come by.

Does the minister believe that the mail delivers itself, just like the Liberals believe that budgets balance themselves?

*Oral Questions*

[English]

**Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times in the House, Canada Post is an arm's-length independent crown corporation, with the responsibility to ensure it operates on a self-sufficiency basis. In doing so, it needs to ensure that it makes up for the loss of revenues associated with simply fewer letters being delivered in Canada.

As a result, it has a five-point plan. In this five-point plan, it is taking action to ensure that, in the future, Canada Post will be there to serve our needs.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Sadia Groguhé (Saint-Lambert, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Canada Post informed my office of a so-called information campaign for the people of my riding who will be getting the new community mailboxes on their property.

However, Canada Post refuses to provide the list of chosen locations and, worse yet, is not taking the time to consult the property owners. This lack of transparency and real consultation is Canada Post's trademark.

Why is the minister allowing Canada Post to act without consulting the people who are being forced to accommodate a community mailbox on their property?

[English]

**Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, my understanding from Canada Post is that, indeed, it is consulting with Canadians across Canada.

However, I would like to take the rest of this opportunity to point out that perhaps the NDP members should consult with taxpayers about whether they plan on paying back the money that they used in their budgets.

\* \* \*

● (1505)

**VETERANS AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Corneliu Chisu (Pickering—Scarborough East, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on the occasion of the 71st anniversary of the Devil's Brigade joining the allied offensive during the Second World War in Anzio, Italy, the legendary joint Canadian-American special elite unit was honoured by our neighbours in Washington, D.C.

Could the Minister of Veterans Affairs please comment on this important event?

**Hon. Erin O'Toole (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the Durham region for his service in the Canadian Forces. He is the only Afghan veteran in the House.

Two years ago, the Minister of Justice, the then minister of national defence, presented the award for operational excellence to veterans of the Devil's Brigade. He was joined by the Prime Minister in that ceremony.

Yesterday, I was honoured to join Canadian veterans from the Devil's Brigade, and their families, when they received the Congressional Gold Medal for their brave service to democracy and freedom.

While only a few MPs could attend the ceremony, I know all MPs join me in thanking Canada's legendary Devil's Brigade.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN COAST GUARD**

**Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, recently there was a large public protest in the town in the Twillingate in my riding, demanding the removal of oil from the sunken ship known as the *Manolis L.*

Currently, the Coast Guard has a temporary measure in place called a cofferdam. It is calling it, so far, effective, and that is all it plans to do.

However, in 2013, the Coast Guard removed oil from a sunken ship off the coast of British Columbia, and here is what it said at the time, "paying the lump sum to be rid of the problem was a better solution than paying for multiple temporary fixes over time".

Would the minister finally, please, pay the lump sum, get rid of that oil and save our shores off the northeast coast of the island of Newfoundland?

**Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the top priority of the Canadian Coast Guard is protection of our marine environment, and also the safety of those at sea.

In December, the Coast Guard did its planned maintenance on the cofferdam of the *Manolis L.* It inspected the hull, which is in good condition. No oil has been detected since that time.

Further, I have instructed our officials to review long-term options for the *Manolis L.*

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**HEALTH**

**Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the so-called mitigation measures at the Port of Québec are not working.

A new sample analysis to measure the quantity of nickel in the air in Limoilou was released in January. This analysis shows that air quality has deteriorated. The standard was exceeded one out of every five days. That is unacceptable.

What does the Minister of Transport plan to do to protect the people of Québec City and ensure that Québec Stevedoring complies with air quality standards?

[English]

**Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the port of Québec, which is arm's-length from the government, is working with its tenants to ensure that it is operating in a way that is sensitive to the environment around it.

I know it meets with its tenants. I know it meets with the community on these issues. I encourage it to continue to do so.

### NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Ryan Leef (Yukon, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, my constituents have been clear that they cannot afford another tax hike.

Recently we heard from the minister about the impact that carbon tax would have on the lives of northerners, who already have a high cost of living.

Could the Minister of the Environment update the House on any strategic investments that we will make in the north that will help improve the quality of life for northerners?

**Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, every year our government has made important investments in the north that have improved infrastructure, health care services and broadband services, and the NDP has voted against all these measures.

The Liberal leader recently told northern media that our government had focused too much on improving infrastructure in the north.

I am proud to be part of a government that stands up for northerners and would not impose a carbon tax that would raise the price of things like food, hunting supplies, fuel and so on.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**Ms. Nicole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, processing times for sponsorship applications made from inside Canada continue to increase. A woman from Hull—Aylmer submitted an application to sponsor her husband in September 2013.

We have been contacting the minister's office since April 2014. Every time we get the same response: "Next month, madam". The problem is that the next month the processing time is pushed forward again.

What explanation does the minister have for the fact that it takes three times longer to process an inland application than an outland application?

• (1510)

**Hon. Chris Alexander (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, since coming to power in 2006, our government has made a great deal of progress in clearing up all our backlogs, including the backlog in the sponsorship program.

In December, our government announced a new initiative to expedite the processing of work permits. We have already issued 3,000 this year. That is a lot. Applications are processed much more quickly. People who are waiting for their application to be processed can work in Canada. The satisfaction rate among parents and spouses is rising.

\* \* \*

### INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mr. Jean-François Fortin (Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matapédia, FD):** Mr. Speaker, when the provincial premiers

### Routine Proceedings

met in Ottawa last week, they reiterated that it is critically important for the federal government to invest in infrastructure. They described this issue as key to economic growth.

I had the opportunity to meet with the Minister of Infrastructure several times regarding extending the runway at the Mont-Joli regional airport. Quite frankly, the minister always demonstrated a good understanding of this issue and its strategic importance for the region.

Is the government preparing to make a good-news announcement?

[English]

**Mr. Peter Braid (Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our government has made record investments in infrastructure. The new building Canada plan was open for business just last March. In less than a year, projects representing approximately \$5 billion have already been identified for funding under the new building Canada plan.

We look forward to working with municipal, provincial and territorial partners, as we continue to renew infrastructure and create jobs and prosperity in our country.

\* \* \*

### PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**The Speaker:** I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Abadula Gameda, Speaker of the House of Peoples' Representatives of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

### INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

**Mr. Bernard Trottier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the delegation of the Canadian branch of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie concerning its participation in the bureau meeting and the XLIX ordinary session of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie held in Abidjan, Ivory Coast, from July 8 to 12, 2013.

\* \* \*

[English]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

**Mr. Daryl Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security in relation to Bill C-12, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act. The committee studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House without amendment.

*Routine Proceedings*

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Joe Preston (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the 28th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs presented on December 8, 2014, concerning the Standing Orders of the House, be concurred in.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** Does the hon. member for Elgin—Middlesex—London have the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

\* \* \*

● (1515)

## PETITIONS

## THE ENVIRONMENT

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

The first is from residents throughout the Gulf Islands, including Pender Island and Mayne Island as well as the town of Sidney, who call on the government to take steps to protect the Salish Sea from raw sewage, primarily from recreational boaters. Over 400,000 recreational boaters ply the beautiful waters of the Salish Sea, and the petitioners want action to prohibit raw sewage discharge.

The second petition calls for a national climate strategy. Petitioners from Galiano, Pender, Mayne, and Sidney, as well as from Nanaimo, call on the government to put in place a strategy to ensure that greenhouse gas levels are reduced by no less than 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.

## IMPAIRED DRIVING

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions signed by a number of citizens of Canada. They want to see tougher laws in the implementation of new mandatory minimum sentencing for those persons convicted of impaired driving causing death. They also want the Criminal Code of Canada to be changed to redefine the offence of impaired driving causing death as vehicular manslaughter.

[*Translation*]

## CANADA POST

**Mr. Alain Giguère (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I want to present two petitions, with more than 5,000 signatures, from my constituents who are protesting the end of door-to-door service.

My constituents were among the first in Canada to get a taste of Canada Post's medicine, and they cannot stomach it. More than 5,000 people have signed these petitions, and they will remember who was responsible for the end of door-to-door service come election time.

[*English*]

## AGRICULTURE

**Hon. Ralph Goodale (Wascana, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to table a petition today signed by a large number of people from all over the city of Regina, expressing their concern about the situation affecting small family farmers, especially women; recognizing the role that small farmers play in the struggle against hunger and poverty; and calling upon the world, and the Canadian government in particular, to adopt policies that allow such farmers to preserve, use, and freely exchange seeds.

## IMPAIRED DRIVING

**Mr. Bev Shipley (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honour to present two petitions today.

The first one follows what was said earlier. Recognizing the interests of public safety, these citizens of Canada want to see tougher laws and the implementation of new mandatory minimum sentences for persons convicted of impaired driving causing death, and a change to the Criminal Code to redefine impaired driving as vehicular manslaughter.

## SEX SELECTION

**Mr. Bev Shipley (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition comes about as a result of a documentary that revealed that ultrasounds have been used in Canada to determine the sex of an unborn child and to terminate pregnancies if the unborn child is a girl.

Surveys and polls have shown that 92% of Canadians believe sex-selective pregnancies should be illegal. Different societies are opposing the non-medical use of fetal ultrasounds. Therefore, the petitioners condemn discrimination against girls occurring through sex-selective pregnancy termination.

## AGRICULTURE

**Ms. Hélène LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, as the member for LaSalle—Émard and as an agronomist, I am very pleased to present a petition signed by dozens of members of my community. They are asking the Government of Canada to respect the right of small-scale family farmers to preserve, exchange, and use seeds.

The government has a very important role to support small family farmers, especially women, in international aid policy. They call on the government to ensure that policies and programs are developed in consultation with small family farmers and that they protect the rights of small family farmers in the south to preserve, freely use, and exchange seeds.

## EATING DISORDERS

**Ms. Kirsty Duncan (Etobicoke North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, eating disorders such as anorexia and bulimia are serious mental illnesses that can be fatal. More than 600,000 Canadians have been incapacitated by eating disorders. They suffer long waiting lists for help and limited access to mental health services.

The petitioners call upon the government to work with provinces, territories, and stakeholders to develop a pan-Canadian strategy for eating disorders, including better prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and support.

• (1520)

#### IMPAIRED DRIVING

**Mr. James Rajotte (Edmonton—Leduc, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is my honour today to present a petition on behalf of hundreds of people from British Columbia and Alberta who are very concerned about the drinking and driving laws in Canada. They want to see tougher implementation of new mandatory minimum sentencing for those persons convicted of impaired driving causing death. They also want to see a redefinition of the offence of impaired driving causing death as vehicular manslaughter.

[Translation]

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

**Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, on behalf of 125 of my constituents from Sherbrooke, a petition calling for the release of Raif Badawi. They are calling on the Government of Canada to use its diplomatic tools to put pressure on the Saudi Arabia government to free Raif Badawi and to allow him to join his family in Sherbrooke.

[English]

#### AGRICULTURE

**Ms. Joyce Bateman (Winnipeg South Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today it is my honour to present a petition from hundreds of my constituents. The petition is a demand for respect for the right of small-scale farmers, family farmers, to preserve, exchange, and use seeds. The petitioners seek the House of Commons' support in adopting international aid policies that support small family farmers, especially women, and recognize their vital role in the fight against hunger and poverty. They want Canadian policies to reflect that.

[Translation]

#### MINING INDUSTRY

**Mr. Jamie Nicholls (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present three petitions from my constituents.

The first petition has to do with the creation of a corporate social responsibility ombudsman for extractive companies. These petitioners think that Canada should be a leader in promoting the social responsibility of extractive companies.

#### RAIL SAFETY

**Mr. Jamie Nicholls (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the two other petitions have to do with rail safety. My constituents are increasingly concerned about the transportation of dangerous goods through Vaudreuil—Soulanges. They want the government to take action and adopt policies that will protect people in my region.

[English]

#### DEMENTIA

**Mr. Craig Scott (Toronto—Danforth, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from several hundred people from the greater Toronto area calling for support for Bill C-356, an act respecting a National

#### Government Orders

Strategy for Dementia, which has been introduced by our colleague, the member for Nickel Belt.

#### PUBLIC TRANSIT

**Mr. Matthew Kellway (Beaches—East York, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today with a petition to implement a national public transit strategy.

The signatories to the petition note that Canada is the only OECD country that does not have a national public transit strategy and that it is estimated that over the next five years there will be an \$18 billion gap in transit infrastructure needs.

The signatories to the petition call upon the House to enact a national public transit strategy, to provide permanent investment support for public transit, and to establish accountability measures to ensure that all governments work together to increase access to public transit.

\* \* \*

#### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

#### MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### VICTIMS BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

##### BILL C-32—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

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

*Government Orders*

That in relation to Bill C-32, An Act to enact the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights and to amend certain Acts, 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 consideration of the third reading stage of the said Bill and, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders on the day allotted to the consideration of the report stage and on the day allotted to the consideration of 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.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion will provide for a ninth and tenth day of debate on this very important bill for victims.

● (1525)

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is very troubling that the government has imposed a time allocation motion for the 86th time, if my information is correct. It is particularly troubling that the government chose to move such a motion for Bill C-32 on the victims bill of rights.

The government spent a lot of time coming up with this bill, following a number of online and group consultations. It took a long time before the government introduced this bill of rights. However, the debates in the House at second reading were concluded rather quickly.

The committee thoroughly examined this bill. No underhanded tactics or anything of the sort were used to delay the process. As usual, the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights did its job as best it could with the resources provided within the allotted timeframe. The bill returned to the House, and I find that every time I hear one of my colleagues speak about this bill of rights in the House, it still gives me something more to think about.

The witnesses who appeared before the committee, both victims and victim support groups, told us that this bill requires a lot of improvement. I think that it would be a good idea for the government to hear what members have to say. Again this morning, the member for York South—Weston made me think about some specific aspects of the bill of rights. It would have been really interesting to hear her give a speech about them in the House.

Things were going well and no tactics were used to delay this bill. Why then has it suddenly become so urgent that a time allocation motion be imposed at this stage?

Is the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada not fed up with seeing his government routinely impose this sort of motion on the democratic consideration of bills?

**Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member. I really understand her perspective on this issue.

The most important thing is that she is right: there were lots of consultations. Throughout the process, we had plenty of opportunities to examine this bill. We heard from over 500 stakeholders on this issue through online consultations and in-person consultations held across Canada before the bill was drafted.

