



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 147 • NUMBER 233 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

—

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 17, 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

[*Translation*]

MEMBER FOR RICHMOND—ARTHABASKA

Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, summing up 11 years in one minute is impossible, but I have to take the time to thank the many people who enabled me to proudly represent the residents of Richmond—Arthabaska—which I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, is the most beautiful riding—these past 11 years.

I could not have done it without my spouse, Annie, our families, my assistants, my other colleagues and the many volunteers who helped get me elected four times. I would also like to salute the members of the Bloc Québécois and the other parties with whom I worked, some of whom have become friends for life.

The most challenging and satisfying part of this job is dealing with and making progress on issues that matter to the people we represent. I will never forget how we fought for supply management, student jobs and Jeffrey Mine retirees in Asbestos. However, what really stands out for me are the people, all of the people I helped, supported or even just met at various functions we were invited to. They are the ones who made me not only the politician but also the human being I am today.

A big thanks to you, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

QUANTO'S LAW

Mr. Costas Menegakis (Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Quanto's law passed in the House on June 15 with a unanimous vote.

Today, I rise to thank my colleagues on both sides of the House who voted to recognize and support the special role that law enforcement, service and military animals have in protecting our communities every day.

Quanto's law will honour the memory of Edmonton Police Service dog Quanto, as well as the Toronto Police Service horse Brigadier, and many other law enforcement animals that have made the ultimate sacrifice. It will ensure that those who choose to harm these animals will face serious consequences.

This legislation is very meaningful to me. It is also meaningful to my Richmond Hill constituents, who provided the inspiration for a similar private member's bill I introduced just two years ago. It is important to the hundreds of Canadians, York Regional Police Chief Eric Jolliffe, students from Sudbury Secondary School, the Edmonton Police Service, and many others, who wrote to me with their support for this legislation.

On behalf of all of them, and myself, I thank everyone again.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, just off the coast of my riding is a cluster of islands in the Salish Sea that encompasses the best marine and coastal environment in urban Canada. Home to migratory birds, rare plants, orca whales and sacred sites for the Songhees First Nation, today these are under-protected and under threat. Lack of coordination and enforcement have left them vulnerable, and we must act now to prevent further damage.

The University of Victoria's Environmental Law Centre has studied the legal designations available to protect this area and preserve the uses, rights and title of the Songhees First Nation. Many of these designations require the direct support of the federal government. Others require Ottawa to work with the Songhees First Nation, the province of British Columbia, and the municipality of Oak Bay.

As our community considers the options in this new report, I hope we will find a true partner in Ottawa. We have a rare moment to save a precious environment, so let us work together.

*Statements by Members***LABOUR ORGANIZATIONS**

Mr. Russ Hiebert (South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my bill, Bill C-377, has been working its way through the legislative process for the past four years. Along the way it has been improved by amendments passed in the House. It is at third reading in the other place and could soon come to a final vote. Canadians are hoping it does.

Polls tell us that well over 80% of Canadians, including union members, want public disclosure of labour organization finances. They have seen the corruption exposed at the Charbonneau commission and the Ontario Provincial Police Association, and they know that sunlight is the best disinfectant. They also know that some labour organizations spend the money of members against their wishes on elections. Whether it is for million dollar advertising campaigns or hiring campaign workers, they spend on partisan politics.

The public and union members should have the right to know how their money is being spent. Bill C-377 would give them that right.

* * *

BRAVERY

Ms. Judy Foote (Random—Burin—St. George's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute three men from my riding of Random—Burin—St. George's, whose bravery and quick action averted a tragedy on June 1.

While driving along the Trans-Canada Highway west of Channel-Port aux Basques, Clifford Lillington of Margaree and Ernie Meade of Fox Roost came upon an accident where a pickup truck had plunged over an embankment into water.

Of the two men in the truck, Clyde Chant and John Caines, John could not swim. Clifford searched for a rope while Ernie attempted to swim to the victims, only to have to turn back because of the extremely cold water. When the truck became completely submerged, John was left in a life or death situation. Ernie again braved the waters and managed to get John close enough to shore where Clifford, joined by Roland Sheaves of Port aux Basques, who witnessed the attempted rescue, helped to get most of the water from John's lungs.

Deflecting any reference to heroism, Ernie said "We are thankful the men are OK and that is all that matters".

I ask all members to join me in recognizing the bravery of Clifford Lillington, Ernie Meade and Roland Sheaves.

* * *

MEMBER FOR NORTHUMBERLAND—QUINTE WEST

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the 41st Parliament ends and this great nation prepares for the 42nd general election, it is only right and fitting that this retiring member of Parliament congratulates his riding of Northumberland—Quinte West for all we have achieved together: a billion dollars for the clean-up of low level radioactive waste in Port Hope, a new community centre in Cobourg, countless miles of road

improvements, two new bridges to be built, hundreds of millions of dollars in new improvements at CFB Trenton in Quinte West.

These projects and those like them are creating jobs for the good citizens of Northumberland—Quinte West and Canada, proof that this Conservative government, working with our provincial and municipal counterparts, can achieve much together.

While much has been accomplished, our work is not finished. More needs to be done, and the Prime Minister will keep his team working on behalf of my constituents and all of Canada long after October 19.

* * *

● (1410)

[Translation]

GABRIELLE DUFRESNE

Ms. Paulina Ayala (Honoré-Mercier, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the "Je suis Gabrielle" march was held last Sunday in honour of a 17-year-old student who was murdered by her ex-boyfriend, who could not accept the fact that their relationship was over.

Gabrielle had just finished high school and was about to begin a CEGEP program to become a nurse, because she wanted to take care of seniors and people who are sick. She had always been a very compassionate girl. As a mother and as a woman, I was really shocked by her death. It is terrible how common violence against women is here in Canada. Just think of the young women at the École polytechnique or our missing aboriginal women and girls.

However, there is hope. I was lucky enough to meet Gabrielle's mother, Marlène Dufresne. She wants to transform her suffering into hope. She wants to help our adolescents have healthier romantic relationships and help them realize that these relationships must be based on respect and caring, not violence and manipulation.

Hon. colleagues, she is calling on us, as politicians, to support all programs to raise awareness about violence—

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound.

* * *

[English]

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT AND PAGES

Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today as the current session of Parliament winds down to recognize and thank many of the people with whom I have had the pleasure of working over the course of this session.

I would like to begin by commending the excellent work that is carried out on a daily basis by the House of Commons pages. Pages are truly the unsung heroes of this place and their work often goes unnoticed or unrecognized. From delivering messages from our respective lobbies, serving water and the handling of important documents, pages have a great deal of responsibility in this place, and I thank each and every page for their hard work. It has indeed been a pleasure to get to know some of them on a first name basis.

Statements by Members

Finally, I want to thank all my colleagues, on both sides of the House, who will not be returning after the election in the fall. It has truly been a pleasure to work alongside all of them, and I wish them all of the best in their future endeavours.

Some of them have become very good friends, and while I will most sincerely miss them, I wish them nothing but the best, and they should not be strangers.

* * *

GRADUATION CEREMONIES

Ms. Wai Young (Vancouver South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this month, thousands of young Canadians will walk across a stage to receive their diplomas, celebrating their graduation from high school.

As my own twins, Sam and Alex, their friends and students just like them take part in graduation ceremonies, I reflect upon this milestone and the difficult decisions and endless sacrifices Canadian parents make to raise their children and make ends meet.

However, parents know that at these challenging moments, they can count on our Conservative government to stand with them and help, whether it is through the expanded universal child care benefit, income splitting for hard-working families, the child fitness tax credit or the numerous other measures that our government has put in place. Canadian parents can count on our government to support them to make the best decisions about how to raise their families.

On this occasion, I want to congratulate students and their parents in my riding of Vancouver South and across Canada for all of their accomplishments and success.

Good luck and Godspeed from our Conservative government.

* * *

PENSIONS

Ms. Hélène LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have some good news: Canadians are living longer. Is that not great?

Unfortunately, though, companies and governments are not keeping their promises. They are slashing pension funds through mismanagement, such as what happened to the Canadian Commercial Workers Industry pension plan and the Nortel pension fund.

Retirees in my community are negatively impacted by these cutbacks. We owe it to the workers who invested in these pension plans to provide them with a comfortable retirement. When will the government enhance the Canada pension plan to compensate for the carelessness of the private pension funds?

* * *

●(1415)

TAXATION

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, family has always been important to me and I am thankful for the many blessings bestowed upon me and my wife. My four wonderful children, their spouses, and 12 grandchildren make me look forward to October 20 and a new chapter in my life.

Our Conservative government also values families and knows that they are the solid building block of our society. That is why we are supporting choice for parents who know best how to care for their children.

Giving \$160 for children under six and \$60 for children up to 17 years of age makes Canada the envy of most nations, but we are also giving solid support to seniors who, together with those parents with children, can split their income for tax purposes and save up to \$2,000 per year.

If the Liberals or NDP were ever to be in charge, this would all disappear. I hope that all Canadians will realize what our Prime Minister and government have done and what is at risk in the next election.

I welcome some of my family to Parliament Hill today. I was elected 22 years ago because I wanted my children and grandchildren to have a better Canada to live in.

May God bless Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

WOMEN IN NON-TRADITIONAL PROFESSIONS

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Abitibi—Témiscamingue is a region known for its vibrant mining sector. As we speak, the fifth Symposium on Mines and the Environment is being held in Rouyn-Noranda. This event is organized by numerous partners, including the Université du Québec in Abitibi-Témiscamingue.

On Monday evening, Louise Grondin, the first female senior executive at Agnico Eagle, was honoured with the 2015 Frederick W. Firlotte lifetime achievement award in mining and the environment. This award recognizes the recipient's remarkable and exemplary contribution to mining and the environment in Quebec. Ms. Grondin is originally from Abitibi-Témiscamingue and is an inspiring female engineer in Canada's mining industry. This is a very clear example of how women can also excel in traditionally male-dominated professions.

In Abitibi-Témiscamingue there are many women who stand out for their excellence in traditionally male-dominated fields and our region is the better for it.

* * *

[*English*]

LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Corneliu Chisu (Pickering—Scarborough East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, being prime minister is not an entry level job. It is one that requires experience and the ability to lead a country like ours under sometimes turbulent global economic uncertainty. The leader of the Liberal Party has proven that he is not up to the task.

Oral Questions

This is the same Liberal leader who said that budgets balance themselves. He is the one who accepted 94 recommendations from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission without even reading them. He is the one who came up with a 32-point plan which clearly looks like it originated from the back of a napkin.

Canadians want a prime minister that they can depend on to make the right decisions. That prime minister is the current Prime Minister.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

Hon. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of four heroic political prisoners and their respective cases and causes.

They are Saudi Arabian blogger Raif Badawi; Venezuelan democratic leader Leopoldo Lopez; Iranian freedom of religion advocate Ayatollah Boroujerdi, as well as the persecuted leadership of the Baha'i community; and Mauritanian anti-slavery advocate Biram Dah Abeid.

Each political prisoner is a case study of the criminalization of fundamental rights, the deprivation of liberty, and torture in detention. Each is a looking glass into their respective oppressive regimes and their standing violation of international obligations, including obligations to us here in Canada.

We say to these courageous prisoners of conscience that they are not alone. We stand in solidarity with them. Their cause is our cause and we will not relent until their liberty is secured.

* * *

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. Scott Armstrong (Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak on how our Conservative government's national shipbuilding procurement strategy is creating literally thousands of high-paying jobs for Nova Scotians.

This week hundreds of prospective employees lined up at an Irving shipyards job fair in Dartmouth, looking for someone to say yes when they applied for a job.

This opportunity was provided to them by our Conservative government's investments at Irving. However, if the Liberals and the NDP have their way, these investments will stop and those thousands of jobs would disappear. High taxes lead to job cuts.

Our Conservative government will never let that happen. We will continue to focus on jobs, long-term prosperity, and economic growth.

Good luck to the people applying at Irving. Many more jobs are coming.

• (1420)

[Translation]

42ND GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Chambly—Borduas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as this government's last day approaches, the Conservatives are shamelessly using taxpayers' money for partisan purposes. They are wasting money on advertising, partisan polls and photo ops for infrastructure projects too long in the making.

Ten years ago, the Conservatives promised to clean house after the Liberal corruption scandals; today, the Conservatives are in the same boat. Ten years ago, the Conservatives promised to clean up the Senate; today, after having appointed 59 senators, the Conservatives are defending the status quo and Senate corruption. Ten years ago, the Conservatives came to change Ottawa; today, we see that Ottawa has changed them.

Fortunately, there is a great deal of optimism in the air. The winds of change are blowing, and on October 19, Canadians will finally be able to vote for a party that will represent them and be representative of them, through good times and bad. That party is the NDP.

* * *

[English]

LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Bob Dechert (Mississauga—Erindale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Liberal Party wants to be the next prime minister of Canada, but Canadians know this simple truth. He is not ready for the job.

There are so many examples of this to point to. He attributed Putin's aggression to a hockey game. He said that the country he most admires in the world is China. He introduced a wide scattershot 32-point plan that was clearly written on the back of a napkin somewhere.

Canada is the best country in the world. It is a country where we stand up for our beliefs, whether it be home or abroad. It is a country where we want every family to succeed and spend on their priorities by cutting taxes and creating jobs.

The leader of the Liberal Party is simply not ready.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, General Lawson said in an interview that sexual harassment within the Canadian Armed Forces was partly due to, and I quote, "biological wiring". Obviously that statement is completely unacceptable.

What does the Prime Minister intend to do to change this culture of sexual harassment within the Canadian Armed Forces?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I found the general's comments to be completely unacceptable, inappropriate and offensive. Sexual harassment and sexual misconduct are unacceptable in any institution. The general did immediately apologize for his comments.

The Canadian Armed Forces and Lieutenant-General Whitecross are in the process of implementing all of the recommendations set out in the Deschamps report.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, what the Prime Minister just said will not drastically change the culture that has permeated the Canadian Armed Forces. The question was what he personally intends to do about it.

[English]

General Lawson's comments are, of course, as wrong as they are a representation of everything that is pervasive in the military.

Will the Prime Minister himself commit to implementing Justice Deschamps recommendations in order to put an end to this toxic culture within our military with regard to sexual assault and sexual misconduct?

That culture is wrong. It has to be changed from the top. Will the Prime Minister act?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I said, I found the general's comments offensive, inappropriate and completely unacceptable. Sexual misconduct, sexual harassment are unacceptable in any institution. We are all very clear on that. There is no excuse for it. The general did immediately apologize for his comments.

I would point out that the men and women in the military commissioned the report on this particular issue and gave a series of recommendations. The armed forces and General Whitecross are in the process of implementing those things immediately. We should not do anything that would slur all of the men and women in uniform.

* * *

• (1425)

[Translation]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister said that his government, and I quote, "encouraged the RCMP to destroy documents", even though he knew that that violated the law. The Ontario Provincial Police are even investigating this matter.

Has the Prime Minister communicated with the police to indicate his own involvement in this illegal activity?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this government made a commitment to Canadians, and especially Canadians in the regions, to abolish the long gun registry, and we passed legislation to do just that in this Parliament.

The RCMP obviously complies with the law, as does the government.

[English]

ETHICS

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister still believe that all senators meet the residency requirements to sit in the Senate? If so, would he be kind enough to tell us where Senator Carolyn Stewart-Olsen lives?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Once again, Mr. Speaker, after a complete audit the leader of the NDP gets up and makes an accusation against someone who is accused of absolutely nothing.

The fact of the matter is that the Senate has done an audit and the Senate is responding to its recommendations.

What has not been responded to is NDP members taking public money and putting it into their own party organization. That is what was done in the sponsorship scandal. They have done that at a level of three times all of the accusations against senators combined.

It is totally unacceptable. I look forward to Canadians passing judgment on them.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Carolyn Stewart-Olsen, the senator for Ottawa-Moncton.

[Translation]

Does the Prime Minister agree with his Conservative senator, Jean-Guy Dagenais, who thinks that his office is entitled to claim money from taxpayers for mileage on travel that he admits never took place?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General issued his report and the Senate is acting on it. The NDP leader is obviously trying to make up accusations against some individuals. The truth is that this member took \$400,000 from taxpayers, as in the sponsorship scandal, for his own political party. That is completely unacceptable, and the public will have a chance to have its say.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is 2015. Sexual harassment in our military is—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Papineau has the floor.

Mr. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, it is 2015, and sexual harassment in our military is unacceptable. Someone in a leadership role excusing it as biological wiring is unacceptable. An apology that says this was just an awkward characterization is unacceptable.

The Prime Minister just said that he agrees, so why will the Prime Minister not immediately dismiss his Chief of the Defence Staff?

Oral Questions

• (1430)

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the leader of the Liberal Party has been briefed on the facts in terms of the year.

In terms of the more serious issue, as I have said, obviously the comments made here are offensive. They are inappropriate, they are inexplicable, and the general did immediately apologize. As we have said repeatedly, sexual misconduct is unacceptable in any institution, government or non-governmental. The Canadian Armed Forces takes this issue very seriously. They commissioned a report, with a series of comprehensive recommendations, and they are acting on them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, sexual harassment is unacceptable. Those in leadership positions need to set an example.

The Canadian Armed Forces Chief of the Defence Staff made unacceptable comments on that subject. His apology is not good enough.

Once again, seriously this time, can the Prime Minister tell us why he did not immediately demand that the Chief of the Defence Staff resign?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the general apologized immediately. As I said, his comments were inappropriate, offensive and unacceptable. The Canadian Armed Forces are acting on recommendations and taking a comprehensive approach to eliminating sexual harassment among military personnel. The Chief of the Defence Staff has already announced his retirement, his successor has been appointed, and the transition will take place soon.

* * *

SUPREME COURT

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, the Prime Minister has repeatedly attacked the Supreme Court. He changed the judicial appointment process, making it partisan and closed.

The Liberal Party has a plan for real change, to make the Supreme Court appointment process inclusive, representative and transparent again, a process that will ensure that judges are bilingual.

Why does the Prime Minister refuse to acknowledge the importance of having judges who understand our two official languages?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the Liberal Party leader's 32 number one recommendations.

[*English*]

He has 32 number one recommendations, number one policies, none of which, of course, correspond to anything here his party has ever done in the past on this or any other issue.

Our institutions are bilingual. The Parliament of Canada is bilingual. The Supreme Court of Canada is bilingual. Other

institutions are. We do not require every single member of them to be bilingual.

* * *

ETHICS

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Nigel Wright told the RCMP that he briefed the Prime Minister on the media lines for the Duffy deal. Wright said in an email that he had the "good to go from the PM".

Why did the Prime Minister claim that he had never given Wright any instructions regarding the Duffy scandal? "Good to go" seems like a pretty clear instruction.

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the leader of the NDP knows very well, he is quoting from an RCMP report that thoroughly examined this matter. It was given access to all documents and was very clear that I knew nothing of this particular matter, unlike him, who signed all of the papers, that took the money, inappropriately and fraudulently, out of the House of Commons, for which he will have to answer.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the question—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair: Mr. Speaker, the question is just that: Is the Prime Minister good to go?

Is he good to go to swear to these statements under oath on a witness stand? If the Prime Minister is called to testify in the Mike Duffy trial, will he appear, or will he hide?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, once again, as those who have investigated this have said that I am neither a participant nor a witness to any of these events, there is absolutely no reason why I would be before the court.

However, I would invite him to have the RCMP look at his files on the \$400,000 he personally took and the \$3 million his party took out of the House of Commons.

• (1435)

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, now that we have heard the Prime Minister talk about the Liberal-Conservative kangaroo court, why do we not look at what real courts have had to say about the Conservative record.

In 2006, convicted in court of cheating in the in-and-out scandal; 2008, convicted of cheating in the Dean Del Mastro affair; 2011, convicted in court for cheating in the robocalls scandal.

The Prime Minister's team has been convicted of cheating in every single election he has won. What safeguards has he put in place to try to ensure that his team does not cheat this time around?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here is a party that itself has been found guilty of inappropriate robo-calls and has been forced to return union funds that it illegally raised, and knowingly did so, and of course, still, \$2.7 million was taken out of the House of Commons by the NDP, not for any parliamentary purpose, for the use of its own party offices across the country.

This is exactly the kind of thing that happened in the sponsorship scandal, and the NDP will be held accountable.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is using Bill C-51 to attack our rights and freedoms while offering no proof that this law will actually protect Canadians.

If the Prime Minister is so confident of the legality of Bill C-51, why does he not simply refer it to the Supreme Court prior to royal assent?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-51 gives our law enforcement and security agencies all of the powers they typically have across major western governments to deal with very real security threats, things like sharing information between departments and having the ability to use peace bonds in case of imminent threat. I could go through those.

Of course, the NDP is always against these things, always against this kind of thing, votes against every single piece of security legislation ever put forward because of its extreme and ideological positions. What would we expect from leader who thinks Osama bin Laden is still alive and there is no such thing as a terrorist attack in Canada?

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, 400,000 good-paying manufacturing jobs have been lost while this Prime Minister did absolutely nothing. Sixty percent of the jobs created over the past six years are precarious, part-time, or contract work. In Ontario, that number is a whopping 83%.

Is that the Prime Minister's plan: for middle-class families to support themselves with part-time jobs?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I say it again. It is very clear in Statistics Canada's report: 1.2 million net new jobs since the end of the recession, overwhelmingly full-time, high-paying, in the private sector. It is the best record in the G7 by a considerable stretch. But we should not expect the leader of the NDP to know his facts, because yesterday he was out there saying businesses need to pay higher taxes. When asked, "What is the tax rate exactly?," he did not know and stated that it was three points lower than it actually is. That is typical of the NDP. It does not know what the taxes are; it just knows everybody's taxes have to be higher.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, heading into a previous election, the Prime Minister handed over a \$5-million cheque at Electro-Motive Diesel in London,

Ontario. The only problem is the plant shut down just a while later, and the jobs were shipped to the U.S.

Heading into this election, the Prime Minister included footage of the Chevy Camaro assembly line in Oshawa. The only problem is that it was shut down, and the jobs have been shipped to the U.S.

Will the Prime Minister admit that his plan is not working, or at the very least, will he please stop visiting assembly lines?

• (1440)

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, at least the leader of the Liberal Party knows when to stop getting up.

The government's job creation record in a period of global economic uncertainty is not paralleled in major industrial countries. We have done that with a balanced budget and with lower taxes for Canadian businesses and Canadian workers and Canadian families. Every sector—the automotive sector, the exporters and manufacturers—is strongly supportive of the government's economic action plan, and nothing is going to convince those businesses or Canadian workers to buy the snake oil that somehow high taxes and big deficits are going to bring about greater prosperity. People can see what NDP policies have done in other countries. They are not going to have them here.

* * *

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of arrogance that could mean that this is the Prime Minister's last question period, so I hope he does not mind that we have a couple more.

The Prime Minister's plan is not working. The Prime Minister has failed. That is why Canadians want change.

As families struggle to make ends meet, the Prime Minister is telling seniors they will have to wait an extra two years to retire, raising the retirement age to 67. The Prime Minister forgot to mention that in the last election campaign.

Can he please tell Canadians today what he is hiding up his sleeve for the next time around?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I remind the leader of the NDP that it will be Canadians, not him, who decide the results of the next election. Canadians understand that we are living in a global economy that is very troubled. They also understand, as they look around the world, that there is absolutely no better place to be than this country, Canada. We have a balanced budget. We have lower taxes for Canadian families, businesses, and workers. We have more money that is going into the pockets of our senior citizens and families. I do not believe anyone is going to blow that by buying the high-tax snake oil of the NDP.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have already decided, and they want change.

Did the Prime Minister ask Pope Francis to apologize on behalf of the Catholic Church for its involvement in the horrors of residential schools?

[*Translation*]

I am not interested in what document was submitted. He met with the Pope. Did he ask for an apology or not?

[*English*]

Did he ask for an apology, yes or no?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this government has apologized for that. We have brought to the attention of the Pope and the Catholic Church the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. It will be up to the Catholic Church to decide how to respond to the recommendations that are pertinent to it.

The kind of change Canadians are seeking is change that means more prosperity, lower taxes and greater trade. That is the kind of change they are looking for. They are not looking for the high tax, protectionist, anti-prosperity agenda of the NDP.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, instead of asking Canadians to give up their freedoms, the Prime Minister ought to be showing a little respect for the people who fought for our freedoms: our veterans. The Prime Minister has closed veterans service centres, ignored a rash of military suicides and let his minister literally berate those who served our country.

Will the Prime Minister make a show of good faith and commit to reopening those nine veterans offices?

•(1445)

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadian veterans services under this government are the best in the world. We have augmented those services across all fronts and have provided more points of service to Canadian veterans than ever before.

The men and women who serve in uniform and have served in uniform can witness the kind of slur made earlier on them by the

leader of the NDP. They know who is on their side and it is this party.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister confirmed yesterday it was on his encouragement that the RCMP was instructed to violate the law and destroy government documents. If anyone needed any more proof that Ottawa is broken, they need look no further than a Prime Minister who puts direct pressure on the national police force to break the law.

