



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 121 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Monday, December 5, 2016**

---

**Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan**

## **CONTENTS**

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

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, December 5, 2016

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayer*

---

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1105)

[*English*]

#### HOLIDAYS ACT

The House resumed from November 2 consideration of the motion that Bill C-311, An Act to amend the Holidays Act (Remembrance Day), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Speaker:** Resuming debate, the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith has six and a half minutes left in her speech.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, to honour veterans, fallen soldiers, and peacekeepers who stood up for Canada, we gather on Remembrance Day to honour the service of the men and women who put their lives on the line for our country.

Nanaimo—Ladysmith's Legions, No. 256 Mt. Benson, and No. 10 Harewood, in Nanaimo; No. 257 Lantzville; No. 171 Ladysmith; the Gabriola Island Veterans Association; and Cedar Valley Memorial Gardens, all held powerful services to recognize Remembrance Day in Nanaimo—Ladysmith. I am grateful for their work. They are keeping veterans' stories alive, and we are grateful to them.

Veterans need parliamentarians to do our part to recognize and support those who have sacrificed for our country. There is clearly a debt owed, there is money in the till, and sincere and vital promises have been made. Every year, 3,000 veterans pass away, so let us get on with it and act to show that we truly support veterans.

There are eight things that parliamentarians can do to live up to that responsibility. Last year, this House unanimously passed a motion brought forward by my colleague, the member of Parliament for Port Moody—Coquitlam, recognizing Canada's covenant of moral, social, legal, and financial obligations to veterans.

Here are the eight ways that we could act on that unanimous commitment of this House:

One, instead of spending thousands of dollars fighting veterans in court, the Liberal government should halt the court proceedings

against wounded veterans and spend that money instead to bring back veterans' pensions.

Second, because one in six vets experiences mental health or alcohol-related disorders, or have in this past year, and because half who have served in Afghanistan have suffered PTSD, depression, and anxiety, I call upon this Parliament to prioritize and support the mental health of military service men and women, veterans, first responders, retired and volunteer first responders, and their families.

Third, to make real change for vets and their families, we can defeat paternalistic legislation that blocks pension benefits for two groups: one, spouses of veterans, RCMP members, judges, and public sector workers who choose to marry after the age of 60; and, second, retired and disabled Canadian Forces and RCMP veterans.

The fix for this bill and the mental health one referred to previously are Bills C-260, C-261, and Motion No. 61, all from the member of Parliament for London—Fanshawe and the New Democrat critic for Veterans Affairs.

Fourth, to our shame, homelessness rates in Canada are shocking, with estimates that there might be as many as 1,300 veterans living on Canada's streets. Canada's national housing strategy must take action on veteran homelessness.

Fifth, the government should act on detox treatments for veterans exposed to chemical defoliants like Agent Orange. Medical treatment can cut dioxin levels such that veterans can return to work. It will not repair the damage, but it can help people function.

Six, we should relax the regulations on access to veterans hospitals, and ensure that veterans from World War II and the Korean War are able to access these beds when they require long-term care.

Seven, and I am very glad to say that this has already been done, the government will start covering the cost of medically prescribed cannabis extract products for police and military veterans being treated for PTSD. This was the subject of a petition that I sponsored, and I am very glad that the government listened to the many Canadians who supported this change.

*Private Members' Business*

Eighth, we can pass this bill to make Remembrance Day a holiday. Earlier versions of this bill to make Remembrance Day a holiday across the country were introduced by former New Democrat MPs Dan Harris, Chris Charlton, Nelson Riis, and veterans' advocate Peter Stoffer.

In my home province of British Columbia, November 11 is already a holiday. As a result, we see families coming together to recognize and celebrate Remembrance Day. When families remember together, they are able to teach their children about the sacrifices that the men and women who have fought and continue to fight for Canada have made.

For example, Ladysmith's Legion hosts an afternoon ceremony in the community of Cedar, at the Cedar Valley Memorial Gardens, where there are cadets, Guides, Scouts, and Beavers. It is lovely to see, and a great example of what happens when families honour and celebrate together.

Last month, on Remembrance Day, we recommitted to standing up for veterans and their families, so that every veteran has the care that our country owes them. Bureaucratic delays and disingenuous platitudes cannot define Canada's response to veterans, and just 2.5 of 23 Liberal promises have been fully implemented. Let us use our power as leaders and voters and support real change for veterans and their families.

On Remembrance Day and all days, we never forget; we forever honour.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Gatineau, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased and proud to be here to support my colleague from West Nova's bill. This bill would make Remembrance Day a legal holiday.

November has passed, and all of our communities have commemorated another November 11. I know how very proud all members of the House are of our veterans and serving military personnel. I know that we are just as proud of our students who are learning about the events of World War I, World War II, the Korean War, and the war in Afghanistan. Some of them are learning for the first time about all the sacrifices made and the lives lost and disrupted here at home in our communities and our country.

I believe that November 11, the day we commemorate these tragic events every year, deserves the same legal status and the same recognition by Parliament as Canada Day and Victoria Day. That is why I am proud to be here to support my hon. colleague's bill.

• (1110)

[*English*]

This year, I was particularly pleased to attend something that happens every year in the only English school in my riding. It was an incredibly happy event, where students were proud to get up and deliver their interpretation of the events we commemorate every year. They were proud to be part of underlining and underscoring our history, proud to learn of the stories of the many Canadians who gave themselves to the defence of our values, our freedoms, our liberties, and proud to look at the military members who are serving today.

There was everyone from CF-18 pilots to bylaw officers, all of those who wake up every day and put on a uniform and defend the laws of Canada, the freedoms of Canada, and the values of Canada and Canadians.

When my colleague asked me if I were able and disposed to support his private member's bill, I was particularly pleased to think of the many people in Gatineau, and the many people I know who reside in his riding and all over this country, who want to stand up every day and recognize the tragic events that we underscore and underline every year.

[*Translation*]

I was so proud to learn that the government is also going to support the key principle of this bill and give Remembrance Day legal status. It is important to emphasize that this does not in any way force the provinces or municipalities to do the same. It is a symbolic gesture, but a very powerful one, given that Parliament is giving Remembrance Day the same legal status as Canada Day and Victoria Day, in May.

I will not dwell on this any further. I hope my colleagues on all sides of the House will support my hon. colleague's bill, and I urge everyone to do so.

I would invite all Canadians to continue to make every effort to mark Remembrance Day with pride every year, as my constituents in Gatineau always do. I hope we can move quickly to pass this bill.

**Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

Indeed, if there is one thing that everyone in the House can agree on, it is the importance of recognizing the contribution of our veterans, the men and women who have fought for our country over the years. I am especially proud to rise today to speak to Bill C-311 sponsored by our colleague, the member for West Nova.

I would also like to commend the work of my colleague, the official opposition critic for veterans affairs, the member for Barrie—Innisfil. He is doing a fantastic job as our veterans affairs critic and on top of that his French is excellent. He spent the weekend in Quebec City speaking with members of associations and other people in the region, all in French. His hard work and his efforts to use both of Canada's official languages deserve recognition. I thank him for that.

Bill C-311 before us today is quite interesting and has quite a background. This is the seventh time this bill has been introduced in the House since 2004. This is therefore not the first time members of the House have the opportunity to speak to such a bill. Although interesting, some aspects of it need some improvement, or at least some clarification. That is more or less what I will be talking about today.

*Private Members' Business*

First, as I said at the outset, it is important to acknowledge the service of our veterans. Since Confederation, more than 110,000 Canadian soldiers have died in combat defending our freedoms. Canada is the free country we are so proud of today because of the sacrifices of these soldiers and their families, whose children were lost in battle to defend us on foreign soil. They fought abroad for Canada's freedom and the modern world we live in today.

The purpose of Bill C-311 is to make Remembrance Day a legal holiday and everything that entails. We absolutely must discuss this bill further in committee. Although this bill seeks to honour veterans, it does not have unanimous support as it is currently worded. In fact, the Royal Canadian Legion has concerns over the effects of this bill on the significance we place on Remembrance Day, and that is what I will be talking about.

We celebrate Remembrance Day on November 11 for a very simple reason. Historically, people have gathered together every year on the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month to mark Remembrance Day and pay tribute to all those who died while serving their country. This important day gives meaning to and allows us to express our gratitude for the sacrifices that were made by those who came before us.

However, not everyone has a day off for Remembrance Day. This day of commemoration is a holiday in some provinces but not in others. That is the case in Quebec, where Remembrance Day is not a statutory holiday for all workers. As a result, most of the time, Remembrance Day is not celebrated on November 11 but rather on the weekend before or after, so that more people can attend the commemoration ceremonies at the cenotaphs. They voluntarily attend these ceremonies and commemorate the service of our veterans.

• (1115)

The Royal Canadian Legion is the reason we have ceremonies in every region, even those without military bases. I would like to tell the House about the Legion. It was founded in 1926 when 15 veterans' organizations united. There were also a number of regimental associations representing former service members.

Despite all their efforts, none of them had much influence individually. They did not have the means to become an association that represented all veterans. That is why the Royal Canadian Legion was founded in 1926. I encourage anyone who wants to know more about the Legion to visit the organization's website, which is nicely set up and does a great job explaining its history. According to the website, initially, the principal objectives of the Legion were to provide a strong voice for veterans and advise the government on veterans' issues.

The Legion was founded after World War I, and it was very busy after World War II because of an influx of new demands. That war was a very hard one, and the Legion had to increase its efforts to help veterans and returned service members in addition to those who continued to serve their country abroad.

The Legion has changed a lot since then. We have the Legion to thank for a few special initiatives, including the two-minute wave of silence in 1999, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier initiative in 2000,

and the declaration of 2005 as the Year of the Veteran. Those are just a few examples of what the Royal Canadian Legion has achieved.