● (1530)

[English]

My friend is absolutely correct in suggesting that there has been massive input and examination, including before a parliamentary committee. I want to express my thanks to her and members of committee for delving deeply into the provisions of this legislation. It will have a profound impact on the Canadian criminal justice system, a positive impact I would suggest.

I believe she and members of her party are prepared to support this legislation. Rather than procedural wrangling, rather than dragging out the debate, which is what appears to be happening after eight days of debate on the bill, we want to move it forward in the process, including giving the Senate the opportunity to have its good input and eyes on it and then, most importantly, let us have the legislation take effect in Canada.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is important that we recognize that since the Prime Minister achieved his majority government, he has demonstrated a lack of respect for procedure in the House of Commons. He has, through the government House leader, brought in well over 80 times time allocation on a wide variety of different pieces of legislation, everything from budgets to pensions to the Canadian Wheat Board, and today it is Bill C-32.

Since achieving his majority government, the Prime Minister has brought in closure, and that is what time allocation is, more than any other government in the history of our relatively young nation. He has demonstrated clearly that he does not respect the proceedings of this chamber.

The current minister was a leadership candidate at one point and a leader of a political party. Surely to goodness he would recognize that there is value in allowing for proper procedure and thorough debate, and having a government House leader work in co-operation with other House leaders to make this chamber work more efficiently at getting the job done in a respectful way, so that democracy ultimately prevails inside the House of Commons.

**Hon. Peter MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, democracy is prevailing. Democracy is working quite well.

In addition to having led a federal party in the House, I was also a House leader of that party. I sat on the opposition benches where the hon. member finds himself today. I sat there and I sat through many House leaders' meetings where similar discussions took place.

It is a bit hypocritical, and the member is standing on shifting sands to suggest that this is somehow new procedure and practice that is being used with time allocation. Let me assure the member that his party and the Liberal government, when it was in office, were not shy of using this procedure to move legislation forward. I was here.

That is what we are trying to do. Let us be clear. This is a bill that really is non-partisan, perhaps more than any other bill I have seen, in what it would bring about in terms of the changes to our criminal justice system. Beyond the procedural wrangling, it is interesting to note that there has been indication from opposition parties of support for this legislation.

*Government Orders*

We are literally, to use the proverbial term, ragging the puck at this point. Let us move the bill forward. Let us bring this good law to the country and allow the committee to do its important work in the Senate in the way that it already has, where it had, I am told, no fewer than nine meetings. This includes the time that we have had debated here on the floor of the House.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Denis Blanchette (Louis-Hébert, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, this is the 86th time they are using measures to speed up legislation. That is not something to be proud of. The minister himself said that everything was going well. The process was going well, then all of a sudden, here we are with these urgency measures. Why is this so urgent? Why are they doing this?

Is this really a democracy if the government refuses to complete a process that, by the minister's own admission, is working well?

If everything is going so well, as he says, why the sudden urgency? Is this a new way of governing that has become the norm over the past few years under this government? Is the minister unable to see that things are going well and that we can continue to do the work properly, which is what people expect of us?

• (1535)

**Hon. Peter MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, as I said, we are certainly not the first Canadian government to use this procedure.

[*English*]

It is also evident that neither the hon. member who asked the question nor I were privy to these discussions that took place at the House leaders' meeting. However, there has been a clear indication that this bill is starting to drag. After nine appearances here in the House, and a similar number in the committee, we want to move this bill forward.

What is the urgency? The urgency is clear. If the member takes the time to read the bill, and I hope that he has, he will see that these are real improvements in our criminal justice system. The consultations that took place both inside and outside the House clearly indicate that these are positive, proactive changes that victims, in particular, have been waiting for, for decades. Those who work in the criminal justice system embrace these as positive changes.

What is the urgency? The question that I will turn around is, why would we delay further what we know would be a positive and proactive change in our criminal justice system, for which we have seen support coming from the opposition?

The short answer is that we are running out of runway. There are only a certain number of sitting days left in this Parliament. We have new legislation still being presented, like the bill with respect to terrorism. We have a budget that we have to get through.

This is a cornerstone piece of legislation, not simply for the government, but for Parliament. It is important to note and stress again that members on the opposition side say that they are supporting it, so why would we delay it?

**Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but notice the kind of hypocrisy that the government shows about this bill when it took it eight years to bring it forward. The government has been talking about this since 2006, and yet eight

days are all we get to talk about it. That is a 365:1 ratio in terms of the amount of time involved.

In addition, if we take the amount of time that we have spent debating time allocation motions, there have been 43 hours of time allocation motion debate. That is far more than the debate for this bill, which the minister himself says is very important, has had in the House.

It is hypocritical and disrespectful of this great chamber to limit the debate on something so important. I, for one, have not had an opportunity to speak. I have not had an opportunity to present my own views. There are serious flaws in this bill that I would love to be able to speak about and portray to the government, but I may not get a chance because the government has decided that the debate is almost over and that it is time to move on before we are done.

**Hon. Peter MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate and respect the opinion of the member opposite, I also hear from victims regularly, front line participants in the justice system, who are anxiously awaiting this legislation to come forward. The member was saying eight years and eight days in the House. There was also committee time, significant opportunity at committee, to hear from witnesses, from members of his party and others, to get their concerns on the record, and to put forward certain propositions and amendments. The time for talk has passed.

Eight years, he says. Yes, this bill has been a long time in the making. There were 500 participants or more who took part in the formulation of this important legislation. This is a bill that would bring about real improvements in the way our criminal justice operates, particularly vis-à-vis victims and their participation, their inclusion, their sense of respect, their right to information and their right to restitution at times. These are the types of proactive changes that many have been working for, not just for eight years but for their entire lives.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I get the sense from the minister that there is a lot of urgency in this matter going forward. In fact, numerous constituents have contacted me with regard to their concerns about restitution for victims. They do not feel included in the system and they do not feel their needs are being met.

Could the minister please share his experience? I know he has travelled right across this country meeting with victims and associations to raise these concerns.

Could he please talk about the urgency of the bill and the need to apply restitution to victims?

• (1540)

**Hon. Peter MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortune to travel to the member's province on several occasions, including as recently as this past summer. In every province and territory, I heard from victims, from front line workers, victims services, child advocacy centres, police, essentially everyone, that important adjustments had to be made.

*Government Orders*

The member references restitution. Sadly, and this is an alarming statistic that I want to have on the record, the cost of criminality in Canada today is over \$100 billion. That is a staggering figure, of which over 80% of those costs are borne by victims. That includes missed time and productivity, counselling and, of course, the costs incurred by victims themselves for damages and harm done to them as a result of criminality.

This bill, among other things, would allow victims greater access to restitution, to share the burden that they are forced to share through no fault of their own. One of the important parts of this bill is to buttress our current system of restitution. We are doing so in large consultation with provinces and territories, so that this will happen. We now have in place a victims ombudsman, another innovative part of the package of the solution coming from this government.

We intend to see this bill and other legislation that we are working on currently, some of which is still before the House, that is designed specifically to help victims and their feeling of respect and inclusion in our justice system.

**Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would be interested to know exactly how this is going to improve the lives on a financial basis for the many victims. I have a constituent who was the victim of a random shooting, a young mother, who was left paralyzed from the neck down. There was very little out there to help her and her family move forward.

I would like to hear from the minister just exactly how this recent legislation is going to benefit people like her.

**Hon. Peter MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, this is a shared responsibility. Surely the member, who herself was on the government benches for many years, is not going to suggest that somehow one government or one government agency is going to take full responsibility for this. It is really a tragic situation that she has described.

Within this particular legislation, there are very serious efforts now to bring about greater accountability at the provincial level, to have compensation for victims of crime, to have funds that are aimed at helping with counselling in some cases because the type of traumatic injury she is describing goes beyond just the physical injury.

The efforts here to bring about the type of restitution that would ever fully compensate somebody who has lost ambulatory skills or the ability to restore them to full health, there is no amount of money in the world that can do that.

This bill is not aimed at just one element of victims restitution, but also their inclusion, their right to information, their right to consultation with prosecutors, police and participants in the justice system, throughout the entire experience, from the time that the crime occurs until the final resolution or meting out of a sentence and then even through the parole process.

This bill would go a long way to help assist and offset costs of crime but also to support victims throughout their entire and, most often, unfortunate experiences in the justice system.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for my Conservative colleague. Of course, the current government cannot remain in power for decades on end.

Once the next government is in place, when he and his colleagues are in opposition, and the government, regardless of which party is in power, moves time allocation motions, gag orders, will he applaud that government for using them repeatedly, when it is not his own party?

● (1545)

**Hon. Peter MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, if a future government uses the procedures and processes needed to move bills forward, I will say that sometimes that is unfortunately necessary.

[*English*]

I am not sure I fully understood the member's question. These are quasi-constitutional powers that would be found within the bill. If the member is suggesting that some future government may in fact try to change, alter, or revoke some of this legislation, I frankly would be surprised if that would be the case, but nothing is beyond the realm of possibility, I suppose.

I want to take a moment to come back to the issue of restitution. So far as restitution goes, there will be new enforceability mechanisms. There will be a new ability for the victims, through the offices, in some cases, of either provincial or federal ombudsmen to seek out civil remedies. That is, they could have judgments placed against the perpetrators, the people responsible for the injury or the loss. It is also incorporated in the bill to bring about greater restitution and greater enforcement in terms of recovery of loss.

**Hon. Mike Lake (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, a couple of New Democrats have talked rather hypocritically about how long it takes to get legislation through the House. It is kind of interesting hearing them talk about how long it takes to get legislation through the House, when time after time they obstruct and delay, on a regular basis, the government's measures on free trade, on safety and security, on criminal justice, and on the economic action plan for this country.

The reality is that the opposition parties, the NDP in this case, particularly, are ideologically opposed to free trade. They are ideologically opposed to the security measures and finding that balance between freedom and security that were taken. They are ideologically opposed to holding those who commit crimes to account. They are ideologically opposed to lower taxes. Therefore, they obstruct and delay at every turn.

I want to ask the minister the following question: When it comes to this piece of legislation in particular, why is it so important that we move this legislation forward, that we make sure we get this legislation passed through the House and the Senate before the next election?

**Hon. Peter MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, my friend from Edmonton is no stranger to the importance of having legislation that protects our citizens, that does more and goes further for victims, and that is, in fact, the short answer.

*Government Orders*

This legislation will incorporate into one federal statute real, entrenched protections for victims. For the first time, there will be a place where victims can go to seek direction, advice, and support for their rights, not the rights of the criminal but the rights of the individual who has been harmed. They can go to seek support, to seek, in some cases, enforcement of restitution orders, and to seek the ability to seek information, something that should be basic.

Make no mistake about it. This does not aim to criticize or highlight shortcomings of the individuals working hard every day to support our victims, to support those who have suffered at the hands of criminals. This is simply to bring about a standardized approach across the country. There is the old saying about a higher tide elevating all boats. That is what we are attempting to do here. We are trying to bring about a greater experience for those who, sadly, find themselves drawn into the criminal justice system because they have been victims.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to oppose the use of time allocation. Members of Parliament in positions such as mine, those of us who are members of parties with fewer than 12 MPs, or independents, rarely have an opportunity to participate in the debates in this place.

I was hopeful that today I would be able to speak to the bill. I support much of it. However, the Minister of Justice just mentioned that we do have an ombudsman dealing with victims of crime. I applaud the government for creating that position, but the ombudsman for victims of crime, Sue O'Sullivan, herself has had many suggestions that were not taken up in the bill. I have attempted to push them forward in amendments. I would like to speak to them again in this place. However, time allocation is a hammer that comes down all too often on democracy, and it makes a mockery of Parliament.

I would ask the Minister of Justice to allow us time to bring forward the changes that would make the bill better.

**Hon. Peter MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the hon. member was here when the House leader rose and suggested that there would be two more days of debate. There will be an opportunity to call witnesses in the Senate, including the current victims ombudsman, Sue O'Sullivan, if she chooses.

This effort to now move the bill forward was brought about because of clear indications from members on the opposite side that they were going to continue to drag out the debate, to put up speakers and bring out further speakers and simply go over the same debate over and over. We have seen time and again when members have come in and in some cases have read the same speeches verbatim that other members of their party have already put on the record. We have seen that happen on a number of occasions with other legislation.

This particular bill, I would suggest again, for emphasis, is of such importance and of such a pressing nature that we need to have this legislation move forward, and most importantly, become law, to protect Canadian victims and enhance their rights and entrench those rights in law once and for all.

• (1550)

**Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I had to rise to correct some egregious misinformation

coming from the other side. The fact, as the member for Gatineau pointed out at the beginning, is that this is the 86th time the current government has used time allocation and closure. There is no precedent in the history of the Canadian Parliament of a government that is so willing to use its procedural weapons to shut down debate.

The fact is that there have been three and a half hours of debate at this stage. The other fact is that the opposition parties presented dozens of amendments to try to improve the bill, and the Conservatives shot down every single one. They are not looking to improve the bill. They are not looking to do anything other than score political points.

The reality is that we have now seen under time allocation half a dozen bills rejected by the courts after the Conservatives rammed them through Parliament. It is not even good law-making when they have bills that are basically product recalls, that are rejected by the courts because the Conservatives did not get them right in the first place.

My question is very simple. Why have the Conservatives rejected every single amendment brought forward by the opposition to improve the bill? Why are the Conservatives risking having yet another bill rejected by the courts because they are not allowing appropriate parliamentary scrutiny?

**Hon. Peter MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is no stranger to hyperbole. The fact is that there have been 18 speakers. Almost one-quarter of the members of the NDP caucus have spoken to this bill. This is in addition to the time at committee.

As the member will know, and as the Speaker is certainly aware, the Minister of Justice does not direct how the business of committee is done in terms of amendments. We know that this legislation received unprecedented input from front-line participants in our justice system, and most importantly, from some of the biggest and best experts we have in the field; that is, victims themselves and some of their advocates, including people like Priscilla de Villiers, Sharon Rosenfeldt, Scott Newark, and others who have been working with victims almost their entire working careers.

Again, this is a piece of legislation that has had tremendous scrutiny already at this point, not to mention the fact that Department of Justice lawyers, as they do in every case, with every amendment and with every piece of legislation that comes forward, examined it for constitutionality and charter compliance. We are confident in the bill. We have had tremendous input from across the country, from every province and territory. Many experts, including parliamentarians now, have had the opportunity to look at this bill. It is time to move it forward.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Mr. Speaker, to continue in the same vein as my colleague from Burnaby—New Westminster, the minister is referring to some important points that are not entirely accurate.