Has the Prime Minister become so out of touch that he thinks he can ask the RCMP to break the law and then write himself a nice little bill to absolve himself of responsibility? Does the Prime Minister really believe he is above the law?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to confirm to my hon. colleague that our government promised to get rid of the costly and ineffective firearms registry. That is what we did.

One thing is clear: the Liberals would reinstate the registry and treat hunters and fishers in this country like second-class citizens. We will continue to stand up for stronger public safety laws without hindering those who hunt for sport.

* * *

[*English*]

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years, the Conservatives' complete neglect of the manufacturing sector has had a devastating toll. In Toronto, one-quarter of its manufacturing jobs have simply vanished. Kitchener, Waterloo, Quebec City, Sherbrooke each have lost one-third of their jobs and in Windsor it is nearly 40%. The Conservatives' only response is to spend millions on partisan ads while posting record trade deficits.

Instead of trying to deceive Canadians with their own money, when are the Conservatives going to produce a real manufacturing strategy?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have. As my colleague may well know, the Stats Canada numbers on jobs in the month of May show that not only 60,000 new jobs were created that month, but that 22,000 new jobs were created in the manufacturing sector about which the member asks.

She asks equally for a plan and for some action by our government on manufacturing. We have done so and have put forward effective measures in our government's budget, from the capital cost allowance to the automotive supplier fund, the automotive innovation fund, the tech demo program. We are supporting manufacturers, which is why the Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters endorsed our budget and attacked the Liberal leader for his saying that Canada needs to move away from manufacturing. We support our manufacturers. We deliver for them, and we will never do what the Liberal leader does.

*Oral Questions***INFRASTRUCTURE**

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Trinity—Spadina, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the more the government announces, the less it seems to happen. The MP for Calgary Centre found this out the hard way, because she just found out what the rest of the country has known for a couple of years now: there is no infrastructure money flowing to major cities in this country. We have now lost two full construction seasons. There are lots of promises, lots of billboards, lots of ads, but the funds, as the Conservative MP said herself, are sitting there unused. She tried to blame the mayor of Calgary for this and he told her to go hire a fact checker.

Since the Conservative government is more interested in slamming the mayor of Calgary than helping that city, let me ask the question: Is the government going to fund the green line? Is the government going to deliver transit and jobs to Calgary or is it going to tell—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Infrastructure.

Hon. Denis Lebel (Minister of Infrastructure, Communities and Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our Conservative government's investments in provincial and municipal infrastructure are unprecedented. Since 2006, we have invested six times more on average than was invested during the Liberal years of darkness and inaction in infrastructure.

Talking about Ontario, we have invested in the Scarborough subway, Sheppard light rail transit, the Union Station revitalization, the Kitchener—Waterloo rapid transit, and the list is very long. Twice a year we are transferring the money for the gas tax fund to the provinces and municipalities. That is being done.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, four decades after the waterways around Grassy Narrows were contaminated, a new report has revealed that the mercury levels in parts of the English-Wabigoon river system are increasing. The mercury is an obvious risk to the health of the Grassy Narrows First Nation, but despite this, there has not been any adequate study of the impact of these levels on people's health.

A new report calls for a comprehensive study to be concluded. Will the government support this study, yes or no?

• (1450)

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the health and well-being of first nations is a priority for our government, and we continue to work with the Mercury Disability Board and the Province of Ontario to support their work in addressing the issue of mercury contamination. We have been working in partnership with the first nation and the Province of Ontario for a number of years, and that good co-operation and work will continue.

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is yet no answer to this question for the people of Grassy Narrows First Nation.

Let us move on to the issue of missing and murdered indigenous women.

This Friday, the RCMP is expected to publish a report talking about this ongoing tragedy. Indigenous people have called for the full analysis and details of what numbers are out there so that all systemic factors can be addressed and analyzed. This evidence should come before an inquiry as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission has also recommended.

When will the government take seriously the issue of the national epidemic that is missing and murdered indigenous women in Canada?

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and for Western Economic Diversification, CPC): Mr. Speaker, these are terrible crimes against innocent people, and the RCMP said in its own study that the vast majority of these cases are addressed and solved through police investigations.

We do not need another study. We have already had over 40 studies that have been done. We need to move forward with the action plan that is going to improve the lives of women and children living on reserves.

* * *

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in the dying days of the 2011 election, Elections Canada warned Canadians about a Conservative voter suppression scheme. However, Elections Canada officials are sounding the alarm bells months before the next election. They are telling people they need to act urgently to get the new voter ID requirement.

Why is it so much harder to vote? Is it because the Conservative Party does not believe it can win a fair fight? The fact is many Canadians, seniors, youth, first nations, will go to vote and will be told "Sorry, you are not allowed to vote this time". Why is the corrupt government relying on voter suppression tactics in order to try to cling to power?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is yet another example of the loony-left in the NDP, which does not even believe people should bring ID when they vote. The good news is 87% of Canadians agree that they should bring ID when they vote.

That is why we passed the Fair Elections Act. Canadians overwhelmingly agree with the Fair Elections Act, and we expect that they will agree with our overall common-sense agenda in the coming election.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, breaking election laws has become basically an automatic reflex for the Conservatives. The in and out scandal, the misleading robocalls, Dean Del Mastro and Peter Penashue, come to mind, just to name a few. They had to add another layer to their electoral “deform”, which will make it even harder to vote. Now, with voting day four months away, Elections Canada is sounding the alarm. Voting is going to be a lot harder for some Canadians.

How can the Conservatives justify their attack on this fundamental right? Why do they want to prevent people from voting? What guarantee do we have that they will not try to cheat again?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Democratic Reform, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is another example of the far left, the New Democrats, believing that people should not even have to bring a piece of ID to vote. Some 87% of Canadians agree that people should have to show ID in order to vote. That is why we included that in our fair elections act. Canadians generally agree with this approach, which is why they support us.

* * *

*[English]***TAXATION**

Mr. Dave Van Kesteren (Chatham-Kent—Essex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the NDP leader reaffirmed his support for higher CPP payroll taxes. The Liberal leader has also committed to imposing the Ontario Liberals' dramatic payroll tax increases.

Could the Minister of State for Finance please give the House an update on the government's position on these?

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hard-working member for Chatham-Kent—Essex for that question.

Our Conservative government understands that Canadians want low taxes and the freedom to make their own financial decisions. We are proud to be providing historic tax relief that is putting \$6,600 back into the pockets of a typical two-earner family of four.

We reject the Liberal leader's \$1,000 tax hike on middle-class workers. Canadians know now is not the time for risky schemes and untested leadership.

* * *

●(1455)

*[Translation]***CANADA POST**

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, people in Laval are outraged by Canada Post's decision to put an end to home delivery. Despite record profits, Canada Post insists on doing away with an essential service for our seniors and SMEs.

Today, we learned that some neighbourhoods will be exempt while others will not. Canada Post is making things up as it goes along. This is another example of the Conservatives' mismanagement.

Will the minister finally do the only reasonable thing and restore home delivery service?

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us get to the facts of the matter. Canada Post is losing a significant amount of money. As a result, it is converting to community mailboxes, which are \$178 per address cheaper. This is the way it is going to be self-sufficient in the future.

Let us contrast that with what the opposition wants to do, which is to reinstate some, all, part—I do not know—of door-to-door service, which will cost upwards of half a billion dollars.

This is not the way to manage finances. Canadians know exactly who can manage the finances in this place, and it is this government.

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canada Post made almost \$200 million in profits last year. However, it is still going ahead with the plan to end door-to-door service for over five million Canadians; that is unless one lives in a certain neighbourhood. Today we found out that Canada Post is allowing some neighbourhoods special concessions.

Why will the minister not admit that the Canada Post plan is flawed in all areas and tell it to go back to the drawing board to restore home delivery?

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think the opposition should admit that it is flawed in anything to do with economics because what it does not realize is this. There is no profit at Canada Post. It had a \$1.4 billion pension payment that had to be made in 2014. That was forgiven, because we are trying to get Canada Post back on its right footing.

The members of the opposition should stop talking to the members of CUPW and they should start speaking on behalf of Canadians who want to make sure their tax dollars are well looked after.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MINT

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, CBC has uncovered yet another Conservative appointee wasting tax dollars. This time it is at the Canadian Mint. He okayed post-conference vacations for employees and their spouses.

Do members remember back when the Conservatives attacked the Liberals for David Dingwall being “entitled to his entitlements” when he was at the Mint? Now the Conservatives' appointees are jetting off on taxpayer-funded vacations, putting even Mr. Dingwall to shame. What happened to them? When exactly did they become just like the corrupt Liberals they replaced?

Oral Questions

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, abuse of taxpayers' dollars is unacceptable and will not be tolerated by our government. As soon as I was made aware of the expenses, I instructed the Mint to adhere to appropriate management and oversight of travel and hospitality expenses by staff and board members, consistent with Treasury Board guidelines.

While the Mint manages its own expenses like other crown corporations, it has a responsibility to ensure public funds are managed properly and in the best interests of taxpayers.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Dionne Labelle (Rivière-du-Nord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, senior executives from the Royal Canadian Mint, those who manufacture our money, have been using taxpayers' money to pay for wonderful personal vacations for themselves and their spouses: five star hotels in Mexico and trips to Thailand, Australia and Vienna. Nothing is too good for the royals at the Royal Canadian Mint. They spent over \$160,000 in public funds to relax with their toes in the warm sand.

Can the Minister of Finance, who is responsible for the Royal Canadian Mint, explain how all this is possible?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I said, any abuse of taxpayers' dollars will not be tolerated by our government.

As soon as I was made aware of the questionable expenses, I instructed the Royal Canadian Mint to adhere to appropriate management and oversight of expenses. Like all other crown corporations, the Royal Canadian Mint has a responsibility to ensure public funds are always managed in the best interests of taxpayers.

* * *

• (1500)

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. John McCallum (Markham—Unionville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Michael Chan has been a good friend of mine for 15 years, and I know he is a loyal, patriotic Canadian.

Four years ago, CSIS told him he was no longer under investigation, and the Premier of Ontario has said the charges against him are baseless.

Do Conservatives believe it is wrong to maintain strong ties with one's country of origin?

Yesterday's comments by the Attorney General on operational matters were beneath the dignity of his office. Will he stand and apologize in this House?

[Translation]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is very simple. This is a Government of Ontario matter. I have no further comment.

[English]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the regulations governing the installation of cell towers require companies to consult local municipalities beforehand, but there is a glaring loophole. If the antenna is to be installed on an existing structure, such as a hydro pole or telephone pole, there is no obligation to consult. Why not?

Whether it is on a new or existing structure, residents like those on Taywood Drive in my riding have the same concerns about an antenna's proximity to their home, especially if children are involved.

Will the minister close this loophole as soon as possible?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the regulations, when applied, actually do not allow for that loophole. I am happy to talk to the member and find out exactly what is happening in his district as he describes it.

The regulations that we put in place were proposed by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Of course, the vastness of this country, the geographic dynamics, and the demand by all Canadians to have access to high-speed cellular connectivity is critically important for our government. However, we want to do this in a way that coincides with the demand for communities to build their communities with an aesthetic that makes sense.

I am happy to look into the matter with the member.

* * *

[Translation]

HEALTH

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago, an NDP motion to regulate trans fats was adopted by Parliament.

Since then, not only have the Conservatives not followed Health Canada's recommendations, which would result in health care savings of \$9 billion, but even worse they decided to abandon the regulations, which were expected in 2010. The United States announced that they would abolish the use of trans fats.

Why is the minister refusing to regulate the use of trans fats, which are so harmful to health?

[English]

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and for Western Economic Diversification, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have been very focused on making sure Canadians have the information they need to make healthy choices. We were the first country in the world to require mandatory labelling to decrease trans fat levels in food. This is working, and we are working with industry. The approach has actually decreased intake by 60% in the last two decades.

However, we are always willing to examine further action if it is going to benefit families.

Oral Questions

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is not okay to put poison in our food just because it is properly labelled. Banning trans fat will save lives, full stop, period, yet 11 years after Parliament directed government to ban trans fat, we are still clogging our children's arteries with this toxic goop.

The United States has taken direct action and banned trans fat in all its forms. Will Canadians have to wait until the NDP forms the next government before we can protect consumers from this public health hazard?

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and for Western Economic Diversification, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have taken important and significant action on this particular issue.

I would like to note that there has been a 60% decrease in the intake of trans fat. Also, I did note that we will work to see if further action will benefit families.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are tough on donuts, but let us talk about saving lives.

Impaired driving is a very serious crime that kills and injures thousands of Canadians every year. Can the hard-working Minister of Justice please update this House on what our Conservative government is doing to crack down on impaired driving?

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member has been an outspoken advocate on this issue for many years.

Impaired drivers pose a significant risk to Canadians. It is the number one criminal cause of death in Canada.

To make offenders more accountable for their crimes, we have introduced legislation to increase mandatory minimum penalties for many transportation offences, including impaired driving involving bodily harm or death. This would also increase efficiency for police officers to investigate impaired driving and for the prosecution to go forward with these serious cases.

I encourage all members of this House to support this important bill, which targets the scourge of impaired driving that is causing carnage on Canadian highways.

* * *

•(1505)

[*Translation*]

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the crisis and violence in Burundi are worsening with the approach of the July 15 presidential election. In my opinion, the Canadian government should expedite family reunification applications. Furthermore, at the end of May we deported a young woman who had to immediately flee Burundi because the police wanted to put her in jail. She probably would have been tortured or raped in prison.

Will the government temporarily stop the 650 or so scheduled deportations of Burundian citizens?

Hon. Chris Alexander (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are closely following the situation in Burundi. Decisions about that country, or any country in conflict, are always carefully considered by the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. We intend to continue reuniting families and welcoming Burundians to Canada, to the extent possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Harris (Scarborough Southwest, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a man with advanced cancer in my riding was nearly denied life-saving surgery all because of a mistake at Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

He could not renew his health card without verification of his immigration status, but immigration lost his application and then sent it to Alberta, mixed in with someone else's paperwork.

Thankfully, after two months, he finally got the life-saving surgery that he needed, but this is unacceptable. Will the minister investigate this horrendous bureaucratic blunder so that it never happens again?

Hon. Chris Alexander (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the member well knows, we cannot speak about individual cases in this place. The Privacy Act forbids it. Decisions are made by highly trained and highly professional public services.

However, the member would do well in this near-final question period of this Parliament not to politicize the cases of individuals, not to politicize the suffering of families, and to answer to the House why the NDP was unable to support a bill yesterday at third reading that would protect women and girls from early and forced marriage, from polygamy, and from honour-based violence.

Why has the NDP done nothing to protect Canadians from abuse in our immigration system?

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Wladyslaw Lizon (Mississauga East—Cooksville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government believes in low taxes for employers and employees. In fact, we have been lowering taxes on job creators since we took office.

Can the Minister of Finance please update the House on our government's policy on taxes for job creators?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hard-working member for Mississauga East—Cooksville for the important question. Today we saw the NDP leader's ideological position on taxes. When asked what the business tax rate is, first he made a mistake and then he admitted that he did not know but still believed they should be higher.

Private Members' Business

This is the NDP position on taxes. Even when it is clueless about fiscal policy, it is convinced that taxes need to be higher.

I want to assure the House that our position on taxes is just as clear but starkly different. We understand that taxes need to remain low to create jobs and growth.

* * *

[Translation]

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, after several years before the courts, there is still no resolution in the case of Cyrenus Dugas, a fisherman from New Brunswick, and his snow crab licence. Fisheries and Oceans Canada would not allow him to transfer his fishing licence. However, it appears that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has authorized the licence to be transferred on the basis of incorrect information and despite the fact that the transfer is still before the Court of Appeal.

Why does the minister not respect the legal process? Why was it so urgent to transfer this fishing licence?

[English]

Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this issue has been before the courts for quite some time. The court has ruled and DFO acted upon that ruling.

* * *

[Translation]

PORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Jean-François Fortin (Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, FD): Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 20, I will attend a rally in Carleton-sur-Mer, in the Gaspé, to show my support for the community's recreational and tourism plan for its wharf.

The goal is to make the wharf conducive to commercial fishing, mariculture, and leisure and tourism activities—a comprehensive plan that will have significant benefits for Carleton-sur-Mer.

To move forward, the community now needs the approval of Transport Canada, which owns the wharf.

Will the Minister of Transport ensure that the development plan for the Carleton-sur-Mer wharf, an important and unifying project for the Gaspé, will be processed quickly?

• (1510)

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have in place a ports asset transfer program which just entered the sales phase on Monday of this week.

[Translation]

I can assure the hon. member that the divestiture program exists for this reason. The discussions with the municipalities will continue.

[English]

However, the province has a role as well, and I expect that the municipality and the province will work with Transport Canada

officials to make sure that we can transfer this into the hands of the local municipalities.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AND OTHER FORMS OF DEMENTIA

The House resumed from June 11 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, June 16, 2015, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 575 under private members' business.

Call in the members.

• (1520)

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

(Division No. 457)

YEAS

Members

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

Private Members' Business

Eyking	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Fletcher
Foote	Fortin
Freeland	Galipeau
Gallant	Garneau
Garrison	Genest
Genest-Jourdain	Giguère
Gill	Glover
Godin	Goguen
Goldring	Goodale
Goodyear	Gosal
Gravelle	Grewal
Groguhé	Harper
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer
Holder	Hsu
Hyer	James
Jones	Julian
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kellway	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kent	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Latendresse
Lauzon	Laverdière
Lebel	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leslie	Leung
Liu	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
Lunney	MacAulay
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Maguire	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	McLeod
Menegakis	Michaud
Miller	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mourani	Mulcair
Murray	Nantel
Nash	Nicholson
Norlock	Nunez-Melo
Obhrai	O'Connor
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Pacetti	Papillon
Paradis	Payne
Péclet	Perkins
Pilon	Poilievre
Preston	Quach
Rafferty	Raït
Rajotte	Rankin
Rathgeber	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Rickford
Ritz	Rousseau
Sandhu	Saxton
Scarpaleggia	Schellenberger
Scott	Seeback
Sellah	Shea
Shipley	Shory
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaiesan	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	St-Denis
Stewart	Stoffer
Sullivan	Sweet
Tilson	Toet
Toone	Tremblay
Trost	Trottier
Trudeau	Uppal
Valcourt	Valeriote
Van Kesteren	Van Loan

Vaughan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 277	

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES

The House resumed from June 12 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, June 16, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 574 under private member's business.

● (1525)

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

(Division No. 458)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Allen (Welland)
Andrews	Angus
Ashton	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Bélangier	Bellavance
Bennett	Benskin
Bevington	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Boivin
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Brisson
Brousseau	Byrne
Caron	Casey
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseau
Easter	Eyking
Foote	Fortin
Freeland	Garneau
Garrison	Genest
Genest-Jourdain	Giguère
Godin	Goodale
Gravelle	Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu	Hyer
Jones	Julian
Kellway	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Latendresse
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	MacAulay
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse

Mathysen
McGuinly
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Murray
Nash
Pacetti
Péclet
Quach
Rankin
Raynault
Rousseau
Scarpaleggia
Sellah
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
St-Denis
Stoffer
Toone
Trudeau
Vaughan— 127

McCallum
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nunez-Melo
Papillon
Pilon
Rafferty
Ravignat
Regan
Sandhu
Scott
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
sor)
Sitsabaesan
Stewart
Sullivan
Tremblay
Valeriote

Rempel
Rickford
Saxton
Seeback
Shipley
Smith
Sorenson
Sweet
Toet
Trottier
Valcourt
Van Loan
Wallace
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)
Zimmer— 149

Richards
Ritz
Schellenberger
Shea
Shory
Sopuck
Stanton
Tilson
Trost
Uppal
Van Kesteren
Vellacott
Warawa
Watson
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Yurdiga

Private Members' Business

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

● (1530)

FREE VOTES

The House resumed from June 15 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, June 16, 2015, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 590 under private member's business.

● (1535)

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

(Division No. 459)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anderson
Ashfield
Barlow
Bergen
Bezan
Block
Braid
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Chisu
Clarke
Crockatt
Davidson
Devolin
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Eglinski
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Galipeau
Gill
Goguen
Goodyear
Grewal
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hiebert
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)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Nicholson
Obhrai
O'Neill Gordon
O'Toole
Payne
Poilievre
Raitt
Rathgeber

Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allison
Anders
Armstrong
Aspin
Benoit
Bernier
Blaney
Boughen
Breitkreuz
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Chong
Clement
Daniel
Dechert
Dreeschen
Dykstra
Falk
Fast
Fletcher
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Gosal
Harper
Hayes
Hillyer
James
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kent
Komarnicki
Lake
Lebel
Leitch
Leung
Lobb
Lunney
MacKenzie
Mayes
McLeod
Miller
Norlock
O'Connor
Opitz
Paradis
Perkins
Preston
Rajotte
Reid

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anderson
Angus
Ashfield
Aspin
Aubin
Barlow
Bellavance
Benoit
Bergen
Bevington
Blanchette
Blaney
Boivin
Boulerice
Brahmi
Breitkreuz
Brousseau
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Byrne
Calkins
Carmichael
Carrie
Cash
Chicoine
Chisu
Choquette

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Welland)
Allison
Anders
Andrews
Armstrong
Ashton
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bélanger
Bennett
Benskin
Bernier
Bezan
Blanchette-Lamothe
Block
Boughen
Boutin-Sweet
Braid
Brisson
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Butt
Calandra
Cannan
Caron
Casey
Charlton
Chisholm
Chong
Christopherson

Government Orders

Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Easter
Foote
Freeland
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Godin
Gravelle
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hsu
Jones
Kellway
Lapointe
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nunez-Melo
Papillon
Pilon
Rafferty
Rathgeber
Raynault
Rousseau
Scarpaleggia
Sellah
sor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
St-Denis
Stoffer
Toone
Trudeau
Vaughan — 129

Dusseault
Eyking
Fortin
Garneau
Genest
Giguère
Goodale
Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)
Hyer
Julian
Lamoureux
Latendresse
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leslie
MacAulay
Marston
Masse
May
McGuinty
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Murray
Nash
Pacetti
Péclet
Quach
Rankin
Ravignat
Regan
Sandhu
Scott
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
sor)
Sitsabaiesan
Stewart
Sullivan
Tremblay
Valeriotte

Lauzon
Leaf
Lemieux
Lobb
Lunney
MacKenzie
Mayes
McLeod
Miller
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Norlock
O'Connor
Opitz
Paradis
Perkins
Preston
Rajotte
Rempel
Rickford
Saxton
Seeback
Shipley
Smith
Sorenson
Sweet
Toet
Trottier
Valcourt
Van Loan
Wallace
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)
Zimmer — 147

Lebel
Leitch
Leung
Lukiwski
MacKay (Central Nova)
Maguire
McColeman
Menegakis
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Nicholson
Obhrai
O'Neill Gordon
O'Toole
Payne
Poilievre
Raitt
Reid
Richards
Ritz
Schellenberger
Shea
Shory
Sopuck
Stanton
Tilson
Trost
Uppal
Van Kesteren
Vellacott
Warawa
Watson
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anderson
Ashfield
Barlow
Bergen
Bezan
Block
Braid
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Chisu
Clarke
Crockatt
Davidson
Devolin
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Eglinski
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Galipeau
Gill
Goguen
Goodyear
Grewal
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hiebert
Holder
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)

Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allison
Anders
Armstrong
Aspin
Benoit
Bernier
Blaney
Boughen
Breitkreuz
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Chong
Clement
Daniel
Dechert
Dreesen
Dykstra
Falk
Fast
Fletcher
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Gosal
Harper
Hayes
Hillyer
James
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kent
Komarnicki
Lake

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

WAYS AND MEANS

MOTION NO. 25

The Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, June 16, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 25 under ways and means.