For over 90 years, the Legion has been an advocate for veterans and has been providing financial assistance to active military personnel, veterans, and their families, whether they are members of the Legion or not. I think that is one of the things that explains why certain veterans associations and the Royal Canadian Legion do not necessarily agree with the objectives of the bill before us.

These days, a majority of the representatives of the Royal Canadian Legion are from civil society and not necessarily veterans. Some of them are family members, relatives, brothers, and sons of military personnel who have served their country, who have passed away or been wounded in combat. These people have decided to volunteer their time to help veterans.

I would like to talk about something that happened in my riding. This year, in Thetford Mines, we came close to not being able to mark Remembrance Day, Armistice Day. Unfortunately, the Royal Canadian Legion in our community had to close its doors after 70 years because of a lack of volunteers. Claude Nadeau, the president of the branch, worked hard to ensure that a ceremony was held every year. He put a lot of effort into bringing together veterans and serving members from our community.

However, since there are not very many veterans or serving members in Thetford Mines, it was becoming increasingly difficult to bring these people together for a ceremony. Our veterans from the last great war have almost all passed away now. We have one or two active members. These people were deeply saddened when they learned that there might not be a Remembrance Day ceremony. That is why, despite the fact that Branch 201 of the Royal Canadian Legion shut down, Mr. Nadeau and a few volunteers still organized a commemorative ceremony.

The same sort of thing happened in another town in my riding, Lac-Mégantic. For the first time in a long time, no Remembrance Day ceremony was held because of a lack of volunteers. If Canadians want an association that helps preserve the memory of our veterans, then they need to understand the essential role that civilians play in the Royal Canadian Legion.

We therefore need to take into consideration the Royal Canadian Legion's views of Bill C-311. We need to listen to what it has to say and find out whether it thinks it is important to pass this bill to make Remembrance Day a legal or statutory holiday. By sending this bill to committee, we would give the Royal Canadian Legion the opportunity to express its views. We owe a great debt to our veterans and also to those who serve them, like the Royal Canadian Legion.

• (1120)

**Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I am honoured to be able to speak today to Bill C-311. This bill has been debated a number of times in the House.

*Private Members' Business*

On reading the bill we see that it seeks to give November 11 official status as Remembrance Day across Canada. However, it does not make Remembrance Day a full-fledged statutory holiday, but instead a legal holiday. The provinces regulate statutory holidays in their own jurisdictions and this bill does nothing to change that and that is too bad. We can continue to mark November 11, but it cannot become a statutory holiday through this bill because that would require provincial legislation. We therefore wonder what purpose this bill serves.

However, I am very pleased to speak to this subject today because my grandfather fought in World War II. He was in the navy. My great-uncle was in the army. When I was 14, he told me stories about the war. At that age, I did not appreciate the gravity of what he experienced. To him, these were pivotal moments.

Now, I am participating in the debate in the House and I am thinking about him. I shared some special times with my great-uncle. Unfortunately, my grandfather, who was in the navy, died when I was 3 years old. Therefore I was unable to learn more about what he went through during the Second World War. My great-uncle had the chance to share his experience with me, and it is with these memories in mind that I am speaking of him.

My father was in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for 35 years. He worked to ensure that our country was safe. This is something I am proud of. Speaking in the House today, I think about my father, who watches me from time to time as well. We have had some good talks about what he experienced during his 35 years of service.

Today we are talking about all those who protect our country. These are men and women who put their lives on the line each and every day, who have given their all to keep us safe at home and to fight abroad.

It is important for me to commemorate Remembrance Day and to share it. I make it a priority to talk about it in schools. Over the past two or three years, students in my riding, Joliette, have been reviving a tradition that was disappearing: they have been making poppies, and their teachers have been explaining the symbolism of the poppy to them and the importance of remembering what happened. I often say that it is important to know and remember what happened so we do not repeat the mistakes of the past and so we can go forward.

I would also like to say a few words about the Arvida branch of the Royal Canadian Legion. I have had the pleasure of getting to know these people since becoming an MP, and they are like a second family. The Arvida branch of the Royal Canadian Legion offers extraordinary support and networking. Branch 209 was founded in 1947, but its current home was built in 1962 by the veterans themselves. Now the building is in need of repair and needs quite a few renovations. The veterans themselves are working on renovating it.

The branch has 150 members, and I am proud to say that the ladies' auxiliary has 130 members. It goes without saying that spouses of people in the armed forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are involved too. The whole family is involved, actually. When people go off on missions, their children and spouses worry. That is why members of the ladies' auxiliary are involved

with the Arvida branch of the Royal Canadian legion. They do so much work in the community.

• (1125)

Some veterans are active in the Fonds de dotation Santé Jonquière, the Jonquière hospital's endowment fund, to help the hospital purchase new research equipment and other new machines. Some veterans have helped create scholarships for veterans. They also raise funds to help children pursue their studies, which I think is amazing.

Getting back to the main point of my speech, Remembrance Day, it is obvious that commemoration is important to veterans.

The Sunday prior to Remembrance Day, I attended a poppy celebration with some veterans. They have a ceremony, and it is quite an event. We also have poppy week, and all veterans participate. They go to shopping malls and schools to raise money to support veterans, including both retired and active military personnel. Unfortunately, many veterans require assistance at some point in their career.

For veterans, it is very important to remember. In the spring I had the opportunity to present a medal to a veteran. It was the highest honour a veteran can receive. Mr. Boivin, who is now 90 years old, had taken part in the Normandy landing. How incredible.

I felt quite moved and fortunate to present him with his medal and this honour. He said he did nothing more than his duty. I was proud to present him with his medal. All he cared about was serving our country and ensuring our safety, but also remembering what happened. Unfortunately, many of his comrades did not come back home with him. Mr. Boivin told me he lost members of his family. Those sad moments make him want to remember what happened all the more. That is to his credit because he and his wife have been on an emotional roller coaster over the years.

For some veterans at the Arvida branch of the Royal Canadian Legion, the war left physical scars. For some, the injuries changed their lives forever, hence the importance of the support they get at the Legion. The Legion not only helps the community, but it also enables veterans to help each other and that support is important.

In my opinion, November 11 has to be a time for gathering and remembrance, a time when we remember what veterans did for us.

I would like to come back to educating children. Our role as MPs involves sharing information with our young people and explaining to them what Remembrance Day is all about. Unfortunately, it seems to be losing its meaning as time goes by. Federal MPs are in a good position to go explain the purpose of Remembrance Day to students.

I will close by saying that I am a bit disappointed by this bill. As I said at the beginning of my speech, the bill makes Remembrance Day a legal holiday. Since statutory holidays fall under provincial jurisdiction, I am wondering how the bill will be implemented.

Of course, as I said before, the Bagotville military base is in my riding. It employs over 2,000 soldiers, and many veterans have also worked there. I am in regular contact with them, and I know that they think it is important for us to remember what they have done.

I am very proud to have had the opportunity to speak to Bill C-311 today.

• (1130)

**Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in the House today to speak to the proposed bill.

[English]

I would like to thank the hon. member for West Nova for his initiative in bringing forward this very important private member's bill.

This bill would make Remembrance Day a national legal holiday. I would like to begin my comments on the importance of remembering and honouring the contributions of our veterans, as well as what it means to me personally.

Once again, as I have said many times in the House, Nova Scotia has the largest veteran population per capita in the country and my riding of Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook has up to 23%, who are either veterans who have served or who are in the military today. As everyone can understand, the people in my riding are extremely proud of the distinguished record and service to our country.

I hear about that service from veterans often, whether it be at legions, town halls, or even at grocery stores. They share many stories with me. These are compassionate, caring, and humble men and women who continue to serve their communities. They serve their communities as volunteers or hockey coaches, or they just lend a helping hand. I must say that I am extremely impressed when I see them out there and they have each other's backs. It is extremely impressive and a learning curve that I have had the opportunity to observe that much more in the last year.

It is of utmost importance that their service continues to be honoured for generations to come. This bill would ensure that Canadians from coast to coast to coast would have more opportunities to participate in and celebrate Remembrance Day across the country.

As a former educator, I can say that schools in Nova Scotia have done an exemplary job, year after year, in raising awareness through sharing some of the sacrifices that past generations have made. This is extremely important for people keep in their memories: to remember their service for decades past but also today and in the future. This bill would complement the good work that is being done in schools across this country.

When I talk about Remembrance Day, it is important to remind ourselves of the people we are honouring. I will provide some examples. A retired master corporal in my riding named Jon bravely served our country abroad, completing two tours in Afghanistan in 2006 and 2009, each for six months. He served in the Canadian Armed Forces from 2002 until 2012, 10 years, and was medically released in 2012 due to injuries sustained in the line of duty. We owe him a sincere debt of gratitude.

### *Private Members' Business*

I also think about a sergeant I had the opportunity to meet and spend time with in the last year. His name is Rollie. Rollie served in the Canadian Armed Forces from 1982 until 2002. He did tours in Germany and the former Yugoslavia in 1994 and 1995. Unfortunately, Rollie was diagnosed in 2000 with PTSD. This is a difficult condition that many veterans face when they return home from abroad. These occupational stress injuries make it especially difficult for veterans when they return to normal civilian life.

I am amazed by the contributions that veterans are making in our communities every day. Rollie is one of many who has become an advocate for the veterans community. He has been part of a group in Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook and works closely with others to advocate for a walk-in clinic that would support veterans with unique needs.

• (1135)

[Translation]

If we look at everything veterans accomplish during their careers in the Canadian Armed Forces and in their civilian lives, it is clear that they make a major contribution to the future of the country and the prosperity of our communities. That is another reason why we should make Remembrance Day a legal holiday in Canada.