*Government Orders*

One of the important points that came out of the committee study, I think, is that it is probably the provinces that will have to enforce the victims bill of rights, about 90% or 95% of the time. I think the minister would agree with that statement. However, the provinces did not seem to be very interested in the minister's proposal. Furthermore, those that were interested said they needed some time to study it properly.

Considering the government's time allocation motion, I cannot help but think that it is not actually listening at all. The minister said that some speeches are repeated, but really, we are simply trying to make important points here in the House. There are still many important points to make, but this does not have to drag things out forever. We simply want to point out some things that perhaps the minister did not think of, or certain things that might have been dismissed too easily because they were expected to just fall into place.

That is the shortcoming of a time allocation motion. This is the 86th such motion. The Conservatives are preventing in-depth debate, which does not take place to annoy people but rather to try to improve the legislation, which ought to be our main duty.

• (1555)

**Hon. Peter MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, once again, that is why we have a process to examine new bills. For parliamentarians, it is an opportunity to study and comment on them.

[*English*]

We are talking about a bill, as we know, that has a history. It has already seen tremendous input and has had many eyes on it.

As far as provincial and territorial input, I am sure the member for Gatineau is aware that this particular legislation has been called for by provincial attorneys general and justice ministers for some time now. We have had numerous occasions to meet face to face with our provincial and territorial counterparts, and they are excited about this bill.

Yes, of course provincial and territorial administrations of justice will have a great deal to do with the implementation of these provisions, and that is why we have been in constant contact and consultation with them throughout. We have already put in place budgetary allocations of \$120 million to support victims and the victims ombudsman. We will work more closely with the provinces that already have victims ombudsmen as well, which is the case for the majority of the provinces and territories.

This bill will be a cornerstone, and I suggest that it will be transformative in the way victims are treated by our justice system, from start to finish in the process. That is why there is urgency. That is why we want this bill to now move forward and form part of Canadian law.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton):** It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put 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.

• (1635)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 321*)

## YEAS

## Members

Ablonczy	Adler
Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambler	Anderson
Armstrong	Aspin
Barlow	Bateman
Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Bezan
Block	Boughen
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Bruinooge	Butt
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Chisu
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	Gosal
Gourde	Grewal
Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Lebel
Leef	Leitch
Lemieux	Leung
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Maguire	Mayes
McLeod	Menegakis
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)

*Government Orders*

Moore (Fundy Royal)  
Oliver  
Opitz  
Paradis  
Perkins  
Preston  
Rajotte  
Rempel  
Saxton  
Seeback  
Shipley  
Smith  
Sorenson  
Tilson  
Trost  
Truppe  
Valcourt  
Van Loan  
Warawa  
Watson  
Sky Country  
Weston (Saint John)  
Williamson  
Woodworth  
Young (Oakville)  
Yurdiga — 141

Norlock  
O'Neill Gordon  
O'Toole  
Payne  
Poilievre  
Raitt  
Reid  
Richards  
Schellenberger  
Shea  
Shory  
Sopuck  
Strahl  
Toet  
Trottier  
Uppal  
Van Kesteren  
Wallace  
Warkentin  
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to  
Wilks  
Wong  
Yelich  
Young (Vancouver South)

Sims (Newton—North Delta)  
St-Denis  
Stoffer  
Toone  
Turmel  
Vaughan — 115  
Sitsabaiesan  
Stewart  
Sullivan  
Tremblay  
Valeriote

PAIRED

Nil

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

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

[*Translation*]

It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, International Trade; and the hon. member for Trinity—Spadina, Infrastructure.

● (1640)

[*English*]

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from December 11, 2014, consideration of Bill C-32, An Act to enact the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights and to amend certain Acts as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

**Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to speak at report stage today in support of Bill C-32, the victims bill of rights act. This bill would change how victims are to be treated by the criminal justice and correction systems in Canada. It acknowledges their suffering and recognizes that they too have rights that must be respected.

The Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights heard testimony from numerous witnesses who described the importance of this legislation. Many shared their own difficult stories of victimization and expressed their appreciation for the changes that the Canadian victims bill of rights would bring to other victims who will follow.

The committee also heard from those who provide victims with much needed services. They too offered their support for the bill, explaining that the rights contained in the Canadian victims bill of rights and the accompanying amendments to the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act would improve the experiences of victims.

The victims bill of rights presents a completely new approach for victims of crime in Canada. There have been many questions about how the bill would actually work and how it would be implemented. This is understandable given its transformative nature.

I would like to take the opportunity today to address three issues that were the subject of discussions at the standing committee: the definition of victim, the steps that we will take to ensure awareness of the rights created in Bill C-32, and the enforceability of those rights.

## NAYS

Members

Andrews  
Atamanenko  
Ayala  
Bellavance  
Bevington  
Blanchette-Lamothe  
Boulerice  
Brahmi  
Byrne  
Casey  
Charlton  
Chisholm  
Christopherson  
Comartin  
Crowder  
Cuzner  
Davies (Vancouver East)  
Dewar  
Dionne Labelle  
Dubé  
Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
Dusseault  
Eyking  
Freeman  
Garneau  
Giguère  
Grogulé  
Harris (St. John's East)  
Hughes  
Julian  
Lamoureux  
Laverdière  
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)  
Liu  
Marston  
Mathysen  
McCallum  
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)  
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)  
Mourani  
Murray  
Nash  
Nunez-Melo  
Papillon  
Péclet  
Pilon  
Rankin  
Ravignat  
Regan  
Sandhu  
Scott  
Sgro  
sor)

Angus  
Aubin  
Bélanger  
Bennett  
Blanchette  
Boivin  
Boutin-Sweet  
Brisson  
Caron  
Cash  
Chicoine  
Choquette  
Cleary  
Côté  
Cullen  
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)  
Day  
Dion  
Doré Lefebvre  
Dubourg  
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)  
Easter  
Freeland  
Fry  
Garrison  
Godin  
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)  
Hsu  
Hyer  
Kellway  
Latendresse  
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)  
Leslie  
Mai  
Masse  
May  
McGuinty  
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)  
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)  
Mulcair  
Nantel  
Nicholls  
Pacetti  
Patry  
Perreault  
Rafferty  
Rathgeber  
Raynault  
Rousseau  
Scarpaleggia  
Sellah  
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-

*Government Orders*

Regarding the definition of a victim in Bill C-32, the committee heard from witnesses who felt that the definition was overly broad, as well as those who felt that it was not sufficiently inclusive. Concern has been expressed about how a definition of victim in federal legislation would co-exist with the definitions of victim found in provincial and territorial victim legislation. We also heard questions about why the bill contains more than one definition of victim and what each purports to do.

As members will know, Bill C-32 includes the new Canadian victims bill of rights and proposes amendments to four federal statutes. The Canadian victims bill of rights portion of Bill C-32 includes a broad definition of victim. This definition recognizes the various kinds of harm that an individual may suffer as a result of an offence, even if the offence were not committed against him or her personally. The definition acknowledges that individuals other than the direct victim can be victims of an offence. All the rights included in the Canadian victims bill of rights can be exercised by a direct victim, as well as others who have suffered harm, such as family members.

The bill would also amend the definition of victim in the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act to ensure that those definitions align with the definition of victim in the Canadian victims bill of rights.

The first part of the proposed definition in the Criminal Code recognizes the same forms of harm that a victim of an offence may suffer as the Canadian victims bill of rights does. Under this part of the definition, only a person who has had an offence committed against him or her is a victim for the purposes of most Criminal Code provisions.

The second part of the Criminal Code definition includes individuals other than the direct victim for the purposes of certain Criminal Code provisions, including the victim impact statement provisions. This is consistent with established case law that recognizes secondary victims for the purpose of these provisions.

The Canadian victims bill of rights would not apply to Canadians who are victims of offences committed outside of Canada, over which Canada is not exerting extraterritorial jurisdiction. This is because the rights under the Canadian victims bill of rights all relate to the various stages of the Canadian criminal justice process, from the investigation and prosecution of an offence through to the conditional release process. For example, a victim's right to present a victim impact statement, to have a court consider making a restitution order against an offender, or to request information about an offender can only apply to offences processed through the Canadian criminal and corrections system. It is not possible for Canada to extend those rights to people or to criminal justice processes within another country's jurisdiction.

We have also heard concerns about differences between the definition of victim proposed in the Canadian victims bill of rights and those found in provincial and territorial legislation. Each province and territory has enacted its own victims of crime legislation with its own definition of victim. Some provinces and territories have multiple definitions for various purposes, such as eligibility for specific services or financial benefits programs. I note that this problem of various definitions of victim did not arise with

Bill C-32 but is a result of the evolution of victims services in each jurisdiction.

• (1645)

It is simply not possible to have one definition of victim at the federal level that would incorporate absolutely all the different definitions of victim that exist at the provincial and territorial levels. Rather, the bill seeks to create a definition that is inclusive and that recognizes all the different forms of harm that victims may suffer as a result of an offence. These include physical or emotional harm, property damage, and economic loss. Most provincial and territorial definitions include similar elements in their definitions.

I will now turn to the issue of ensuring that victims are able to exercise their rights under the act.

The justice committee heard from witnesses who questioned how victims would be made aware of their new rights under the act. This is a very fair question. All the rights in the world will not benefit victims if they do not know about them.

A Government of Canada website will be developed making information on the Canadian victims bill of rights available to all Canadians. During last year's consultations, numerous stakeholders stressed the importance of a one-stop shop for victims to access information. The Government of Canada website will meet that need.

The committee also heard from several aboriginal groups that are concerned that aboriginal victims would not be able to exercise their rights in the same way as other victims. They noted the disproportionate impact of factors such as poverty, marginalization, and lack of safe housing for aboriginal victims and explained that they would therefore need extra support in order to fully exercise their rights in a Canadian victims bill of rights.

The government recognizes that every victim is different and has different needs. That is why budget 2014 committed to providing funding to the provinces and territories to assist with the implementation of the bill. The government recognizes that the provinces and territories will play a crucial role in the effective implementation of the bill and has been working with them through various fora—such as the meetings of the federal, provincial, and territorial ministers responsible for justice and public safety—to address the implementation issues.

We need to continue to work with our provincial and territorial partners to ensure that the Canadian victims bill of rights brings about the changes in the criminal justice and corrections systems that we have promised victims.

I will turn now to the issue of enforceability.

Some have criticized Bill C-32 as nothing more than a statement of principle because they believe the enshrined rights to be unenforceable. This is simply not true.

*Government Orders*

The victims bill of rights includes a remedial scheme to address an infringement or denial of a victim's rights under the act. This is what distinguishes Bill C-32 from many provincial or territorial victims acts that have been found to be just statements of principle. Under Bill C-32, every federal department, agency, or body involved in the criminal justice system would be required to have a complaints mechanism in place that would review complaints and make recommendations to remedy any infringement or denial of a victim's rights under the act, and they would be required to inform victims of those recommendations. If victims were not satisfied with the recommendations made by the department, agency, or body, they could then raise the issue with an oversight agency where one exists, such as the RCMP public complaints commission. If no oversight body exists for a particular department, agency, or body, a victim could seek the assistance of the Office of the Federal Ombudsman for Victims of Crime, whose mandate includes reviewing concerns regarding noncompliance with legislation or established policies.

Complaints regarding a provincial or territorial agency, including police, the crown, or victim services, would be addressed in accordance with the applicable provincial or territorial legislation. In order to improve the remedies available to victims, the government will provide a limited amount of funding through the victims fund for provinces and territories to enhance or establish complaint bodies for victims of crime.

I hope members of all parties will join me in supporting the victims bill of rights to ensure that victims of crime in Canada receive the recognition and protection that they deserve.

**Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciated hearing from the member opposite. I wonder why the government decided not to entertain some of the fairly important and well-meaning amendments that were presented by our caucus at committee stage, particularly as they related, in a couple of instances, to clauses requiring the victim to make a request in order to receive certain important information.

The wording says that the victim has to request it. We tried to change it to say that the victim has the right to receive this information. I wonder why the government did not see fit to make some of those important changes, recognizing that victims do have the right to this information. If they do not receive the education on what their rights are, then they will not be able to request this important information.

• (1650)

**Mr. James Bezan:** Mr. Speaker, the committee also heard from prosecutors that they would be overburdened with all the requests.

I would also point out that the Canadian victims bill of rights would enshrine a victim's right to receive, on request, general information. That is information regarding the criminal justice system and the role for victims. It would also make sure they were informed about the available victim services and programs, including the restorative justice programs. They would also have the right to make a complaint if they felt their rights had been infringed upon.

There is a lot of information-sharing. There would notification about release of the offender if the offender was being conditionally released. There are a lot of great opportunities here.

I know the NDP brought forward ideas, but we also wanted to make sure we kept a very strong bill, one that was not watered down. We wanted to make sure the bill spoke to the issues that were brought forward to the committee as well as during the consultation process when the bill was drafted by the department. Victims were telling us right across the country in our consultations that this is what they wanted to see in the bill.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague make reference to passing a bill that is not watered down. I noticed something when I read the bill. Bill C-32 states that victims may have access to a complaints mechanism, but it does not set out a specific amount for that and no compensation amount is mentioned.

In fact, I wonder how the complaints process will be effective and could satisfy the requests made by the victims.

[*English*]

**Mr. James Bezan:** Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the member listened closely to my speech, because in it I talked about how that was an issue that came forward. We made sure in budget 2014 that there was funding available to the provinces to ensure that there was a mechanism for complaints at the provincial level.

We also enshrined the complaint process in federal departments. In the case that there is not a complaint process in place, we have the victims ombudsman to ensure that victims' rights are protected and are being enforced by the various government agencies at the federal, provincial, and territorial levels.

**Mr. Robert Chisholm:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity because I am not on the committee and did not have an opportunity to follow the bill at that stage. However, I am interested in the issue. I will explain my support for this issue when I get up to speak in a moment, but I do have a question.

There is no question that in many ways this is a framework document that frames the rights of victims across the country, but a lot of the commensurate responsibilities and costs are going to be devolved to the provinces. The provinces will have to step up as a result of a number of these provisions.