● (1550)

[*English*]

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

(Division No. 461)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allison
Anders
Andrews
Ashfield
Barlow
Bellavance

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anderson
Armstrong
Aspin
Bélanger
Bennett

Government Orders

Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Bezan
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brison
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Casey	Chisu
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Cotler
Crockatt	Cuzner
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Devolin
Dion	Dreeshen
Dubourg	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dykstra
Easter	Eglinski
Eyking	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Fletcher
Footé	Fortin
Freeland	Galipeau
Gallant	Garneau
Gill	Glover
Goguen	Goldring
Goodale	Goodyear
Gosal	Grewal
Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Holder
Hsu	James
Jones	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kent	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lamoureux
Lauzon	Lebel
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	Leef
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
Lunney	MacAulay
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Maguire	Mayes
McCallum	McColeman
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McLeod	Menegakis
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Murray
Nicholson	Norlock
Oblrai	O'Connor
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
O'Toole	Pacetti
Paradis	Payne
Perkins	Poilievre
Preston	Raitt
Rajotte	Rathgeber
Regan	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rickford	Ritz
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Seeback
Shea	Shiple
Shory (sor)	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind- sor)
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
St-Denis	Sweet
Tilson	Toet
Trost	Trottier
Trudeau	Uppal
Valcourt	Valerioté
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vaughan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga

Zimmer — 185

Allen (Welland)
Ashton
Aubin
Benskin
Blanchette
Boivin
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cash
Chicoine
Choquette
Cleary
Côté
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dewar
Donnelly
Dubé
Dusseault
Genest
Giguère
Gravelle
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hyer
Kellway
Latendresse
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Marston
Masse
May
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nash
Papillon
Pilon
Rafferty
Ravignat
Rousseau
Scott
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Stewart
Sullivan
Tremblay — 91

NAYS

Members

Angus
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bevington
Blanchette-Lamothe
Boulerice
Brahmi
Caron
Charlton
Chisholm
Christopherson
Comartin
Crowder
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Godin
Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)
Julian
Lapointe
Laverdière
Leslie
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Nantel
Nunez-Melo
Péclet
Quach
Rankin
Raynault
Sandhu
Sellah
Sitsabaiesan
Stoffer
Toone

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried

● (1555)

MOTION NO. 26

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 26 under Ways and Means.

● (1600)

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

*(Division No. 462)***YEAS**

Members

Ablonczy	Adler
Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Amber	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong

Private Members' Business

Ashfield	Aspin	Brison	Brosseau
Barlow	Benoit	Byrne	Caron
Bergen	Bernier	Casey	Cash
Bezan	Blaney	Charlton	Chicoine
Block	Boughen	Chisholm	Choquette
Braid	Breitkreuz	Christopherson	Cleary
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Comartin	Côté
Butt	Calandra	Cotler	Crowder
Calkins	Cannan	Cullen	Cuzner
Carmichael	Carrie	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Chisu	Chong	Day	Dewar
Clarke	Clement	Dion	Dionne Labelle
Crockatt	Daniel	Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Davidson	Dechert	Dubé	Dubourg
Devolin	Dreeschen	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra	Dusseau	Easter
Eglinski	Falk	Eyking	Foote
Fantino	Fast	Fortin	Freeland
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Fletcher	Garneau	Garrison
Galipeau	Gallant	Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Gill	Glover	Giguère	Godin
Goguen	Goldring	Goodale	Gravelle
Goodyear	Gosal	Grogoué	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Grewal	Harper	Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hayes	Hyer	Jones
Hiebert	Hillyer	Julian	Kellway
Holder	James	Lamoureux	Lapointe
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Latendresse	Laverdière
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Énard)
Kerr	Komarnicki	Leslie	Liu
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake	MacAulay	Mai
Lauzon	Leef	Marston	Martin
Leitch	Lemieux	Masse	Mathysen
Leung	Lizon	May	McCallum
Lobb	Lukowski	McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Lunney	MacKay (Central Nova)	Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
MacKenzie	Maguire	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Mayes	McColeman	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
McLeod	Menegakis	Mourani	Mulcair
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	Murray	Nantel
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Nicholson	Nash	Nunez-Melo
Norlock	Obhrai	Papillon	Péclét
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon	Pilon	Quach
Opitz	O'Toole	Rafferty	Rankin
Pacetti	Paradis	Ravignat	Raynault
Payne	Perkins	Regan	Rousseau
Poilievre	Preston	Sandhu	Scarpaleggia
Raït	Rajotte	Scott	Sellah
Rathgeber	Reid	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Rempel	Richards	Sims (Newton—North Delta)	St-Denis
Rickford	Ritz	Sitsabaiesan	Stoffer
Saxton	Schellenberger	Stewart	Toone
Seeback	Shea	Sullivan	Trudeau
Shipley	Shory	Tremblay	Vaughan— 126
Smith	Sopuck	Valériote	
Sorenson	Stanton		
Sweet	Tilson		
Toet	Trost		
Trottier	Uppal		
Valcourt	Van Kesteren		
Van Loan	Vellacott		
Wallace	Warawa		
Warkentin	Watson		
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)			
Weston (Saint John)	Williamson		
Wilks	Woodworth		
Wong	Young (Oakville)		
Yelich	Yurdiga		
Young (Vancouver South)			
Zimmer— 149			

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

The House resumed from June 16 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 585 under private members' business.

• (1610)

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

NAYS

Members

Adams	Allen (Welland)
Andrews	Angus
Ashton	Aubin
Ayala	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Boivin	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi

*Private Members' Business**(Division No. 463)***YEAS**

Members

Adams	Allen (Welland)
Andrews	Angus
Ashton	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Bélanger	Bellavance
Bennett	Benskin
Bevington	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Boivin
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Brisson
Brosseau	Byrne
Caron	Casey
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Comartin	Côté
Cotler	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	Foote
Fortin	Freeland
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Godin
Goodale	Gravelle
Groguhé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu
Hyer	Jones
Julian	Kellway
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Latendresse	Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leslie	Liu
MacAulay	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
May	McCallum
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mourani	Mulcair
Murray	Nantel
Nash	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Péclet	Pilon
Quach	Rafferty
Rankin	Rathgeber
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
Trudeau	Valeriot
Vaughan — 127	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adler
Aglukkaq	Albas
Albrecht	Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Allison
Amler	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Ashfield	Aspin
Barlow	Benoit

Bergen	Bernier
Bezan	Blaney
Block	Boughen
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chisu	Chong
Clarke	Clement
Crockatt	Daniel
Davidson	Dechert
Devolin	Dreeschen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Eglinski	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Fletcher
Galipeau	Gallant
Gill	Glover
Goguen	Goodyear
Grewal	Harper
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer
Holder	James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Leef
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
Lunney	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mayes	McColeman
McLeod	Menegakis
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Nicholson
Norlock	Obhrai
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Paradis	Payne
Perkins	Poilievre
Preston	Raitt
Rajotte	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rickford	Ritz
Saxton	Schellenberger
Seeback	Shea
Shiple	Shory
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Sweet	Tilson
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Uppal
Valcourt	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	Williamson
Wilks	Woodworth
Wong	Young (Oakville)
Yelich	Yurdiga
Young (Vancouver South)	
Zimmer — 145	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

The House resumed from June 16 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 21st report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

• (1620)

The Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Minister of National Defence could clarify which way he meant to vote.

Hon. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, as they say, “Vote early and vote often”. I intend to vote in favour of the motion.

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

(Division No. 464)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Anders	Andrews
Armstrong	Ashfield
Aspin	Barlow
Bennett	Benoit
Bergen	Bezan
Blanchette	Blaney
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brisson
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Butt	Byrne
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Casey
Chisu	Chong
Clarke	Côté
Cotler	Crockatt
Cuzner	Daniel
Dechert	Devolin
Dion	Dubourg
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault	Dykstra
Easter	Egliński
Eyking	Falk
Fantino	Fletcher
Foote	Fortin
Freeland	Gallant
Garneau	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Glover
Goguen	Goldring
Goodale	Goodyear
Grewal	Harper
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Holder
Hsu	Jones
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Latendresse
Lauzon	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leef	Leitch
Lemieux	Leung
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney

MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
May	Mayes
McCallum	McColeman
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McLeod	Menegakis
Miller	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mourani	Murray
Nicholson	Norlock
Nunez-Melo	O'Connor
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
O'Toole	Pacetti
Payne	Perkins
Poilievre	Preston
Raitt	Rajotte
Rathgeber	Regan
Reid	Rickford
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Shea
Shipley	Shory
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Smith	
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	St-Denis
Stewart	Sweet
Tilson	Toet
Toone	Tremblay
Trottier	Trudeau
Uppal	Valcourt
Valeriote	Van Kesteren
Vaughan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga
Zimmer— 169	

Routine Proceedings

NAYS

Members

Albas	Allen (Welland)
Anderson	Angus
Ashton	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Bélanger	Bellavance
Benskin	Bernier
Bevington	Blanchette-Lamothe
Block	Boivin
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brousseau	Calandra
Calkins	Caron
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Clement	Comartin
Crowder	Cullen
Davidson	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dreeschen	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Fast
Glover	Garrison
Galipeau	Gill
Genest	Groguhé
Godin	Hyer
Harris (St. John's East)	Julian
James	Lake
Kellway	Leslie
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Mai
Liu	Martin
Marston	Mathysen
Masse	Moore (Fundy Royal)
Michaud	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Nantel
Mulcair	Obhrai
Nash	Paradis
Papillon	Pilon
Péclet	Rafferty
Quach	Raynault
Rankin	

Routine Proceedings

Rempel	Richards
Ritz	Sandhu
Scott	Seeback
Sellah	Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan	Stoffer
Sullivan	Trost
Van Loan	Warawa
Watson	Wilks
Williamson— 97	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

GLOBAL CENTRE FOR PLURALISM

Hon. Tim Uppal (Minister of State (Multiculturalism), CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Global Centre for Pluralism's Corporate Plan 2015.

Hon. Irwin Cotler: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege related to the government's responses to two questions on the order paper, which became accessible only online yesterday. Thus, I am raising this matter at the earliest opportunity.

I know that you and your predecessors—

The Speaker: Order. I would like to take this opportunity to inform the hon. member for Mount Royal that as of this moment, I have not received written notice.

Standing Order 48 states that members must give the Speaker an hour's written notice before raising a question of privilege. He can do that, and 60 minutes after he does so he can raise the question of privilege in the House. I cannot hear him now because of that requirement, but no doubt he will remedy that situation.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to 13 petitions.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. Gordon Brown (Leeds—Grenville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, two reports of the Canadian delegation of the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group.

The first concerns the 38th annual conference of New England governors and eastern Canadian premiers, which was held in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, the United States of America, July 13 to 15, 2014.

The second concerns the Canadian/American Border Trade Alliance conference that was held here in Ottawa, Ontario, on May 3 to 5, 2015.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following reports of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts: the 20th report, on chapter 2, Required Reporting by Federal Organizations, of the spring 2015 report of the Auditor General of Canada; the 21st report, on chapter 3, Tax-Based Expenditures, of the spring 2015 report of the Auditor General of Canada; and the 22nd report, on chapter 5, Information Technology Investments, Canada Border Services Agency, of the spring 2015 report of the Auditor General of Canada.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109 of the House of Commons, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to these three reports.

• (1625)

TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, entitled “Updating Infrastructure in Canada: An examination of needs and investments”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109 of the House of Commons, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

Mr. Hoang Mai (Brossard—La Prairie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to present the NDP's dissenting opinion, in both official languages. I would like to thank and congratulate the MP for Beaches—East York, the NDP's infrastructure and urban affairs critic, who worked really hard on this matter.

[Translation]

We issued a dissenting opinion because the committee, with its Conservative majority, left some important testimony out of the final report. Unfortunately, studies on first nations infrastructure and communities were left out. The NDP's dissenting report includes recommendations about infrastructure, such as our bridges and roads, and public transit. We need to make sure that future generations do not have to bear the financial burden for that infrastructure.

[English]

HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Phil McColeman (Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 12th report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, entitled “Exploring the Potential of Social Finance in Canada”.

Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP): Mr. Speaker, included in the report is our dissenting report. We feel that this is an area where there is a great deal that is not known and much further study needs to be done. We are also very concerned about the impact on social programs in our communities.

HEALTH

Mr. Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 13th report of the Standing Committee on Health, entitled “Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Radiation and the Health of Canadians”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

I would also like to mention that this is the second unanimous report this year from the health committee. There has been good work by all members.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Ron Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on International Trade, entitled “Connecting Canadian Companies to International Markets: Global Markets Action Plan and Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

I also wish the chair of the standing committee, the member for Prince Albert, a speedy recovery from his surgery in hospital.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of accomplishment that I present today, in both official languages, the official opposition's supplementary report to the trade committee's report entitled “Connecting Canadian Companies to International Markets: Global Markets Action Plan and Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises”.

We believe in the great potential of Canada's small and medium-sized enterprises to drive Canada's economic prosperity and contribute to the well-being of our communities. Seeing new opportunities to promote SME success on the international stage, the NDP introduced the motion at the trade committee that launched this study. Our hope was to spur a thoughtful and meaningful conversation between SME owners, experts, and parliamentarians that would generate new and innovative ideas. I am proud to say that this study was conducted in an atmosphere of collegiality and bipartisan co-operation.

We are pleased with the findings of this report. Nevertheless, the official opposition has included this supplementary opinion to provide further insight into witness testimony and add important recommendations that were missed in the main report.

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the tenth report of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, entitled “Licensed Hunting and Trapping in Canada”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

• (1630)

Mr. Dennis Bevington (Northwest Territories, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the New Democratic Party's

Routine Proceedings

dissenting report on the report from the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development on hunting and trapping in Canada.

New Democrats support and encourage Canadians to spend time enjoying Canada's outdoors. We see it as a privilege. New Democrats recognize and salute the fact that hunters and trappers have played an important role in the conservation of wildlife habitat, which complements the vital and important role carried out by government agencies through regulation, enforcement, research, and environmental protection and monitoring.

We make the following recommendations.

First, in order to ensure healthy wildlife populations and a sustainable environment that protects habitat, it is recommended that the Government of Canada initiate and provide funding for wildlife research and monitoring, particularly in the area of the impact of climate change on habitat.

Second, as federal legislation has played an important role in maintaining healthy wildlife populations and a sustainable environment, it is recommended that the Government of Canada support and enhance laws to protect Canada's environment and wildlife.

Third, because of the special role that hunting and trapping play in the culture of Canada's aboriginal peoples, it is recommended that the Government of Canada take active steps to ensure that the hunting and trapping rights of Canadian aboriginal people, which were established in nation-to-nation treaties, are well protected.

* * *

CANADA SHIPPING ACT, 2001

Mr. John Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-695, An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, 2001 (prohibition against abandonment of vessel).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of pride on behalf of B.C.'s coastal communities that I introduce a long-awaited private member's bill to counter the increasing problem of vessels abandoned on B.C.'s coastal waters. As of last year, Transport Canada had identified 245 boats that might be deemed abandoned off B.C., in addition to vessels abandoned on the east coast.

The bill is called a prohibition against abandonment of vessels, and it would provide jail time and fines for people who intentionally abandon a vessel. I hope that all members in this chamber will work with me to get this bill passed.

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

* * *

ROUGE NATIONAL URBAN PARK ACT

Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan (Scarborough—Rouge River, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-696, Act to amend the Rouge National Urban Park Act (ecological protection).

Routine Proceedings

She said: Mr. Speaker, over the last year, the government has pushed through critically flawed legislation for Rouge National Urban Park, ignoring the advice of several thousand Canadians, 106 members of Parliament, the Ontario government, and several of Canada's top environmental organizations. Even the former chief scientist for Parks Canada, Stephen Woodley, publicly stated that the Rouge National Urban Park Act “falls considerably short” of the accepted environmental standards for protected areas, whether urban or wilderness.

The new park that is being created would be less than two square kilometres and would not include the currently existing Rouge Park. The bill that I have put forward would actually fix many of the serious flaws in the existing Rouge National Urban Park Act by prioritizing and protecting the restoration of ecological integrity and watershed health; by respecting water quality agreement objectives and policies for the provincial Greenbelt, Rouge Park, the Rouge watershed, the Oak Ridges Moraine, and the Great Lakes; by requiring good public consultation and scientifically sound park management; by supporting healthy and sustainable farming in the park; and by respecting the history and heritage of the first peoples of the land.

I hope that we will be able to move forward with the bill and see a Rouge national park that is 100 square kilometres, a people's park and will continue to be the gem in everybody's backyard in the city of Toronto and the greater Toronto area.

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

* * *

●(1635)

RECALL OF A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT ACT

Mr. Brent Rathgeber (Edmonton—St. Albert, Ind.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-697, An Act to establish a process to recall members of Parliament.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise to table a private member's bill, an act to establish a process to recall members of Parliament. This legislation, also to be known as the “recall of a member of Parliament act”, would allow the electors of an electoral district to apply to the Chief Electoral Officer for the issuance of a petition for the recall of their member of Parliament.

Recall legislation would allow electors disappointed with their representative to recall or fire that member. If the petition was signed by at least 25% of the electors who were eligible to vote for that member and still resided in that electoral district, the seat would be declared vacant and a recall election would be held on the same basis as a by-election.

The recalled member could contest the by-election to determine if he still maintained the confidence of his or her constituents. A recall petition could not be issued within 12 months from the member's election or within the 12 months preceding a fixed election date.

For a representative democracy to function, government must be responsible to Parliament and parliamentarians must be accountable to their constituents. Accordingly, I encourage all members to support the recall of a member of Parliament act.

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

NAVIGATION PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-698, An Act to amend the Navigation Protection Act (Tod Creek).

He said: Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce a private member's bill to restore federal environmental protection for the Tod Creek watershed. This protection was removed from all rivers, lakes, and streams on Vancouver Island by the Conservative government in 2012.

The Tod Creek watershed covers 23 square kilometres on the Saanich Peninsula. Its headwaters are found at Maltby Lake, but it also includes Prospect Lake, Durrance Lake, three other smaller lakes, 29 wetlands, and many small creeks as it winds its way to the Saanich Inlet.

Over the years, a wide variety of volunteer groups have undertaken efforts to preserve and enhance this watershed. In the last 15 years, there has been significant progress in restoring salmon runs by improving fish habitat and creating a fishway around the waterfalls 450 metres upstream. Today significant efforts are also under way to protect the watershed's headwaters at Maltby Lake, a jewel of a lake with near-pristine water, surrounded by 172 acres of undisturbed forest and wetland and the home of a rare freshwater jellyfish.

Restoring federal environmental protection to the Tod Creek watershed would put the federal government squarely on the side of local efforts by Friends of Maltby Lake, Friends of Tod Creek, the Peninsula Streams Society, and others to restore and protect this precious urban watershed.

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

* * *

NATIONAL SEAL PRODUCTS DAY ACT

Mr. Ryan Leef (Yukon, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill S-224, An Act respecting National Seal Products Day.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to introduce this piece of legislation recognizing that humans have depended on ocean resources, including seals and other marine animals, for nourishment for thousands of years and that Canada's aboriginal peoples and coastal communities have developed traditional knowledge of how to use these resources. Of course, the traditional, cultural, and heritage practices of Canada's aboriginal people and coastal communities respect these ocean resources, and they should be preserved and recognized. Therefore, this legislation seeks to establish that the 20th day of May every year be known as national seal products day.

Routine Proceedings

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

* * *

**LAKE SUPERIOR NATIONAL MARINE CONSERVATION
AREA ACT**

(On the Order: Government Orders)

C-61—June 2, 2015—The Minister of the Environment, Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and Minister for the Arctic Council—Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development of Bill C-61, An Act to amend the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act.

Mr. Bruce Hyer (Thunder Bay—Superior North, GP): Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent for the following motion.

I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, Bill C-61, An Act to amend the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act be deemed to have been read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole, deemed considered in Committee of the Whole, deemed reported without amendment, deemed concurred in at report stage, and deemed read a third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to present the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Members have heard the terms of the motion. Does the hon. member have the unanimous support of the House for the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, deemed considered in committee of the whole, reported without amendment, read the third time and passed)

* * *

• (1640)

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House a petition on respect for the rights of small family farmers to preserve, exchange and use seeds.

This petition was signed by dozens, perhaps hundreds of people because this is obviously a major component of humanity's heritage, and it is under threat, as described in this petition.

The people who signed this petition care about preserving this traditional practice.

[*English*]

Mr. Royal Galipeau (Ottawa—Orléans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am honoured to present the attached petition.

[*Translation*]

This is a petition presented in the House of Commons calling for respect for the rights of small family farmers to preserve, exchange and use seeds.

[*English*]

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present this petition, on behalf of my constituents, calling for an inquiry into violence against women and girls in this country. They are asking that the government pay heed to what is going on and feel that justice is needed for many of those women and girls who have gone missing or have been murdered. They feel that a national inquiry is necessary to get to the root cause of this and are calling on the Government of Canada to do that. I support them in this petition.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Andrew Cash (Davenport, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions I would like to present today.

The first petition pertains to the plummeting job quality index for Canadian workers. So many workers today are working part time, on contract, or freelance or are self-employed. Many are working for free as unpaid interns. This petition, signed by people throughout my riding and across the GTA, calls for the support of a national urban workers strategy to deal with and take seriously the issue of precarious work across Canada.

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. Andrew Cash (Davenport, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition. We have many immigrants in Toronto who work hard and who are having a very difficult time with our current immigration system. They are calling on the federal government to make changes to make it simpler for them to bring their families here and to make it simpler for workers who are working hard here to have the right to stay and build a life in Canada.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of presenting six petitions today on the same subject matter. The petitioners are asking us to implement tougher laws and new mandatory minimum sentences for 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.

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Ms. Kirsty Duncan (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I present 10 petitions on chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency.

It has been five years since people began travelling overseas for this treatment for CCSVI. Canadians with multiple sclerosis are wondering when there might be an update on the government's clinical trials and MS registry. The petitioners are asking the government to proceed to phase 3 clinical trials.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé (Saint-Lambert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by more than 700 people from my community on Montreal's south shore. They denounce Canada Post's decision to eliminate home delivery.

In four years I have not seen an issue that has drawn such a response. People back home are very angry. They think that the Conservatives are refusing to listen to them and are dismissing them.

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Joe Preston (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by a number of people from St. Thomas and throughout the Elgin riding in respect of the rights of small-scale family farmers to preserve, exchange, and use seeds.

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I present a petition that reflects the hard work of the Safe Rail Communities organization and the results of town hall meetings held by the members for Toronto Centre, Trinity—Spadina, and St. Paul's.

The petitioners call on the government to follow through on tank car standards, to reverse the budget cuts in rail transport safety, to require the industry to invest in ways to decrease the volatility of bakken crude, and to require both railways and shippers to carry sufficient insurance to cover the true costs of an accident, spill, or derailment.

● (1645)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): I would like to remind all hon. members that many members seem to have petitions, so if members could keep their explanations brief, we will make sure we get to everyone.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Dan Harris (Scarborough Southwest, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present two petitions. The first one is on fighting climate change. Petitioners say that climate change is an urgent national and international issue, and they call on the government to immediately pass Bill C-224, the climate change accountability act.

CANADA POST

Mr. Dan Harris (Scarborough Southwest, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition has 4,000 signatures from residents in my riding. I would like to present them all today to counteract the position the Minister of Transport took earlier that it is only Canada Post workers who want home mail delivery saved.

I have 4,000 signatures from residents to add to the 2,000 I have already submitted. That is 6,000 people from my riding who want to save home mail delivery.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today with a petition from hundreds of people from my community demanding respect for the right of small-scale family farmers to preserve, exchange, and use seeds.

MATERNITY BENEFITS

Mr. Ted Hsu (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition today from my constituents regarding women who work in dangerous jobs who become pregnant and whose employers cannot accommodate them. Presently the EI benefits and maternity benefits do not cover the full term.

[Translation]

In Quebec, the programme for a risk-free pregnancy provides for what is known as a preventive withdrawal.

[English]

Petitioners are asking that a federal early maternity leave program be created to reflect the change in our workforce and that the government update our policies in the area of maternal and infant care.

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Marc-André Morin (Laurentides—Labelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition from my constituents, who are calling on the government to demonstrate international responsibility by recommitting Canada to contributing 0.7% of GDP to overseas development assistance.

[English]

TOBACCO PRODUCTS

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from constituents in my riding of Wellington—Halton Hills who are calling on Parliament to pass legislation that would remove all flavours from all tobacco products.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions from people in my riding.

One petition deals with the requirement to have a climate strategy. The petitioners refer back to the targets and timelines that were included in the bill that was passed in this place, Bill C-31, sponsored by the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Superior North.

WASTE REDUCTION

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls for the Government of Canada to collaborate with the provinces to put in place a national strategy for extended producer responsibility.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Claude Gravelle (Nickel Belt, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am quite proud to present dozens of petitions from northerners asking the Government of Canada to work collaboratively with the provinces to defend and strengthen public health care for northerners, including investing in better home care, long-term care, and palliative care in northern Ontario, and to implement a strategy for mental health and suicide prevention.

SERVICE CANADA

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions about the same issue. The petitioners are asking the Government of Canada to improve the wait times at Service Canada. They are asking that the processing time to deal with many Service Canada programs be reduced. The petitioners are saying that things like guaranteed income supplements and other applications are backlogged, and sometimes the wait time can be up to six months. They are asking for that to be changed.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to present petitions on behalf of my constituents on three different topics.

The first one is against Bill C-51, the dangerous, vague, and likely ineffective proposed law by the Conservatives. The petitioners want to stop this attack on our civil liberties.

• (1650)

HOUSING

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is a housing crisis for so many people in my city of Toronto. Petitioners are calling on this House to develop a national housing strategy to ensure safe, accessible, and affordable housing for all Canadians.

CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, too many Canadian cyclists are injured and killed. Petitioners are calling on this House to work with communities across Canada to promote and create cycling infrastructure.