On a more personal note, I would like to share the stories of the people I think about on November 11. I would like to begin with my father, who was unable to join the army for health reasons but who passed away on November 11.

• (1140)

[English]

I also think of members of my extended family who have contributed directly to the Canadian Armed Forces.

There is my Uncle Dan, who spent 26 years; my Uncle Wilfred who, in World War II, spent 25 years; and my Uncle Lubin who spent 12 years. There is also my godfather, Gérald Thériault, who was a sergeant in World War II.

Furthermore, there is now my cousin, Mark Thériault, who is with the Joint Task Force Atlantic, and another cousin, Brent Thériault, who is now with the infantry unit in Gagetown and who previously served in Poland and Afghanistan.

Recently, I have seen things come full circle where the grandson of my godfather, the late Gérald Thériault, and my godchild, is a member of the Canadian Armed Forces at 17 years of age. His name is Private Zachary Thériault.

What brings all these stories together is the fact that our men and women have served our country with distinction and with honour. That must never be forgotten.

Making Remembrance Day a national legal holiday would ensure that generations of Canadians have the opportunity to learn about the realities of war, about the distinguished service of veterans, and to better understand, for their children and their children's children.

I would like to, once again, thank the member for West Nova for his hard work in bringing forward this piece of legislation.

*Private Members' Business*

We must continue to remember the fallen who have made the ultimate sacrifice so that we may continue to hold the values and the institutions we hold so dearly.

Lest we forget.

**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is a privilege for me to stand today and speak to this particular bill, Bill C-311, An Act to amend the Holidays Act, Remembrance Day.

It has been a real honour for me to serve on the Veterans Affairs committee and serve as deputy critic for Veterans Affairs, especially as a first-time member of Parliament, and to be a part of standing up for our veterans and making sure their needs are understood and met by this House, and understood by the Canadian population as a whole. Of course, this is basically a symbolic gesture, but it is important to do what we can to make sure that Remembrance Day is recognized and continues to be recognized throughout the years forward, even though so many of the veterans who were part of World War I and World War II are at an age that makes it very difficult for them to be able to attend and be part of the ceremonies. In Yorkton this year, it was just so overwhelming for me to see the veterans make the huge effort that it takes to be there and be part of that ceremony, and to stand even though it is so difficult to stand and make sure that this is not forgotten. Regardless of the approach that we take, the important thing is that we do remember.

The fact that it is at the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month is very fitting. From our veterans and being part of different ceremonies, we start to realize how important these special traditions are to our veterans and to our armed forces as well. I recently attended the 64th field battery 10th field artillery regiment, Saint Barbara celebration in my home city of Yorkton with our reservists there. It was something to listen and to learn about why they take each of the steps they do during that celebration. It is all part of building up that community and making sure we value each other as reservists. That is one example where I say we need to make sure that, whatever approach we take as a legislature in our communities, the total focus is on valuing our veterans and keeping that in front of other generations as they come forward.

My grandson was born on November 11. It is a very special day to him, and he always says, "Grandma, the first half of the day is very sad", and he talks about Remembrance Day and they always go to and are part of the services. He says, "And then the second half of the day is very happy". I thought that was something that he is being taught the value of the individuals who stood up for Canada to keep it as the free country that it is today, and it is very much a part of his psyche. I thought that was very special.

I also had the opportunity as a new member of Parliament to attend the Battle of the Atlantic gala, and attend the ceremonies on Parliament Hill. Again, members of the regiments, the cadets, the reserves, and the navy were all there on time ready to start this event. It was so bitter cold outside. I was sitting out on the lawn waiting for this to start, and I was beyond cold. I think I was as cold as I have ever been in my life, and thinking, "I do not think I am going to make it". Then I looked across the grounds, and there were 80- and 90-something year-old veterans sitting there waiting for the event to happen. It was pouring rain, but they were sitting there with their

jackets on. They were not putting on their caps or carrying their umbrellas until the very last moment. They were choosing to sit there and persevere through the cold. When I put that together with the battle gala and saw the pictures, I saw that these elderly men were the same men who were so young on those ships getting the supplies across the Atlantic. Seeing the pictures of them caked in ice is what got me through the event, and just made me so proud in my heart to be a part of that particular celebration.

There are army cadet reviews, and opportunities when we go home to our riding to be a part of those celebrations as well.

● (1145)

It is really important that we do whatever we can to make sure we are recognizing everything our veterans have done for us. We have to make sure that within our school systems, they are learning about the different battles and the amazing things Canadians have done.

I just learned that our soldiers had to take on the Battle of Vimy Ridge after France had lost 200,000 men on that hill and Britain had lost 100,000. Our troops came together for the first time as Canadians from across the country, put their heads together, and devised what they would do. They ended up laying out the whole battlefield behind them to practice what was ahead of them. How did they do this? Our young aboriginal soldiers went out in the dead of night and basically mapped out the whole area. We were able to go forward and win that battle, starting at five in the morning and ending at noon.

We have so much to be proud of as Canadians because of our veterans and armed forces. I know that in Afghanistan, the question was asked of the Taliban, "Do you fear western forces?" They said, "No, except the Canadians". That says so much about our armed forces.

That being said, it is very important that we do these things to celebrate, commemorate, and remember. We fall short if we do not do everything we can as legislators in this House and on the committee, which I am on, to make sure that we are truly caring for our armed forces when they transition to the veteran's life. We need to do whatever we can to make sure that the transition is as painless as possible and that they are recognized for what they have done. They sacrifice their families, their own choices, and their own decision-making to become part of the armed forces. They stand side by side and serve for us, then come back to the very difficult circumstance of transitioning to civilian life.

It is a pleasure to serve on that committee. There are many things we are working on with our report, and I am certainly hopeful that the government will do everything it can to look at the recommendations from us, and from the two ombudsmen, to make sure that we are doing everything we can to close that seam and deal with circumstances that have been left hanging for a very long time.



*Private Members' Business*

One of those is the issue of mefloquine and how it impacted our soldiers in Somalia, Rwanda, Afghanistan, and other battlefields. There are a number of heartbreaking stories coming from veterans who have lived with the results of this and are not being recognized for having suffered from what this actually is. It is not just PTSD. It is a brain injury as well. Our government needs to recognize that this particular anti-malaria drug is not being used by the rest of the world.

We are falling behind in making some of the decisions that say to our veterans that they are important to us and that we will do whatever it takes to ensure that they are cared for in the way they should be.

We talk about caring about our veterans and about how much we want to recognize them but then do not do what needs to be done. This does not mean huge changes. It means simply putting things in place to ensure that veterans do not end up more ill after coming home because of the stress of getting settled in their new civilian lives.

One of the things we heard over and over again was about family life and how difficult it is for the other parent and the children to deal with the challenges of being an armed forces family and a veteran's family. We need to be there to support them in taking care of the soldier who has come home.

We need to tell our veterans that they really matter to us and that they matter to us every day of the year, from the moment they sign up with our forces right up to when they retire or have to quit because of an injury. We need to put real meat on these things. I am not making light of that at all. We need to commemorate what they have done for us.

• (1150)

There is another issue we are all facing right now, which is medical marijuana. Veterans are concerned about the fact that the government is considering legalizing marijuana for recreational use. They are concerned about how this would dumb down the importance of it as a medical prescription. I regularly hear stories about how this is replacing pharmaceuticals for so many veterans, with far fewer side effects, and about improvements in dealing with their pain so they can get on with their lives. It is not costing us anywhere near what it costs to have them on pharmaceuticals.

Those are just some issues that come to mind when I think about commemorating our veterans. We certainly want to do this. I am so proud to have a role as deputy critic, to be involved in specific instances in my riding, and to be part of making decisions that are good for them.

**Mr. Sean Fraser (Central Nova, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill, which would raise the profile of Remembrance Day and make it a national legal holiday on par with Canada Day and Victoria Day. When I think about the immense sacrifice that those we celebrate on Remembrance Day have made, this is absolutely the least we could do.

I would like to draw attention to two quick items. The first is the mental health crisis our emergency services personnel and our military are going through right now. At least 70 veterans have ended their lives by suicide since the end of the Afghanistan mission.

If this legislation will help draw attention to that crisis, we will be better for having supported it.

In addition, the veterans who fought so bravely overseas fought for the freedom of the most vulnerable, but they also fought to protect certain key values: equality, democracy, and liberty. We should promote these values every day of our lives. When the last child in our community goes to bed without being hungry, when the last person is not discriminated against because of the colour of their skin, their religion, or the person they love, we will have lived up to the sacrifices these soldiers made by protecting the values they fought so bravely for.

If this legislation helps raise the profile of Remembrance Day one iota and draws attention to the mental health crisis our military faces or to the freedoms we need to live and breathe every day at home, or if it encourages young people to take part in Remembrance Day ceremonies in their communities, then I am pleased to support it. I urge all members of the House to do the same.

• (1155)

**Mr. Colin Fraser (West Nova, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to give my right of reply with regard to the debate that has taken place on my private member's bill, Bill C-311.

I want to thank all the members who participated in the debate on my private member's bill. I want to acknowledge the members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs I have served with who have presented their points of view on this bill. I am so pleased to have worked with them on that committee to make sure that we are continuing to honour the service of those brave men and women who have served our country, past and present, and that we are doing the right things to honour their service.

I think we can all agree on the importance of Remembrance Day in Canada. We also share the desire to ensure that we are appropriately honouring those brave Canadians in uniform who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

My bill is a modest measure that seeks to change the language in the Holidays Act to make Remembrance Day a legal holiday and to ensure that consistency of language is reflected in the act. This bill would ensure consistency with both Canada Day and Victoria Day in the Holidays Act and would elevate the status of Remembrance Day to put it on an equal footing with those other days.