I know that at least in one case, if not in others, Attorneys General have asked for some time to be set aside for implementation. In one case it was six months, and we introduced an amendment at committee to give those provincial jurisdictions the opportunity to get ready for the impact of the bill when it comes into effect.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. James Bezan:** Mr. Speaker, they have had the dialogue already through the federal-provincial-territorial ministers meetings. The justice committee did ask the Attorneys General from across Canada to appear, and only one province did appear. The overwhelming message from that province, as well as all justice ministers across the country, was that they have no problem with this legislation or with making sure the services are in place and are provided for victims.

I also want to say that the reason I am so interested in this is that I have had the opportunity to talk to victims of crime, such as Sharon Rosenfeldt, whom I have dealt with in the past. Her son was brutalized and murdered by Clifford Olson. We want to make sure that these types of families do not have to go through the same horror that she and her husband experienced attending these ongoing Parole Board hearings. They never received any restitution and never had their rights respected. We want to stand up for families such as hers and for others in the future as well.

● (1655)

**Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to rise and speak to this bill. As I indicated, I think this is an important bill and an important step forward.

It is interesting that one of the thoughts provided for me in notes provided by members of our caucus is that Bill C-32 would codify long-used practices related to such things as keeping victims informed of the status of prosecution, ensuring that protection and security are available for the victims, and allowing victims to participate in sentencing and parole hearings. It would turn them into rights. What was particularly important for me was the reference that it would involve codifying long-used practices, and I will tell members why.

In 1989, my wife was hired by the Government of Nova Scotia to help set up a victim services division within the Department of Justice. It was to be built up from scratch, along with the systems to facilitate programs that would exist from one end of the province to the other, as a recognition that victims had an important role to play within the system and that they needed to be provided with the support and, in some cases, the resources and education to make sure that their rights were recognized and upheld.

Those were the early days of the rights of victims being increasingly recognized within the judicial system and process in Canada. In those days, certainly in Nova Scotia, I recall that it was often a question of finding room for victims separate from the accused within the court. It was a question of finding specific spots that victims could call their own, places they could go to be separate from the accused and receive support from justice officials at that time. That was often how basic it was in those beginning stages of trying to ensure that those services were available. We have come some distance, and that is only a good thing.

The bill would further extend a number of rights to victims and their family members. They or a spouse, dependant, or guardian mandated to act on their behalf would be able to demand to be informed about the resources available to them in the criminal justice system. They could also request information on the status of an investigation and prosecution, make a victim impact statement, apply

for a publication ban in cases involving young victims, obtain information about the convicted parties, and gain restitution from the convicted.

As I said, this is an important initial step by the federal government to establish this framework, this charter, to clearly indicate the rights of victims and the responsibility of the justice system to recognize those rights.

Why is this bill important? It recognizes the impact that crimes can have on individuals, their families, and their communities, and it would give them better access to information, tools, and services.

The parliamentary secretary spoke to that particular point when he was up earlier. He talked about how important and urgent he thinks it is, and he named some victims. We all, in our constituencies, have dealt with families and victims of crime. We have all seen the damage that can be done through the criminal justice system.

● (1700)

That is one reason why I was so disappointed the government brought forward time allocation on this bill. It has only been in the House for three hours up to this point, and it is being limited. I think we may end up dealing with this for a total of eight hours. There are a lot of members on all sides of the House who want to speak to how important the bill is to victims in their constituencies, to families and others who have been involved in these issues and are pleased to see Parliament moving forward on this. I am pleased to see this moving forward in the House, but disappointed that it has taken eight years for it to get to this stage.

The government clearly has been dragging its feet. Some would say, especially those on the other side, that it has taken so long because the government has been consulting. Surely, when we finally have legislation in this place, all members of the House who have been duly elected by their constituents, whether in they are in a recognized party or not, should have an opportunity to participate and provide the feedback they have received from their communities and the people in their constituencies.

We want victims to have access to the services and supports they need. We recognize that for many victims getting assurance that they can participate in sentencing and parole hearings and being informed of the status of a prosecution are very important steps. However, we want the government to provide real support and processes that will work.

That brings me to another disappointment I have with the bill. I have not heard the government enunciate that the bill it is bringing in feels in many ways a bit like a policy document. It is setting a framework with respect to how things should happen in the criminal justice system, the rights and the roles of victims and their families, when a lot of that would happen at the provincial government level, as it does now. The government is not providing the resources along with those added roles and responsibilities. We have seen this in some of the other legislation that has come forward, where the government has said that this will be, that this will happen, and who shall do the following, yet the provincial governments have ended up picking up much of the responsibility.

*Government Orders*

We just heard that the government cut its disaster relief to the provinces. There used to be a \$1 million eligibility threshold for disaster relief. It is now \$3 million. That may not seem like a big deal, but over the past 15 years, my home province of Nova Scotia has made 15 applications under the disaster relief plan that previously existed with the \$1 million threshold. The new \$3 million threshold would have meant that 14 of those applications would not have been eligible and that upwards of \$20 million would need to borne by the province and the communities, many of which are small communities.

I am just illustrating my point about how the government tends to download roles and responsibilities to the provincial government without taking into account the attendant costs.

There will be, and there should be, an expectation that victims will receive the support that is clearly spelled out in the bill. They will demand them and the provinces will have to step up. That is not a bad thing, but in many cases there will be some financial responsibilities.

• (1705)

I am glad this bill has come forward. I support it. It is a good move. I wish the government would have allowed more fulsome debate on it so we could all tell stories from our individual constituencies, but it is a step in the right direction. We will have to ensure that in future Parliaments we are able to correct the existing weaknesses.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Denis Blanchette (Louis-Hébert, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

He said that, yes, we have a bill of rights, but it also needs the commensurate resources to accomplish anything. Knowing this government, we might see good intentions, but no real measures to achieve the desired goal.

I would like my colleague to talk to us about the need to add resources immediately to ensure that the spirit of the bill of rights is respected and that people can truly benefit from it.

[*English*]

**Mr. Robert Chisholm:** Mr. Speaker, my colleague is right. It is all well and good to lay out the principle and to give direction that one shall do this or do that. I am providing the context in this case of a lower level government, but without the commensurate resources. What is in fact being accomplished, other than raising the expectations perhaps of people who, in this case, deserve to be treated better? That is one of my concerns.

Nonetheless, it will not prevent me from supporting the legislation. It is a weakness, though, that will have to be addressed later on down the road.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my New Democrat colleague for his excellent speech.

Something is bothering me about today's debate. The Conservatives accuse us of not being on the victims' side. I find that very offensive, since the NDP has always supported victims' rights. Obviously, being the victim of a crime is a terrible thing. My

thoughts go out to victims and their families, who go through very tough times and sometimes even struggle to make it through.

I also know that my New Democrat colleague has spoken a number of times in the House on behalf of the families of victims, lobbying the government to pass bills that protect victims. Unfortunately his own bill was rejected by the Conservatives.

Could my colleague talk more about the Conservatives' doublespeak? They choose the type of assistance they want to give victims, yet refuse to implement good solutions suggested by the New Democrat opposition.

[*English*]

**Mr. Robert Chisholm:** Mr. Speaker, that is a good point, but we will fix that in the election in 2015. The New Democratic Party will form government in our country, and we will not only correct the most egregious parts of the agenda of the members opposite, but will bring in our vision, the vision that has been articulated by the leader of my party, the MP for Outremont, who is so clearly leading the strongest opposition that has ever been seen in our country and in Parliament.

• (1710)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Hélène LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his speech and for having always defended victims.

I would like to talk about how the debate on the bill currently before the House is once again being shut down. The official opposition is prepared to debate this bill and to talk about the importance of giving victims a voice. However, we are once again dealing with closure.

I would like my colleague to comment on this measure that the Conservatives keep using, namely imposing closure on bills that they themselves introduce in the House.

[*English*]

**Mr. Robert Chisholm:** Mr. Speaker, my colleague is absolutely right, and I said this in my remarks earlier.

It does not matter if we support this legislation, and we have indicated that, but it does not mean that we have to ram it through. When legislation comes to this place, it is our opportunity to bring the perspectives of our constituents forward, to address it, comment on it, to share our stories and those experiences, and to raise what we think are the strengths and weaknesses of particular legislation. Just because we support a bill does not mean that it should be rammed through the House. Likewise, if we have concerns about particular legislation, it should not be rammed through the House.

How many times has there been time allocation? It is in the eighties, and that is very bad. It is bad government.

**Mr. Mark Adler (York Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the report stage of debate on Bill C-32, the victims bill of rights Act, which will build upon the government's continuing efforts to protect Canadians and communities.

*Government Orders*

I would like to focus my remarks on two areas specifically. First, how the bill complements and builds upon current policies, legislation and practices for victims of crime; and second, how the bill assists victims of crime to deal with the financial impact of victimization.

The past 30 years have seen many important advances for victims of crime. Victim-serving organizations and various levels of government have contributed tremendously to making a substantive change for victims of crime in this country.

An important milestone in our country's work for victims of crime was the endorsement in 1988 and 2003, by federal-provincial-territorial ministers responsible for justice, of the Canadian statement of basic principles of justice for victims of crime, which recognizes victims' interests and promotes, at a national level, fair treatment of victims in our criminal justice system.

The Canadian victims bill of rights will complement the solid foundation set out in the Canadian statement and will go one step further by entrenching rights of victims into a single, federal law.

The Canadian statement has guided and informed the development of policies, legislation and practices for victims of crime across Canada. Each province and territory has developed victims services and legislation unique to their provincial and territorial reality. Provincial and territorial legislation for victims of crime in some cases includes provisions worded as rights, such as the right to information, to consideration of personal safety and to respectful treatment.

Bill C-32 will not impede existing provincial and territorial legislation but rather complement it. This is important. The bill reflects provincial and territorial input received from a variety of processes, including the public consultations and ongoing discussions with the provinces and territories. It is also informed by best practices from provincial and territorial victim legislation and programs. It has been carefully crafted to deliver on the government's objective of transformational change for victims of crime, while respecting constitutional divisions of power.

This respect for federal and provincial jurisdiction is reiterated in the preamble to Bill C-32, which explicitly recognizes that criminal justice is a shared responsibility between the federal, provincial and territorial governments.

In addition, Bill C-32 also balances the rights of victims of crime with other fundamental interests in the criminal justice system, such as the need not to interfere with prosecutorial independence or police discretion.

Section 20 of the bill specifies that rights must be applied in a manner that is reasonable in the circumstances and not likely to endanger life or safety, interfere with police or prosecutorial discretion or compromise an investigation or prosecution.

During the consultations held in 2013, the government heard clearly from stakeholders about the importance of these principles. Many stakeholders, including provinces and territories and criminal justice professionals, argued that these principles underpin the effectiveness and efficiency of the criminal justice system.

We all recognize this, so I am pleased to see that Bill C-32 provides rights granted to victims that must be interpreted and applied in a reasonable way and with regard to these principles.

I would now like to pay particular attention to the rights and amendments relating to restitution. Many victims expressed concerns over the financial burden of crime and these provisions have been designed to address these concerns.

A disproportionate percentage of all costs related to crime are borne by victims. Numerous submissions addressed the financial impact of crime on victims, including concerns about loss of income as a result of the crime and an inability to work out-of-pocket expenses related to criminal proceedings and additional costs that were borne by victims. In some cases, these expenses placed people in situations of serious financial hardship.

The Canadian victims bill of rights aims to address this imbalance and relieve some of the financial burden of crime from victims.

● (1715)

The bill clearly indicates that every victim has the right to have the court consider making a restitution order against the offender and, when not paid, the right to enforce the order as a civil judgment. These amendments acknowledge the harm done to victims and promote a sense of responsibility in offenders. The bill would make a number of amendments to the restitution regime in the Criminal Code to ensure that the existing legislative framework properly supports these rights.

Under the current restitution regime, victims have expressed frustration over collecting the amounts that have been ordered to them. Furthermore, the amount of moneys ordered consistently exceeds the amount of moneys collected. Victims' confidence in the criminal justice system is undermined when restitution orders are not paid.

The Canadian victims bill of rights would amend the Criminal Code to direct that judges must consider ordering restitution as a part of an appropriate sentence in all cases. Before a decision is made on restitution, the court would be required to inquire with the prosecutor if reasonable steps have been taken to provide the victim with an opportunity to indicate whether they are seeking restitution for losses or damages. If the court decides not to order restitution, it would be required to state the reasons for its decision into the record.

*Government Orders*

The proposed amendments would enable victims to use an optional form in the Criminal Code to assist them in calculating and describing the readily ascertainable losses and damages. A motion accepted by the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights would also amend the Criminal Code to allow a public authority responsible for enforcing a restitution order to be designated by a provincial or territorial order in council or a minister's order. This would allow for bodies to be designated more quickly and efficiently, and would help to avoid lengthy delays that may result from the proposed requirement for regulations.

At its core, this bill aims to give victims of crime a more effective voice in the criminal justice system. In the context of restitution, this would be achieved by permitting victims to speak to their ascertainable losses and damages in a victim impact statement. In determining the sentence to be imposed on an offender, the court must take this statement into account. Furthermore, the offender's financial means or inability to pay the restitution order cannot in and of itself prevent a court order from issuing the restitution order. This provision of the bill codifies decisions from various appellate courts across Canada.

The proposed reforms regarding the payment of the restitution order were built on the necessity for victims to receive reparation for their losses and damages. The bill would provide that the offender's failure to pay the restitution by the date or dates specified in the order would allow the victim to enter any amount that remains to be paid as a judgment in any civil court in Canada. This provision would provide clarity to victims and to the court about exactly when the restitution order can be deemed unpaid and properly entered as a civil judgment against the offender.

This carefully tailored restitution regime, when entrenched in criminal law, would have many benefits. It would provide victims with effective reparations and allow them to avoid lengthy civil proceedings. Equally important, these measures would ensure that offenders are accountable for the harm they have done.

This bill represents a balancing of the many interests at stake in the criminal justice process. It would also help to improve victims' experiences and assist them to deal with the financial costs of their victimization.

I would urge all members to join me in supporting the victims bill of rights act to provide victims of crime with a more effective voice in the criminal justice and corrections system.

• (1720)

**Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am going through the bill and I am a little puzzled how, in the actual provisions of the bill, the government is professing that this is a new mechanism whereby any victim of a crime can go through a procedure and participate, whether investigation or prosecution, in the course of the trial.