[*Translation*]

CANADA POST

Mrs. Djaouida Sellah (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by my constituents in Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, who are calling on the government to stop making cuts to our postal services. My constituents are calling on the Government of Canada to not proceed with these devastating cuts to our postal services.

HOUSING

Mrs. Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to present a petition signed by a number of co-operative members in my riding, who are simply calling on the government to maintain federal funding for low-income households, to maintain the \$1.7 billion set out in the operating agreements and to reinvest in new or recent housing co-operatives.

Routine Proceedings

CANADA POST

Mrs. Anne-Marie Day (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we collected thousands of signatures. The petitioners are opposed to the elimination of home delivery and the increase in fees. In particular, seniors, people with reduced mobility and small businesses are calling for this service to be restored as an essential public service.

Mr. Sylvain Chicoine (Châteauguay—Saint-Constant, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the people of Châteauguay—Saint-Constant to present a petition signed by dozens of my constituents who oppose the cuts to postal services.

This is not the first time I have presented a petition like this, since this issue is very important to my constituents. The petitioners want the government to maintain home delivery and put an end to the cuts to our postal services.

[*English*]

Mr. Matthew Kellway (Beaches—East York, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table hundreds of signatures, adding to the many thousands already tabled, protesting the end of door-to-door delivery by Canada Post. The signatories wish to point out that the elimination of door-to-door delivery will have a particularly hard impact on seniors and the disabled, and they call upon the government to reject Canada Post's plan to cut mail services and increase prices and to instead explore other options for modernizing our postal delivery system.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tyrone Benskin (Jeanne-Le Ber, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present.

The first is another petition opposing the cuts to Canada Post. People want home delivery service to be restored because it affects seniors and people with disabilities.

[*English*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Tyrone Benskin (Jeanne-Le Ber, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition, which has quite a few signatories, is to ensure the dignity of Canada's veterans.

The petitioners feel that the families of veterans and veterans themselves do not have proper access to the services they were promised.

HEALTH

Mr. Tyrone Benskin (Jeanne-Le Ber, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the third petition is signed by hundreds of individuals across the country. They are calling for better support for public health. The petitioners feel that the government is failing in that regard.

AGRICULTURE

Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan (Scarborough—Rouge River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present three separate petitions.

Routine Proceedings

The first petition is from petitioners who say that multinational seed companies are gradually replacing the immense diversity of farmers' seeds by industrial varieties. They are obtaining an increased number of patents on different seeds and are threatening the ability of small family farms to produce the food that is required to feed their families and their communities.

The petitioners are asking the government to adopt international aid policies that support small family farmers, especially women, and recognize their vital role in the struggle against hunger and poverty, and that these policies be developed in consultation with small family farms.

•(1655)

TOBACCO PRODUCTS

Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan (Scarborough—Rouge River, NDP): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by youth and adults alike across the country and talks about the flavouring of tobacco products that are marketed to youth by the tobacco industry. The petitioners are requesting that all flavours be removed from all tobacco products.

TAXATION

Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan (Scarborough—Rouge River, NDP): Finally, Mr. Speaker, the third petition contains thousands of signatures of petitioners who are calling for the removal of the gender-specific discriminatory tax on feminine hygiene products.

I am happy to report while I table this petition that the NDP motion to do the same thing has now been adopted by this House, and as of July 1 this year, this gender-specific discriminatory tax on women and feminine hygiene products will no longer be in effect.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the following question will be answered today: No. 1273.

[Text]

Question No. 1273—**Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan:**

With regard to the government's role in promoting consensual, healthy sexual relationships, as well as sound reproductive health: (a) what steps is the government undertaking in this regard; (b) what budget allocations has the government made in this regard; (c) what steps is the government taking to ensure that quality sexual and reproductive health services, including abortion services, are accessible and available for all; (d) will the government impose penalties on provinces failing to ensure the availability of individuals' right to access safe abortion services without discrimination; (e) what steps is the government taking to ensure that all individuals are able to access sexual and reproductive health services and information, free from all barriers, including timely and systematic referral in the event of conscientious objection on moral or religious grounds; (f) what steps is the government taking to ensure that conscientious objection exemptions are well-defined in scope and well-regulated in use; and (g) how is the government working with provinces to improve the accessibility and availability of abortion services in Canadian hospitals and in rural or remote areas?

Hon. Rona Ambrose (Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to parts (a) and (b), the Public Health Agency of Canada supports a wide range of actions related to the prevention and control of sexually transmitted infections, which can be considered to be one element of healthy sexual relationships. Further

information is available at: <http://www.healthycanadians.gc.ca/healthy-living-vie-saine/sexual-sexuelle/index-eng.php>.

The agency works collaboratively with provinces and territories to monitor data through its national surveillance network and update guidance and recommendations on prevention, diagnosis, treatment and management of sexually transmitted diseases. More details can be found at: <http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/std-mts/index-eng.php>. In addition, the Government of Canada's family violence initiative and the children's programs administered through funding from the Public Health Agency of Canada contribute to resilience, positive parenting and healthy relationships.

The level of precision to answer (b) is not available from agency financial systems.

Parts (c) to (h), the primary responsibility to organize and ensure the delivery of health services to Canadians, including sexual and reproductive health services, belongs to the provinces and territories. The provinces and territories are also responsible to ensure that these services are reasonably accessible to their residents.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 1259, 1260, 1262 to 1264, 1267 to 1272, 1274, 1275, 1277, 1278, 1280 to 1282, 1285, 1287, 1289, 1293, 1295, 1299, 1301, 1302, 1305, 1307, 1309, 1310, 1313, 1314, 1316, and 1320 to 1323 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 1259—**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:**

With regard to Veterans Affairs Canada: (a) how many veterans have been hired at Veterans Affairs Canada since 2009; (b) how many of these were medically released members of the Canadian Forces hired in priority through the Public Service Commission; (c) what percentage of all hires at Veterans Affairs Canada since 2009 have been veterans (including medically released veterans); and (d) what specific efforts are being made by the department to increase the number, and percentage, of veterans working within Veterans Affairs Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1260—**Mr. John Weston:**

With regard to government funding in the riding of West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, for each fiscal year since 2007-2008 inclusively: (a) what are the details of all grants, contributions, and loans to any organization, body, or group, broken down by (i) name of the recipient, (ii) municipality of the recipient, (iii) date on which the funding was received, (iv) amount received, (v) department or agency providing the funding, (vi) program under which the grant, contribution, or loan was made, (vii) nature or purpose; and (b) for each grant, contribution and loan identified in (a), was a press release issued to announce it and, if so, what is the (i) date, (ii) headline of the press release?

Routine Proceedings

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1262—**Mr. Andrew Cash:**

With regard to International Experience Canada, for the year 2014: (a) with which countries did Canada have an agreement; (b) what were the reciprocal quotas; (c) how many Canadians travelled to each country under the auspices of the agreement; (d) how many youths from each country travelled to Canada under the auspices of the agreement, broken down by (i) working holiday, (ii) young professionals, (iii) international cooperative work placements; (e) how many Canadian employers employed foreign youth in the young professionals stream; (f) how many Canadian employers employed foreign youth in the international cooperative work placements stream; (g) when will the government be finished its detailed labour market assessment of the program and will the assessment be made public; (h) how many Canadian employers have been subject to investigations for compliance; (i) how many Canadian employers have been found to be in non-compliance as a result of an investigation, broken down by type of issue; (j) how many Canadian employers have had to take remedial actions in order to be considered compliant as a result of an investigation; (k) how many Canadian employers have been subject to penalties as a result of an investigation; (l) how does Citizenship and Immigration Canada define reciprocal with respect to its goal to make the program more reciprocal; and (m) what is the Department's target for reciprocity?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1263—**Mr. Andrew Cash:**

With regard to the International Mobility Program: (a) how many applications were received for work permits in 2014 and in 2015 year-to-date, (i) in total, (ii) broken down by month; (b) how many applications for work permits were approved in 2014 and 2015 year-to-date, (i) in total, (ii) broken down by month; (c) how many employers using the International Mobility Program have been subject to an investigation for compliance from in 2014 and 2015 inclusively, broken down by (i) month, (ii) province; (d) how many investigations have revealed non-compliance by employers, broken down by (i) month, (ii) issues identified, (iii) industry of the employer; (e) how many employers have had to take steps to be considered compliant following an investigation, broken down by (i) month, (ii) type of action required, (iii) industry of the employer; (f) how many employers have received penalties for non-compliance as a result of an investigation, broken down by (i) month, (ii) type of penalty, (iii) industry of the employer; (g) how many investigations have involved an on-site visit, broken down by month; and (h) how many Citizenship and Immigration staff are currently assigned to conduct investigations for compliance?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1264—**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:**

With regard to Employment and Social Development Canada and the Social Security Tribunal: (a) how many appeals are currently waiting to be heard at the Income Security Section (ISS), in total and broken down by (i) Canada Pension Plan (CPP) retirement pensions and survivors benefits, (ii) Canada Pension Plan Disability benefits (CPPD), (iii) Old Age Security (OAS); (b) how many appeals have been heard by the ISS in 2015, in total and broken down by (i) CPP retirement pensions and survivors benefits, (ii) CPPD benefits, (iii) OAS; (c) how many appeals heard by the ISS were allowed in 2015, in total and broken down by (i) CPP retirement pensions and survivors benefits, (ii) CPPD benefits, (iii) OAS; (d) how many appeals heard by the ISS were dismissed in 2015, in total and broken down by (i) CPP retirement pensions and survivors benefits, (ii) CPPD benefits, (iii) OAS; (e) how many appeals to the ISS were summarily dismissed in 2015, in total and broken down by (i) CPP retirement pensions and survivors benefits, (ii) CPPD benefits, (iii) OAS; (f) how many appeals at the ISS have been heard in person in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (g) how many appeals at the ISS have been heard by teleconference in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (h) how many appeals at the ISS have been heard by videoconference in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (i) how many appeals at the ISS have been heard in writing in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (j) how many members hired in the Employment Insurance Section (EIS) are currently assigned to the ISS; (k) how many income security appeals are currently waiting to be heard by the Appeal Division (AD), in total and broken down by (i) CPP retirement pensions and survivors benefits, (ii) CPPD benefits, (iii) OAS; (l) how many income security appeals have been heard by the AD in 2015, in total and broken down by (i) CPP retirement pensions and survivors benefits, (ii) CPPD benefits, (iii) OAS; (m) how

many income security appeals heard by the AD were allowed in 2015, in total and broken down by (i) CPP retirement pensions and survivors benefits, (ii) CPPD benefits, (iii) OAS; (n) how many income security appeals heard by the AD were dismissed in 2015, in total and broken down by (i) CPP retirement pensions and survivors benefits, (ii) CPPD benefits, (iii) OAS; (o) how many income security appeals to the AD were summarily dismissed in 2015, in total and broken down by (i) CPP retirement pensions and survivors benefits, (ii) CPPD benefits, (iii) OAS; (p) how many income security appeals at the AD have been heard in person in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (q) how many income security appeals at the AD have been heard in videoconference in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (r) how many income security appeals at the AD have been heard by teleconference in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (s) how many income security appeals at the AD have been heard in writing in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (t) how many appeals are currently waiting to be heard at the Employment Insurance Section (EIS); (u) how many appeals have been heard by the EIS in 2015, in total and broken down by month; (v) how many appeals heard by the EIS were allowed in 2015; (w) how many appeals heard by the EIS were dismissed in 2015; (x) how many appeals to the EIS were summarily dismissed in 2015; (y) how many appeals at the EIS have been heard in person 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (z) how many appeals at the EIS have been heard by videoconference in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (aa) how many appeals at the EIS have been heard by teleconference in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (bb) how many appeals at the EIS have been heard in writing in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (cc) how many EI appeals are currently waiting to be heard by the AD; (dd) how many EI appeals have been heard by the AD in 2015; (ee) how many EI appeals heard by the AD were allowed in 2015; (ff) how many EI appeals heard by the AD were dismissed in 2015; (gg) how many EI appeals to the AD were summarily dismissed in 2015; (hh) how many EI appeals at the AD have been heard in person in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (ii) how many EI appeals at the AD have been heard by videoconference in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (jj) how many EI appeals at the AD have been heard by teleconference in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (kk) how many EI appeals at the AD have been heard in writing in 2015, broken down by (i) appeals allowed, (ii) appeals dismissed; (ll) how many legacy appeals are currently waiting to be heard at the ISS; (mm) how many legacy appeals are currently waiting to be heard at the EIS; (nn) how many legacy income security appeals are currently waiting to be heard at the AD; (oo) how many legacy EI appeals are currently waiting to be heard at the AD; (pp) how many requests has the Tribunal received for an expedited hearing due to terminal illness in 2015, broken down by (i) month, (ii) requests granted, (iii) requests not granted; (qq) how many requests has the Tribunal received for an expedited hearing due to financial hardship in 2015, broken down by (i) month, (ii) section, (iii) requests granted, (iv) requests not granted; (rr) when will performance standards for the Tribunal be put in place; (ss) how many casefiles have been reviewed by the special unit created within the department to review backlogged social security appeals; (tt) how many settlements have been offered; (uu) how many settlements have been accepted; (vv) for 2014 and 2015, what is the average amount of time for the Department to reach a decision on an application for Canada Pension Plan Disability benefits, broken down by month; and (ww) for 2014 and 2015, what is the average amount of time for the Department to reach a decision on a reconsideration of an application for Canada Pension Plan Disability benefits, broken down by month?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1267—**Mr. Frank Valeriote:**

With regard to materials prepared for past or current ministers or their staff from January 28, 2015, to the present: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is the (i) date, (ii) title or subject matter, (iii) department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1268—**Mr. Frank Valeriote:**

With regard to materials prepared for Deputy Heads or their staff from January 30, 2015, to the present: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is (i) the date, (ii) the title or the subject matter of the document, (iii) the department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1269—Mr. Frank Valeriote:**

With regard to contracts under \$10 000 granted by the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario since January 28, 2015: what are the (a) vendors' names; (b) contracts' reference numbers; (c) dates of the contracts; (d) descriptions of the services provided; (e) delivery dates; (f) original contracts' values; and (g) final contracts' values, if different from the original contracts' values?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1270—Mr. Frank Valeriote:

With regard to government procurement: what are the details of all contracts for the provision of research or speechwriting services to Ministers since December 4, 2014, (a) providing for each such contract (i) the start and end dates, (ii) contracting parties, (iii) file number, (iv) nature or description of the work; and (b) providing, in the case of a contract for speechwriting, the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) audience or event at which the speech was, or was intended to be, delivered?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1271—Mr. François Choquette:

With regard to government spending in the constituency of Drummond, in the past four fiscal years, what was government spending, broken down by (i) year, (ii) program?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1272—Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan:

With regard to the government's commitment to address child, early and forced marriages, and sexual violence: (a) what programming approaches is the government supporting; (b) what percentage of funding will be or has been directed towards (i) reproductive health care, (ii) family planning; (c) how much funding has the government committed to provide in order to address sexual violence; (d) which organizations and other partners will the government take on when establishing this programming; and (e) will any of the partners identified in (d) be former co-sponsors of the 2014 Human Rights Council resolution on violence against women, if not, why not?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1274—Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan:

With regard to government funding for the constituency of Scarborough—Rouge River for each fiscal year since 2007-2008 inclusively: (a) what are the details of all grants, contributions and loans to any organization, body or group, broken down by (i) the name of the recipient, (ii) the municipality in which the recipient is located, (iii) the date on which funding was received, (iv) the amount received, (v) the department or agency providing the funding, (vi) the program under which the grant, contribution or loan was made, (vii) the nature or purpose; and (b) for each grant, contribution and loan identified in (a), was a press release issued to announce it and, if so, what is the (i) date, (ii) headline of the press release?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1275—Ms. Christine Moore:

With regard to government funding for the constituency of Abitibi—Témiscamingue for each fiscal year since 2007-2008 inclusively: (a) what are the details of all grants, contributions and loans to any organization, body or group, broken down by (i) the name of the recipient, (ii) the municipality in which the recipient is located, (iii) the date on which funding was received, (iv) the amount received, (v) the department or agency providing the funding, (vi) the program under which the grant, contribution or loan was made, (vii) the nature or purpose; and (b) for each grant, contribution and loan identified in (a), was a press release issued to announce it and, if so, what is the (i) date, (ii) headline of the press release?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1277—Hon. Geoff Regan:

With regard to materials prepared for past or current ministers or their staff from April 1, 2009, to March 31, 2011: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is the (i) date, (ii) title or subject matter, (iii) department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1278—Hon. Geoff Regan:

With regard to materials prepared for past or current ministers or their staff from April 1, 2007, to March 31, 2009: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is the (i) date, (ii) title or subject matter, (iii) department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1280—Hon. Carolyn Bennett:

With regard to contracts under \$10 000 granted by Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada since February 2, 2015: what are the (a) vendors' names; (b) contracts' reference numbers; (c) dates of the contracts; (d) descriptions of the services provided; (e) delivery dates; (f) original contracts' values; and (g) final contracts' values, if different from the original contracts' values?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1281—Hon. Carolyn Bennett:

With regard to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and Aboriginal Affairs: what are the file numbers, dates, and titles of all briefing notes, dockets, dossiers, reports, or other documents of any kind which were used to compile or inform the statistics concerning missing and murdered indigenous women which were referred to, referenced, or cited by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs during his meeting with First Nation leaders in Calgary, Alberta, on or about Friday, March 20, 2015?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1282—Hon. Carolyn Bennett:

With regard to materials prepared for past or current parliamentary secretaries or their staff from January 28, 2015, to present: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is the (i) date, (ii) title or subject matter, (iii) department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1285—Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia:

With regard to materials prepared for past or current assistant deputy ministers or their staff from January 30, 2015, to the present: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is (i) the date, (ii) the title or the subject matter, (iii) the department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1287—Mr. Rodger Cuzner:

With regard to materials prepared for past or current ministers or their staff from April 1, 2009, to March 31, 2011: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is the (i) date, (ii) title or subject matter, (iii) department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1289—Hon. Geoff Regan:

With regard to contracts under \$10 000 granted by Industry Canada since January 28, 2015: what are the (a) vendors' names; (b) contracts' reference numbers; (c) dates of the contracts; (d) descriptions of the services provided; (e) delivery dates; (f) original contracts' values; and (g) final contracts' values, if different from the original contracts' values?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1293—Mr. Don Davies:**

With regard to the federal executive vehicle fleet, broken down by year since 2012: (a) what was the total number of vehicles in the fleet; (b) what was the (i) total cost of procuring vehicles for the fleet, (ii) total cost of the fleet as a whole; (c) what was the total cost of salaries for drivers, including ministerial exempt staff and federal public servants whose primary responsibility consists of driving vehicles in the fleet; (d) what are the models, years and manufacturers of each vehicle in the fleet; and (e) what are the names and positions of each authorized user of a vehicle in the fleet?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1295—Mr. Mathieu Ravignat:

With regard to federal financial investments since 2011, how much was provided by (a) Canada Economic Development and, in particular, by (i) the Building Canada Fund, (ii) the gas tax fund, (iii) the Small Communities Fund; (b) Employment and Social Development; (c) Canadian Heritage; and (d) Industry Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1299—Mr. Ryan Cleary:

With regard to government funding for the constituency of St John's South—Mount Pearl for each fiscal year since 2007-2008 inclusively: (a) what are the details of all grants, contributions and loans to any organization, body or group, broken down by (i) the name of the recipient, (ii) the municipality in which the recipient is located, (iii) the date on which funding was received, (iv) the amount received, (v) the department or agency providing the funding, (vi) the program under which the grant, contribution or loan was made, (vii) the nature or purpose; and (b) for each grant, contribution and loan identified in (a), was a press release issued to announce it and, if so, what is the (i) date, (ii) headline of the press release?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1301—Hon. Ralph Goodale:

With regard to federal support for provincial-territorial-municipal infrastructure, for each of fiscal year 2014-2015 and the current fiscal year to date: for each of the Community Improvement Fund, the New Building Canada Fund's (NBCF) National Infrastructure Component, the NBCF's Provincial Territorial Infrastructure Component, the P3 Canada Fund, the Building Canada Fund (BCF) Major Infrastructure Component, and the BCF Communities Component, (a) how much has been spent; (b) how many projects were under construction in each province and territory; (c) how many projects received funding in each province and territory; and (d) how much of each province and territory's allocation remained unspent?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1302—Hon. Ralph Goodale:

With regard to Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's Agroforestry Development Centre in Indian Head, Saskatchewan: (a) since 2012, what steps have been taken by the government to dispose of the facility; (b) what is the current status of the facility; (c) is there any on-going relationship between the government and Help International or Rodney Sidloski; (d) what is the status of negotiations for transfer of the facility; (e) are there any negotiations underway with any First Nations for the transfer of the facility, including with Carry-the-Kettle First Nation, (f) will any research be undertaken at the facility this year; (g) will any trees from the facility be distributed this year; and (h) and are the seedlings growing in its fields being maintained, and if so, by whom?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1305—Ms. Éline Michaud:

With regard to government funding in the riding of Portneuf-Jacques-Cartier since 2011-2012 inclusively, what are the details of all grants, contributions, and loans to any organization, body, or group, broken down by (i) name of the recipient, (ii) municipality of the recipient, (iii) date on which the funding was received, (iv) amount received, (v) department or agency providing the funding, (vi) program under which the grant, contribution, or loan was made, (vii) nature or purpose?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1307—Ms. Nycole Turmel:

With regard to government grants and contributions in the federal riding of Hull-Aylmer from fiscal year 2011-2012 to the current fiscal year: (a) what are the details of all grants, contributions and loans to any eligible organization, body or group, broken down by (i) name of the recipient, (ii) date on which the funding was received (iii) amount received (iv) federal department or agency providing the funding (v) program under which the funding was provided (vi) detailed rationale for the funding; and (b) for each grant, contribution and loan identified in (a), was a press release issued to announce it and, if so, what is the (i) date, (ii) headline, (iii) file number of the press release?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1309—Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre:

With regard to Government of Canada expenditures in the riding of Alfred-Pellan: (a) what were the expenditures over the last ten years with respect to (i) the environment, (ii) transit, (iii) public safety, (iii) seniors, (iii) youth, (iv) citizenship and immigration, (v) status of women, (vi) health, (vii) culture, (viii) public works, (ix) social development, (x) housing, (xi) national defence, (xii) assistance for workers such as employment insurance, (xiii) pensions; and (b) which businesses in the riding of Alfred-Pellan were awarded procurement contracts from the federal government, (ii) what was the value of these contracts, (iii) what was the length of these contracts, (iv) which department or agency issued these contracts?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1310—Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre:

With respect to government grants and contributions allocated within the riding of Alfred-Pellan from fiscal year 2011-2012 to the present: what is the total amount allocated, broken down by (i) amount, (ii) individual recipient?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1313—Mr. Rick Norlock:

With regard to government funding in the riding of Northumberland—Quinte West, for each fiscal year since 2007-2008 inclusively: (a) what are the details of all grants, contributions, and loans to any organization, body, or group, broken down by (i) name of the recipient, (ii) municipality of the recipient, (iii) date on which the funding was received, (iv) amount received, (v) department or agency providing the funding, (vi) program under which the grant, contribution, or loan was made, (vii) nature or purpose; and (b) for each grant, contribution and loan identified in (a), was a press release issued to announce it and, if so, what is the (i) date, (ii) headline of the press release?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1314—Ms. Nycole Turmel:

With regard to the employees of the government and all federal public agencies: (a) in the National Capital Region, (i) what was the total number of jobs from fiscal year 2011-2012 to the current fiscal year, broken down by year, (ii) what was the number of temporary jobs from fiscal year 2011-2012 to the current fiscal year, broken down by year, (iii) what was the number of jobs filled by employment agencies from fiscal year 2011-2012 to the current fiscal year, broken down by year; and (b) at the national level, (i) what was the total number of jobs from fiscal year 2011-2012 to the current fiscal year, broken down by year, (ii) what was the number of temporary jobs from fiscal year 2011-2012 to the current fiscal year, broken down by year, (iii) what was the number of jobs filled by employment agencies from fiscal year 2011-2012 to the current fiscal year, broken down by year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1316—Hon. Stéphane Dion:

With regard to contracts under \$10 000 granted by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans since February 5, 2015: what are the (a) vendors' names; (b) contracts' reference numbers; (c) dates of the contracts; (d) descriptions of the services provided; (e) delivery dates; (f) original contracts' values; and (g) final contracts' values, if different from the original contracts' values?