Some have expressed that this provision would do more than that. Let me be clear that my bill, by adding the word "legal", would not impact the Canada Labour Code, which establishes the policy on non-working days for holidays. Federally speaking, the day is already and will remain a federal paid non-working day.

Furthermore, and I want to be very clear on this point, it is up to each province and territory to determine whether Remembrance Day on November 11 is a statutory holiday or a day off in their jurisdiction. This is what determines whether there is no school and whether it is a public paid non-working day.

*Government Orders*

This bill does not and cannot make Remembrance Day a national holiday, because it is not within the purview of Parliament to do so. I am hoping that this bill may provide an occasion for the provinces and territories that do not already do so to determine whether Remembrance Day should indeed be a statutory holiday.

I note that some of my colleagues in the debate have mentioned that the bill would not make it a statutory holiday, and it cannot, but what it can do is elevate the day, put it on an equal footing, and hopefully provide an occasion for those jurisdictions that do not already do so to allow it to be a statutory day.

There are examples of other jurisdictions that do not mark the day as a so-called statutory holiday, but they mark the solemn occasion in other ways. For example, in my home province of Nova Scotia, it is separate from other statutory holidays, but it is kept in force under the Remembrance Day Act to ensure that people have time off to attend ceremonies. I would like to see this across the country, but of course, our Constitution requires that we respect the jurisdiction of provinces in this regard.

I want to address one issue that has been brought up by some who oppose the bill, which is the argument that students should be in school on November 11 to ensure that they are marking the day and reflecting on what November 11 at 11 a.m. means for our country. I respect their point of view. However, in my experience in Nova Scotia, and I believe in most places in Canada, it is far more meaningful for the students to learn the importance of Remembrance Day and the sacrifices of our forces in the days leading up to November 11.

Veterans come into the schools during Veterans' Week, and in addition to the teaching, there is also a remembrance service in schools, which veterans attend. Of course, if these were marked on November 11 at 11 a.m., veterans marking the occasion with the community could not attend those school services. However, if students had time off, they could mark November 11 in the community with veterans at their public ceremonies. We have seen increasing attendance, including by children and their families, in Nova Scotia.

I believe that all Canadians should be able to have the same experience and that all veterans should have the opportunity to be publicly appreciated for their service and remembered on November 11 at a collective experience with the whole community.

As I mentioned in my speech to begin this debate, proposed subsections 3(2) and 3(3) are not at all essential to my intent in raising the profile of Remembrance Day. Since I now recognize that those are problematic provisions, I support their removal at committee, and I will be asking the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage for their removal if the bill is sent to it following a debate at second reading. We should therefore turn our minds to just proposed subsection 3(1) of this bill.

● (1200)

As my final words in this debate on Bill C-311, while the bill of course is about November 11, I am sure that we all agree that we must show respect to our veterans and members of Canadian Forces throughout the year and honour them in our words and our deeds.

As we come into the holiday season, let us keep them and their families top of mind and always show them extra kindness and warmth for all that they do for our country.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2016, NO. 2

BILL C-29—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I move:

That in relation to Bill C-29, a second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2016 and other measures, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill; and

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

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I just want to remind members that the House is in session and that the back and forth of conversations should be kept on the sidelines.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period.

I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places so the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

● (1205)

[*English*]

Debate, the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC):** Madam Speaker, once again, we are very disappointed to have to rise, on this side of the House, in response to the government's systematic obstruction of parliamentarians' right to speak.

In both form and substance, the government is simply wrong. First, wanting to deny the right to speak, even though at this stage of the bill we have had just one hour of debate, is completely disrespectful and irresponsible on the government's part toward the official opposition.

*Government Orders*

As for substance, it is worse. In fact, Bill C-29 concerns implementation of the government's budget measures, a budget that, as we know, will lead to the unfortunate inflationary spiral of this government's colossal deficits. We are headed toward a \$30-billion deficit, three times higher than what the Liberal Party had promised in its election platform.

I could go on at length about this, but I am going to give the minister a chance to clearly explain himself. I am reaching out to him for the 13th time. Can he tell us when and how he intends to return to balanced budgets for all Canadians?

**Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, we know that it is very important for the level of economic growth to be higher than it has been over the past decade. We have chosen to make significant investments to improve economic growth.

We have already made infrastructure investments and we have ideas about how to help the middle class. We are confident that the measures we have proposed will increase growth in the Canadian economy.

[*English*]

**Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I rise and find myself in substantial agreement with the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent. It is really quite disturbing that after merely one hour of debate at report stage, a bill as important as Bill C-29, the budget implementation bill after all, will suddenly be subject to this guillotine motion.

I think it is the 10th time, if I am not mistaken. Who can keep count if the government has done that. I know it is only a 10th as much as the Conservatives did, but nevertheless, any Canadian watching who thinks this is real change will have to conclude that it is not. It is a very sad day.

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that including the two days provided with the adoption of this motion, we will have provided nine days of debate on the bill, not including the time the bill spent in committee. This has allowed more than 60 members of Parliament to debate it so far.

We know it is important, and we will continue to work collaboratively with all parties to try to come to a consensus on how much time is needed for debate, but we also need to be mindful that decisions on important financial legislation need to be taken.

**Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC):** Madam Speaker, we have talked about this before. The government has just invoked closure on this important bill.

There are 338 members of Parliament elected to be the voices of their ridings, and on this side, members have not had an opportunity to speak to the bill. Indeed, on the opposite side, members have also not had an opportunity to speak to this.

We just had a member from the government get on record. Unfortunately, it might be the first time in years I have heard him speak. It came across as a heckle, but, indeed, members on all sides are being muzzled.

Why is the government so keen and quick to invoke closure on the bill when 338 members of Parliament should have a voice? All of us should be the voice of our constituents.

If my hon. colleague, a member of the government across the way, has something to say, rather than heckle, why does he not stand and speak to this debate, but we cannot with the closure. Why is it so important, why is it so necessary, that we invoke closure and shut these voices down?

• (1210)

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, we know that it is important in the House to get things done on behalf of Canadians. We know that we need to move forward in a way that will make a real difference.

I would like to give some statistics on our debates and sittings. There are 55 sitting days in the September to December period, including seven supply days, which the opposition can use as they see fit. There were three days of debate on the Paris agreement, one day mandated by the Standing Orders to debate those orders in the House. That has left only 44 days for the rest of government business.

With nine days of debate, including today and tomorrow, that means we will have provided 20% of available time for government business on this bill alone. We think that is appropriate.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I find it strange that the Minister of Finance should say that 20% of time is allocated to debate when the budget implementation act, 2016, No. 2 is 100% dedicated to government expenditures.

The member for Winnipeg North is always outraged about the opposition's tactics. However, today we are studying an amendment that moves deletion of the bill's short title. I do not understand why the opposition is being accused of using tactics to prevent work from being done when our time is being wasted by a motion such as this.

Last week, the government leader in the House of Commons prevented us from tabling petitions for the second time in two weeks because she was afraid of the tactics being used by the opposition. In reality, the government is muzzling parliamentarians after just one hour of debate at report stage. That is totally unacceptable.

Is this what the Minister of Finance was campaigning on when his party was promising "real change"?

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, as I said, we think that nine days of debate are sufficient, and 20% of speaking time is available during government business for this bill.

What is important to us is to do what we have to do for Canadians. We have to make investments in our economy so that we can have a better future, and we have to start now. That is our plan.

*Government Orders*

[English]

**Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I guess I can understand why the government wants to shut down debate on this finance bill to implement its budget. It is because the Liberals are embarrassed by their record. On Friday, for the second month in a row, Statistics Canada said that all of the gains in jobs were in part-time positions. Some 8,700 full-time jobs were lost in November. Plus, Gluskin Sheff's chief economist, David Rosenberg, said that the latest numbers were clearly a case of “nice headlines, shame about the details”. In fact, full-time employment in Canada has not risen in almost a year and a half. He said that that was, in a word, “pathetic” and attested to an unusually high level of uncertainty among the business community writ large.

Is not the real reason the government is cutting off debate that the Liberals are so embarrassed of their horrible economic performance?

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, we need to move forward on the measures that we have to improve the economy. What we are trying to do is to ensure that we can improve full-time employment. Our job is to move forward on that basis. What we saw in the third quarter was growth of 3.5%. We did exceed economists' expectations. We saw a level of employment that did decline in the third quarter. Yes, we know that we need to do more, and that is what we are moving forward with in the House to make sure we can make the investments that will make a long-term future for Canadians to get jobs so they can have successful lives.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I am looking at the Liberals' website. This is the 2015 version of the Liberals, though, so maybe things have changed. Under the topic of openness, transparency, and fairness, they said on the site that the Conservative government had broken Canadians' trust and that the Liberals had a solution for this. One of the problems the Liberals had at the time was the use of this tactic that we're seeing them use here today. After just one hour, notice was given that debate would be shut off. The Liberals decried this in opposition and said it was no wonder that Canadians were ready for real change. The Liberals said that they were going to send resolutions to Ottawa that, in their words, would “make sure that Parliament is at a place where all Canadians can serve their country. A Liberal government will restore Parliament as a place where accountable people with real mandates do serious work”.

That was the 2015 version of the Liberal Party when its members were campaigning for the job. Now that they are doing the job, do they not find it so convenient to use the very same tactics they decried? After just one hour of debate, they gave notice that debate had to be shut down on the implementation of the budget, a significant, sweeping, and broad bill with many issues that members of Parliament would like to speak to. That is our job and why we are here. In saying this, I include the backbenchers from the Liberal Party of Canada who sit in those seats and pretend to speak on behalf of their constituents as well. Is that not what this job is? Is that not why we come together? Why do we hear no complaints from the Liberals in the backbench who say, “This is fine. We did not like it when Mr. Harper did it, but we like it when our guy does it. It is okay”.