However, this bill only has a procedure for the federal departments or agencies to establish a complaints system and, as we all know in this place, the Criminal Code is actually investigating and prosecuting by provincial and territorial authorities. Section 26 does say that victims must go to a territorial or provincial entity if they cannot get recourse elsewhere.

Can the member tell us how exactly this law would actually enable Canadian citizens to file a complaint or participate in that case?

**Mr. Mark Adler:** Mr. Speaker, let me enlighten the member on the Constitution Act, 1982 which delineates the separation of powers between the federal government and the provincial government.

The federal government is charged with constructing the Criminal Code of Canada and the provinces are charged with implementing the Criminal Code of Canada.

The federal Parliament, by way of jurisdiction according to the Constitution Act, 1982 and before that, the British North America Act, only has jurisdiction over federal institutions.

I would refer the member to read the British North America Act, to read her history, to refer back to the Constitution Act, 1982. That should give her the right information in terms of why we here in the Parliament of Canada only have jurisdiction over federal institutions and federal organizations.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government likes to talk and to attempt to appeal to victims through legislation such as this. We, too, support and want to be there for victims of crime.

What my constituents really want to see is a proactive government that understands that the best way we can protect victims is to prevent crimes from taking place in the first place. If the government gave just as much attention to dealing with that issue as it puts on spin, we would have safer communities.

Does the member recognize that if we invest in our communities, through different types of programming, especially those that deal with youth, gangs and things of this nature, that we would be able to prevent crimes from taking place, and therefore there would be fewer victims? All of society would benefit.

The government should not only be talking about this, but it should be delivering the financial and other resources to make that happen.

**Mr. Mark Adler:** Mr. Speaker, the measure of any society is how it treats its most vulnerable. Canadians can count on this Conservative government to look after all citizens of Canada, including the most vulnerable.

The member brings up some interesting perspectives. We have funded many programs to enhance the security functions of our police, to give them more tools and more law enforcement abilities, and that party has voted against it time and time again.

The other day my wife was making a soup. This anecdote will elucidate exactly what the NDP and Liberals say here in the House, that they support this bill. My wife was making a vegetable soup and it was very thick. My eight year old boy came into the room and said, "Mom, is that a stew?" She said, "No, it is soup". He said that he was going to call it stew because it looks like stew. My wife said that he could call it whatever he wanted, but it was still soup.

*Privilege*

The victims bill of rights is exactly that. It is what it says it is. There is no hidden agenda here. There is nothing untoward here. The opposition members say they support it. We have had 500 different consultations. It has been before committee. It has been debated in this House.

Let us think of the victims who need this bill, who need this enacted into law. This is a transformative piece of legislation. Opposition members should get with the program, get on board. Let us pass this legislation and get it through the House as quickly as possible. The victims of crime here in Canada are waiting for it.

\* \* \*

● (1725)

[Translation]

**PRIVILEGE**

## ACCESS TO PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS

**Mr. François Lapointe (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a question of privilege regarding a surprising incident that occurred today on Parliament Hill.

I am of the opinion that there was a *prima facie* breach of my privileges as a member. The incident in question occurred at 2 p.m., when I was physically prevented from entering Parliament and getting to the House of Commons in a timely fashion. Here is what happened: at around 1:55 p.m. today, I took one of the parliamentary precinct shuttle buses from the Valour Building to get to question period. At around 2 p.m., the bus stopped in front of the east door of Centre Block, the Senate door. I felt it was unnecessary to ask the driver to make to another stop by the door of the House of Commons and, as I have done dozens of times since May 2011, I simply decided to enter Parliament through the door where we were stopped. Before I could even lay a hand on one of the doors to get in, an RCMP officer asked me to identify myself. I immediately and respectfully informed him, as I always do, that I am the member for Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup. The officer asked me if I had my pin. That was the first time in four years that an officer outside Parliament asked to see my MP pin.

Mr. Speaker, you will understand that I no longer wear my pin all the time because, following the events that occurred in Parliament in October, we were told not to wear our pins all the time so that we are not targeted should another tragic incident like that occur. I therefore had to apologize to the officer for not wearing my pin. He told me that I needed my pin or my pass, otherwise I could not enter the building. In an attempt to resolve this issue, I asked the officer to let me speak to one of the security guards inside the building so that he could confirm that I am in fact a member of Parliament. The officer in question then physically blocked my access to the door and said that the RCMP is now responsible for deciding who gets in, that those officers are armed and that I could not enter if I did not have my pin or my pass.

I believe that this obstruction was a breach of my parliamentary privileges. Access to the parliamentary precinct, whether it is to attend question period, vote, attend a committee meeting, give a speech or simply to listen to the debate, is a strictly protected

privilege. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the second edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* states on page 110 that:

In circumstances where Members claim to be physically obstructed, impeded, interfered with or intimidated in the performance of their parliamentary functions, the Speaker is apt to find that a *prima facie* breach of privilege has occurred.

Incidents involving physical obstruction—such as traffic barriers, security cordons and union picket lines either impeding Members' access to the Parliamentary Precinct or blocking their free movement within the precinct...have been found to be *prima facie* cases of privilege.

I would therefore ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider my question and the facts I just related. I believe you will also find that my privilege was breached and that I was prevented from carrying out my functions as an elected member of the House of Commons. If you find that there was a *prima facie* breach of my privileges as a member, I am prepared to move the appropriate motion.

● (1730)

**Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, not only was this a breach of the member's privilege, it was a violation of the law. Allow me to explain. On September 25, 2014, I was on my way to Parliament when I was stopped by the RCMP at the corner of Bank Street and the road that goes to the West Block. The same thing happened to me. That day, when I told the RCMP officer that I was an MP, he replied in English, "I don't care." I told him that there was going to be a vote in the House of Commons. He replied, "I don't care." I asked him what he would do if the vote caused Parliament to fall. He replied, "I don't care about the Parliament."

There is a fundamental problem. I would like to read this definition of parliamentary privilege:

Pursuant to parliamentary privilege, the holder has full access at all times, without obstacle or interference, to the house of Parliament the holder is a member of.

Government MPs seem to be saying that he did not have his pin. The RCMP officers outside and the security guards inside are here to keep parliamentarians safe. How likely is it that the RCMP guy outside did not know the member? His job is to know all members of Parliament as well as our House of Commons security guards do. Since the Speaker of the House ruled in my favour on September 25, a motion was moved in the House of Commons. It went to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. Now it is February 4, 2015, and we have not yet received the committee's report because they are blocking the committee's report.

We are not saying that we should have all of the rights in the world, but since the member was elected by his constituents, he has the right to enter the House of Commons at any time. The Parliament of Canada Act makes it clear that we cannot be prevented from entering.

*Privilege*

I want our colleagues to understand that the member was at the door and clearly told the RCMP officer that there were security guards just on the other side of the door who know him and the officer simply needed to verify with them. For the RCMP officer to turn around and say that they are in charge and the member cannot enter and to refuse to check with the security guards on the other side of the door constitutes a breach of the member's parliamentary privilege, and that is serious. It is very serious. We have a right to be here. The people in charge of security within the parliamentary precinct should know all members. It is a right and a privilege, and I hope you will find that there has been a violation of the Parliament of Canada Act.

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with everything my colleague just said regarding the rights of members. I just wanted to add one thing. Security for MPs has been increased, but most of the additional security officers are not bilingual. However, under the Official Languages Act, anyone responsible for security and anyone who interacts with members of Parliament or the public must be bilingual. I think it is also the Speaker's duty to verify that and ensure that the RCMP assigns bilingual personnel to control access to Parliament. Perhaps this would also help the officers to recognize members more, as the previous speaker said.

[*English*]

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take an inordinate amount of time, but I am very disappointed that we are having this dialogue in the House of Commons today, after October 22, when we saw what happened.

We do have to take responsibility for our identification. When I go through airport security, sure it is a bit of nuisance to take off my belt, my shoes, or my jacket, but these are things that protect us. Our job in this Parliament is not only to protect ourselves but to protect those who are in these buildings.

I think it is important that our RCMP officers and our security personnel on the Hill take their jobs seriously. To assume that they will recognize every one of us, regardless of how long we have been here, I think is too much to expect.

I urge all members to have ID or some way of identifying themselves before they try to enter these buildings.

• (1735)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as many members I am sure are already aware, the procedure and House affairs committee is currently dealing with this issue. It is in the midst of compiling a report to report back to the House.

All members take the issue of access to the House of Commons precinct as an important right. I would suggest that the member talk to his House leader and members of the procedure and House affairs committee over the next seven days. I understand that it is the committee's intent, at the very least, to try to come up with recommendations.

I do not know if there would be any value in initiating a separate report. Members of the committee are already looking at the subject and debating the report. We are familiar with the previous incident.

All members of the committee are concerned about having access, but we also need to be concerned about the security of the premises.

I would suggest to the member that he allow for the discussion to occur among the members of his party. They could then bring suggestions forward to the committee, which is putting forward a report that will include recommendations. It would be timely if the member could do it some time this week. We might be able to resolve it quickly, as opposed to having another Speaker's ruling on this issue.

**Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to hear the entirety of the comments by the member who raised the question of privilege regarding access, but I would like an opportunity to review them to see if there are specifics relating to this specific incident that are worthy of comment.

However, I will make this observation. There are some other important points that have been raised. All of us hold sacred the right of access and the privileges of parliamentarians in their ability to do their work without interference. Of course, after the incident of October 22, I think there was broad agreement that there was a need for efforts to strengthen security around this place.

It is important, as members of Parliament, that as we conduct and carry out our business around here, we recognize, whether we are dealing with the Senate force, the House of Commons security force, or the RCMP in the building, that they are our partners.

As members of Parliament, we all recognize that the measures that have been put in place to date are measures that have been supported by all parties. There has been a broad consensus behind the extent to which there has been enhanced security, and we should view those carrying out that important work on our behalf not as a hostile force but rather as our partners. They are doing that job for us. It is our job to try to work with them as partners to make it easy for them to do that job and to make it easy for them not to focus on us but on others who may be threats. I simply say that as a word of encouragement to all members of Parliament as we go through this process, which will be ongoing, of adjusting to new security measures.

It is obviously an adjustment for the people carrying out the security but also an adjustment, to some degree, for members, some of whom are not accustomed to, as I am not, wearing a pin and carrying an ID with me that would help me out. That sometimes means that I have to be a little patient, and I am quite happy to do that in that circumstance.

Again, I would appreciate the opportunity to come back to the House on this topic, after having reviewed the specifics, if further comment is necessary.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise particularly to respond to the description by the hon. government House leader of the state of broad consensus on new security measures. I am very concerned that the members of this place, at least in the position of the Green Party, members here for the Bloc Québécois, Forces et Démocratie, and independents, have not been consulted at all, nor has any information on any findings about security been shared.

*Privilege*

I find that the privileges of the hon. member were violated if he was not even allowed to have internal House of Commons security verify his identity, which it could have had in a moment.

I would like to believe that all members of the House, in principle, but also in practice, are equals. We all witnessed and experienced what happened on October 22. We have all formed conclusions about the ways in which security could be improved. We would very much like to have access to official reports, analysis, or anything that has been done to analyze forensically what occurred on October 22 and how it can be improved.

I very much regret that former sergeant-at-arms Kevin Vickers is not with us to steer us through the new process, because I think his wisdom would cast a lot of light on what should be done in future.

I would like to ask the government House leader, when he speaks of broad consensus, to think about those of us who have had no access to any of the information to which he refers.

• (1740)

**Mr. Ted Opitz (Etobicoke Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am rising in support of my House leader.

It behooves us all to work with our partners and to ensure that they have the ability to do their job properly to protect us.

I was stopped at the gate in a taxi the other day. The individual officer did not recognize me. I gladly produced my ID to demonstrate who I was. That is why we are issued government ID, namely to demonstrate who we are when the need arises. I was more than happy to do so. It took me less than half a moment to do it and I was on my way.

We should use some common sense in helping our security forces who try hard every day to protect us. I do not think it is too much to have on our person the instruments that we are given to demonstrate who we are.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I would advise the hon. government House leader that we only have about two and a half to three minutes before I have to end the debate on this point.

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Mr. Speaker, I want to respond briefly to the issue raised by the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands regarding briefings or information on the steps toward improved security.

I know that the Acting Sergeant-At-Arms and the head of House of Commons security are both very open and willing, and have been available, to speak with members of Parliament about measures to consult with them. I do not think I am being presumptuous in saying that they would be happy to answer any questions she might have and provide any information she might be seeking.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for South Shore—St. Margaret's. Again I would advise the member that we only have two minutes.

**Mr. Gerald Keddy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Minister of National Revenue and for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I will be quick.

This debate is about privilege and it is quite simple. With parliamentary privilege comes responsibility. We have a responsi-

bility as members of Parliament to carry our badge or ID. Most of the time, 99 times out of 100, the officials recognize us, but when they do not, we have some responsibility. Of course we have rights, but with rights come responsibilities. It is as simple as that.

**Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I will be brief.

The Conservatives are trying to defend government policy in a kind of bizarre way. They are not touching in any way the question of privilege raised by my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you will be taking under serious consideration the concerns that have been raised by the member.

Quite frankly, I hope that the government has a better thought-out intervention than simply going off politically and saying that the traditions of this place do not matter. They certainly do matter. Democratic institutions matter and we will defend them, because that is what we are all about.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Louis Plamondon:** Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to clarify that the contract of the police officers currently in the House of Commons requires them to recognize 98% of all members. RCMP officers, however, are not under the same obligation.

**The Deputy Speaker:** That concludes the debate.

I assure the member for Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup that the Speaker will consider everything and respond as soon as possible.

[*English*]

I thank all members for their interventions.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### VICTIMS BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-32, An Act to enact the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights and to amend certain Acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

**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 Motions Nos. 3 and 4. 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.

• (1745)

[*Translation*]

I declare Motion No. 1 defeated.

I therefore declare Motions Nos. 3 and 4 defeated.

(Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 4 negatived)

[*English*]

**Hon. Lynne Yelich (for the Minister of Justice)** moved that the bill be concurred in, with amendments.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

• (1825)

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

(*Division No. 322*)

**YEAS**

**Members**

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Anders	Anderson
Andrews	Angus
Armstrong	Aspin
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Barlow
Bateman	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Bevington
Bezan	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Block
Boivin	Borg
Boughen	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brisson	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinooge	Butt
Byrne	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Caron

Carrie
Cash
Chicoine
Chisu
Choquette
Clarke
Clement
Côté
Crowder
Cuzner
Davidson
Day
Devolin
Dion
Donnelly
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Easter
Eyking
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Fletcher
Freeland
Fry
Gallant
Garrison
Gill
Godin
Goldring
Goodyear
Gourde
Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes
Hoback
Hsu
Hyer
Julian
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lamoureux
Larose
Lauzon
Lebel
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leitch
Leslie
Liu
Lobb
Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)
Maguire
Marston
Mathysen
Mayes
McColeman
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Menegakis
Miller
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Mourani
Murray
Nash
Norlock
Oliver
Opitz
Pacetti
Paradis
Payne
Perkins
Pilon
Poilievre
Quach
Raitt
Rankin
Ravignat
Regan
Rempel

*Privilege*

Casey
Charlton
Chisholm
Chong
Christopherson
Cleary
Comartin
Crockatt
Cullen
Daniel
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dechert
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Dubé
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dykstra
Eglinski
Falk
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fortin
Freeman
Galipeau
Garneau
Giguère
Glover
Goguen
Goodale
Gosal
Grewal
Harper
Harris (St. John's East)
Hawn
Hillyer
Holder
Hughes
James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kellway
Kent
Komarnicki
Lake
Lapointe
Latendresse
Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leaf
Lemieux
Leung
Lizon
Lukiwski
MacAulay
MacKenzie
Mai
Masse
May
McCallum
McGuinty
McLeod
Michaud
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Nunez-Melo
O'Neill Gordon
O'Toole
Papillon
Paty
Péclet
Perreault
Plamondon
Preston
Rafferty
Rajotte
Rathgeber
Raynault
Reid
Richards

*Private Members' Business*

Rousseau	Sandhu
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Scott
Seeback	Sellah
Sgro	Shea
Shiple	Shory
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaiesan	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	St-Denis
Stewart	Stoffer
Strahl	Sullivan
Sweet	Tilson
Toet	Toone
Tremblay	Trost
Trottier	Truppe
Turmel	Uppal
Valcourt	Valeriot
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vaughan	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga — 273	

## NAYS

Nil

## PAIRED

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS***[English]***STATISTICS ACT**

The House resumed from January 29 consideration of the motion that Bill C-626, an act to amend the Statistics Act (appointment of Chief Statistician and long-form census), 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-626.

● (1835)

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

*(Division No. 323)*

## YEAS

## Members

Andrews	Angus
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Bevington	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Brisson	Byrne
Caron	Casey
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary

Comartin	Côté
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Easter	Eyking
Fortin	Freeland
Freeman	Fry
Garneau	Garrison
Giguère	Godin
Goodale	Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu	Hughes
Hyer	Julian
Kellway	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larose
Latendresse	Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leslie	Liu
MacAulay	Mai
Marston	Masse
Mathysen	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Patry	Pécelet
Perreault	Pilon
Plamondon	Quach
Rafferty	Rankin
Rathgeber	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Rousseau	Sandhu
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaiesan	St-Denis
Stewart	Stoffer
Sullivan	Toone
Tremblay	Turmel
Valeriot	Vaughan — 126

## NAYS

## Members

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

*Private Members' Business*

Gosal  
Grewal  
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)  
Hayes  
Hoback  
James  
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)  
Kent  
Komarnicki  
Lake  
Lebel  
Leitch  
Leung  
Lobb  
Lunney  
MacKenzie  
Mayes  
McLeod  
Miller  
Moore (Fundy Royal)  
Oliver  
Opitz  
Paradis  
Perkins  
Preston  
Rajotte  
Rempel  
Saxton  
Seeback  
Shipley  
Smith  
Sorenson  
Strahl  
Tilson  
Trost  
Truppe  
Valcourt  
Van Loan  
Warawa  
Watson  
Sky Country)  
Weston (Saint John)  
Williamson  
Woodworth  
Young (Oakville)  
Yurdiga— 147

Gourde  
Harper  
Hawn  
Hillyer  
Holder  
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Kerr  
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)  
Lauzon  
Leef  
Lemieux  
Lizon  
Lukiwski  
MacKay (Central Nova)  
Maguire  
McColeman  
Menegakis  
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)  
Norlock  
O'Neill Gordon  
O'Toole  
Payne  
Poilievre  
Raiitt  
Reid  
Richards  
Schellenberger  
Shea  
Shory  
Sopuck  
Stanton  
Sweet  
Toet  
Trottier  
Uppal  
Van Kesteren  
Wallace  
Warkentin  
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to  
Wilks  
Wong  
Yelich  
Young (Vancouver South)

Allison  
Anders  
Andrews  
Armstrong  
Atamanenko  
Ayala  
Bateman  
Bellavance  
Benoit  
Bernier  
Bezan  
Blanchette-Lamothe  
Boivin  
Boughen  
Boutin-Sweet  
Braid  
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)  
Brown (Barrie)  
Butt  
Calandra  
Cannan  
Caron  
Casey  
Charlton  
Chisholm  
Chong  
Christopherson  
Cleary  
Comartin  
Crockatt  
Cullen  
Daniel  
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)  
Day  
Devolin  
Dion  
Donnelly  
Dreeschen  
Dubourg  
Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
Dusseault  
Easter  
Eyking  
Fantino  
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)  
Fletcher  
Freeman  
Gallant  
Garrison  
Gill  
Godin  
Goldring  
Goodyear  
Gourde  
Groguhé  
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)  
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)  
Hayes  
Hoback  
Hsu  
Hyer  
Julian  
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Kerr  
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)  
Lamoureux  
Larose  
Lauzon  
Lebel  
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)  
Leitch  
Leslie  
Liu  
Lobb  
Lunney  
MacKay (Central Nova)  
Maguire  
Marston  
Mathysen  
Mayes  
McColeman  
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)  
Menegakis

Ambler  
Anderson  
Angus  
Aspin  
Aubin  
Barlow  
Bélanger  
Bennett  
Bergen  
Bevington  
Blanchette  
Block  
Borg  
Boulerice  
Brahmi  
Brisson  
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)  
Bruinooge  
Byrne  
Calkins  
Carmichael  
Carrie  
Cash  
Chicoine  
Chisu  
Choquette  
Clarke  
Clement  
Côté  
Crowder  
Cuzner  
Davidson  
Davies (Vancouver East)  
Dechert  
Dewar  
Dionne Labelle  
Doré Lefebvre  
Dubé  
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)  
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)  
Dykstra  
Eglinski  
Falk  
Fast  
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)  
Freeland  
Galipeau  
Garneau  
Giguère  
Glover  
Goguen  
Goodale  
Gosal  
Grewal  
Harper  
Harris (St. John's East)  
Hawn  
Hillyer  
Holder  
Hughes  
James  
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)  
Kellway  
Kent  
Komarnicki  
Lake  
Lapointe  
Latendresse  
Laverdière  
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)  
Leef  
Lemieux  
Leung  
Lizon  
Lukiwski  
MacAulay  
MacKenzie  
Mai  
Masse  
May  
McCallum  
McGuinty  
McLeod  
Michaud

## PAIRED

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion defeated.

[Translation]

\* \* \*

## CHILD POVERTY

The House resumed from January 30 consideration of the motion.

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recording division on Motion No. 534 under private members' business.

The question is on the motion.

● (1840)

[English]

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

(Division No. 324)

## YEAS

## Members

Ablonczy  
Adler  
Albas  
Alexander

Adams  
Aglukkaq  
Albrecht  
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)

*Routine Proceedings*

Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mourani	Mulcair
Murray	Nantel
Nash	Nicholls
Norlock	Nunez-Melo
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Pacetti	Papillon
Paradis	Patry
Payne	Pécelet
Perkins	Perreault
Pilon	Plamondon
Poilievre	Preston
Quach	Rafferty
Raitt	Rajotte
Rankin	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Rousseau
Sandhu	Saxton
Scarpaleggia	Schellenberger
Scott	Seeback
Sellah	Sgro
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind- sor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
St-Denis	Stewart
Stoffer	Strahl
Sullivan	Sweet
Tilson	Toet
Toone	Tremblay
Trottier	Truppe
Turmel	Uppal
Valcourt	Valeriotte
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vaughan	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga— 269	

NAYS

Members

Trost— 1

PAIRED

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

● (1845)

[English]

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The House resumed from February 3 consideration of the motion.

**The Speaker:** We will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion to concur in the 13th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights concerning the extension of time to consider Bill C-587.

**Hon. John Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, I think if you seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote on the motion

for concurrence at report stage of Bill C-32, which the members here voted on, to the current motion before the House, with the Conservative members voting yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**Ms. Nicole Turmel:** Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote and we will vote yes, with the addition of the member for Vancouver Kingsway.

[English]

**Mr. Frank Valeriotte:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply the vote and shall be voting yea.

[Translation]

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

**Mr. Jean-François Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, the members of Forces et démocratie agree to apply the vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote, and vote yea.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply my vote.

[English]

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

[Translation]

**Mr. Massimo Pacetti:** Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with proceeding in this manner. I will vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

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

[Translation]

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

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

[English]

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

(Division No. 325)

## YEAS

Members

Ablonczy  
Adler  
Albas  
Alexander  
Allison  
Anders  
Andrews  
Armstrong  
Atamanenko

Adams  
Aglukkaq  
Albrecht  
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Ambler  
Anderson  
Angus  
Aspin  
Aubin

*Routine Proceedings*

Ayala	Barlow	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Bateman	Bélangier	Mulcair	Murray
Bellavance	Bennett	Nantel	Nash
Benoit	Bergen	Nicholls	Norlock
Bernier	Bevington	Nunez-Melo	Oliver
Bezan	Blanchette	O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
Blanchette-Lamothe	Block	O'Toole	Pacetti
Boivin	Borg	Papillon	Paradis
Boughen	Boulerice	Patry	Payne
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi	Pécelet	Perkins
Braid	Breitkreuz	Perreault	Pilon
Brison	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Plamondon	Poilievre
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)	Preston	Quach
Bruinooge	Butt	Rafferty	Raitt
Byrne	Calandra	Rajotte	Rankin
Calkins	Cannan	Rathgeber	Ravignat
Carmichael	Caron	Raynault	Regan
Carrie	Casey	Reid	Rempel
Cash	Charlton	Richards	Rousseau
Chicoine	Chisholm	Sandhu	Saxton
Chisu	Chong	Scarpaleggia	Schellenberger
Choquette	Christopherson	Scott	Seeback
Clarke	Cleary	Sellah	Sgro
Clement	Comartin	Shea	Shiplee
Côté	Crockatt	Shory	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind- sor)
Crowder	Cullen	Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Cuzner	Daniel	Smith	Sopuck
Davidson	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Sorenson	Stanton
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day	St-Denis	Stewart
Dechert	Devolin	Stoffer	Strahl
Dewar	Dion	Sullivan	Sweet
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly	Tilson	Toet
Doré Lefebvre	Dreeshen	Toone	Tremblay
Dubé	Dubourg	Trost	Trotter
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Truppe	Turmel
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault	Uppal	Valcourt
Dykstra	Easter	Valeriote	Van Kesteren
Egliniski	Eyking	Van Loan	Vaughan
Falk	Fantino	Wallace	Warawa
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Warkentin	Watson
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	Williamson
Fortin	Freeland	Weston (Saint John)	Woodworth
Freeman	Fry	Wilks	Young (Oakville)
Galipeau	Gallant	Wong	Yurdiga — 274
Garneau	Garrison	Yelich	
Giguère	Gill	Young (Vancouver South)	
Glover	Godin		
Goguen	Goldring		
Goodale	Goodyear		
Gosal	Gourde		
Grewal	Groguhé		
Harper	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)		
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)		
Hawn	Hayes		
Hillyer	Hoback		
Holder	Hsu		
Hughes	Hyer		
James	Julian		
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)		
Kellway	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)		
Kent	Kerr		
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)		
Lake	Lamoureux		
Lapointe	Larose		
Latendresse	Lauzon		
Laverdière	Lebel		
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Énard)		
Leef	Leitch		
Lemieux	Leslie		
Leung	Liu		
Lizon	Lobb		
Lukiwski	Lunney		
MacAulay	Mackay (Central Nova)		
MacKenzie	Maguire		
Mai	Marston		
Masse	Mathysen		
May	Mayes		
McCallum	McColeman		
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)		
McLeod	Menegakis		
Michaud	Miller		
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)			
Moore (Fundy Royal)			
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)		

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

The House resumed from February 3 consideration of the motion.

**The Speaker:**

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion to concur in the 14th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights concerning the extension of time to consider Bill C-590.

**Hon. John Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent that the members who voted on the motion for concurrence at the report stage of Bill C-32 be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Conservative members voting yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for the motion itself?

*Routine Proceedings*

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

*(Division No. 326)*

## YEAS

## Members

Abлонczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Anders	Anderson
Andrews	Angus
Armstrong	Aspin
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Barlow
Bateman	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Bevington
Bezan	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Bloch
Boivin	Borg
Bougen	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brison	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinooge	Butt
Byrne	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Caron
Carrie	Casey
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Chisu	Chong
Choquette	Christopherson
Clarke	Cleary
Clement	Comartin
Côté	Crockatt
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Daniel
Davidson	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dechert	Devolin
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dreeshen
Dubé	Dubourg
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseau
Dykstra	Easter
Egliniski	Eyking
Falk	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Fortin	Freeland
Freeman	Fry
Galipeau	Gallant
Garneau	Garrison
Giguère	Gill
Glover	Godin
Goguen	Goldring
Goodale	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Grewal	Grogue
Harper	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	Hsu
Hughes	Hyer
James	Julian
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kellway	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kent	Kerr
Kornamicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lamoureux

Lapointe	Larose
Latendresse	Lauzon
Laverdière	Lebel
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leef	Leitch
Lemieux	Leslie
Leung	Liu
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mai	Marston
Masse	Mathysen
May	Mayes
McCallum	McColeman
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McLeod	Menegakis
Michaud	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Norlock
Nunez-Melo	Oliver
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
O'Toole	Pacetti
Papillon	Paradis
Patry	Payne
Pécelet	Perkins
Perreault	Pilon
Plamondon	Poilevre
Preston	Quach
Rafferty	Raitt
Rajotte	Rankin
Rathgeber	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Rousseau
Sandhu	Saxton
Scarpaleggia	Schellenberger
Scott	Seeback
Sellah	Sgro
Shea	Shiple
Shory	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
sor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
St-Denis	Stewart
Stoffer	Strahl
Sullivan	Sweet
Tilson	Toet
Toone	Tremblay
Trost	Trottier
Truppe	Tumel
Uppal	Valcourt
Valeriotte	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vaughan
Gill	Warawa
Wallace	Watson
Warkentin	
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga— 274

NAYS

PAIRED

Nil

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

•(1850)

[English]

**PROTECTING TAXPAYERS AND REVOKING PENSIONS OF CONVICTED POLITICIANS ACT**

The House resumed from February 3 consideration of Bill C-518, An Act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act (withdrawal allowance), as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions.