(Return tabled)

*Government Orders***Question No. 1320—Mr. Rodger Cuzner:**

With regard to materials prepared for past or current parliamentary secretaries or their staff from April 1, 2009, to March 31, 2011: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is the (i) date, (ii) title or subject matter, (iii) department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1321—Ms. Niki Ashton:

With regard to government funding for the constituency of Churchill for each fiscal year since 2007-2008 inclusively: (a) what are the details of all grants, contributions and loans to any organization, body or group, broken down by (i) the name of the recipient, (ii) the municipality in which the recipient is located, (iii) the date on which funding was received, (iv) the amount received, (v) the department or agency providing the funding, (vi) the program under which the grant, contribution or loan was made, (vii) the nature or purpose; and (b) for each grant, contribution and loan identified in (a), was a press release issued to announce it and, if so, what is the (i) date, (ii) headline of the press release?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1322—Hon. John McKay:

With regard to the government's Federal Sustainable Development Strategy (FSDS): (a) by what percentage of 2005 levels are federal departments and agencies currently committed to reducing their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2020; (b) as of the most recent year on record, by what percentage have federal departments and agencies reduced their emissions compared to 2005 levels; (c) what were the total, government-wide greenhouse gas emissions for the federal government in the most recent year on record; (d) how much of the government's overall GHG emissions are actually subject to the targets set under the FSDS' Green Government Operations Initiative; (e) why has the federal government not released a FSDS progress report since 2013; and (f) when will the government release its next FSDS progress report?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1323—Hon. John McKay:

With regard to lapsed spending by Environment Canada, Parks Canada and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency: (a) how much has each department and agency lapsed in each of fiscal years 2006-2007 to 2014-2015 inclusive, broken down on a program-by-program basis; and (b) what are the answers to (a), provided in digital .csv format?

(Return tabled)

[English]

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): 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. Barry Devolin): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Churchill, Aboriginal Affairs; the hon. member for

Surrey North, Public Safety; the hon. member for Québec, Consumer Protection.

I also wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded divisions, government orders will be extended by 69 minutes today.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

DIGITAL PRIVACY ACT

Hon. Ed Holder (for the Minister of Industry) moved that Bill S-4, An Act to amend the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act and to make a consequential amendment to another Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Joe Daniel (Don Valley East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in my place today to speak to Bill S-4, the digital privacy act.

Last year our government launched digital Canada 150, an ambitious plan for Canadians to take advantage of the opportunities of this digital age. It is a broad-based ambitious plan to take full advantage of the digital economy as we celebrate our 150th anniversary in 2017. It is the next step to build our nation and to connect Canadians to each other. As the digital economy grows, individual Canadians must have confidence that their personal information will be protected. That is why under digital Canada 150, one of the five pillars is known as "protecting Canadians".

The digital privacy act would provide important and long awaited updates to our private sector privacy law, the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, commonly known as PIPEDA. PIPEDA provides a legal framework for how personal information must be handled in the context of commercial activities while also setting guidelines for the collection, use and disclosure of personal information.

These rules are based on a set of principles developed jointly by government, industry groups and consumer representatives. The digital privacy act would strengthen marketplace rules set out by PIPEDA in important ways. In addition to protecting and empowering consumers, the amendments would clarify rules for businesses and reduce red tape.

These guidelines would ensure that vital information is available to Canadian businesses so that they have the necessary tools to thrive in a global economy. Balancing individual expectations for privacy and the need for businesses to access and use personal information in their day-to-day operations is important. Bill S-4 gets this right. It assures individuals that no matter the transaction, their personal information will continue to be protected under Canadian law.

Government Orders

The need to update the rules for online privacy continues to grow. Breaches of personal information held by retail giants like Target and Home Depot, where the credit card information of millions of Canadians was stolen, underscore the need to strengthen PIPEDA with mandatory breach requirements. The bill before us does exactly this by establishing new requirements for organizations to inform Canadians when their personal information has been lost or stolen and there is a risk of harm. The Privacy Commissioner will also be notified.

An organization that deliberately covers up a data breach or intentionally fails to notify individuals and report to the commissioner could face significant fines as a result.

Let me now take a minute to point out some of the ways in which the bill before us creates an effective streamlined regime for reporting data breaches. The digital privacy act establishes a clear and straightforward test that businesses must apply to determine whether or not they are required to report a breach.

If a business determines that the data breach creates a significant risk of harm to a customer or client, then it must report this information both to the individual affected and the Privacy Commissioner.

If the organization determines that the data breach does not pose a risk of significant harm, that is, its data security safeguards were compromised but it avoided a situation where the customers are exposed to a threat, like identity theft, fraud or humiliation, then that organization must keep a record of that breach.

The requirement to maintain these records, even if the breach is determined not to be serious at the time, serves two purposes. First and most important, it requires companies to keep track of when their data security safeguards failed, so that they can determine whether or not they have a systemic problem that needs to be corrected.

An initial breach may not be serious because the information lost is not particularly sensitive. The next time, however, the company and the individual affected may not be so lucky. Keeping track of these breaches will help companies identify potential problems before individual privacy is seriously harmed.

Second, these records provide a mechanism for the Privacy Commissioner to hold organizations accountable for their obligations to report serious data breaches. At any time, the Privacy Commissioner may request companies to provide these records which will allow the commissioner to make sure that organizations are following the rules.

• (1700)

If companies choose to deliberately ignore these rules, the consequences as set out under the digital privacy act are serious. Bill S-4 would make it an offence to deliberately cover up a data breach or intentionally fail to notify individuals and report it to the commissioner.

In these cases, organizations could face a fine of up to \$100,000 for every individual they fail to notify. These penalties represent one way that the digital privacy act would safeguard the personal information of Canadians.

The Privacy Commissioner of Canada strongly supports the proposed data breach rules in Bill S-4. He told the standing committee:

I am greatly encouraged by the government's show of commitment to update the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, and I generally welcome the amendments proposed in this bill. Proposals such as the breach notification, voluntary compliance agreements and enhanced consent would go a long way to strengthening the framework that protects the privacy of Canadians....

Similarly, the Canadian Bankers Association voiced its support for these amendments, telling the committee:

The banking industry supports the requirements in the digital privacy act for organizations to notify individuals about a breach of their personal information where there is a risk of significant harm. We also support the commissioner's new oversight powers to ensure that organizations comply with these new provisions.

I have been discussing the data breach rules which are a very important element of the bill before us. I would like now to turn my attention to four ways that Bill S-4 would strengthen Canada's privacy rules.

First, the bill establishes strong consent requirements to protect vulnerable individuals online, particularly children. These enhanced consent provisions were introduced as a result of recommendations made by Parliament during the first statutory review of PIPEDA.

Under PIPEDA, organizations need to obtain an individual's consent to collect, use, or disclose their personal information. Under the bill before us, an individual's consent would not be considered valid unless the way the information will be used is clearly communicated in language appropriate to the target audience.

For example, some businesses operate online playgrounds or educational websites that target children and collect personal information of children that is used for marketing and other purposes. Bill S-4 requires that the language used to obtain consent must be such that a child could reasonably be expected to understand the nature, purpose and consequence of sharing his or her personal information. If the consent request is too complicated for the child to understand, the consent would not be valid.

Again, the Privacy Commissioner of Canada supports this amendment. He told the committee:

I think it would be useful to further clarify that consent is to be evaluated from the perspective of the person whose consent is invoked. Organizations would be asked to put themselves in the shoes of various clientele from whom they are collecting information so that consent is as meaningful as possible.

Second, Bill S-4 seeks to harmonize federal laws with provincial privacy protection laws when it comes to a sharing of personal information without consent in narrow, limited circumstances.

Government Orders

PIPEDA already provides for a number of circumstances where personal information can be shared without consent when it is clearly in the public interest to do so. The amendments in Bill S-4 would add to this by allowing information to be shared in order to protect seniors and other vulnerable individuals from financial abuse or neglect, communicate with the family of an injured or deceased individual, or identify a victim of an accident or a natural disaster.

In his testimony before the standing committee, Mr. Marc-André Pigeon, director of financial sector policy at Credit Union Central of Canada expressed his strong support for Bill S-4 and the financial abuse amendment. He said:

In general, we think Bill S-4 does a lot of things right. We are especially pleased with the provisions that would make it easier for credit unions to share personal information with the next of kin or authorized representatives when the credit union has reasonable grounds to suspect that the individual may be a victim of financial abuse.

● (1705)

The third way that Bill S-4 would strengthen PIPEDA would be through changes that would support day-to-day business operations. The digital privacy act would remove unnecessary red tape for businesses by allowing for the collection, use and disclosure of personal information without consent in the context of specific legitimate business activities. For example, Bill S-4 would allow information to be more readily available in order to conduct due diligence in the context of mergers and acquisitions.

Similarly, the digital privacy act would allow businesses to share any type of business contact information in order to carry out normal business activities. It is simply ridiculous that PIPEDA allows an employee to share an office phone or fax number, but not an email address. Bill S-4 would fix this problem, a solution supported by the Retail Council of Canada. It told the committee:

—we support the clarification on the exclusion of business contact information... This section 4 clarification will better equip businesses to conduct their ongoing operations.

Finally, the digital privacy act would make existing compliance tools stronger and more effective. PIPEDA is enforced by the Privacy Commissioner of Canada who can turn to the Federal Court when an organization is found to break the rules. Bill S-4 would also give Canadians the option of taking an organization to Federal Court to order an organization to change its practices or to seek damages.

While the digital privacy act would keep those options open, it would also provide an alternative to court action such as voluntary compliance agreements. Under a compliance agreement, organizations would voluntarily commit to take action to comply with the law to avoid costly legal action. The agreements would be legally binding and would allow the commissioner to hold organizations accountable to follow through on their commitments to private privacy protection.

Again, the Privacy Commissioner expressed his strong support for this tool when he appeared before the standing committee. He said that the compliance agreement amendment was “very necessary” and “helpful for us to implement and apply”.

Canadian organizations care about their reputation and they know that sound privacy practices will have a lasting impact on the legitimacy of their brand. They also know that the reverse is true,

that if their customers find out about shoddy privacy practices, their businesses will suffer. This is why the digital privacy act would give the Privacy Commissioner broader powers to name and shame a non-compliant organization to encourage it to take corrective action.

If either of these measures fail to provide the right incentives for businesses to fix their privacy problems, Bill S-4 would give the Privacy Commissioner more time to take them to court. Under the current law, the commissioner only has 45 days after he finishes the investigation to take the organization to court.

The Privacy Commissioner told the standing committee that it was simply not enough time, given the high complexity of issues with which his office dealt. Quite often, the Privacy Commissioner will work with organizations for several months, if not a year, to ensure they follow through on their commitments to fix any problems he has identified. The problem, of course, is that organizations can simply delay taking action for a couple of weeks, knowing that after 45 days, the commissioner will no longer have the option to take them to court. Bill S-4 would fix this problem and would provide the commissioner with a year to take an organization to court for non-compliance.

I have just outlined the five major provisions in Bill S-4, which include: new data breach rules; clear requirements when obtaining consent from individuals, including from minors; changes to support other public interest objectives, like fighting financial abuse; reducing the red tape for day-to-day operations; and new compliance tools for the Privacy Commissioner of Canada.

It is clear that Bill S-4 would deliver a balanced approach to protect the personal information of Canadians, while still allowing the information to be available to the growing, innovative digital economy.

Karl Littler, vice-president of Public Affairs at the Retail Council of Canada, summed it up best when he told the standing committee:

Generally speaking, Bill S-4 strikes the right balance between action to protect digital privacy on digital fraud and financial abuse, while recognizing the strengths of PIPEDA and its forward-thinking technologically neutral approach.

Government Orders

We have it right with this digital privacy act. Both businesses and consumers have been empowered in this digital age, but if Canada is to remain a leading digital nation, Canadians need to have confidence that their online transactions are safe and their privacy is secure.

• (1710)

Bill S-4, the digital privacy act, would strengthen the rules protecting personal information, and that is essential to conduct business in virtually all sectors of the economy. The digital privacy act would go a long way to improving the protection of privacy for Canadians. I urge hon. members to join me in supporting this bill.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Ève Péclet (La Pointe-de-l'Île, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague mention amendments. However, the Conservatives rejected one of our critical amendments that was supported by many witnesses. That is rather problematic. We wanted to work with the Conservatives, but as usual, they turned a deaf ear in committee and refused to work as a team.

Why did they once again refuse to accept our amendments, which would have corrected and improved the bill so that we could better protect Canadians? As it now stands, Bill S-4 is still quite flawed. For example, it leaves it up to the companies to enforce the regulations, which is unacceptable.

I would therefore like my colleague to explain why the Conservatives rejected our amendments.

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Daniel: Clearly, Mr. Speaker, when the committee looked at the amendments, they were not considered suitable or applicable at that stage. There is a lot of confidence in the companies that we are working with and that are working on these. The recommendations in this bill came from the companies, as well as all the industries, et cetera. Therefore, I do not think there was any need for those changes to be admitted in.

• (1715)

Mr. Ted Hsu (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat the question of my hon. colleague on the opposition benches. I want to ensure that the government member really believes this is the best possible bill we could pass in the House of Commons, since we are at third reading debate.

Forty-two opposition amendments were passed over, I understand, with very little discussion, explanation or even defence of the rejection of those amendments. It is really a simple question, and perhaps my hon. colleague has already answered it. However, I would like him to say clearly whether he believes this is the best possible bill we could pass.

Mr. Joe Daniel: Mr. Speaker, on any bill that comes through the House, the question can be asked whether it is the best bill. We believe this is the best bill we have for this time, for this place, for now, in protecting the privacy of Canadians who are working in this digital economy. We believe these things will strengthen PIPEDA and close the gaps. That is why we have submitted it.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his description of the balanced approach we have taken, in

contradiction to the NDP's heavy-handed approach. I would like him to comment on how Bill S-4 would amend PIPEDA to reduce red tape for normal business activities.

Mr. Joe Daniel: Mr. Speaker, our government understands the need for businesses to conduct normal, everyday activities, and not be inundated with red tape, while at the same time maintaining the privacy of Canadians.

The digital privacy act proposes common sense changes that recognize that companies need access to and the use of personal information to conduct legitimate business activities, for example, taking a merger and acquisition process, an insurance claim, or sharing an employee's email address and fax number with another company in those circumstances. These important fixes were introduced in response to unanimous recommendations made during the first parliamentary review.

The digital privacy act would reduce the unnecessary red tape for businesses, while also maintaining and protecting privacy rights for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is truly a pleasure for me to ask my colleague opposite a question on behalf of my constituents from Alfred-Pellan in Laval.

In the bills that the Conservatives introduce, the devil is often in the details. When examining the proposals set out in Bill S-4, I had some concerns that I would like to raise.

One of those concerns in particular reminds me of the nightmare of Bill C-51 and its lack of a proper oversight mechanism. Bill S-4 presents the same type of problem. It would allow greater access to personal information without a warrant and without provisions for an oversight mechanism.

In fact, I am wondering why the Conservative government is working so hard to allow snooping without a warrant and why it is creating bigger holes with bills such as Bill S-4.

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Daniel: Mr. Speaker, while we look at what the question is about, we already have this information in the system. This is information that people have put online with businesses they are working with to ensure that information is used for legitimate businesses. There is no need for a warrant for those sorts of information unless some criminal activity is going on, in which case there would be a warrant. I do not think there is any relevance to that question, to be quite frank.

Government Orders

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we look at the process of Bill S-4, is it any wonder that Canadians look at Ottawa and come to the determination that Parliament is broken? There is a need for real change, and the Liberal Party of Canada will be advocating for that.

Let us look at this bill. We have legislation before us that has some serious flaws. We had the opportunity in committee stage to make some changes with amendments. The majority government, over the years, has made the determination that it does not matter what kind of amendment it is if it comes from the opposition benches. It is an automatic default that amendments are bad unless they are Conservative amendments.

Will the member not recognize that this bill is faulty in the sense that the many amendments that were brought forward, whether from the Liberal Party or other opposition members, did have some merit to them? Would he not acknowledge that fact?

• (1720)

Mr. Joe Daniel: Mr. Speaker, that was an interesting question.

Of course there is some merit in all of these things. This bill was specifically designed to fix some of the issues in PIPEDA. It would provide that oversight with the Privacy Commissioner. It would do everything that we need to do to fix the issues for now. Some of the changes that were proposed were not accepted for those various reasons. They were looked at and therefore rejected.

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listen to the remarks of my hon. colleague from Don Valley East. He talked a bit about fighting financial abuse. He went on to say something related to making it easier to contact a family member or next of kin when financial abuse was suspected.

Could the member tell us who might fall victim to this type of financial abuse and why the legislation is so important in order to protect these people?

Mr. Joe Daniel: Mr. Speaker, there are several categories of people who are vulnerable: children who are now doing a lot more work online than many adults, and seniors who are also online and are likely to be subject to financial fraud, et cetera. The bill would allow for somebody to identify that there was a potential fraud taking place and would allow communication with somebody responsible for those people to analyze and see if these could be fixed. The bill ensures we make that provision for those people.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague across the way another question about Bill S-4.

According to some experts, many parts of Bill S-4 are unconstitutional. Why, then, will the government not simply take out the parts that are unconstitutional, especially in light of the Spencer ruling?

I would like my colleague to comment on that.

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Daniel: Mr. Speaker, as we reviewed the bill in committee, issues of unconstitutionality were never raised. Therefore, there does not seem to be a problem with it from that

perspective. Bills go through the usual process of legal assessment before they are put forward, to understand whether that is the case. I do not think there is anything in there that is unconstitutional.

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and speak to Bill S-4, which would amend the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, called PIPEDA. The bill has the rather misleading title of the digital privacy act.

I will be speaking against this bill for a number of reasons that have been articulated very well in past debates by the member for Terrebonne—Blainville, our digital issues critic. She has brought in a bill of her own. The government took parts of it and did not go as far as it needed to, to actually protect the digital privacy of Canadians.

I would like to, first, talk about why this is such an important bill. Second, I will talk about the history of getting it here. Last, I will talk about some of the critical problems with this bill and propose an amendment at the end of my remarks.

E-commerce is the backbone of the modern Canadian economy and it is only going to be more important going forward. Think of our children and their use of digital material.

My colleague, the member for Toronto—Danforth, made some comments about e-commerce and why this bill, which underscores legal protections for privacy and e-commerce, is so important. He said that the world's largest taxi company has no cars. It is the largest taxi company because it has personal information. It is called Uber.

The world's largest accommodations company, Airbnb, owns no property, but it is the richest and largest company because it owns personal information. The world's largest retailer has absolutely no inventory. He was referring to Alibaba in China.

As we move to what my colleague called the Internet of Things, by 2020, we will have 26 billion devices connected to the Internet. I hope that people appreciate that we are moving into an economy where we need to know the rules of the game and we need to know that our personal privacy in the private sector is protected. Business wants that certainty and consumers demand that what is left of their privacy be treated fairly by those private sector organizations that hold their information.

Canada is really in a unique position on the planet. We are halfway between the European Union, which has a very aggressive data protection regime, and the United States, which has sectoral legislation but not a comprehensive private sector law like PIPEDA, the bill that is before us in its amended form.

Government Orders

I say that we are halfway between those two regimes because, under PIPEDA, Canada has managed to create what is called a substantially similar regime to the European Union. That means that e-commerce companies in England, Ireland, France, and the 28 other countries that make up the EU can confidently share their personal information with Canadians because they know that they will have substantially similar protection. Canada achieved that. The United States does not have anything like that, so companies like Google and Facebook will often use Canada as a launching pad.

If we can make privacy protection sufficient in Canada, it will likely be sufficient for Europeans, who have had the most stringent requirements of privacy on the planet. It is important that we get this right.

It is amazing and very timely that we are having this debate at this time because on Monday of this week a clear signal was given by the Council of Ministers in the European Union that it is going to go for a regulation soon, not the directive that has been enforced for some time. After two years, all 28 countries will have to come up with an even more stringent regime.

That is why this bill is so problematic. It would not help small business, as I will describe, and it certainly would not give consumers the protection that the courts say that they are entitled to. I refer to the case of Spencer in 2014, where warrantless searches were said to be not on for Canadians, yet they seem to be just fine in this bill, which is odd. We need it get it right from a commercial point of view, as well.

I am indebted to Professor Michael Geist, who testified before the industry committee and the Senate, and who is so prolific and thoughtful in his analysis of private sector privacy legislation and other privacy regimes. He talks about how it is has taken us eight to nine years to get to this state.

I wanted to talk about this because the government's ineptitude in helping the e-commerce industry that I talked about and protecting the privacy of Canadians is on full display in the history of this bill.

• (1725)

The Conservatives tell us that it is urgent, that we must get on with it. Well, that is because they have dropped the ball, as I will describe in many ways. It has taken eight or nine years to get to this situation.

The Conservatives left an earlier version of a privacy bill sitting for two years in the House of Commons with no movement whatsoever and then it died at prorogation. How did that happen? In November 2006, the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics undertook its hearings on this reform. That was one year later than the five-year review process required by the act.

Just to back up, PIPEDA, the bill before us that is being amended, requires parliamentarians to review it after five years. They could not even get that deadline together.

In 2007, there was a report recommending certain things be done. Nothing seemed to happen. First reading was in 2010 for Bill C-29, the first PIPEDA reform. Second reading of the bill was in October. In September 2011 there was the first reading of Bill C-12, the second attempt to reform PIPEDA. That never got past second reading. It died when the government prorogued. Then another bill,

this Bill S-4 was introduced in April 2014. This was the third try. Three strikes are lucky, I guess.

Here we are before Parliament with a bill that when it was in committee, the government said solemnly that it was urgent that we get on with it because it did not want to take a chance on any further delays and amendments. It is laughable the way the government treats the backbone of e-commerce, this privacy legislation. It has taken eight or nine years to get to where we are tonight. In the dying days of Parliament we are debating the legislation. It shows how important this must be to the government of the day.

In my riding, where we have a thriving e-commerce industry, with start-ups trying to develop apps and so forth, the bill is important and the government treats it with a history of neglect, which is the best way I can put the ineptitude I have described.

It is critical for small businesses, as I will describe, because they just do not have the wherewithal of large business to comply with some of the provisions of the legislation. I will come to that in a moment.

What does the bill do? Some of the things it does right is that it has finally agreed with endless Privacy Commissioner recommendations that there ought to be mandatory breach disclosure. If there has been a breach of data by a company, where it is sent to the wrong place and suddenly my personal information is found in the back of a taxi cab on a data stick, someone has to be told about it. That is pretty simple and obviously long overdue. That is a good thing to have in the bill.

Second, there are increased enforcement powers for the Privacy Commissioner, including the notion of compliance agreements that companies would enter into. This is a long-standing consumer protection approach that has now found its way into the bill.

According to experts, such as Mr. Lawford, testifying on behalf of the Public Interest Advocacy Centre, it would likely result in fewer reported breaches because it leaves the determination of whether a breach causes a real risk of significant harm entirely in the hands of the private sector companies.

Government Orders

Do the words “conflict of interest” seem to come up? They do and that obvious conflict of interest is fatal to the purpose of the bill. Why is a company going to want to blow the whistle on itself? It seems a bit odd and others have suggested, as has my colleague from Terrebonne—Blainville, in her Bill C-475, that it ought to be for the Privacy Commissioner, an independent officer of Parliament, to pass on that, not the industries themselves. That was the subject of much criticism in the industry committee, which studied Bill S-4.

That gives me a chance to talk about the attempt by the opposition to actually get meaningful debate in the industry committee. Since I got here, probably the most disappointing thing I have found is the government's utter indifference to any amendments unless they come from its side of the aisle.

• (1730)

There is an effort to have a real dialogue and to improve this and come up with a kind of unanimous support for something which is technical in nature, but the government said no to every single amendment, which, of course, in my experience is the way it does it every single time. I have been on two committees and I have not seen one amendment passed that anybody but the government proposes.

Trying to co-operate with the government to do something which is at the backbone of the new economy and it will not even talk to us. Apparently, that is how the government wants to do business. Fortunately, like so many Canadians, I hope that these are the dying days of a government with such arrogance and indifference to what Canadians want.

The efforts to try to fix this bill fell on deaf ears. My colleague, the digital critic from Terrebonne—Blainville, proposed that the Privacy Commissioner be the one who determined whether a data breach was significant enough to report, which makes sense, as opposed to the fox in the henhouse, where a company has to decide whether it is big or little.

That is not for banks to decide, whether they weigh their reputational risk that they might have versus consumers' rights. I know who could do that, an officer of Parliament. That would be the right person to do that. That is what my colleague suggested. The Conservatives propose putting the burden on companies.

Here is the problem with that, and not only the obvious conflict of interest but there are large companies, think banks, telecoms, companies of that size, that have departments that are responsible for privacy protection. More and more companies have what is called chief privacy officers to regulate this very technical area of the law.

They do a good job sometimes, but they often have this penchant that they obviously feel when they are trying to protect privacy, which is their job description, and not make a career-limiting move when information that is disclosed could cause harm, and the company would be angry with them and shoot the messenger. I have talked to CPOs in companies that tell me that the conflict is alive and well and I can understand that.

Small companies do not have these chief privacy officers, for example, to determine whether there is a significant breach or a significant risk of harm. They have no idea what to do. They want to co-operate, but they do not have the personnel or expertise to do it.