• (1215)

**Mr. Bryan May:** Oh, come on.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** It is the same tactic regardless of the party stripe. It is time to be consistent for once and allow this place to do its job on behalf of all Canadians.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I want to remind the member for Cambridge that if he has something to say, he should get up during questions and comments and not yell it across the way.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

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

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Order. Again, I ask the member for Cambridge to refrain from yelling out.

The hon. minister has the floor.

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, I want to be clear that this is not about tactics; this is about doing work for Canadians that we know needs to be done. This is about moving forward on consumer protection so that Canadians will be protected. This is about moving forward on tax fairness so that we will have a system that will work for all Canadians.

I want to repeat that including today and tomorrow, we will have had nine days of debate on Bill C-29. That has allowed more than 60 members of Parliament so far to participate in debate. Again, with nine days of debate, including today and tomorrow, that means we will have provided 20% of the available time for government business on this bill, and this bill alone. It is important that we move forward and make a measurable difference for Canadians. That is what we intend on doing.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I do appreciate what the Minister of Finance is saying. I would ask him this. When we talk about a budget implementation bill, we are talking about the budget in general. There are many things within this budget that Canadians will benefit from. We can talk about the Canada child benefit program, about the guaranteed income supplement, we can talk about the money spent on infrastructure.

When I hear concerns from the opposition benches with respect to time and time allocation, there have been many days, not only of actual debate, but on questions and answers. The minister made reference to how members have been able to get engaged in up to 20% of all government business, which is a significant amount of time. I wonder if the Minister of Finance can highlight how important it is that we get the job done at some point and get the legislation passed. That is something that the Minister of Finance is ultimately responsible for doing.

*Government Orders*

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his question. I would point out that we have moved forward on important measures and that we want to have closure on these important measures that are making a real difference for Canadians. We talked about some important things that we have moved forward on, such as helping single and vulnerable seniors in our society with a 10% increase in the guaranteed income supplement. We have moved forward on the Canada child benefit, which is helping literally hundreds of thousands of families, and 300,000 children will be moved out of poverty. We are starting to see a real impact on our economy. In the third quarter, we started to see a turnaround in our economy. We know that is a result of the important work in Fort McMurray. It is also because so many Canadian families that were struggling to get by now have access to the Canada child benefit, which is making a real difference for their families and also helping our economy. That has a positive impact today and for tomorrow. It is something we need to move forward on so that we can continue to make a difference for Canadian families.

**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC):** Madam Speaker, during the worst economic recession since the great recession, our government had the best job creation and economic growth record among the G7 countries. We had the lowest tax rate in 50 years. During that same time, 200,000 jobs were created. We kept our promise to balance the budget and left the Liberals with a surplus during the worst recession since the great recession. Therefore, my question to the member is this. Is time allocation being placed here because in the arena of public opinion, the government can no longer afford to have revelations and affirmations of the facts on this side of the House that its tax hikes and deficit expenditures are not working to create jobs?

• (1220)

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, it is important to consider the record that we came in on. We came in after 10 years. We were left with a significant amount of additional debt by the previous government. There was over \$100 billion of additional debt that was built up. We were left with the lowest growth rate in the period since the Great Depression. Therefore, we found ourselves in a situation where something had to be done to help Canadian families. We have already moved forward on some things that are making a real and measurable difference for Canadian families. We have helped those who are challenged. The unemployment rate has declined. What we need to do is move forward on how we can create long-term, full-time jobs for Canadians. We know that making investments in infrastructure and finding ways to ensure that our economy is innovative and successful will make a difference over the long term. That is what we are moving forward on. We need to get this bill passed, so that we can move forward with the business of this House to help Canadians.

**Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP):** Madam Speaker, we have often heard from the current government the commitment that it wants to hear from Canadians, and from parliamentarians, whatever side of the House they are on, and time allocation on debate is obviously antithetical to that. We hear often from the Liberals in conversation that they have not used as many time allocation motions as the Harper Conservatives did. However, that is partly because they do not have anywhere near as much legislation on the Order Paper as the last government did. Therefore, the variable we need to control for is the laziness of the government.

There were 122 bills that received royal assent in the last Parliament, and there were 102 time allocation motions. That is 0.84 time allocation motions per bill that received royal assent. To date in this Parliament, there have been nine bills that have received royal assent, and eight time allocation motions on those bills that received royal assent. That is a rate of 0.89. How does the current government justify using time allocation at a higher rate than the Harper government for the bills that it is getting through Parliament?

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, I want to be clear. The way we measure success has everything to do with how much of a difference we are making for Canadians. The kinds of measures that we take are measures such as, how many single seniors who were in a vulnerable position before the guaranteed income supplement top-up are now in a better position? That is an important measurement. How many children have been lifted above the low-income cut-off because we have increased the Canada child benefit? That matters. These are the kinds of measures that matter. We are going to move forward on measures that are actually going to improve our growth rate. That is going to matter. We are going to do it in a way that is inclusive, that ensures that Canadians from all incomes are actually doing better. Those are the kinds of measures that matter.

We are absolutely going to move forward to make a real difference for Canadians. That is what they expect us to do.

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I think what Canadians are seeing over and over again with the Liberal government is that it has a facade. It says one thing—it says it is going to respect Parliament, for example—and then as soon as Canadians or, in this case, parliamentarians, kind of scratch away at the surface, we realize there is absolutely nothing behind the facade. It says one thing and then it does something completely different. Whether it is on deficit, on policy in the Middle East, on fighting ISIS, on fiscal policy, or whether it is on respecting Parliament, it is all a facade.

The new House leader came in saying that she was going to set a new tone. I can tell members that on the opposition side of the House, we have been working in good faith with the government. We only ask for what the previous House leader implemented, as far as the ability to debate. He allowed five days at this stage of the previous budget implementation act. We have had one hour on this.

Canadians are seeing the complete charade that the Liberals are showing them, and they are not buying it.

I want to ask the current finance minister—and I do not want to hear the talking points that the House leader gave him—when they will start doing what is right for Canadians, when will they be authentic and real with Canadians, and when they will quit this act and this facade in everything that they do?

• (1225)

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, I think we have been pretty clear. We have said that we want to grow the economy for the middle class and for those who are striving to get into the middle class. It has been a consistent message from the day we came into office. The very first thing we did was to lower taxes on middle-class Canadians, which is entirely consistent with what we said we were going to do: help the middle class.

*Government Orders*

Then we moved forward on helping those struggling to get into the middle class. The Canada child benefit is helping the poorest of Canadians to have a better outcome for their children. It is also helping middle-class Canadians to buy the things that they want for their families. We then moved forward and said we were going to help single seniors who are in a vulnerable situation, which is, again, entirely consistent with what we said we were going to do.

What we are doing now is moving forward on a long-term agenda, to make investments that are going to help all Canadians with a more productive economy over the long term.

This is what Canadians expect. They expect us to do things that are on their behalf and on their children's behalf, for today and for tomorrow. That is exactly what we are going to do.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP):** Madam Speaker, last year, the Liberals told us that they were going to do politics differently. They were going to restore citizens' confidence in their institutions, put the members back at the centre of our parliamentary system, fight cynicism, and turn the page to to have a political approach that is healthier, more transparent, more open and more attentive to the people.

Today, we realize that the government is employing to the same tactics we have seen before. Parliamentarians are being muzzled. Members cannot do their work. It is all quite crazy. There are 338 members in the House, and the Liberal government has just limited time for debate at the report stage to one hour.

Is this how they fight cynicism? Is this how they put members back at the heart of our democracy? Is this how they restore confidence in institutions?

What will it be next time, five minutes of debate and that's it?

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, as I said, counting today and tomorrow, we will have had nine days of debate on Bill C-29. We know that 60 members have had the opportunity to participate in our debate. That is very important.

We also know that corresponds to 20% of the time available for government business for this session. It is very important to have time. We have had time, and that is how we can get things done for Canadians. That is our goal.

[*English*]

**Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I had an opportunity earlier today to talk about the percentage of bills that have had time allocation. I know how frustrating it is for members on this side of the House having only one hour of debate.

We should be looking at some of the issues. Liberals speak about real differences for Canadians. When we look at the chart on page 240 of the Liberal budget, it shows even less than 3% of the floor that the Conservatives had set after negotiations for health care transfers. This is something that people should recognize for the sham it really is.

Perhaps the minister could talk about how that particular part got into the budget.

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, I would like to use some statistics from the previous government that might be helpful. A number of years ago, on Bill C-4, which consisted of 322 pages, there were five days of debate at second reading under time allocation, two days at report stage under time allocation, and one day at third reading under time allocation.

On Bill C-31, which was 380 pages, there were five days of debate at second reading under time allocation, two days at report stage under time allocation, and two days at third reading under time allocation.

On Bill C-29, on the other hand, which was only 244 pages, there were six days of debate at second reading, there were two days at report stage, and one day at third reading.

We are doing things in a way that will allow us to get our work done. We are doing it in a way that is appropriate, so that Canadians can understand what we are trying to achieve for them and their families. That is the way we plan on moving forward to make a real difference to our economy and for Canadians over the long run.

• (1230)

**Mr. Erin Weir (Regina—Lewvan, NDP):** Madam Speaker, it is ironic that the government is using time allocation to ram through this budget, because the budget itself imposes a far more brutal type of time allocation on unemployed workers in Regina. It is depriving laid-off workers in my city of the additional weeks of employment insurance benefits that the budget provides everywhere else in Saskatchewan and across Alberta.

On Friday, Statistics Canada reported that for the first time since 1989, Saskatchewan did not stay below the national unemployment rate. Last month and the month before were the only two months in the entire history of Statistics Canada's labour force survey, since 1976, that Saskatchewan had a higher unemployment rate than Quebec.