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motions at report stage of Bill C-518 under private members' business. The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 2.

•(1855)

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

(Division No. 327)

**YEAS**

Members

Andrews	Angus
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélanger
Bellavance	Bennett
Bevington	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Brisson	Byrne
Caron	Casey
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Comartin
Côté	Crowder
Cullen	Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dubé	Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseau	Easter
Eyking	Fortin
Freeland	Freeman
Fry	Garneau
Garrison	Giguère
Godin	Goodale
Grogulé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu
Hughes	Hyer
Julian	Kellway
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larose	Latendresse
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	MacAulay
Mai	Marston
Masse	Mathysen
May	McCallum
McGuinty	Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Patry	Péclet
Perreault	Pilon
Plamondon	Quach

*Private Members' Business*

Rafferty	Rankin
Ravignat	Raynault
Regan	Rousseau
Sandhu	Scarpaleggia
Scott	Sellah
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaiesan	St-Denis
Stewart	Stoffer
Sullivan	Toone
Tremblay	Tumel
Valeriote	Vaughan— 122

**NAYS**

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Anders	Anderson
Armstrong	Aspin
Barlow	Bateman
Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Bezan
Block	Boughen
Braid	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinooge	Butt
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Chisu
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Crockatt
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Devolin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Eglinski
Falk	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Galipeau	Gallant
Gill	Glover
Goguen	Goldring
Goodyear	Gosal
Gourde	Grewal
Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Lebel
Leaf	Leitch
Lemieux	Leung
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Maguire	Mayes
McColeman	McLeod
Menegakis	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Norlock	Oliver
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
O'Toole	Paradis
Payne	Perkins
Poilievre	Preston
Raitt	Rajotte
Rathgeber	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saxton	Schellenberger
Seeback	Shea
Shiple	Shory
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Strahl	Sweet
Tilson	Toet
Trost	Trotter
Truppe	Uppal

*Private Members' Business*

Valcourt	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga— 149	

## PAIRED

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 1 defeated and I therefore declare Motion No. 2 defeated.

**Mr. John Williamson** 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.

*And five or more members having risen:*

• (1905)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** Mr. Speaker, I voted twice. The first vote was my real vote. I apologize.

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 328*)

## YEAS

## Members

Adams	Adler
Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Ambler	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Angus	Armstrong
Aspin	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Barlow	Bateman
Bellavance	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Bevington	Bezan
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Block	Boivin
Borg	Boughen
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Braid
Brison	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Brunoogge	Butt
Byrne	Calandra

Calkins	Carmichael
Caron	Carrie
Casey	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Chisu
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Clarke
Cleary	Clement
Comartin	Côté
Crockatt	Crowder
Cullen	Cuzner
Daniel	Davidson
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dechert
Devolin	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dreeshen	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseau	Dykstra
Easter	Eglinski
Eyking	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Fortin
Freeland	Freeman
Fry	Galipeau
Gallant	Gameau
Garrison	Giguère
Gill	Glover
Godin	Goguen
Goodale	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Grewal	Grogulé
Harper	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	Hsu
Hughes	Hyer
James	Julian
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Kellway
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerr
Lake	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larose
Latendresse	Lauson
Laverdière	Lebel
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Énard)
Leaf	Leitch
Lemieux	Leslie
Leung	Liu
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mai	Marston
Masse	Mathysen
May	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinty
McLeod	Menegakis
Michaud	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Norlock
Nunez-Melo	Oliver
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
O'Toole	Pacetti
Papillon	Paradis
Patry	Payne
Péclet	Perkins
Perreault	Pilon
Plamondon	Poilievre
Preston	Quach
Rafferty	Raitt
Rankin	Rathgeber
Ravignat	Raynault
Regan	Rempel
Richards	Rousseau
Sandhu	Saxton

## Private Members' Business

(Division No. 329)

## YEAS

## Members

Adler  
Albas  
Alexander  
Allison  
Anders  
Andrews  
Aspin  
Aubin  
Barlow  
Bellavance  
Bergen  
Bevington  
Blanchette  
Block  
Borg  
Boulerice  
Brahmi  
Brison  
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)  
Bruinooge  
Byrne  
Calkins  
Caron  
Casey  
Charlton  
Chisholm  
Chong  
Christopherson  
Cleary  
Comartin  
Crockatt  
Cullen  
Daniel  
Davies (Vancouver East)  
Dechert  
Dewar  
Dionne Labelle  
Doré Lefebvre  
Dubé  
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)  
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)  
Dykstra  
Eglinski  
Falk  
Fast  
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)  
Fortin  
Freeman  
Galipeau  
Garneau  
Giguère  
Glover  
Goguen  
Goodyear  
Gourde  
Groguhé  
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)  
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)  
Hayes  
Hoback  
Hsu  
Hyer  
Julian  
Kellway  
Kent  
Lake  
Lapointe  
Latendresse  
Laverdière  
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)  
Leef  
Lemieux  
Leung  
Lizon  
Lukiwski  
MacAulay  
MacKenzie  
Mai

Scarpaleggia  
Scott  
Sellah  
Shipley  
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)  
Sims (Newton—North Delta)  
Sitsabaiesan  
Sopuck  
Stanton  
Stewart  
Strahl  
Sweet  
Toet  
Tremblay  
Trottier  
Turmel  
Valcourt  
Van Kesteren  
Vaughan  
Warkentin  
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)  
Weston (Saint John)  
Wilks  
Wong  
Young (Vancouver South)

Schellenberger  
Seeback  
Shea  
Shory  
Smith  
Sorenson  
St-Denis  
Stoffer  
Sullivan  
Tilson  
Toone  
Trost  
Truppe  
Uppal  
Valeriotte  
Van Loan  
Wallace  
Watson  
Williamson  
Yelich  
Yurdiga— 256

## NAYS

## Members

Ablonczy  
Cannan  
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)  
Komarnicki  
Mayes  
Rajotte  
Warawa  
Young (Oakville)— 15

Bélanger  
Goldring  
Kent  
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)  
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)  
Reid  
Woodworth

## PAIRED

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. John Williamson** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

**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.

*And five or more members having risen:*

• (1915)

**Mr. Larry Miller:** Mr. Speaker, there was a bit of fun being had over here, with the consequence that I believe I voted twice. I want my first vote to count, not the last one.

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

Adams  
Aglukkaq  
Albrecht  
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Ambler  
Anderson  
Armstrong  
Atamanenko  
Ayala  
Bateman  
Benoit  
Bernier  
Bezan  
Blanchette-Lamothe  
Boivin  
Boughen  
Boutin-Sweet  
Braid  
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)  
Brown (Barrie)  
Butt  
Calandra  
Carmichael  
Carrie  
Cash  
Chicoine  
Chisu  
Choquette  
Clarke  
Clement  
Côté  
Crowder  
Cuzner  
Davidson  
Day  
Devolin  
Dion  
Donnelly  
Dreeshen  
Dubourg  
Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
Dusseauit  
Easter  
Eyking  
Fantino  
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)  
Fletcher  
Freeland  
Fry  
Gallant  
Garrison  
Gill  
Godin  
Goodale  
Gosal  
Grewal  
Harper  
Harris (St. John's East)  
Hawn  
Hillyer  
Holder  
Hughes  
James  
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)  
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)  
Kerr  
Lamoureux  
Larose  
Lauzon  
Lebel  
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)  
Leitch  
Leslie  
Liu  
Lobb  
Lunney  
MacKay (Central Nova)  
Maguire

*Adjournment Proceedings*

Masse	Mathysen
May	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinty
McLeod	Menegakis
Michaud	Miller
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	Nantel
Nash	Nicholls
Norlock	Nunez-Melo
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Pacetti	Papillon
Paradis	Patry
Payne	Péclet
Perkins	Perreault
Pilon	Plamondon
Poillievre	Preston
Quach	Rafferty
Raitt	Rajotte
Rankin	Rathgeber
Ravignat	Raynault
Regan	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rousseau	Sandhu
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Scott
Seeback	Sellah
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind- sor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
St-Denis	Stewart
Stoffer	Strahl
Sullivan	Sweet
Tilson	Toet
Toone	Tremblay
Trost	Trottier
Truppe	Turmel
Uppal	Valcourt
Valeriotte	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vaughan
Wallace	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Yelich	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga— 257	

## NAYS

## Members

Ablonczy	Angus
Bélanger	Goldring
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Marston
Mayes	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Warawa	Woodworth
Young (Oakville)— 13	

## PAIRED

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

Devastating news, colleagues. I need 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.

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*Translation*]

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Ms. Marie-Claude Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in December 2014, I outlined for the government the concerns that milk and cheese producers have about the impact of the Canada-Europe free trade agreement.

Although Quebec producers have developed some very high-quality fine cheeses, many producers are afraid that the arrival of several tonnes of European cheeses will weaken our young industry.

Just yesterday, I had the opportunity to meet and talk with Quebec's milk producers. This agreement could have major consequences for the industry. Quebec's milk producers say that the concession given to the European Union could mean that 180 million litres of milk will not be produced or processed here. This could translate into \$150 million a year in lost revenue for producers.

In the past 20 years, these producers have invested more than \$100 million to develop the market. It would be quite unfortunate if these investments were in vain. It is important to add that the negative impact of this concession would be felt by Quebec in particular, as it produces more than 50% of Canada's cheese and more than 60% of its fine cheese.

Milk producers have been clear about what they want from the Government of Canada. Among other things, they want the government to invest the promised compensation in promotional measures for cheesemakers and producers, impose the same production and processing requirements on imported products, and apply the new quotas for imported cheese using a management method that will benefit the producers and cheesemakers concerned by investing a portion of the profits to promote cheese and develop new markets.

The member for Berthier—Maskinongé, who is the deputy agriculture critic, moved a motion in the House to have milk and cheese producers compensated for the potential value of their losses caused by the agreement. This motion was adopted and the Conservatives have since promised to compensate producers.

However, no compensation plan has yet materialized. I will read part of the motion because I believe it is important to discuss it:

That, in the opinion of the House, the government should respect its promise to dairy and cheese producers of Quebec and Canada who will be affected by the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement between Canada and the European Union, by: (a) revealing details without delay related to the compensation that will be paid; (b) providing for an implementation period for the agreement that is as long as possible; (c) putting an end to the circumvention of tariff quotas and the misclassification of products at the border; (d) maintaining high quality standards by imposing the same production and processing requirements on imported products; and (e) committing to provide support for commercialization.

However, since June 2014, no tangible measures have been proposed, and the minister even mentioned in committee that no plan will be made for compensation until producers suffer losses. No losses, no compensation. Dairy farmers are concerned that they do not know how the compensation system will work. What form will it take? How will losses be assessed?

It is important to understand that these measures are being sought to ensure the sustainability of the industry, which generates a significant number of direct and indirect jobs. Will the Conservatives keep their promise and provide cheese producers with proper compensation?

• (1920)

[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, I am pleased to rise this evening in reply to the member's question. I do need to correct a number of facts, though, and a number of mistakes.

To begin with, long before June 2014, the Prime Minister himself stated in October 2013 that the Conservative Party was fully committed to monitoring the potential impact of the implementation of new cheese tariff rate quotas under CETA and, if needed, providing compensation to industry producers should a negative impact be observed. This is not a blank cheque; this is only if the industry were to suffer a negative impact.

The other thing, quite frankly, that bothers me about the hon. member's statement is that she is talking about having a discussion with cheese makers in Quebec. Quebec has a very successful cheese industry, probably the most successful cheese industry in Canada.

In Nova Scotia, the small boutique fromageries have embraced this trade deal. They say the more cheese that comes in, the more cheese that is on the market, the more likely the person now buying boutique cheese for the first time will look for that product in Nova Scotia. They sell more cheese when there is more variety for the consumer. They have embraced this deal, and many of the cheese makers and fromageries in Quebec have embraced this deal as well. So, I disagree with her summation that the industry in Quebec is somehow completely against this deal.

Let us talk about the Canada-EU CETA and the position that it would put agriculture in this country. With CETA and the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, Canada will find itself in a very advantageous and preferential position. We will have access to the two of the world's largest economies, representing over 800 million very affluent consumers.

When we negotiated this agreement, our government made sure that it defended Canada's supply management system, unlike the official opposition, which only brings up supply management when it is politically advantageous, and which totally neglected it in its platform and during the last election and now, all of a sudden, is interested in it.

Unlike the opposition, it is our government that continues to ensure that the three key pillars—production control, import controls, and price controls—remain in place.

### *Adjournment Proceedings*

As I have said, this is an opportunity. Look at agriculture in Canada. Farm gate receipts in Canada are up straight across the board. The dependence on farm programs, meanwhile, is down across the board. Agriculture has never had a better government defending it than this Conservative government. We have done so and signed more free trade agreements than any other government in Canada's history, and have done it while defending supply management.

• (1925)

[Translation]

**Ms. Marie-Claude Morin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his response.

Regarding supply management, it is not true that the official opposition, the NDP, only brings it up when it is politically advantageous. Supply management is part of our values, and we have always defended this system.

Also, my colleague said that Quebec producers are not saying the same thing as producers in the rest of Canada. That is not the reality.

As a member representing a riding in Quebec, I definitely plan to discuss this further with producers in Quebec. However, there is a consensus among Canada's dairy producers.

What I want to point out to the government is that producers are worried, and we need a concrete commitment concerning this agreement in order to ensure that our producers are not disadvantaged.