My colleague reasonably suggested that we give them a little help by letting them have access to the Privacy Commissioner's expertise and resources. Is that not a common sense provision? Is that not one that would help those small start-ups in the e-commerce industry that would really like the opportunity to do the right thing but do not have the budget to do it?

The economy in my community, the largest sector now, is not tourism or hospitality, it is high tech. The people who are producing the largest contribution to the Victoria economy are people who are just in this situation, wanting to understand the rules of the game in the new e-commerce, looking to the government to give them clarity, make it easy for them to do the right thing, so they can compete internationally, as they are doing so effectively, and to be onside with the European Union's incredibly stringent rules.

Guess what? They do not have a CPO, paid \$150,000 a year or whatever, like the large banks would. The government has done nothing to assist them and they are angry about it. They do not understand why this so-called business-friendly government simply does not get it.

Some 18 amendments were proposed by the NDP and 18 amendments declined by the government of the day. We tried to work it out, but the government just wanted to jam it through. To add insult to injury, for the 97th time it used time allocation on a bill of a technical nature like this. I think the government is over 100 times now.

In the history of Parliament, has there ever been a government that has done this more often? I certainly do not know. I want to study it. I have a student looking at this because the arrogance and the anti-democratic behaviour of the government has to be exposed. The 97th time was for a bill on digital privacy. It is shocking and shameful that we are in this world today with this government.

The Supreme Court has told us that warrantless searches are wrong. They are unconstitutional. My colleague from Toronto—Danforth said we should send it to the court for a constitutional reference. We cannot have yet another loss in the Supreme Court. How many would that be? I have lost count. It is six or seven. How about having a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada?

The leader of the opposition asked for that today with respect to Bill C-51. The government, of course, would never do that. It just wants to go lose again in the Supreme Court.

Government Orders

●(1735)

The Spencer case in 2014 established that warrantless searches are a bad thing. How can the government then put these searches into Bill S-4, the bill before us, and pretend it is going to be constitutional? It is great work for lawyers. I have many friends who welcome the government's position because it is a make-work project for constitutional lawyers, but is it helping the Canadian taxpayers? Is it helping the e-commerce businesses, those little businesses from coast to coast that are struggling in this international economy? Do they have the clarity they need to go forward? Why do we have to waste our time with yet another Supreme Court loss by the government? It makes no sense.

Could the government have co-operated a little with people of good faith who wanted to make it better and solve this problem, as New Democrats tried to do in committee? One would think the government would welcome that, but it simply said no.

My next point is kind of a technical thing, but I want to raise it. We talked about breach notification, and I want to give an idea of how complicated this is for the little mom-and-pop or individual family businesses that are now arising in the economy. Clause 10, which would add section 10.1 to PIPEDA, talks about the kind of notification that is required when there is a breach. I want to give an idea of how complicated this can be and how lack of clarity means something.

Proposed subsection 10.1(5) says, "The notification shall be conspicuous and shall be given directly to the individual in the prescribed form and manner, except in prescribed circumstances, in which case it shall be given indirectly in the prescribed form and manner."

Three times the word "prescribed" is mentioned, which means it will be prescribed by regulation to follow later. There would be regulations that would define the kinds of things that would have to be done to give notification of a breach. However, as an example, let us take a small business that is trying to do the right thing. When there is a breach, it wants to notify people immediately. What is it going to do? Until there are regulations, it is utterly meaningless.

I know the government will bring in regulations eventually. That is a good thing, and I am sure companies are looking forward to seeing them, but as they plan ahead in this incredibly dynamic sector, they do not have a clue, and neither do we. None of us can say what those prescribed requirements are, because "prescribed" means to follow later in regulations, regulations nowhere to be found. People will have to try to figure that out. People sitting in a little start-up in Victoria or St. John's or Toronto or Montreal will have to try understand how to work their way through this difficult bill.

It is a history of neglect. It is a history of failure to listen to the opposition, which wanted to work together to create this regime. It has a history of eight or nine years in coming to the dying days of Parliament, but we should not worry, because it is urgent now, according to the Minister of Industry.

New Democrats do not believe it.

Therefore, I move:

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

"this House decline to give third reading to Bill S-4, An Act to amend the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act and to make a consequential amendment to another Act, because it:

a) threatens the privacy protections of Canadians by allowing for the voluntary disclosure of their personal information among organizations without the knowledge or consent of the individuals affected;

b) fails to eliminate loopholes in privacy law that allow the backdoor sharing of personal information between Internet service providers and government agencies;

c) fails to put in place a supervision mechanism to ensure that voluntary disclosures are made only in extreme circumstances;

d) does not give the Privacy Commissioner of Canada adequate order-making powers to enforce compliance with privacy law; and

e) proposes a mandatory data-breach reporting mechanism that will likely result in under-reporting of breaches."

●(1740)

The Deputy Speaker: The amendment is in order.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for La Pointe-de-l'Île.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Ève Pécelet (La Pointe-de-l'Île, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague really put his finger on the problem, which is rather widespread and applies to other bills besides the one before us today.

For instance, following public pressure, the government unfortunately had to withdraw Bill C-30 from the order paper. However, there was also Bill C-51 and Bill C-13 on cybercrime. Now we are talking about Bill S-4, which completely destroys Canada's privacy protection regime. It waters down the criteria for obtaining warrants and, in some cases, even allows authorities to access the personal information of Canadians without a warrant.

I wonder whether the member could tell us just how troubled he is that this government says here in the House and elsewhere that it wants to protect Canadians, and yet it introduces a number of bills, like Bill C-51, Bill C-13 and Bill S-4, that put Canadians' privacy at risk.

●(1745)

[*English*]

Mr. Murray Rankin: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for La Pointe-de-l'Île for her observation and her very pointed question. It helps put in context what we are talking about today.

The member referenced Bill C-30. That was the infamous bill where the former minister of public safety and emergency preparedness told us that we either stood with the government or we stood with child pornographers. Members will remember that. I know that I will never forget it. I was standing up for the privacy rights of Canadians. To be told we were in that box may have been the low point of this House, but there may have been others. It was shocking.

Government Orders

Bill C-51 is another example. There have been articles written as recently as today. I saw one entitled “Stumbling toward Total Information Awareness: The Security of Canada Information Sharing Act”. It is an article about the bill that is part of Bill C-51. Total information awareness: anyone who has studied the United States legislation in this regard will know what the reference is to.

The shameful protection of our civil liberties, of which privacy is just one, is emblematic of the current Conservative government. We can hardly wait for Canadians to be given the choice on October 19 to change all of that.

Mr. Ted Hsu (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague from British Columbia for his excellent speech. I would like to give him a chance to expound a bit on his point, which I think is correct, that given the history behind the bill, there is no urgent need to pass it today.

We would gain much by passing the best possible bill, given all the amendments raised in committee by opposition members of Parliament, based on expert testimony. We do not need to pass the bill today. We could pass a better bill later this year or early next year.

Mr. Murray Rankin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Kingston and the Islands and recognize his efforts in this regard. I wish him well as he leaves this place. His contribution has been very important, and on this particular point, I could not agree with him more.

There were 28 amendments offered. We worked on the rules of the committee in order to get them in under the McGrath procedure, but all of them were rejected by the government in what can only be described, frankly, as a mean-spirited way.

I would rather have no bill than the bill before us. I think that is the burden of the hon. member's remarks, and I think that is absolutely right. After all, it is nine years out of date anyway. It has so many problems it will be found unconstitutional anyway. Why do we not do it right? I think that is what the member is saying.

Bill C-475, from the hon. member for Terrebonne—Blainville, would have gone some distance. It would not have allowed warrantless searches, for one thing. It would not have allowed companies to decide what a significant risk of harm is if there is a breach. It would have done so many things that would have been so much more consistent with how Canadians used to do business and how we used to protect our rights and freedoms.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and neighbour from Victoria for an excellent speech.

I also want to pay particular tribute to another member of his caucus, the hon. member for Terrebonne—Blainville, who had put forward, as he mentioned in his speech, an excellent private member's bill, which would have gone much further in dealing with the current issues that this bill fails to grapple with effectively. We missed opportunities here, and I agree that after so many years of inaction it is a shame to pass a bill that could be so efficaciously improved.

I also had amendments before committee in clause-by-clause study that were similar to those put forward by the member for Terrebonne—Blainville, and they were all rejected, so I lament that.

Perhaps my research has not been as exhaustive as the research the hon. member's student is now doing, but I did examine the records of this place for time allocations when they first began to be used routinely. I found seven examples of time allocation between 1920 and 1954. As we all know, in the last four years we have experienced 100 time allocations. I am 99% certain that the Conservative administration in this Parliament has broken all records for shutting down debate by an order of magnitude.

• (1750)

Mr. Murray Rankin: Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and neighbour from Saanich—Gulf Islands for her thoughtful intervention. I would appreciate sharing research with her on the issue of parliamentary decline, which her comment addressed.

There may be some Commonwealth country in Africa that has done this more often. There may be some parliamentary democracy that I am unaware of that has done this, and that is the research I want to do. I believe that it may be a parliamentary record in the entire Commonwealth from Westminster to Zimbabwe, but I do not know, because I have not looked at Zimbabwe's record. However, it would not surprise me if we have achieved a record in this place in moving time allocation 100 times to curtail democratic debate.

Canadians should be aghast, they should be ashamed, and they should try to figure out how we can create a new government that would no longer put up with this if we are to be a democracy any longer.

[*Translation*]

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

What I found really interesting about his speech was the way he put the bill into context. All of a sudden, at the last minute, the government decided that the Senate bill is urgent.

I would like to remind everyone that in 2010 the President of the Treasury Board, who was then the minister of industry, started a discussion about a digital economy strategy, a public consultation that never saw the light of day and that never produced any results. I think that when a bill like this comes from the Senate, that is pretty simplistic.

Given the growing importance of the digital economy and our digital lives, broadly speaking, does my colleague not think that we should simply drop this bill and rethink government regulations relating to the digital world?

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Murray Rankin: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for that very thoughtful question. I think it might make better sense to simply drop this bill and come up with a better bill along the lines of the one put forward by my colleague from Terrebonne—Blainville, but even that is getting out of date. This economy is moving very quickly, and given the kinds of protections that are needed, we obviously should be thinking five years down the road, not nine years behind us.

It is true that the bill does come from the Senate. Then it went to the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology in February of 2015. At that point the Minister of Industry said he was open to changes, but the government warned that any amendments would mean the bill would go back to the Senate for approval and likely die with the fall election. The minister emphasized that “there is some urgency” with this bill.

Why create law that we know to be bad? Why create law that is going to be found unconstitutional once again? Why do that when the industry wants more certainty, not less certainty? In my remarks, I gave an example of one clause that deals with the prescribed form and manner of notification, and in it there are three references to regulations that are not out there.

We have no idea what this is all going to mean. It is a complete joke.

Industry deserves better. Canadians protecting their privacy deserve better. Small business deserves better. We can do better.

Mr. Ted Hsu (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak to Bill S-4, legislation which amends the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act.

As our lives are more and more immersed in a digital world, our understanding of digital privacy changes and our means of protecting digital privacy also needs to be updated. We use the Internet in so many ways. Our digital identity is now more a part of our identity when it comes to banking and commerce, our tax returns, government services, and our interactions with other people in society. Those are examples of how our identity is becoming more digital. In a world where crimes involving data theft, identity fraud and online stalking are on the rise, and we are becoming more worried about those, it is crucial to protect data to protect our identity.

Data is not simply information. In fact, as my colleague from Victoria very elegantly gave some examples, it is power. It is a doorway into the private lives of many. It is commercial power. The Liberal Party is deeply concerned that the government's commitment to safeguarding the personal information and privacy of Canadians is less than absolute.

Let me give another example which is not quite related to Bill S-4 but I think is important to mention just for the record. Members might know that since the elimination of the long form census, the government has been looking at linking different so-called administrative data sources in different parts of the government in order to reduce the burden of filling out the census. Indeed, some European countries do not have a census. They have deep links between different pieces of administrative data, and people have to report where they live every time they move. The Privacy

Commissioner, whose testimony on Bill S-4 at committee was also quite important, has warned Canadians that we should be very wary of simply moving over to this European system, that there are serious privacy considerations which Canadians should look at and agree with before the government proceeds in that direction.

More and more, all of this information is becoming digital. As an example, although I think this is perhaps not the point at which we should be too concerned, in the 2016 census, the government is planning to automatically use income and benefit information from the Canada Revenue Agency. It can do this because everything is digitized. That information would be automatically tacked onto census information and any voluntary replies that Canadians provide to the national household survey, unless of course the election result in October is such that we do not have to go through that. I just wanted to bring that up for the record.

What I would like to talk about most is the process that happened at committee. We are at third reading now. We are trying to decide whether this is the best possible bill that this Parliament could pass.

Unfortunately, there are definitely concerns about whether the approach in Bill S-4 is too broad and whether there are unintended consequences. I will not go too deeply into them. In fact, my friend, the member for Victoria, has done a much better job than I ever could. Suffice it to say that Bill S-4 identifies situations where personal information can be disclosed without the knowledge or consent of an individual. It permits federal works, undertakings and businesses to collect, use and disclose personal information, without the knowledge or consent of an individual, to establish, manage or terminate their employment relationships with the individual. It permits organizations, for certain purposes, to use and disclose, without the knowledge or consent of an individual, personal information related to prospective or completed business transactions. Therefore, there is a danger, we believe, that Bill S-4 is too broad.

● (1755)

The problem is that at committee stage, there really was not sufficient examination of these details. There were 42 amendments proposed by the opposition parties. There was not substantive debate at committee. There were no explanations for why the government members opposed amendments that were based on the testimony of expert witnesses, such as the Canadian Bar Association, the Privacy Commissioner and the Insurance Bureau of Canada. There were 42 opposition amendments, all of them defeated rather quickly without a defence of that vote by the government side.

It has been brought up in debate by previous speakers about how committees have worked in this Parliament and how they could be changed in the next Parliament. I really do believe that a couple of simple steps would be a good start to reforming the committee system.

Government Orders

The first one would be to allow committee chairs to be chosen by a secret ballot in this House, just as the Speaker is chosen. My first encounter with this idea was in fact a motion from a Conservative backbencher, the member for Saskatoon—Humboldt. That would be a good measure to ensure that committee chairs are as independent as possible not only from the government, but from their own party leadership. That would be a step toward what we need to make committees really fulfill their role in Parliament, which is ultimately the role that all of us have, which is to hold the government to account.

The second thing which I think would be very useful in committee, and this reverts to past practice in this House, would be to forbid parliamentary secretaries and ministers from sitting as voting members of committees. That would be a good way to protect the independence of committees for the purpose of committees being able to do a better job of holding the government to account.

I believe that if committees had been working better, we would have at least had on the record somewhere the reasons for rejecting the 42 opposition amendments to Bill S-4. In fact, I also believe that if we really had independent committees, some of these amendments would have been adopted, and even in this majority Conservative Parliament, with those amendments we would have passed a better bill than it looks like we might be passing, given the majority on the Conservative side.

By way of conclusion, I just want to say that without a genuine, collaborative, detailed committee study, I believe that the committee has not held the government to account with regard to Bill S-4. Expert testimony has not been properly either taken into account or discounted with some evidence or some cogent argument. We have in Bill S-4 a bill in which there are potentially overly broad provisions and good reason in fact to believe there are overly broad provisions and unintended questions. That is why I will be voting against the bill at third reading.

• (1800)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my hon. colleague for Kingston and the Islands that spontaneous rounds of applause when a colleague stands to give a speech in this place are not common, but I had a feeling that since he is choosing not to run again, perhaps this is my last chance to give him a round of applause. Having a scientist in this place, someone with a Ph.D. in physics, is very helpful. I have always been somewhat in awe of my colleague from Kingston and the Islands.

I want to second his concern about the course of review of legislation in parliamentary committees. I had the great good fortune, although I have only had the honour of serving here since 2011, to serve in the administration of former prime minister Brian Mulroney. I was not a member of his party, but I was fortunate to be working with the minister of the environment and steered many bills through committees. There was non-partisan co-operation. That was the usual approach. Members of all parties within committees listened to witnesses. They never browbeat them. They listened respectfully. They asked questions about things that they thought would serve the committee in finding better public policy. It is new to have parliamentary secretaries sitting in committee holding the Conservative members at committee to whipped votes and often to scripted speeches and questions.

I just want to reinforce what my friend from Kingston and the Islands has said and ask him to expand on how we can ensure that Parliament returns to its true function of non-partisan, thoughtful, evidence-based review of legislation.

• (1805)

Mr. Ted Hsu: Mr. Speaker, let me say that one consequence of this change of returning committees to their function of keeping the government to account is that committees would become headaches for governments, but that is what they are supposed to be if they do their job of keeping governments to account.

How can we effect this? If I could be slightly partisan, the Liberal Party has promised to make these changes to committees. My guess is that some of the other parties would agree with those changes, and hopefully, if we roll the dice on October 19 and it turns out well, we will have the votes that we need to change the rules in the House and to allow members of Parliament and the committees of the House to hold the government to account to do its job for the benefit of all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Ève Pécelet (La Pointe-de-l'Île, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of our biggest concerns here is that a provision in this bill would allow organizations to share personal information more freely and without a warrant for business purposes.

For example, a telecommunications company or some other type of business could share an individual's personal information with another business for the purpose of a prospective business transaction between another company and a Canadian citizen.

This bill would allow different companies to share personal information that belongs to Canadians without clear, precise and robust oversight by Canada's Parliament, which is to say, by Canadians.

Would my colleague comment on that provision in the bill?

Mr. Ted Hsu: Mr. Speaker, it is true that this bill contains elements that may be too broad and would result in violations of Canadians' privacy.

[*English*]

One example that comes to mind is the do not call list. In the past it was possible to share information, telephone numbers and so on, and I think Canadians rightly did not want information like telephone numbers to be shared.

Government Orders

Going forward, individuals in Canada will have more and more digital identities that they may want to be protected and not to be passed around, not to be shared without at least their knowledge or consent. That is the sort of thing that needs to be constantly updated. The member for Victoria talked about the bill already being out of date and as time passes, this sort of digital privacy legislation needs to be updated constantly. We cannot sit still in legislation as technology evolves.

That is probably a general principle and why it would be good to have members of Parliament constantly consulting experts in technology, especially experts at the forefront of technology so that we can constantly update our laws regarding the protection of Canadians and protection of privacy.

• (1810)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is worthy to note that we are of the digital age and more and more Canadians are becoming aware and concerned that with one touch on a keyboard, one could have all sorts of information being transferred. It is an important issue for all Canadians.

The leader of the Green Party and the member made reference to the need for change. There were numerous amendments suggested. My colleague and I were just talking about how parliamentary secretaries should not be on standing committees in a voting capacity or otherwise.

A wonderful plan was released just yesterday by the leader of the Liberal Party. At www.realchange.ca one can see the 30-plus ideas and thoughts in terms of how we can effect real change.

I wonder if the member could highlight why he believes that the need for changing the system is so critically important. I suspect there would be a lot more support in the House if the government had accepted the amendments that were being proposed. That is the type of change that we need to see.

As many say, Ottawa is broken because of the actions of the government over the last 10 years.

Mr. Ted Hsu: Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken about the independence of committee chairs, how we could ensure that independence by how we choose the committee chairs and take that out of the hands of the government and party leaders. I have also already spoken about the idea of removing the possibility of parliamentary secretaries sitting as voting members of committees.

However, what I think is also important is that committees need to be given the resources to really acquire the independent expert analysis that they need for any proposed legislation.

I would supplement what I said earlier with respect to resources. More generally, there are a lot of cases where we can change rules, but unless we put resources behind those rule changes, we do not actually accomplish what we want to accomplish.

I would ask that in the next Parliament the House ensure that committees have the resources they need to hold the government to account.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I will take the opportunity to ask the member if there is some aspect of the legislation that he

personally would have liked to have seen changed or that he is concerned about.

Mr. Ted Hsu: Mr. Speaker, there was an amendment by my colleague, the Liberal member for York West, regarding the threshold at which a company or an institution was required to report an unlawful breach of personal information, not only to some authority, but to the individual related to the information of concern. The language was “represents a significant threat of harm to the individual”.

That amendment was important so Canadians could feel confident that if their information was released and if it would have any effect on them, they would be notified as well as authorities that could deal with the breach more generally.

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment. I must advise the member that he will only have about eight and a half minutes in his speech before we conclude this debate.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Kelowna—Lake Country. I appreciate the timeline on this.

I am pleased to rise in my place today to speak to Bill S-4, the digital privacy act, which would make a number of important changes to strengthen Canada's private sector privacy law, the Personal Information Protection and Electronics Documents Act, or what is more commonly known as PIPEDA.

Data breaches are very concerning to Canadians. In fact, a recent survey conducted by the Office of the Privacy Commissioner in 2014 found that news of data breaches among several large retailers had made 80% of Canadians more reluctant to share their personal information with businesses. This is simply unacceptable. Canadians need to know that when they choose to share their personal information with a business, it will be protected and kept confidential.

The proposals in Bill S-4 will amend PIPEDA to significantly strengthen the current law and ensure that the privacy of Canadians will be protected when it comes to the rules that companies must abide by when they collect, use or disclose personal information in the course of commercial activities. In the current legislation, there is no legal obligation for businesses and organizations to tell customers and clients when their personal information has been lost or stolen.

The digital privacy act would correct this by making important changes to PIPEDA and implement new data breach requirements for businesses. These changes would ensure that organizations would be taking appropriate steps to notify Canadians. The requirement for mandatory notification is welcome by many stakeholders, in particular the Privacy Commissioner of Canada. In his recent annual report to Parliament on PIPEDA, he stated:

—we welcome the proposed amendment to PIPEDA in Bill S-4, the Digital Privacy Act, which seeks to implement mandatory breach notification.

He went on to say:

Government Orders

Mandatory notification will also provide a clearer picture of the frequency and type of data breaches experienced by organizations.

Mandatory notification would better inform Canadians of situations in which their personal information has been compromised. It would also enable Canada to keep pace with other jurisdictions where similar measures have been enacted or are being considered.

As we have discussed many times, strong rules are meaningless if they are not backed up with strong compliance tools. Bill S-4 would give the Privacy Commissioner of Canada the necessary tools to hold companies accountable when it comes to the protection of the personal information of Canadians.

In addition to the notification provisions, Bill S-4 would also require organizations to keep a record of the event, regardless of whether a breach posed a risk of harm. These records would not only allow organizations to demonstrate due diligence in the risk assessment, but would also require companies to keep track of when their data security safeguards fail so they could determine whether they have a systemic problem that would need to be corrected. What is more, organizations will be required to provide these records to the commissioner upon request at any time.

This record-keeping requirement will give the Privacy Commissioner the appropriate tools to hold organizations accountable for their obligation to report serious data breaches. Once again, I would like to quote the Privacy Commissioner's 2014 annual report, where he stated:

—requiring organizations to keep and maintain a record of breaches, and provide us with such information upon request would be an important accountability mechanism. Our Office would be able to evaluate compliance with the notification provisions and assess how organizations are deciding whether—

• (1815)

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. parliamentary secretary on a point of order.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and for Western Economic Diversification, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I seek the unanimous consent of the House for the following motion. I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing or Special Order or usual practice of the House,

(a) when no member rises to speak at the third reading stage of Bill S-4, An Act to amend the Personal Information Protection and Electronics Documents Act and to make a consequential amendment to another Act, or at 6:30 p.m. this day, whichever comes first, every question necessary to dispose of the said stage of the said bill shall be deemed put, and a recorded division deemed demanded and deferred until the expiry of the time provided for oral questions on Thursday, June 18, 2015; and

(b) when no member rises to speak at the third reading stage of Bill S-2, An Act to amend the Statutory Instruments Act and to make consequential amendments to the Statutory Instruments Regulations, or at 1:59 p.m. on Thursday, June 18, 2015, whichever comes first, every question necessary to dispose of the said stage of the said bill shall be deemed put, and a recorded division deemed demanded and deferred until the expiry of the time provided for oral questions on Thursday, June 18, 2015.

• (1820)

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon member have unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: 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)

* * *

DIGITAL PRIVACY ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill S-4, An Act to amend the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act and to make a consequential amendment to another Act, be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the commissioner made this same point when he appeared before the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology during its study of the bill. He said:

Requiring organizations to keep a record of breaches and provide a copy to my office upon request will give my office an important oversight function with respect to how organizations are complying with the requirement to notify.

It is up to all organizations to protect the personal data they have collected from their clients and customers. This is a responsibility that most take seriously. They understand that in the wrong hands this information could be used for nefarious purposes.

Most organizations in Canada are good corporate citizens. When the commissioner identifies that they are in violation of PIPEDA, they move quickly to correct their practices. Unfortunately—

The Deputy Speaker: I want to advise the parliamentary secretary that, as a result of the motion that was just adopted unanimously, he will have his full time, which at this point leaves him with just a few seconds less than five minutes to complete his speech.