In light of these figures, will the finance minister finally include Regina in the budget's extension of employment insurance?

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, since the member opposite is talking about irony, I want to point out the irony that he is trying to slow down something that we know will have an impact on our economy. We want to make investments that will help us to have long-term jobs in our country. That means making investments in infrastructure that will have an impact across the country, but, importantly, in Saskatchewan. It means moving forward on the kinds of things that we know we can do to actually make a difference for people.

We have made some differences on employment insurance, and now we need to think about how we can make a long-term difference, especially for those parts of our country like Alberta, Saskatchewan, Newfoundland and Labrador, that are actually struggling. We need to make the kinds of long-term investments that will make a difference there. That is what we intend to move forward on, and we hope to have the approval of the other side of the House in order to do that.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I want to add my voice to the chorus of people who are disappointed that, after one hour, the Prime Minister is shutting down debate on something that is very important to our economy. Economic policy is being developed, and debate is being shut down after one hour.

I have a specific question for the minister. Why would a government member move motion no. 1, which would actually delete a clause of a government bill? Could the minister explain to Canadians and parliamentarians why a government member would move to delete a clause of a government bill?

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, we are focusing on what we can do to help Canadians, and not on questions that are not going to move forward the important work we need to do for them. That is why we want to move forward on this as rapidly as we can. We know that this is a time when many families are struggling. We have seen significant increases in unemployment in Alberta, and challenges in Saskatchewan and Newfoundland and Labrador. The time to move is now.

Canadians do not expect us to bandy about over tactics. They do not expect us to be talking about little clauses. They want us to make a difference for them and their families. That is what we want to do: move forward in making the kinds of investments that will make a difference. That is what we hope will make a difference in the future for Canadians.

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):** Madam Speaker, it has often been said that, if the only tool one has is a hammer, every problem begins to look like a nail.

I remember my partner from Skeena—Bulkley Valley reading out the 2015 edition of the Liberals. Well, let us not forget the 2012 edition of the Liberals, when the member for Winnipeg North often criticized the former Conservative government for ramming through legislation and not working with the opposition; the moral outrage.

Could the Minister of Finance tell us what happened? Where is the moral outrage today? What has changed their stripes?

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, I want to come back to the situation in which we find ourselves.

We are saying that, with nine days of debate, including today and tomorrow, we will have provided 20% of the available time for government business this fall on this bill and this bill alone. We know this is an important bill. We know we need to move forward in order to make a difference for Canadians. That is what we are working to do.

We look forward to the support of the other side of the House.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** We have time for a very brief question.

**Mr. Dan Vandal (Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Finance knows that budget 2016 has been very positive for Manitoba, in terms of infrastructure.

In the riding of Provencher, the village of St-Pierre has received \$1.5 million for lagoon expansion. In the riding of Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, the City of Selkirk has received \$3 million for water supply. In the riding of—

• (1235)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I indicated just a very brief question. If we want the minister to answer, we have to get the minister to answer right now.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Bill Morneau:** Madam Speaker, it is exactly the case: we have moved forward on these sorts of projects to make a real difference in Manitoba and other parts of the country where those investments will help Canadian families today and tomorrow.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

The vote is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Call in the members.

• (1315)

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

*(Division No. 168)*

## YEAS

## Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Chagger
Champagne	Chan
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCoursey
Dhalwal	Dhillon
Di Iorio	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter	Ehsassi
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson

*Government Orders*

Fergus	Fillmore	Généreux	Genuis
Finnigan	Fisher	Gladu	Godin
Fonseca	Foote	Gourde	Hardcastle
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)	Harder	Hughes
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry	Jeneroux	Johns
Fuhr	Garneau	Kelly	Kent
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones	Kitchen	Kmiec
Goodale	Gould	Lake	Lauson (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Graham	Grewal	Laverdière	Lebel
Hajdu	Hardie	Liepert	Lobb
Harvey	Hehr	Lukiwski	MacGregor
Holland	Housefather	MacKenzie	Malcolmson
Hussen	Hutchings	Marcil	Masse (Windsor West)
Iacono	Joly	Mathysen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Jones	Jordan	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Jowhari	Kang	Motz	Mulcair
Khalid	Khera	Nater	Nicholson
Lametti	Lamoureux	Nuttall	Paul-Hus
Lapointe	Lauson (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Plamondon	Poilievre
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Quach	Rankin
Lefebvre	Lemieux	Rayes	Reid
Leslie	Levitt	Rempel	Richards
Lightbound	Lockhart	Saganash	Saroya
Long	Longfield	Shields	Shipley
Ludwig	MacAulay (Cardigan)	Sopuck	Sorenson
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Stanton	Stetski
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	McCrimmon	Strahl	Sweet
May (Cambridge)	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Thériault	Trudel
McCallum	Mendès	Van Kesteren	Van Loan
McDonald	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	Vecchio	Wagantall
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Morrissey	Warawa	Warkentin
Medicino	O'Connell	Watts	Waugh
Soeurs	Oliver	Webber	Weir
Morneau	Ouellette	Wong	Yurdiga
Murray	Peschisolido	Zimmer — 105	
Oliphant	Petitpas Taylor		
O'Regan	Picard		
Paradis	Qualtrough		
Peterson	Robillard		
Philpott	Romanado		
Poissant	Rudd		
Ratansi	Rusnak		
Rodriguez	Saini		
Rota	Samson		
Ruimy	Sarai		
Sahota	Schieffe		
Sajjan	Sgro		
Sangha	Sheehan		
Scarpaleggia	Sikand		
Schulte	Sohi		
Shanahan	Spengemann		
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Tassi		
Simms	Vandal		
Sorbara	Vaughan		
Tan	Whalen		
Trudeau	Wilson-Raybould		
Vandenbeld	Young		
Virani			
Wilkinson			
Wrzesnewskyj			
Zahid — 163			

**NAYS**

## Members

Albas	Albrecht
Allison	Ambrose
Anderson	Arnold
Barlow	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Block	Boulerice
Brassard	Brosseau
Brown	Cannings
Caron	Carrie
Christopherson	Clarke
Cooper	Cullen
Davies	Deltell
Diotte	Doherty
Donnelly	Dreeshen
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Eglinski	Falk
Finley	Gallant

**PAIRED**

Nil

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

**Hon. Candice Bergen:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to ensure that I do not comment on the current or past presence of any member of Parliament, which I know is out of order. My point of order has to do with the future.

We noticed that today the Prime Minister has a meeting scheduled right at 2:15 p.m. The event is one of the only meetings he has today, and the meeting is here in Ottawa. We want to be able to help the Prime Minister accommodate his open and accountable government. In the message that he gave to his ministers he said that he thought it was important to be in Parliament to answer honestly and accurately. In order to help the Prime Minister do that, I would ask for unanimous consent of the House to move question period for today as follows: that notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, on Monday, December 5, 2016, members may make statements pursuant to Standing Order 31 at 4 p.m. instead of 2 p.m. and oral questions shall be taken up not later than 4:15 p.m. instead of 2:15 p.m. in order to help the Prime Minister, and the House shall proceed to the ordinary daily routine of business at 5:00 p.m. instead of 3:00 p.m., followed by government orders.

**The Speaker:** Does the hon. opposition House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.**Some hon. members:** No.



*Government Orders*

[Translation]

## REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from December 2 consideration of Bill C-29, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2016 and other measures as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

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

[English]

**Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to speak in the House, even if it is after the government has decided not very many members of Parliament should actually get that opportunity. That is what we are facing here again today. We are seeing a government that is very proud of the fact that 60 members of Parliament have spoken to this. Last time I checked, there were 336 members in the House of Commons currently, with two vacancies, so that is fewer than 20% of members of Parliament being afforded an opportunity to speak to the budget implementation act. The government has brought down the hammer. It has shut off debate. It does not want members of Parliament to speak in the House.

It is kind of funny. I just did the Liberals' MyDemocracy.ca survey where they ask things like, "Do you think members of Parliament should better represent their constituents or should they toe the party line?" We have seen their preference here today. Instead of representing their constituents, getting up and defending their own budget, they get up and defend cutting off debate in the House.

It is shameful but it is becoming a part of their routine business. They said, "Trust us. We will do things so much differently." They talked about real change. The only real change is, after Friday, a single hour of debate on the budget implementation act at this stage, they brought in time allocation. For the people at home, that means they no longer want members of Parliament to be able to debate this.

It is no wonder the Liberals do not want Canadians and members of Parliament debating the bill, because it is about their economic performance. The budget implementation act speaks to their ineptitude, quite frankly, on the economy. That is what we are seeing day after day and time after time. Their economic plan, if we could even call it that, is not working.

Statistics Canada said on Friday that for the second month in a row all job gains were in part-time positions and noticed the jobless rate only fell because fewer people were seeking work. Some 8,700 full-time jobs were lost in November. Gluskin Sheff chief economist David Rosenberg said that the latest numbers were clearly a case of "nice headline, shame about the details". In fact, full-time employment in Canada has not risen in almost a year and a half. What happened just a little over a year ago? This government took office. Since it has taken office, it has not created a single net full-time new job. It is outrageous.

The Liberals talk about how we need to get this passed so that they can deliver on their economic platform. We need to prevent that from happening as much as possible because it has been an unmitigated disaster. They have misled Canadians time after time,

and their budget is the primary example of where they have done that.

I want to continue to quote from David Rosenberg. He said the Liberal economic performance is "in a word, pathetic and attests to a usually high level of uncertainty among the business community, writ large".

There were 8,700 jobs lost just in November. That was in addition to the 100,000 jobs that have been lost in the energy sector since the government took office. Its plan, if we can call it that, is simply failing Canadians.