[English]

**Mr. Gerald Keddy:** Mr. Speaker, what we said very clearly is that producers will not be disadvantaged. Actually, they will have an advantage of 500 million consumers in the European marketplace to whom they will be able to sell cheese and cheese products.

Let us talk about this agreement and how this agreement was formulated. We did not just go out and sign this overnight. There were years of negotiations. There were dozens and dozens, and hundreds of stakeholders meetings. I attended many of those stakeholder meetings myself.

We were actively engaged with the cheese processors, with the provincial dairy producers and processors associations, from coast to coast. We dealt directly with the provincial governments and the municipal governments, with the cheese importers and with the downstream stakeholders. Everybody who could possibly be spoken to and consulted was given a chance to speak.

Finally, here is the deal as it is set out. If the industry has a negative effect, we will look at compensation. The reality is there will be no negative effect. There is room for extra cheese quota in Canada. Quebec has done a great job at producing it and I am sure they will continue.

### INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mr. Adam Vaughan (Trinity—Spadina, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rose in the House late last year to ask a specific question about federal infrastructure spending and referenced the city of Calgary.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

I suggested that perhaps the problem Calgary was having was that it had not elected enough members of the government to this House in order to receive its fair share of infrastructure spending.

We have heard through repeated questions that the government claims it is making the largest investment in infrastructure in the history of this country. Let me explain what that means to the city of Calgary, as the big city mayors gather in Toronto as we speak to discuss the crisis on this very subject.

Last year Calgary got the grand total from the new building fund of zero dollars. There was not one penny. This year, again, zero dollars, not one penny. That is two straight years without a single investment from the government and the new building fund, despite the claims that it is a grand fund and a big fund.

Cities like Calgary, cities right across this country, and even small towns, for example we heard about Sydney, Nova Scotia this week, are getting nothing from the government this year, and they got nothing last year.

The problem with the fund as it is being proposed is that it is back-end loaded. Those of us with municipal experience and those of us who have watched government accounts know what this means. All of the money comes in the latter years of the program and none of the money is doled out on a consistent basis.

Canadian cities, and we will hear it from the big city mayors tomorrow as they meet in Toronto, are asking for a very simple commitment from the government. They do not want big funding announcements that get handed out sporadically and are back-end loaded. What they need is consistent and robust funding this year and every year.

The challenge the cities are facing is that without that funding arriving in city coffers on an annual basis, in a consistent and predictable way, they are unable to do the planning that is required to sustain growth in the cities.

In Calgary, with the oil market in decline and with oil prices dropping, and with the announcement this week that the housing market is very soft and prices dropping, it means that people are being unemployed in that city due to cuts at places like Suncor. What they also are not getting, despite the promise of the government, in terms of infrastructure support, are jobs to pick up the slack as other parts of the economy start to fail.

The call we have been making and the request we make of the government is to stop talking about these plans as being big unless they are big every year, to stop talking about them as a plan if they are simply back-end loaded, and to allow cities to move forward with constructive plans that make sense for the residents of their cities.

In the city of Calgary, it is very clear what that money is needed for. The money is needed, in particular, for transit. The request that we are going to see coming straight out of city hall will be for the Green Line transitway, \$150 million; the goods and movement package which is going to refine and fix overpasses right across the city of Calgary, \$78 million. They also need support for disaster resiliency funding and they are not getting it.

Zero dollars this year; zero dollars last year. When the government stands up and claims, as it will, I am sure, I have heard the speech,

that this money is large, robust and is going to meet the needs of Calgary, the city of Calgary quite clearly, in concert with other big cities across this country, is saying zero dollars is not funding.

Zero dollars now is not meeting the needs of Calgary now. The challenge with receiving the funding in 10 years is, as we have seen with the government, that there is always an opportunity for governments to bail on the programs, to cut when they see recessions heading their way, and not sustain these commitments.

What we are asking the government to do is very clear. Will it make the funding available immediately? Will it roll these programs out immediately? Will the funding start to arrive at the same time the billboards come?

It is \$29 million for billboards that arrive now; zero dollars for Calgary this year and zero dollars last year. That is unacceptable. Make a change, please.

• (1930)

**Mr. Peter Braid (Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we acknowledge the importance of infrastructure investment in cities and communities across the country. We also recognize the diversity of the needs from coast to coast to coast. That is why our government has continued to make long-term, predictable funding for public infrastructure a priority.

In 2007, we announced \$33 billion in stable, flexible and predictable funding to the 7-year building Canada plan. Fresh on the heels of launching this plan, our government responded quickly to the economic crisis in 2009 with \$5.25 billion more in infrastructure stimulus investments. In fact, the infrastructure stimulus fund supported over 4,000 projects across the country.

Collectively, this funding has had a significant impact. As a result of these investments, the average age of Canada's infrastructure has been steadily decreasing from 17.8 years in 2000, to 14.7 years in 2013.

More recent, economic action plan 2013 announced \$70 billion for public infrastructure over the next decade. This of course includes the \$53 billion new building Canada plan, the largest and the longest-term infrastructure plan in Canadian history, providing stable funding for a 10 year period. Seventy per cent of the funds available through the plan directly support infrastructure in cities and communities across the country.

In addition, just last month, our Prime Minister announced another \$5.8 billion to address federal infrastructure priorities that will have long lasting benefits, including job creation. In total, that is over \$75 billion that will be injected into the economy over the coming decade to support public infrastructure in communities across the country.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

The new building Canada plan has been open for business since March 2014, and these programs are well under way. We are working with provinces and territories to identify projects. In fact, it is the responsibility of provinces to identify those project priorities. When they are provided to us, we are processing proposals as quickly as they come in. In fact, close to a billion dollars in federal funding for regional and national projects have already been announced, and we look forward to announcing many more in the year ahead.

Funding will begin to flow for these priority projects as construction begins and costs are incurred. This is solid stewardship of public funds and a principle we have applied since 2006.

In addition, we made close to \$2 billion available to municipalities in 2014 alone under the now permanent, doubled and indexed federal gas tax fund. The city of Calgary is getting that federal gas tax funding directly.

As we clearly can see from the continuous federal investments in public infrastructure, there has been no break in federal funding since 2007, and money continues to be available to our cities and communities to address their infrastructure priorities. No federal government has ever made a stronger commitment to supporting public infrastructure.

• (1935)

**Mr. Adam Vaughan:** Mr. Speaker, Calgary remains with the \$3.2 billion deficit in infrastructure funding. Calgary got zero dollars last year and will get zero dollars this year. These facts are undisputable and they are part of the public record of the budget that the city of Calgary has produced.

We also have a softening housing market in Calgary, a 4,000 person waiting list for people looking for affordable homes in Calgary, and there is no action on this file to reduce that wait time. This is unacceptable, especially if the government spends \$29 million advertising its program that will not arrive for 10 years.

We need stable funding. Continuing the Liberal policy of the gas policy is good news for cities. We applaud the moves that have been made to strengthen it. The trouble is that the infrastructure money is not arriving. Why will the government not flow the infrastructure money on an annual basis and on a consistent basis? Why do cities like Calgary have to spend zero dollars in new infrastructure when quite clearly they have transit needs, transportation needs and housing needs that are not being met and have no partner in Ottawa to help them meet those challenges? Why?

**Mr. Peter Braid:** Mr. Speaker, as I explained, our Conservative government remains committed to working with our partners, the municipalities and provinces, to make investments in infrastructure that encourage job creation and economic growth, and that enhance our quality of life. That is why we are investing \$75 billion in public infrastructure, of which money is flowing now and over 10 years. This includes the \$53 billion new building Canada plan, the largest and longest-term infrastructure plan in Canadian history.

From this plan, proponents can identify their priorities now and we will profile the funds to be delivered when proponents are ready to receive them as work gets under way. That is how the program works.

Close to \$2 billion in funding was made available for municipalities in 2014 alone, supporting over 2,000 new projects, and funds continue to flow from existing federal infrastructure programs.

We continuously see infrastructure work under way in our communities, and this is a clear indication that the money is flowing.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:39 p.m.)



# CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 4, 2015

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>The Environment</b>		Mr. Harper .....	11035
Ms. May .....	11031	Mr. Mulcair .....	11035
<b>Public Safety</b>		Mr. Harper .....	11035
Mr. Menegakis .....	11031	<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<b>World Cancer Day</b>		Mr. Trudeau .....	11035
Mr. Marston .....	11031	Mr. Harper .....	11036
<b>Renewable Energy</b>		Mr. Trudeau .....	11036
Mrs. Gallant .....	11031	Mr. Harper .....	11036
<b>Amateur Weatherman</b>		<b>Employment</b>	
Mr. Eyking .....	11032	Mr. Caron .....	11036
<b>Vietnamese Community</b>		Mr. Kenney .....	11036
Mr. Adler .....	11032	Ms. Nash .....	11036
<b>Employment</b>		Mr. Kenney .....	11036
Ms. LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard) .....	11032	Ms. Nash .....	11036
<b>Nach Balliye</b>		Mr. Kenney .....	11037
Mr. Gill .....	11032	Mr. Sullivan .....	11037
<b>Canadian Flag</b>		Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam) .....	11037
Mr. Galipeau .....	11033	<b>Intergovernmental Affairs</b>	
<b>The Economy</b>		Ms. Boutin-Sweet .....	11037
Mr. Kellway .....	11033	Mr. Braid .....	11037
<b>Taxation</b>		Mr. Kellway .....	11037
Mr. Shory .....	11033	Mr. Braid .....	11037
<b>Eating Disorder Awareness Week</b>		<b>Employment</b>	
Ms. Liu .....	11033	Ms. Sims .....	11037
<b>New Democratic Party of Canada</b>		Mr. Kenney .....	11038
Mrs. Block .....	11033	Mr. Boulerice .....	11038
<b>Congressional Gold Medal</b>		Mr. Kenney .....	11038
Mr. Valeriote .....	11034	Mr. Cullen .....	11038
<b>Taxation</b>		Mr. Kenney .....	11038
Mr. Lizon .....	11034	<b>Veterans Affairs</b>	
<b>Employment</b>		Mr. Valeriote .....	11038
Ms. Charlton .....	11034	Mr. O'Toole .....	11038
<b>Taxation</b>		<b>Statistics Canada</b>	
Mr. Daniel .....	11034	Mr. Dion .....	11038
<b>ORAL QUESTIONS</b>		Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam) .....	11039
<b>Employment</b>		Ms. Freeland .....	11039
Mr. Mulcair .....	11034	Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam) .....	11039
Mr. Harper .....	11035	<b>Democratic Reform</b>	
Mr. Mulcair .....	11035	Mr. Dusseault .....	11039
Mr. Harper .....	11035	Mr. Poilievre .....	11039
<b>Public Safety</b>		Mr. Scott .....	11039
Mr. Mulcair .....	11035	Mr. Poilievre .....	11039
Mr. Harper .....	11035	<b>Public Safety</b>	
Mr. Mulcair .....	11035	Mr. Garrison .....	11039
		Mr. MacKay .....	11039
		Ms. Doré Lefebvre .....	11039
		Mr. MacKay .....	11040

<b>Social Development</b>	
Ms. Crockatt .....	11040
Ms. Bergen .....	11040
<b>Public Safety</b>	
Ms. Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine) .....	11040
Ms. James .....	11040
<b>Rail Transportation</b>	
Ms. Sitsabaiesan .....	11040
Ms. Raitt .....	11040
<b>Transport</b>	
Mr. Masse .....	11041
Mr. Watson .....	11041
Mr. Masse .....	11041
Mr. Watson .....	11041
<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	11041
Mr. Anderson .....	11041
<b>Canadian Heritage</b>	
Mr. Bélanger .....	11041
Mrs. Glover .....	11041
<b>Canada Post</b>	
Mr. Morin (Laurentides—Labelle) .....	11041
Ms. Raitt .....	11042
Mrs. Groguhé .....	11042
Ms. Raitt .....	11042
<b>Veterans Affairs</b>	
Mr. Chisu .....	11042
Mr. O'Toole .....	11042
<b>Canadian Coast Guard</b>	
Mr. Simms .....	11042
Mrs. Shea .....	11042
<b>Health</b>	
Mr. Côté .....	11042
Ms. Raitt .....	11042
<b>Northern Development</b>	
Mr. Leef .....	11043
Mrs. Aglukkaq .....	11043
<b>Citizenship and Immigration</b>	
Ms. Turmel .....	11043
Mr. Alexander .....	11043
<b>Infrastructure</b>	
Mr. Fortin .....	11043
Mr. Braid .....	11043
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	11043

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Interparliamentary Delegations</b>	
Mr. Trotter .....	11043
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Public Safety and National Security</b>	
Mr. Kramp .....	11043

<b>Procedure and House Affairs</b>	
Mr. Preston .....	11044
Motion for concurrence .....	11044
(Motion agreed to) .....	11044
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>The Environment</b>	
Ms. May .....	11044
<b>Impaired Driving</b>	
Mr. Albrecht .....	11044
<b>Canada Post</b>	
Mr. Giguère .....	11044
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Goodale .....	11044
<b>Impaired Driving</b>	
Mr. Shipley .....	11044
<b>Sex Selection</b>	
Mr. Shipley .....	11044
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Ms. LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard) .....	11044
<b>Eating Disorders</b>	
Ms. Duncan (Etobicoke North) .....	11044
<b>Impaired Driving</b>	
Mr. Rajotte .....	11045
<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Mr. Dusseault .....	11045
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Ms. Bateman .....	11045
<b>Mining Industry</b>	
Mr. Nicholls .....	11045
<b>Rail Safety</b>	
Mr. Nicholls .....	11045
<b>Dementia</b>	
Mr. Scott .....	11045
<b>Public Transit</b>	
Mr. Kellway .....	11045
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Lukiwski .....	11045
<b>Motions for Papers</b>	
Mr. Lukiwski .....	11045

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Victims Bill of Rights Act</b>	
<b>Bill C-32—Time Allocation Motion</b>	
Mr. Van Loan .....	11045
Motion .....	11045
Ms. Boivin .....	11046
Mr. MacKay .....	11046
Mr. Lamoureux .....	11046
Mr. Blanchette .....	11047
Mr. Sullivan .....	11047
Mr. Albas .....	11047
Ms. Sgro .....	11048
Mr. Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord) .....	11048
Mr. Lake .....	11048
Ms. May .....	11049
Mr. Julian .....	11049



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>