Mr. Colin Carrie: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, as lawmakers we know from experience that there will always be those who will break the rules. That is why Bill S-4 would make important improvements to PIPEDA's compliance framework. These changes would ensure the commissioner has the necessary tools to ensure organizations respect the law and protect the privacy of Canadians.

The digital privacy act would set out serious consequences for any organization that deliberately ignores its data breach obligations and intentionally attempts to cover up a data breach. Bill S-4 would make it an offence for any organization to deliberately fail to notify individuals, report to the commissioner, or keep the necessary records.

Government Orders

In these cases of deliberate wrongdoing, an organization could face fines of up to \$100,000 per offence. I want to ensure this point is very clear. It would be a separate offence for every single person and organization that is deliberately not notified of a potentially harmful data breach, and each offence would be subject to a maximum \$100,000 fine.

These changes are widely supported by stakeholders, as evidenced by witness testimony during the committee's review of the bill. Professor Michael Geist stated:

These disclosure requirements are long overdue as I think it creates incentives for organizations to better protect their information and allows Canadians to take action to avoid risks such as identity theft. There are aspects in this bill that are an improvement over the prior bills, Bill C-12 and Bill C-29, most notably the inclusion of actual penalties that are essential to create the necessary incentive for compliance.

At committee, the Canadian Internet Policy and Public Interest Clinic stated:

We're very grateful to see a penalty regime for instances where the breach notification obligations are knowingly ignored...The fines currently in PIPEDA are designed as penalties for very overt offences.

The list continues. The Canadian Bankers Association stated:

We also support the commissioner's new oversight powers to ensure that organizations comply with these new provisions.

The Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association Inc. was also supportive. It stated that the bill takes a balanced approach to the responsibilities placed on business and organizations, but most importantly, it will protect the consumer of those businesses, and gives individuals the information they need to take corrective action when it is necessary.

The digital privacy act does indeed take a balanced approach, one that avoids the over-reporting of harmless incidents while ensuring that the commissioner has the necessary tools to oversee whether organizations are meeting their obligations under Bill S-4.

This balanced approach would also ensure that punishment is reserved for the most egregious offenders, those who knowingly and deliberately try to circumvent the law. Those organizations caught making a mistake in good faith would instead work with the Privacy Commissioner under the existing dispute resolution tools in the act.

Our government recognizes that many organizations already notify individuals of data breaches in a responsible manner.

Let me be very clear. The penalties in the digital privacy act would target the bad apples, those organizations that willfully and knowingly disregard their obligations or, worse, cover up a breach.

The digital privacy act would encourage all organizations to play by the same rules. It would provide incentives to comply with the new data breach obligations, and also to implement appropriate data security practices to prevent breaches from happening in the first place.

• (1825)

By requiring organizations to keep records of their data breaches and by enforcing the requirements with stiff penalties, these amendments would increase the accountability of organizations to maintain good privacy practices and would provide the Privacy Commissioner with the tools he needs to enforce these protections.

I urge hon. members to join with me in supporting the bill.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Ève Pécelet (La Pointe-de-l'Île, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague spoke in some detail about the bill, but I did not hear him talk about one very problematic clause.

Companies will be responsible for deciding whether to report a possible violation of the Privacy Act. They will have to decide whether they believe they have broken the law. Furthermore, they will decide whether their violations present a serious risk. This bill basically amends the law, but the member did not mention that all the changes benefit the companies, which will decide for themselves if there has been a violation and if that violation results in real harm.

Can my honourable colleague explain which Canadian interests are protected by this clause? It is not obvious to me at this time.

[*English*]

Mr. Colin Carrie: Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my colleague that the bill is all about a balanced approach. If we look at what the Privacy Commissioner of Canada actually said, he said that the introduction of Bill S-4 is a positive development for privacy in Canada.

He said:

...I am greatly encouraged by the government's show of commitment to update the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, and I generally welcome the amendments proposed in this bill.

He also said:

Proposals such as breach notification, voluntary compliance agreements and enhanced consent would go a long way to strengthening the framework that protects the privacy of Canadians in their dealings with private sector companies...

The proposed voluntary compliance agreements will enhance my office's ability to ensure, in a timely and cost-effective manner, that organizations are meeting their commitments to improve their privacy practices without having to resort to costly litigation before the Federal Court...

That is good legislation.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It being 6:30 p.m., pursuant to an order made earlier today, all questions necessary to dispose of the motion for third reading of Bill S-4 are deemed put and the recorded division is deemed to have been demanded and deferred until Thursday, June 18, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

[*English*]

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services.

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, I ask you to seek unanimous consent to see the clock at 6:39 p.m.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Private Members' Business

Some hon. members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1830)

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Jim Hillyer (Lethbridge, CPC) moved that Bill C-644, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (failure to comply with a condition), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, nine years ago, our Conservative government made a pledge to overhaul our criminal justice system. We told Canadians we would make sure that our laws, the police and the courts would be focused on the needs and rights of victims, and we have followed through on that pledge.

Notwithstanding the bleeding hearts who think that every violent criminal just needs a hug, most Canadians want a more just justice system, one that puts the rights of the victim above that of the criminal and one where punishments fit the crime.

As happy as people are with measures like the Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act, they shake their heads in disbelief when they find out why we needed such a law in the first place. They cannot believe that such a particular measure was actually needed to address a real problem that allowed foreign criminals, individuals who committed a crime in their home country, to enter our country on false pretenses, which is crime two, and then commit crimes in Canada, which is crime three.

These foreign criminals were able to exploit our generous nature and our generous systems by making appeal after appeal for up to 10 years before we had the legal right to get rid of them. Thankfully, that mind boggling problem is fixed. Even though, for the vast majority of Canadians, this change is simply common sense, I actually heard opposition members say that the Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act discriminated against criminals. Canadians want to see us continue on with our commitment to common-sense reforms of some of our laws that clearly fly in the face of our sense of justice.

As part of our ongoing efforts toward a more just justice system, I have introduced my private member's Bill C-644, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (failure to comply with a condition) to create a new offence for violating parole and requiring these violations to be reported.

Canadians would probably be astounded to know that violating parole is not a criminal offence. It is not even necessary to report parole violations to judges when criminals are being considered for early release or release in general. Currently, the singular method for parole review does not work.

It is well documented that a disproportionately small number of offenders are responsible for a disproportionately large number of offences. Yet, when it comes to parole, all criminals are reviewed in

the same manner which permits the most dangerous offenders to slip through the cracks and back into society to offend again and again.

My proposed legislation will correct that shortcoming through two simple reforms. First, the bill would make parole violation a criminal offence. Second, the legislation would also make it mandatory for the Correctional Service of Canada to report to the police all cases parole violation.

Reporting parole violations will help ensure the justice system has all the information on an offender in order to make the best public safety decisions before determining whether an offender should be given parole in the future.

By legislating parole violation as a criminal offence and making it mandatory to advise judges and parole boards of these violations prior to sentencing and early release considerations, we establish firmly that early release from jail or parole is a privilege to be earned and not a right to be demanded.

This legislation is consistent with other kinds of release from jail laws. For example, it is already a criminal offence in itself to skip bail and it is already a criminal offence in itself to violate probation. Then why is the violation of parole not a criminal offence in itself? There is no good answer.

Let us look at how the system works today. Under the current law, offenders who are granted conditional release or parole are subject to a certain number of conditions. That is why it is called conditional release. Some are standard conditions such as staying within Canada at all times and reporting regularly to a parole officer. Some offenders receive additional special conditions depending on their specific risk for reoffending. This could include a condition to live in a halfway house, or to abstain from drugs and alcohol or to refrain from associating with certain individuals.

If offenders violate parole by breaching any of these conditions, such as showing up late for a meeting with their parole officer or breaking curfew, the law provides a range of options for correctional authorities on how to deal with that violation. They can either do nothing, other than tell the offender he or she should not violate parole, which is usually what happens, or they can add stricter parole conditions, like an earlier curfew, or they can revoke parole and send the offender back to jail.

Private Members' Business

If he commits a crime while violating parole, he will be charged for that crime, but there will be no additional penalty for violating parole. It is as if the only punishment for escaping jail is a return to jail, with no additional sentence. The violation does not even have to be reported to future parole boards. In fact, until the changes we made in 2012, police could not even arrest parole violators caught in the very act of violating parole. Now, thanks to the Safe Streets and Communities Act, they can do that.

Let me re-emphasize that it is possible, and based on research it is even highly likely, that an offender can violate parole and receive no penalty. Of course, this does nothing to promote respect for the rule of law, and it greatly increases the likelihood that offenders will reoffend.

After the initial astonishment of learning that violating parole is not already against the law, people gave strong support to this amendment. For example, the mayors and reeves of my region of southern Alberta have written a joint letter urging the government to support this legislation. The good news is that it supports this legislation.

Tom Stamatakis, president of the Canadian Police Association, said:

Our members appreciate the step taken...to introduce this legislation which will ensure accurate records are kept, and that a full history of an offender's actions can be considered before any parole is earned.

This legislation is named after Constable Ezio Faraone, who was killed in action while he was attempting to arrest repeat criminal Albert Foulston. If one Googles Constable Faraone, Albert Foulston's name comes up over and over again, even though it was Foulston's accomplice, Jeremy Crews, who pulled the trigger.

Albert Foulston was out on parole. He had repeatedly violated parole, yet he was on the streets. He was under surveillance, but police were not able to do anything until he actually robbed a bank. Constable Faraone had him cornered in an alley when Foulston feigned surrender, allowing his accomplice to shoot Faraone with a sawed-off shotgun at point-blank range.

In 2009, Foulston was released on parole after just 20 years of a 30-year sentence. His parole was automatic, even though he was involved in about 100 incidents while in prison, including fights and assaults on staff, and even though the parole board assessed his risk of reoffending as moderate to high. According to the board, it had no choice but to release him, because the law said that parole was automatic after serving two-thirds of the sentence. All the parole board could do was impose various conditions on that parole.

The trouble is, no matter how many or how limiting the conditions of parole are, there are no criminal consequences for violating those conditions. If Foulston's parole conditions said he could not hang out with other drug dealers or bank robbers, it would not matter. It was not until he actually robbed a bank that he committed an actual crime. If my bill had been law, he could have been arrested just for hanging out with his accomplice, Mr. Crews.

Sure enough, the next page in our Google search shows that in 2012, Albert Foulston recommitted again and was facing jail time for trafficking illegal drugs. No wonder the Edmonton Police Association refers to Faulston as the poster boy for problems in the Canadian

correctional system. Faulston has spent more than 30 years behind bars on more than 50 convictions. He has been released ten times.

Sadly, his name came up more recently. In fact, it was in an interview with retired police sergeant Tony Simone, the sergeant who replied to Constable Faraone's fatal shooting 25 years ago. Sergeant Simoni was responding to the tragic death of Constable Daniel Woodall recently, on June 8, in Edmonton. He said that the incident brought Faraone's shooting home like it was yesterday. He said that it was very vivid, very profound, and brought back very traumatic memories and emotions.

He said, "It's surprising how long it does last. And the [Edmonton police] who went through what they went through [June 8] will be experiencing the same, I'm sure".

While this legislation would give police important tools for crime prevention, there are other important reasons to support these changes. According to the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act:

The fundamental purpose of sentencing is to contribute, along with crime prevention initiatives, to respect for the law and the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society by imposing just sanctions...

There is more to it than just crime prevention. Critics of our tough-on-crime measures focus only on the impact of the measure on the criminal himself. Clearly no amount of deterrent would be enough to dissuade someone like Albert Foulston, but our laws are not in place just to control the criminal. Laws and the rule of law have great power over the minds of law-abiding citizens. One of Canada's great values is the rule of law, or respect for the rule of law. We are a law-abiding people.

Why do most Canadians honour and obey the law? It is not because we fear punishment and it is not because we fear a minimum sentence. It is because we want to be a law-abiding people.

However, law has the power to command a willing respect and obedience of those who are subject to it only if the law is legitimate. There are a few key principles or elements that make law legitimate. One, for example, is how the law was made. Was the process leading to the development of the law legitimate?

As well, the law must also contribute to a just, peaceful, and safe society. For law to be legitimate, it must satisfy our sense of justice. This is one reason that we say the punishment must fit the crime. Anything more or less than that violates our sense of justice. A society can only find themselves saying "that is ridiculous" about so many laws before they start saying that the law itself is ridiculous.

Private Members' Business

When we reach that point, there will never be enough police to monitor and enforce obedience. Of course we do not want to lock up someone for life for making a youthful mistake. While mercy cannot rob justice, mercy is actually compatible with our sense of justice. We do not want to live in a Hugo-like miserable society that would force Jean Valjean to live for a lifetime carrying a yellow passport for stealing a loaf of bread for his sister's starving children. Punishments that are too severe are unacceptable, but so are punishments that are far too lenient. They simply violate our sense of justice.

This bill addresses an important particular loophole in the justice system, but it is just part of our overall common sense reform of our justice system. Simply put, Canadians want a more just justice system. Our sense of justice cries out that the rights of the victim must take priority over those of the criminal and that the punishment must fit the crime.

This legislation complements our government's ongoing work to support victims of crime in this country and further holds offenders to account for their actions. I look forward to receiving support from all parties on this much-needed piece of legislation.

● (1840)

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am truly proud to rise in the House as the deputy public safety critic for the official opposition and speak to Bill C-644. I will have the opportunity to do so in my speech.

I must say that I am rather surprised by this bill, which was introduced by a backbencher and pertains to the Criminal Code. There are specific aspects of this bill that will be very harmful to the Parole Board of Canada. The member mentioned in his speech that we have no choice but to release inmates after they have served two-thirds of their sentence. I would like to set the record straight by reminding members that that is not true. The people who work at the Parole Board of Canada do a very good job, and they always consider whether an inmate should or should not be released. They will always act in the best interests of Canadians.

The current system already allows for the return to custody of offenders who violate parole. I truly believe that the Conservatives are heading in the wrong direction by interfering in the operations of the Parole Board of Canada and the rehabilitation of offenders. Studies have clearly shown that a gradual, supervised and monitored release is the best way to keep the public safe.

I am wondering what my colleague opposite thinks about that.

● (1845)

Mr. Jim Hillyer: Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the NDP is opposed to this reform.

[English]

This does not address the release of prisoners through parole. It addresses a clear shortcoming in our Criminal Code where someone can violate parole and that violation is not a criminal offence. It is a criminal offence to violate probation and it is a criminal offence to violate bail. In fact, it is a criminal offence to violate any court ordered release from jail.

This is a clear problem. Police have said it is a problem. It allows a small number of offenders to repeat that offence over and over again. It is not going to stop anyone's rehabilitation if the person truly is rehabilitated because the person will keep his or her parole conditions.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I certainly have to agree with what the member for Alfred-Pellan said. Her position is the same.

The member talked about this as more just. It is not more just and it is not punishment to fit the crime.

As the member for Alfred-Pellan said, the parole board already has the authority to deal with these situations. It has the expertise and authority to deal with them. The bill takes the authority out of its hands. Under the bill, if someone failed within a 24-hour period to state their change of address, they would have a new criminal record. They would go back into prison. What is the cost to the system? This is blanket treatment for anything a person does that is outside the conditions of his or her parole, and some of them can be terribly minor.

I would like the member to tell me how this in any way is going to help with rehabilitation to put these people back out onto the streets so they can be productive in society. Also, what would be the added costs to the system for this one-off bill that we are seeing again from the Conservative Party?

Mr. Jim Hillyer: Mr. Speaker, the bill certainly would not force every parolee to go back to jail. It actually has a maximum sentence of two years. It does not mean that every single violation would send someone back to jail for two years.

It also is important because it requires that all parole violations be reported. When future parole boards considered situations, they would have the facts about prior parole violations. It is something the police have requested and it is something which they applaud. It certainly is the right balance between rehabilitation and making sure we have punishments that fit the crime and that crimes are called crimes.

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour for me to rise in the House and speak on behalf of the people I represent in Alfred-Pellan, in the eastern part of Laval.

I took the time to carefully study Bill C-644, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (failure to comply with a condition). After what was presented to us and what was included in the bill, and after discussing it with various experts in a number of fields—and I will talk more about that later in my speech—I unfortunately must oppose such a bill, for a number of reasons that I will go over here today.

Private Members' Business

First of all, by introducing this bill, the Conservatives have proven once again that they are more interested in scoring political points than they are in bringing forward really effective measures to improve public safety. The current system, as we know it, already allows for a return to custody when offenders violate parole.

What is more, the courts are already clogged up and can barely keep up with the cases submitted in a reasonable timeframe, which is hurting victims and undermining the entire justice system. Not only does Bill C-644 exacerbate that problem, but it could also prove to be extremely costly for Canadian taxpayers.

As I mentioned, the current system already allows for a return to custody of offenders who violate parole. Such violations include breaking a curfew, associating with a criminalized group, being under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and so on. It is based on an individual risk assessment done for every offender by either the Correctional Service of Canada or the Parole Board of Canada.

I would remind the House and especially the member introducing this bill that conditional release is an integral part of the rehabilitation process and contributes to enhancing public safety. I am not the only one to say so. A number of experts in various fields, including people who work with victims groups, people who work with Correctional Service Canada, or other people who work along the way in the conditional release process all agree.

By disrupting the Parole Board of Canada's operations in this way and interfering with offenders' reintegration into society, this bill does absolutely nothing to improve public safety in Canada.

As I said, we on this side of the House took the time to consult a number of experts to ensure that we had good advice on this bill. A number of stakeholders support the NDP's position. I received an opinion from the Office of the Correctional Investigator, among others, expressing concerns about this bill. Furthermore, much like us, Steve Sullivan, a former federal ombudsman for victims of crime, the John Howard Society of Canada, the Union of Canadian Correctional Officers and the Association des services de réhabilitation sociale du Québec have serious concerns about Bill C-644.

I would like to talk about what some stakeholders who oppose this bill had to say. I spoke with the Association québécoise Plaidoyer-Victimes, which said that this bill will only complicate the system and burden everyone involved, especially the victims and their loved ones, who go through incredibly stressful and disappointing situations as a result of the slow process and the lack of consideration they face. The association is wondering how this bill will benefit victims and their loved ones. Unfortunately we cannot get a straight answer to that question.

I also took the time to meet with the Union of Canadian Correctional Officers. Although this is not being considered, this bill, as it is now, will have a direct impact on the officers' work. They have no idea how these new conditions will apply to their work. It seems that there will be a very significant impact on the procedures within Canada's correctional system and on the work of these corrections officers. They have some serious concerns and they also oppose this bill.

●(1850)

I also found it extremely interesting that the former federal ombudsman for victims called for better parole provisions and wanted the government to work on that. When he appeared before the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, he said a number of things, including this:

I would encourage all members to understand, and I'm sure you all know this, that parole is actually an integral part of public safety.

We absolutely must not forget—for public safety and for the safety of the many victims all across Canada—that we need good laws.

The bill before us conflicts with everything we know about the parole system. We have to make sure that people reintegrate successfully. Unfortunately, what this bill proposes will just make things worse.

If I may refer to my notes, there are several other things I would like to mention. For example, various provisions of this bill suggest that it also conflicts with several UN conventions we have signed. What is more, it conflicts with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. All in all, what we have before us today is very serious.

In summary, I would have liked to see a more useful bill. If the members on the other side of the House really want to protect victims as much as they say they do, then could they propose concrete measures to truly ensure that victims are protected? Could they ensure that we have an effective conditional release system? It already is, as there are some extremely competent people working in that area. However, there is currently a very heavy burden in terms of timeframes. The system is often too slow and if the government really wanted to improve things, it should have invested its energy on improving conditional release measures.

I think that was all I wanted to say about this bill. As I will say again to the House, I will oppose this piece of legislation. I think that as the official opposition, the NDP did a very good job and held meaningful consultations on this bill. We consulted people from various sectors, including Correctional Service Canada officers who will be directly affected on the ground.

What is more, the people who represent victims across the country or who have done so in the past have some serious concerns about Bill C-644.

That is why I am with them, I am standing up for them, and I will oppose Bill C-644.

●(1855)

[English]

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would not say I am pleased to speak to Bill C-644 because it is just another one-off bill by a government that is continuing, by a private member in a governing party, to complicate the criminal justice system at the end of the day in order to make the system work.

Private Members' Business

The purpose of the bill is yet another in a long line of punishment rather than any effort of rehabilitation legislation from Conservative backbenchers. It is designed to achieve the following or claim to achieve the following.

It would amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act to create a new offence for the breach of conditions of conditional release and to require the reporting of those breaches to the appropriate authority. It would do absolutely nothing to enhance justice.

We cannot support the legislation because it is only based upon punishment and misses the point on making Canadians safer.

There are no costs attached to it and there will be substantial costs, both in real financial terms and in human terms as a result of the bill.

Reports by Correctional Services Canada and Public Safety Canada state that the rate of reoffending while on conditional release has been steadily declining. We should be making evidence-based decisions here. If the Conservatives were concerned with reoffenders, they should consider proven ways to limit reoffending, such as rehabilitation and other ways, in terms of which the Parole Board, which has the expertise, can deal with these issues.

Further, we question that the repercussions of the bill have been properly accounted for. There are no provisions for adequate resources for the enforcement of this policy, both within Correctional Services Canada and the Parole Board of Canada.

According to the definition from the Parole Board of Canada:

Conditional release includes those federal offenders conditionally released on day parole, full parole and statutory release...It contributes to the protection of society by allowing some offenders to serve part of their sentence in the community under the supervision of a Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) parole officer, and subject to conditions.

On average, for the past 10 years, approximately 8,500 offenders are participating in conditional release programs. Of these, approximately 5,500 are released under statutory release provisions. The remainder fall almost entirely under the day and full-time parole category.

According to the Parole Board of Canada, "All federal offenders serving determinate sentences are entitled to statutory release after serving two-thirds of their sentences".

This provision does not apply where it is determined an offender is likely to commit an offence causing death or serious harm to another person, a sexual offence including a child, or a serious drug offence.

According to the Parole Board of Canada's 2013-14 performance monitoring report on successful completion rates for federal conditional release, the following is stated: full parole, 90% successful completion; day parole, 85% successful completion; and statutory release, lower, at 62% successful completion.

It shows the importance of gradual entry into society under the Parole Board system.

The Parole Board has examined the issue of low successful completion rate for those on statutory release and provided the following remedy.

● (1900)

This is from a Parole Board document. It states:

Over the last ten years the successful completion rate on statutory release for offenders who had a day and/or full parole supervision period prior to a statutory release supervision period on the same sentence was on average 11% higher than the rate for offenders who had no prior supervision period. Two possible explanations for this are:

1. Offenders that had a day or full parole supervision period prior to statutory release are less likely to reoffend and this is part of the reason they had the prior supervision periods.

2. Offenders that had a day or full parole supervision period prior to statutory release have learned from their time in the community and are thus more likely to successfully complete statutory release.

The whole point is the importance of parole: gradual entry into the community, the Parole Board, officials with the Parole Board and supervisors on the ground working with these inmates as they re-enter society.

The report confirmed:

In the last ten years, violent reoffending on statutory release was considerably lower for offenders who had a prior day and/or full parole supervision period...

While there are a number of conditions, it is important to consider what conditions, if breached, would be criminalized if Bill C-644 were passed: if an offender leaves the residence and forgets the release certificate; failure to report any change, regardless of significance, in the domestic or financial situation of the offender; and any change to the offender's normal occupation, including employment, vocational or educational training and volunteer work. Those are minor, and the bill gives the Parole Board and others no option but to throw away the key and lock them up for a little longer. Will that do anything for society? I do not think so.

Breach of any of these conditions could, with Bill C-644, result in a criminal charge being laid, which could result in the offender being liable for a term not exceeding two years in prison. Yes, serious breaches need to be dealt with, and dealt with harshly, but the ability to do that right now is already there with the Parole Board.

Bill C-644 would also require a parole supervisor to report a breach of condition, not only to the Parole Board of Canada but to Correctional Service, the Attorney General and the police force which has jurisdiction.

If one takes note of the Parole Board's decision-making policy manual, it is clearly evident that the relationship between the Parole Board and local police authority is already well established.

Under the provisions of the Correctional and Conditional Release Act, section 161, the police are very much involved in the process involving parole and statutory release offenders, and a critical component of the supervision of those offenders, if required.

Private Members' Business

It is my opinion that members of this party cannot support the legislation because the measures are excessively punitive and do not address the real issue, which is how to ensure high profile offenders do not offend again. The Liberal Party of Canada believes in relying on facts and evidence, particularly when changing laws that alter our criminal justice system and affect the public safety of Canadians.

Evidence provided by Public Safety Canada itself confirms that the vast majority of inmates on conditional release, which includes full and day parole, and statutory release, do not breach the conditions of their release, and this success rate is steadily increasing over the past decade.

Clearly this legislation is unnecessary, whether it is one-off for political gain in the member's riding, I do not know, and it will actually jeopardize the Criminal Code of our country.