The budget, and the budget implementation act, is a litany of broken promises. The Liberals promised in the last campaign that they would have a \$10-billion deficit and that it would be gone within the time of their mandate, that within four years there would be no deficit and we would be back to a balanced budget. One year later, it is now a \$30-billion deficit, and there is no plan to ever get back to a balanced budget. That is the Liberal record. They no longer even pretend they are going to get back to a balanced budget. That is after our Conservative government left them with \$2.9 billion in surplus, and over 1.3 million net new jobs was our record. In one year, they have blown through the entire contingency fund they had set aside in their first budget and they are three times more money in debt.

What does that mean? It means that future generations, our children and grandchildren, will pay higher taxes to pay that money back. Canadians know, when they borrow money, they have to pay it back. The government has said that it was just going to borrow a little bit. It was going to spur the economy on to create all kinds of jobs. It has not happened. It is a record of broken promises.

● (1320)

The Liberals also said that they would be cutting the small business tax rate for communities like mine in Chilliwack—Hope. Small and medium-sized enterprises in Chilliwack—Hope are the backbone of my community. Every major party in this place promised in the last election that we would cut the small business tax rate to 9% from 11%. Every single one of us here in the major recognized parties campaigned on cutting the small business tax rate to 9%.

What did we see? The Liberals got into power, and it said sorry to all the small business owners who create all of the jobs in this country, but they did not have the money for them. They had to spend it on other things. They are running a \$30-billion deficit, but they cannot afford to keep their promise to them. Instead, they are going to raise their payroll taxes and make it more expensive for them to hire people. Not only were they not going to give them the break they promised, but they are going to make it more expensive.

It is no surprise, given the comments of the Prime Minister during the campaign when he said that small businesses were simply a way for rich Canadians to avoid paying their fair share of taxes. This is what the Liberal Party believes about small business in Canada, that they are simply avoiding taxes and avoiding their obligations to Canadians.

*Government Orders*

The Liberals are making life more expensive for the people in my riding by raising their taxes. They talk as well about how they are raising taxes on the wealthiest Canadians and cutting them for lowest-income Canadians, except they are doing nothing of the sort.

In my riding, the average income is \$34,787 per year. Guess how much the average income earner in Chilliwack—Hope got from the Liberal tax cuts? It is zero. They do not make enough money to qualify for the Liberal tax cuts, because they kick in at \$45,000 a year. Therefore, the person who actually makes the most money from the Liberal income tax cuts is someone making \$199,000 a year. That might be who the Liberals represent, but in my riding, that is not who I represent. I represent middle and low-income Canadians who are looking for a break. They were promised a tax break from the current government and they got nothing.

Another group that has gotten nothing from the government is the natural resource sector. I was honoured to be named the natural resources critic, and it is a tough time for our natural resource industries. Right now in committee, we have been studying the mining industry. Mining company after mining company has come before the committee to say that a carbon tax will put more people out of work, and it may prevent projects from even starting. That is how serious this is.

The government has not adjusted its plan at all, given the surprising outcome in the United States where we now have president-elect Trump, who says he is going to cut corporate and business taxes. He has no intention of bringing in a carbon tax. Yet the Liberals continue on as though nothing has changed, as if it is still going to be Barack Obama in the White House in another month or so.

Things have changed. The landscape has dramatically shifted. If we do not adjust, we will continue to see massive outflows of capital from the natural resource sector to other jurisdictions. Businesses are going to leave this country, jobs are going to leave this country, and yet the government has done nothing except make it more expensive for businesses to operate in Canada. It is shameful. The 100,000 lost jobs in the energy sector that have happened since the current government took office will seem like the good old days if it continues down this path where people continue to look for lower-cost jurisdictions in which to operate.

Therefore, this is not a plan to get Canadians back to work. It is not a plan to make life more affordable for Canadians. It is a failed plan. It is a litany of broken promises. We on this side of the House will not support it.

• (1325)

**Mr. François-Philippe Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am surprised, and I am sure the member can help me understand, because he said that few people in his riding would be impacted. Let me remind him of what we have done for people in his riding.

When we cut taxes for nine million Canadians, is he saying to this House that there is no one in his riding who is going to benefit?

When we introduced the Canada child benefit, nine families out of 10 in this country are going to be better off. Is the member telling

people watching at home that there is nobody in his riding who is going to benefit from the Canada child benefit?

We have increased the GIS top-up, and 900,000 seniors are going to be better off in Canada because of that. Is the member pretending that there are no seniors in his riding who will benefit?

For youth in our country, we have increased grants. I am sure there are students in the member's riding.

My question to the member is: Why does he not support measures that are going to help the same people who sent him to Ottawa?

• (1330)

**Mr. Mark Strahl:** Madam Speaker, of course, if he had been listening to my speech, he would note that the average income in my riding does not qualify for the so-called middle class tax cut of the government. They get nothing from it, and he wants to walk past that.

There has not been a single net new job created. The small businesses, as I said, that are counting on that tax cut that he promised when he was going door to door have got nothing from the government. The Liberals have broken that promise.

My constituents know that when a government comes in, it is expected to keep its promises, not break every single milestone that they promised they would deliver on within a few short months.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I have a question for my Conservative colleague and fellow British Columbian about perhaps not what is in this budget implementation act, which is of course under the guillotine of time allocation, which the Liberals said they would not use. Sorry, that was the 2015 Liberals. These are the different ones.

We have a lot of fundamental challenges in our economy. We can see the economic numbers that my friend points out and that they are universally accepted, that the economy is sputtering at best, and I am being complimentary, yet we have seen a government go out and borrow an extraordinary amount of money, much more so than it promised, and we are wondering where the results are.

There are a lot of incentives in our tax system for manufacturing and some other businesses, but not a lot for adding value to our natural resources. It seems to be remaining in forestry, oil, and other industries, raw resource extraction model is still in place. Are there any suggestions he might have to improve the state of the Canadian economy to change that particular conundrum?

**Mr. Mark Strahl:** Madam Speaker, I think under a Conservative government we certainly took steps to improve the tax regime for manufacturers, for natural resource industries to make sure that the accelerated capital cost allowance for LNG, for instance, in my province of British Columbia will be a big advantage.

*Government Orders*

I think there are always opportunities to incentivize the behaviours that we want to see in Canada, but we do not do that by raising taxes on small businesses. We do not do that by raising payroll taxes on small businesses, which is exactly what the government has done, which it promised it would not do.

I think Canadians are waking up to the fact that this is a government that breaks its promises.

**Mr. Dan Vandal (Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I completely disagree with the hon. member's assumptions. Budget 2016 has been very positive for my province. One of the ridings that has benefited the most is Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, with \$3.5 million for a new water treatment system in Gimli and \$3 million for a new waste-water treatment facility in Selkirk.

Why does the opposition continue to vote against a budget that is so beneficial to the province of Manitoba, especially the rural municipalities?

**Mr. Mark Strahl:** Of course, Madam Speaker, we thank Stephen Harper for that infrastructure plan. It was the biggest and broadest in Canadian history, and we also thank the member of Parliament for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, one of the finest members of Parliament in this House and certainly in Manitoba for getting the job done for his constituents.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. François-Philippe Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the House today about Bill C-29 and to invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill, which is a step forward for Canadian society and the country. As I said earlier, this bill will help families and all Canadians. Naturally, I encourage our colleagues to support it.

Our government made a solemn promise to Canadians. We promised to help members of the middle class who work hard every day and those who are working hard to join it. The government built its 2016 budget around them, and I am proud to speak in favour of that budget in the House today. I am particularly proud to speak in favour of the Budget Implementation Act, 2016, No. 2, which is before us today.

Our government has tabled a bold budget, one that considers all those who are supporting their families through their work and yet feel they still cannot catch up. Therefore the government is going to stimulate the economy through measures that foster the growth of the middle class, because when the economy is working for the middle class, the entire country is pushed into a cycle of growth. We listened to Canadians all over the country before tabling this budget, and what we heard is that they need a financial breather.

One of the budget's primary measures is therefore an income tax reduction. Almost nine million Canadians have more money in their pockets thanks to one of our government's very first measures. That measure has been to reduce income taxes for the middle class, putting them in a better position to save or invest in their own priorities.

Families are at the heart of the middle class. In this bold budget, we find a social innovation that directly affects families living in each of the constituencies represented here in the House. This

innovation, called the Canada child benefit, came into effect last July 1. I will cite the numbers for the House, since they speak for themselves. Those who are watching us today know this very well. For each child under six years of age, a family can receive up to \$6,400 a year, that is, \$533 per month for each child.

For children between six and 17 years of age, the allowance is up to \$5,400 per year, or a maximum of \$450 per month for each child. This is an innovation because it is a direct investment in the country's middle class. The Canada child benefit is producing results which can be felt all over the country, in each of our constituencies.

First of all, the Canada child benefit is much more generous than the previous benefit. For the families affected by this change, this represents close to an average of \$2,300 for the 2016-17 benefit year. Next, it is simpler: families get a single payment every month. It is also tax-free, as the money received does not have to be partially refunded on the income tax return. It is also better targeted, since low- or medium-income families receive higher benefits, while families with very high incomes receive lower benefits than what they received under the previous system.

I am delighted to tell the House that the bill that we are debating today will only increase this benefit, and at the same time improve the lot of this country's children and their families. There are also plans to index benefits to inflation starting on July 1, 2020, which means that benefits will rise with the cost of living.

In addition to helping Canadians, the bill also protects them as consumers, and that protection is tailored to their needs. This bill strengthens and modernizes the protection framework for consumers of financial products and services. We must also ensure that the financial system is adaptable. It met the challenge of the 2008 crisis and demonstrated its soundness to the world.

● (1335)

Traditional business models are nonetheless upset by technological innovations, new consumer demands, and new modes of consumption. Accordingly, the banking sector has to adapt.