• (1905)

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my privilege to rise today to lend my voice in support of private member's Bill C-644, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (failure to comply with a condition).

I would like to begin by first thanking the hard-working member of Parliament for Lethbridge for his initiative in bringing this bill forward. In considering the elements that he has proposed in this bill, it becomes apparent that he is also concerned with improving offender accountability and improving public safety, improvements which our Conservative government has long advocated.

Indeed, since 2006, we have made it a top priority to help ensure that Canadians can live, work and raise a family in communities that are safe and also secure. This has meant investing in crime prevention programs and strengthening our laws to give police the proper tools to fight crime; tackle crime by holding violent offenders more accountable for their crimes; give victims of crime a stronger voice in the criminal justice system; and increase the efficiency of the justice system. Holding offenders to account, which is a critical goal of the bill before us, is an important part of our efforts to reduce crime and to improve the chances for offenders to reintegrate into the community as law-abiding citizens.

For example, we passed the Truth in Sentencing Act, which provides the courts with clear guidance and limits for granting credit for time served in custody prior to conviction and sentencing.

We also passed the Safe Streets and Communities Act, which made a number of important changes, including restricting the use of conditional sentences, including house arrest; providing better support for victims of crime; increasing offender accountability; and preventing individuals convicted of sexual offences against minors from applying for a record suspension.

We also passed the Drug-Free Prisons Act to improve opportunities for drug testing in our federal penitentiaries and thereby give offenders more chances to succeed in rehabilitation and reintegration. We also passed the Tougher Penalties for Child Predators Act, which will better protect children from a range of sexual offences and exploitation at home and even abroad.

These measures are working in tandem to help us keep our pledge to Canadians that we will support victims and keep dangerous offenders off of our streets. Bill C-644 is one more step in the right direction.

Allow me to begin with a brief overview of how the conditional release system works today.

Offenders may be released on a number of forms of supervised conditional release, including day parole, full parole, or statutory release. This type of release is granted based on an assessment of the risk of reoffending, with a view to gradually returning offenders to the community under supervision. When an assessment indicates that it is safe to release an offender into the community, the Parole Board of Canada, in its capacity as releasing authority, imposes conditions on offenders in an effort to guide their behaviour. It must be said that public safety is always the paramount consideration in how these decisions are made. It is absolutely critical.

All offenders who receive conditional releases are subject to a number of standard conditions. For example, they are required to report to police as instructed, report to their parole officer any changes in address or their financial or domestic situation, and at all times must carry an identity card and release certificate. In addition, special conditions of release that are specific to their risk and needs may also be imposed on offenders. For example, some offenders may be ordered to abstain from alcohol, or be required to observe geographical restrictions. Still others may be ordered to refrain from initiating any contact with their past victims.

As it stands, authorities have a range of potential responses to address any breaches in these conditions, depending on the severity of the breach that has occurred. It is quite possible, however, and sometimes very likely that individuals who do not abide by their parole conditions simply receive a slap on the wrist and sometimes they do not receive any sanctions whatsoever. I think most Canadians would be alarmed by that. In fact, I have stood in this place many times and said that it is important to ensure that the correctional system actually corrects criminal behaviour. Teaching offenders that there are consequences for their actions will help achieve that goal. A slap on the wrist or no recourse at all has the opposite effect.

Let us discuss the two main elements of the bill. The first is to create a new Criminal Code offence for offenders who breach the conditions of conditional release. The second is to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act to require that breaches be reported to the appropriate authorities.

• (1910)

The member's stated intention is to ensure that the justice system has the most complete information possible on an offender. I think this is absolutely critical. This includes accurate records on previous breaches of release conditions. In this way, authorities would be able to make the best public safety decisions by taking all available information into account.

Adjournment Proceedings

Given that the intent of the bill is to increase the accountability of offenders who violate the conditions attached to their conditional release, I am pleased to note that it is a proposal that our government believes has strong merit.

There are further refinements that could be made when this bill is referred to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. I look forward to continued debate and discussion on this bill, and I certainly hope that all parties will support this important legislation.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, September 23, 2015, immediately before the time provided for private members' business.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[English]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise here today to continue the pressure on an issue I raised in this House a few weeks ago.

A question that I repeatedly asked both as the NDP aboriginal affairs critic and as the member of Parliament for Churchill is how the government can justify egregiously long wait times when dealing with indigenous communities.

First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people are bucking under the lack of attention and response on issue after issue. When it comes to first nations settling land claims, implementing treaties, claiming treaty land entitlements, and creating additions to reserves, the government needs to act. Nations are waiting for the government to enable them

to create economic opportunities for the prosperity and welfare of their people and across the country in all regions.

Unfortunately, it is the glacial response or sheer inaction on the part of the minister and his department that is standing in the way.

I am here to raise the issue faced by the Nisichawayasihk Cree Nation, or NCN, a first nation in northern Manitoba that has been attempting to convert an addition to reserve package known as the Mystery Lake parcel for 12 long years. The minister has given no reason for the delay, which is costing the first nation millions of dollars. That is money that could be spent to improve the lives of their people.

Chief Marcel Moody from NCN came all the way to Ottawa to advocate for his people. He testified at our aboriginal affairs committee, where he said:

We've been trying to convert that property to an urban reserve for the last 12 years. It's been a slow and cumbersome process. ...

It has taken that long. Over that time we have lost between \$20 million and \$30 million because that property hasn't been converted to a reserve. ...

The support from the mayor and council of Thompson has been great. ...The support has been always been there from Thompson. It's a process that's so slow, and it really impedes our ability to move forward as a community.

My question to the government is this: when will the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development move to sign the NCN addition to reserve?

In most cases when the government is delaying ATR implementation, it is the municipalities that are ready and willing partners in the exchange. In fact, when Chief Moody came to testify at the aboriginal affairs committee, so did Tim Johnston, the previous mayor of Thompson. He spoke in support of the first nation:

One of the comments we make is that the challenge, when we're talking access to capital, is that we have to encourage first nations to create capital. Unfortunately, right now, at the federal level there are real challenges with doing that between programs and policies among departments, which counteract, in many ways, the ability of first nations to accumulate wealth.

Mystery Lake is a prime example of this problem. The process has been under way for 12 years, including many years prior to that in negotiations. ...This is absolutely a shame.

The NCN's Mystery Lake package is a done deal and will work to benefit both the first nation, the City of Thompson, and our region as a whole. It is only now being stalled because the government is not prioritizing this case.

I repeat: when will the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development move to sign the NCN addition to reserve?

● (1915)

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to the question from the member for Churchill.

Adjournment Proceedings

Our government is committed to improving community access to lands and resources and simplifying processes for additions to reserves. Completing additions to reserves is part of our government's overall commitment to helping unlock the economic potential of reserve land. We understand the benefits that increased economic activity on reserve land brings to first nation communities. It increases their self-sufficiency and allows them to participate more fully in Canada's economy.

Since forming government, we have been committed to improving the Indian Act land administration to promote economic development on reserve and to provide first nations with the tools they need to take greater control of their own affairs. For example, by clarifying processes and improving alignment with provincial and municipal practices, the land designation and additions to reserve processes have become far more streamlined than in the past.

Our government supports the treaty land entitlement process in Manitoba, which includes the Cree nation mentioned by the member. We know that the fulfillment of treaty land entitlement agreements assists in building partnerships and spurring economic development on reserves and in surrounding communities. Businesses and citizens of nearby communities are able to feel the effects of the increased prosperity enjoyed by first nations in the area.

Adding land to reserve is just one way in which we are working with first nations to drive economic participation and job creation in aboriginal communities.

Our government also continues to support the first nations land management regime. This very successful first nation-led initiative enables first nations to manage their own lands, resources and environment outside the limitations imposed by the Indian Act. Currently, this regime has benefited 94 first nations across the country.

Our government remains focused on ensuring Cree nations benefit from economic opportunities such as these. This is one of the most effective ways to improve the well-being and quality of life of aboriginal people in Canada. Our government is committed to working with first nations so that more first nations can access lands, resources and economic opportunities.

● (1920)

Ms. Niki Ashton: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member of the government for her response. Many of us have said that the government has made a commitment to treaty land entitlement and additions to reserve. However, the issue here is not what has been said. The issue is the lack of action.

What I would ask of the member and the government is to move on the application that has been made by NCN, Nisichawayasihk Cree Nation, on the specific parcel that is truly only awaiting an approval by the President of the Treasury Board. Obviously, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs is also involved.

This is an addition to reserve situation. It is something the municipality is firmly behind. It is something that our region desperately needs. Obviously, the first nation is asking for this to be done as soon as possible. When will this addition to reserve be completed?

Ms. Roxanne James: Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, our government is committed to improving community access to lands and working collaboratively with first nations to deliver on our additions to reserve commitments.

Expanding the reserve land base through additions to reserve is an important mechanism by which first nations can foster economic development in their own communities. That is why our government remains committed to working with all Cree nations. We understand that improving the additions to reserve can create jobs, growth and long-term prosperity in first nation communities right across our country. This benefits not only aboriginal communities, but all Canadians.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Jasbir Sandhu (Surrey North, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to call on the government to act now to address the violence that is taking place in my city of Surrey. Last weekend we had another two shootings, one on Friday night and another one on, I believe, Saturday night. Every week there are more shootings, and I have been standing in the House and asking the government what it has been doing and what its plans are.

People in my community are afraid. Mothers are afraid to let their kids play outside. I have a son who is eight years old, and my wife is very concerned about him playing outside on the street. This is simply not acceptable. People expect better from government, whether it is the federal government, provincial government, or city government. One of the primary responsibilities of a government is the security and safety of its citizens. That is not the case in my community right now.

The crime problem and shootings have reached a crisis level. I have stood in this House many times to ask the government to tell us what its plans are and what concrete action it is taking to ensure that we do not have any fatalities. We have already had one. We do not want innocent people or any young person killed.

I have stood in the House multiple times demanding that the government take action. Yes, the government came up with a big announcement in Surrey that it would deliver 100 officers and \$3.5 million for the gang prevention program. It cut the funding for this program back in 2013. The funding was ongoing until 2013. Maybe the Conservatives forgot to renew it.

On the 100 officers the city has been asking for, the Conservatives finally said they would approve them and that they were on the way. Last week the Minister of Public Safety announced in the House that he has 20 boots going out to Surrey.

I want the government to confirm how many officers have actually gone to Surrey. How many boots are in Surrey? How many boots are being trained? When are they going to get there? Is it going to take one month? Is it going to take two months or three months?

Adjournment Proceedings

The Minister of Public Safety said that the boots are on the ground in Surrey. I would like the parliamentary secretary to be very clear and tell me how many are on the ground, how many are in training, and how many are going to be dispatched, and I want a timeframe, because people in Surrey expect that. They are waiting to have some sort of help from the government to curb the violence that is taking place.

More RCMP officers alone is not going to resolve the issue. I put forward a motion in the House that calls for sustainable long-term funding for crime prevention and youth gang prevention programs that need to be ongoing, but the government has failed to have sustainable funding on an ongoing basis.

My questions are very simple. Where are those 100 RCMP officers? Are they on the ground, are they still in the air, are they still in Regina, or are the Conservatives just making this stuff up? This is not something to be fooled around with. This deals with public safety. This deals with gun violence in my community. Please answer those questions.

● (1925)

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to answer those questions, as I have done every time that member has asked the same questions. I just hope this time that he listens and actually remembers the answers.

Our Conservative government continues to take action to ensure the safety and security of all Canadians, including those from British Columbia. No one should ever be afraid for their safety when walking down a street in this country.

I am pleased to reconfirm once again that the deployment of the first 20 members committed to Surrey is under way and that boots are already on the ground.

What is clear is that while our Conservative government has passed over 30 new measures to crack down on crime, including new prison sentences for drive-by shootings, the Liberals and the NDP have preferred to vote against these common sense measures, and they should be ashamed. In fact, the member who just asked this question actually answered it. He said that they voted against it. This is a member who is proud to vote against tough-on-crime measures to keep Canadians safe.

Canadians expect and deserve police officers in their communities who are highly trained and professional, and our government will not compromise this in the interest of expediency. Given the ever-evolving complexities of ensuring the public safety of Canadians, this world-renowned training does in fact take time. It is unfortunate that the member opposite has absolutely no clue about this whatsoever.

Upon successful completion of the cadet training program, newly engaged members of the RCMP will be posted in accordance with these collective commitments throughout the country, including Surrey. Given the increased demand for more police officers, the RCMP continues to increase the training of cadets at the RCMP depot with the goal of getting more cadets out to detachments right across Canada. It is also worth noting that under the dark days of the

previous Liberal government, the RCMP training depot was closed down.

The member has asked repeatedly what we have been doing. I would like to remind the member that we have actually been putting forward legislation to keep Canadians safe. In fact, we have put forward more than 30 tough-on-crime measures. However, I think what is more interesting and more important to note is what the member from the NDP has not been doing. He has not been voting to support any of these measures to support crime prevention, tough-on-crime legislation, or resources for our RCMP and police agencies across this country.

I am going to remind the member of a couple of things that the member for Surrey North has actually voted against. They include cracking down on drug dealers who target children, ending house arrest for serious and violent crimes, and early parole for white-collar fraudsters and drug dealers. I can hear from across the way that the NDP actually thinks this is funny.

What is clear as I hear remarks coming from the NDP on the opposite side that there is only one political party in this House that is taking the safety and security of Canadians seriously, and that is this Conservative government.

● (1930)

Mr. Jasbir Sandhu: Mr. Speaker, the member talks in circles and does not answer the questions.

The 30 bills that the Conservatives brought in are not working in my community. The shootings are still happening.

The member said that I do not know how the training takes place. Let me remind her that I worked in a college that trained police for 15 years, so I know exactly how it works.

Do not blame this on those people in the corner, the Liberal Party, because you had 10 years to put this straight and have the training in place, and you failed to do that.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I would remind the member that addressing comments directly to another member of Parliament is unparliamentary. The comments have to be made through the Chair.

Mr. Jasbir Sandhu: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have failed to put in place training that would allow those officers to be there.

My question is very simple. The member said that “deployment of the 20 members committed to Surrey is under way and that boots are already on the ground.” Are they under way to there? How many are actually in Surrey? Are there two, three, four?

Are there two members on the ground, three members on the ground in Surrey? How many are in Regina?

I am not asking how many people are on the way. How many are in Surrey right now?

Ms. Roxanne James: Mr. Speaker, not only does the member not understand what is required to train RCMP officers and detach them to specific areas in this country, but apparently he does not understand how the protocols in this place actually work.

Adjournment Proceedings

I am going to remind his constituents of Surrey North of some of the other measures that our government has brought forward that the NDP and the member for Surrey North have actually voted against. They include cracking down on those who travel abroad to engage in terrorism and taking citizenship away from convicted terrorists. Those members actually believe that is an affront to Canadian values.

They have also voted against giving victims information about criminals convicted of victimizing them. He voted against ending criminal record suspensions for child molesters, against creating tougher sentences for desecrating war memorials, cracking down on human smugglers, stopping prisoners from making frivolous complaints and wasting taxpayers' dollars, and repealing the so-called faint hope clause that used to give early parole to convicted killers. They even voted against tougher sentences for those who kidnap children. Again—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The time has expired.

The hon. member for Québec.

[*Translation*]

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Ms. Annick Papillon (Québec, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have often risen in the House to speak about the infamous bank fees, a very important issue throughout Canada. Canadians all agree that we pay too much in bank fees.

Major banks are raking in huge profits, particularly as a result of an increase in bank fees. In 2013 alone, Canada's six major banks made more than \$30 billion in net profit.

During that time, Canadian household debt reached an all-time high. In fact, approximately 60% of Canadians are forced to live paycheque to paycheque. They are told to save, but that is difficult to do when you have trouble making ends meet.

Going back a little further, in 1980 the ratio of household debt to personal disposable income was 66%. Today, it is 164%. That is the situation we find ourselves in. The Governor of the Bank of Canada, Stephen Poloz, has said that household debt is a major risk factor for the Canadian economy. Credit card interest rates can be as high as 18.9% for cards issued by financial institutions and 25% to 28.8% for cards issued by department stores and gas companies. That is huge and unfair.

The NDP is proposing that consumers be given reasonable access to credit cards at prime plus 5%. That is a worthwhile measure. No one should have to pay \$2, \$3, \$4 or \$6 to have access to their own money. Every year, Canadians pay \$420 million in ATM fees, which unfairly inflate banks' profits.

The NDP is not opposed to banks making a profit. However, it is the government's duty to provide a framework to ensure that those profits are not overly excessive and that they are not earned on the backs of poor Canadian taxpayers who are already paying enough. We are proposing limiting the fee for an ATM withdrawal to 50¢, which is still double what that type of transaction costs banks. That is a really worthwhile solution proposed by the NDP.

I also introduced a variety of bills. Recently, this government adopted the NDP's motion on pay-to-pay fees. However, although

the government adopted that motion, it refused to give it the strength required. It refused to implement the motion by incorporating it into the most recent budget. That is unfortunate, because although Canadians no longer have to pay the infamous \$2 to get a paper invoice from telecommunications companies, for example, they will still have to pay at the banks. Once again, this Conservative government is unable to set a limit on banks. Enough is enough. We are not that stupid. We are going to set limits on banks because it is important.

I also introduced a bill on the Competition Bureau because it is not fair that banks make huge profits on the backs of Canadian families and that nothing is being done about gas price collusion. The government continues to offer billions of dollars in subsidies to the oil industry.

The NDP is proposing concrete solutions, and we will do so by enforcing the provisions of the Criminal Code and the Competition Act, which the current government chooses to ignore. Canadians expect to pay a fair price at the pump. That is why I introduced a bill that provides for the appointment of the director of the competition prosecution service.

What do the Conservatives have to say about that?

• (1935)

[*English*]

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise to discuss how our government continues to lower costs for businesses and consumers and in that process update this House on all that our government has done on this subject in recent years.

We do understand that Canadians are tired of hidden fees. That is exactly why we introduced the code of conduct for the credit and debit card industry in Canada.

The code was launched in 2010 to promote fair business practices and ensure that merchants and consumers understand the costs and benefits associated with credit and debit cards. At the same time, Canadian banks understand that they operate in a highly competitive environment and that they must be prepared to respond to the specific and often changing needs of Canadian consumers.

Canadians work hard for their money. That is why our government believes that Canadians deserve to keep more of that money in their own pockets. That is why we have taken action to improve low cost accounts and expand access to no cost banking services to protect consumers and save even more money for Canadians.

Adjournment Proceedings

In this spirit, in May 2014, the government secured voluntary commitments from Canada's eight largest banks to enhance low cost bank accounts and offer no cost accounts with the same features as low cost accounts to a wider range of eligible consumers.

What does this mean? As a result no cost accounts are available to youth, students, seniors qualifying for the guaranteed income supplement, and registered disability savings plan beneficiaries.

Banks also committed to provide free monthly printed credit card statements to their customers. This action fulfills a 2013 Speech from the Throne commitment to expand no cost basic banking services as well as an economic action plan 2014 commitment to enhance access to basic banking services.

Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, just this past April the government released an update to the code of conduct for the credit and debit card industry in Canada, delivering on a commitment made in 2014 to help make life more affordable for Canadians and entrepreneurs.

Consumers will also benefit from a new requirement that requires credit card issuers to disclose to consumers who apply for premium credit cards that the use of these cards results in higher merchant fees.

Finally, let me again remind the member that banks have already made a commitment to the federal government that they will not charge customers for bills when money is owing. To spell it out, banks have voluntarily already promised to end pay-to-pay fees.

With this knowledge and the fact that the NDP has refused to support any of our measures, not a single one, to support small businesses, on top of all our measures to protect consumers, I find it remarkable and very hard to believe that all of a sudden the NDP is actually concerned about helping consumers at this point in time.

● (1940)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Annick Papillon: Mr. Speaker, it is time to do more. It is time for a real party in Ottawa, the NDP, as I mentioned, to lower bank fees. My Conservative colleague said that the Conservatives were proud of having adopted a voluntary code of conduct. It is as though they moved a motion for peace but did not offer any

resources to implement it. A voluntary code of conduct is ridiculous. It has no teeth and there is no way to guarantee that it will be honoured. This is the case with a number of measures that the Conservatives have put forward.

I am the official opposition's consumer protection and SME critic. Do my colleagues know how much credit card transaction fees cost Canadian businesses every year? I asked the Minister of Finance that question. It costs them \$6 billion. That is far too much. Our SMEs are overburdened by bank fees, as are poor Canadian consumers. Now is the time for us to cap these fees, and we must take action now.

[*English*]

Ms. Roxanne James: Mr. Speaker, let me remind the member once again that the answer lies right before her own eyes. Banks have already committed to ending pay-to-pay charges. This is already something that has been committed to.

Having said that, our government is not done yet. In economic action plan 2015 we propose to amend the Bank Act to strengthen and modernize Canada's financial consumer protection framework to respond to the diverse needs of Canadians. Most Canadians would want that and that is what we all need, especially when our government's actions on this would benefit all Canadians, including the most vulnerable consumers.

Throughout our time in office, our government has been focused on helping Canadian consumers identify and take advantage of the best possible financial products and services for their needs, as well as protecting consumers in all aspects.

The measures I have described today, in responding to the member's question, would benefit all Canadians, including the most vulnerable consumers.

[*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 7:42 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Member for Richmond—Arthabaska	
Mr. Bellavance	15199
Quanto's Law	
Mr. Menegakis	15199
The Environment	
Mr. Rankin	15199
Labour Organizations	
Mr. Hiebert	15200
Bravery	
Ms. Foote	15200
Member for Northumberland—Quinte West	
Mr. Norlock	15200
Gabrielle Dufresne	
Ms. Ayala	15200
Members of Parliament and Pages	
Mr. Miller	15200
Graduation Ceremonies	
Ms. Young (Vancouver South)	15201
Pensions	
Ms. LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	15201
Taxation	
Mr. Breitzkreuz	15201
Women in Non-traditional Professions	
Ms. Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	15201
Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada	
Mr. Chisu	15201
Human Rights	
Mr. Cotler	15202
Shipbuilding Industry	
Mr. Armstrong	15202
42nd General Election	
Mr. Dubé	15202
Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada	
Mr. Dechert	15202

ORAL QUESTIONS

National Defence	
Mr. Mulcair	15202
Mr. Harper	15203
Mr. Mulcair	15203
Mr. Harper	15203
Public Safety	
Mr. Mulcair	15203
Mr. Harper	15203

Ethics	
Mr. Mulcair	15203
Mr. Harper	15203
Mr. Mulcair	15203
Mr. Harper	15203
National Defence	
Mr. Trudeau	15203
Mr. Harper	15204
Mr. Trudeau	15204
Mr. Harper	15204
Supreme Court	
Mr. Trudeau	15204
Mr. Harper	15204
Ethics	
Mr. Mulcair	15204
Mr. Harper	15204
Mr. Mulcair	15204
Mr. Harper	15204
Mr. Mulcair	15204
Mr. Harper	15205
Public Safety	
Mr. Mulcair	15205
Mr. Harper	15205
Employment	
Mr. Mulcair	15205
Mr. Harper	15205
Mr. Mulcair	15205
Mr. Harper	15205
Government Policies	
Mr. Mulcair	15205
Mr. Harper	15206
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Mulcair	15206
Mr. Harper	15206
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Mulcair	15206
Mr. Harper	15206
Public Safety	
Mr. Easter	15206
Mr. Blaney	15206
Manufacturing Industry	
Ms. Sgro	15206
Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	15206
Infrastructure	
Mr. Vaughan	15207
Mr. Lebel	15207
Aboriginal Affairs	
Ms. Ashton	15207

Ms. Doré Lefebvre.....	15233
Mr. Lamoureux.....	15234
Ms. James.....	15234
Mr. Rankin.....	15234
Amendment.....	15237
Ms. Péclet.....	15237
Mr. Hsu.....	15238
Ms. May.....	15238
Mr. Blanchette.....	15238
Mr. Hsu.....	15239
Ms. May.....	15240
Ms. Péclet.....	15240
Mr. Lamoureux.....	15241
Mr. Carrie.....	15241
Business of the House	
Mrs. McLeod.....	15242
Motion.....	15242
(Motion agreed to).....	15242
Digital Privacy Act	
Bill S-4, Third reading.....	15242
Mr. Carrie.....	15242
Ms. Péclet.....	15243
Division on motion deferred.....	15243

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code	
Bill C-644, Second reading.....	15244
Mr. Hillyer.....	15244
Ms. Doré Lefebvre.....	15246
Mr. Easter.....	15246
Ms. Doré Lefebvre.....	15246
Mr. Easter.....	15247
Ms. James.....	15249
Division on motion deferred.....	15250

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Aboriginal Affairs	
Ms. Ashton.....	15250
Ms. James.....	15250
Public Safety	
Mr. Sandhu.....	15251
Ms. James.....	15252
Consumer Protection	
Ms. Papillon.....	15253
Ms. James.....	15253

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>