What the bill proposes is to simplify and consolidate the current consumer provisions by grouping them under a single section of the Bank Act. It would introduce amendments to the Bank Act to improve consumer protection, that is, to guarantee better access to basic banking services, limit certain business practices, ensure that consumers have access to all the information they need to make informed decisions, ensure that complaints management is better organized, and finally, improve corporate governance and accountability.

Canada's government is showing leadership by taking this series of steps to strengthen financial protection for Canadians, wherever they may live in the country. This is a matter of maintaining public trust.

I have a little time left to talk about another important measure in this bill, specifically the legislation to combat international tax evasion and tax avoidance.

*Government Orders*

Our country already has measures to combat non-compliance with tax law. However it is important to fight tax evasion and tax avoidance in co-operation with other countries and international organizations.

This bill proposes the adoption of tools and procedures originating in the G20 and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the OECD.

First of all, there is country-by-country reporting. This is an instrument that will oblige big corporations to report their activities and the nature of those activities in each jurisdiction where they operate. This will enable the Canada Revenue Agency to have a global view of the activities of multinationals. The interest of this tool is that it can tax the profits of companies in the countries where those profits are made. This is then an initial measure to combat aggressive tax avoidance.

A second instrument provided in the bill applies to tax evasion. It was developed by the OECD and is called the Standard for Automatic Exchange of Financial Account Information in Tax Matters. It will compel Canadian financial institutions to put mechanisms in place to identify all accounts held by non-resident Canadians. This information will have to be transmitted to the Canada Revenue Agency. The 100 or so countries and jurisdictions that have adopted this standard will also identify accounts held by foreign nationals, including Canadians. Next, a series of security mechanisms will be introduced to ensure that this information is exchanged among the standard's signatories.

These measures constitute a step forward for compliance with tax obligations for all Canadians and all businesses established in Canada.

I encourage all members of the House to vote in favour of this bill because it will help every family in our country. There are people who expect this Parliament to take responsibility and pass this bill in order to help families in need in Canada.

• (1340)

[English]

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):** Madam Speaker, when the Liberals refused to move on their promise to lower the small business tax rate, I know a lot of small businesses owners across Canada felt a little betrayed. They really are the life blood of the Canadian economy.

Furthermore, we know that a lot of small business owners pay themselves quite a low salary just to make sure they can keep up with costs and so that their employees have an adequate standard of living.

Under the Liberals' tax measures, small business owners are not going to get the benefit of a small business tax rate reduction, but they are also going to miss out because they not pay themselves enough to qualify for the middle-income tax bracket.

I would like to hear the parliamentary secretary's response to those people who feel a double betrayal, those who work in small businesses and who were really hoping for a lot more.

**Mr. François-Philippe Champagne:** Madam Speaker, what we did is very simple. We went across Canada to talk to thousands of

Canadians about budget 2016. I went from Moncton to Yellowknife and met a number of small business owners. They told us to invest in the economy. That is what small business across this country wants, an economy that will work for the middle class. When it works for the middle class, it works for entire of this country. That is what small business wanted.

In addition, the first thing we did was to reduce taxes on the middle class, leaving more money in the pockets of people who can go to these small businesses and buy their goods and services. It is the same thing with the Canada child benefit. We put money in the pockets of Canadian families, so they can invest, save, and make sure their children will be better off.

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Madam Speaker, during the campaign, the Liberals were very clear that they would run a modest deficit of about \$10 billion. We know that has ballooned to well over \$30 billion. In the House, my colleague has asked the minister many times when the government will return to a balanced budget. The minister has not been able to answer, so I am wondering if the parliamentary secretary would answer the question of when Canadians can expect the current government to return our spending to a balanced budget.

• (1345)

**Mr. François-Philippe Champagne:** Madam Speaker, I am happy to respond to the member and to repeat that our priority is growth. It is about investing in Canadian families, because confident economies today invest in their people. That is exactly the choice we have made: to invest and grow our economy to generate inclusive growth that will benefit middle-class families across the nation.

The member well knows that our policies have not only been applauded in this country but also around the world. We have the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7 and G20 countries. That obviously allows us to invest in the economy, and that is what we are going to continue to do—

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

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I would remind members that when a member has the floor, he deserves the respect that other members get when they ask questions.

[Translation]

The hon. member for Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel.

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I have a rather simple question for my colleague.

The four parties at the Quebec National Assembly unanimously passed a resolution denouncing Bill C-29, since Quebec has consumer protection legislation. For example, in Quebec, an individual whose credit card has been stolen is liable for a maximum of \$50 only. However, this bill gives the bank full discretion to claim the full amount that was stolen. Quebec has been operating this way for 40 years now.

As a member from Quebec, how can my colleague steamroll the very clear will of the Government of Quebec, here in the House of Commons?

*Government Orders*

**Mr. François-Philippe Champagne:** Madam Speaker, I run into the member for Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel regularly. I thank him for his question.

The answer is as simple as his question. We are working in the interest of Canadian consumers across the country, including those from Quebec. In Marcotte, the Supreme Court asked us to clarify our position on consumer protection. We not only clarified it, but we also modernized and simplified the legislation for the sole purpose of looking out for Canadian consumers. That is what the Supreme Court asked us to do and that is exactly what we did with this legislation.

[English]

**Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP):** Madam Speaker, it was only 13 months ago when I attended an orientation session for new members of Parliament here in Ottawa. There was a cameo appearance by the Prime Minister, which was very much appreciated by all of us. During that cameo appearance, he said that the role of opposition is to make government better. I fail to see how bringing time limitations on debate works toward that objective of making government better. However, I will do my best in the time I have to make some suggestions on how we can make this a better bill.

I want to start with the tax break for the middle class. In my riding of Kootenay—Columbia, when I tell people about the tax break for the middle class, which goes from \$45,000 up to potentially \$190,000, frankly, my constituents shake their heads. We put forward an amendment to try to bring it down to from \$20,000 to \$45,000, which was defeated in this House. I can assure members that the middle-class salary in my riding of Kootenay—Columbia is not \$45,000 to \$190,000.

With respect to small businesses, I am holding a series of sessions around the riding, meetings with small businesses, and bringing together a representative of the provincial and municipal governments, along with myself representing the federal government, to talk to small businesses about how we can help them get ahead. Interestingly, members will not find too much congruity between what small businesses at a meeting in Fernie had on their list and what is in the current bill from our friends across the floor.

I will read from their list of how to help small businesses.

With respect to payroll taxes, businesses want a clearer understanding of how they are being used. With respect to the temporary foreign worker program, the program is cumbersome and needs fixing. The \$1,000 fee is too high, and there is no clear path to citizenship, so the turnover is high. They think there should be an increase in minimum wage. There is a need for subsidized affordable housing units. This is from small businesses.

Programs should be redesigned to be suitable for small businesses rather than just targeting medium-sized businesses and manufacturing. There is a real lack of support for small business programs. Youth employment programs should be expanded. A scientific development tax credit for sole proprietorships should be introduced, something which is not currently available. The digital technology adoption program should be redeveloped to include use by small businesses.

We need to recognize and rectify the reality of the digital divide in rural areas and small communities, which is a barrier to cloud-based systems, and redefine broadband to bring it to the level of modern requirements. Right now, the definition of “broadband” is too low in terms of speed.

Canada Post needs to reinstate more affordable shipping options, particularly for books. We have a book publisher in my riding. It can cost more to ship a book via Canada Post than the profit he makes on that book. Credit card fees are too high for small local businesses.

These are things coming right from small businesses, and, had they been included in this budget, it would have made it a much better budget for small businesses.

I want to turn now to helping people in real need. There are 15% of Canadian children who live in poverty. For aboriginal children, that number is 27%. In my home province of B.C., the rate of child poverty is even worse than the Canadian average, at 19.8%. The majority of these children have parents in paid work. If we think about that for a moment, one in every five children in British Columbia is living in poverty.

My colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot had a recommendation for Bill C-245 that would help fix some of that, by bringing in the office of the commissioner for poverty reduction and proposing a national council for the promotion of social inclusion and elimination of poverty.

Approximately 35,000 Canadians are homeless on any given night in the year, and one in five household is at risk of homelessness because they spend over 50% of their income to secure shelter. However, over the past 25 years, while the population of Canada has increased by 30%, national housing investment has decreased by 46%. We need a national housing strategy. I know the government has one on the books, but we need to see the details to know whether that will really help the groups that need it.

● (1350)

This morning I met with a group called Inclusion BC, and number one on their list is also affordable housing for people who are living with challenges. They want housing to be integrated so that people with challenges are part of a regular community and not set aside in special housing. Affordable housing for all Canadians is really important moving forward. We need to hear a little more about what is in the budget around that particular initiative.

As a former mayor, I can say how important having access to dollars for infrastructure is, particularly for smaller communities. I was mayor of a community of about 20,000 people. When we look at the current formula that was in place for many years, it was a one-third formula. The municipality had to come up with the first one-third, the provincial government the second one-third, and the federal government the third one-third. For small communities, coming up with that first one-third is a real challenge. I will give a quick example. In Cranbrook, if we wanted to raise \$1 million through property taxes, every 1% increase in property tax equalled \$200,000. To raise \$1 million to meet our one-third was a 5% increase in property taxes. One is not very popular as a mayor with a 5% increase in property taxes to cover one project.

*Statements by Members*

As the infrastructure project funding rolls out, we need to make sure that the federal government provides at least 50% of the infrastructure dollars and that the provinces continue to provide their 33 1/3%, reducing municipalities' input to a little over 16%.

Infrastructure funding needs to be long term, so that municipalities can plan. It should not just be one year at a time. We need to change the definition of infrastructure. Those of us who have worked for municipalities know that infrastructure is generally considered to be sewer, water, roads, and storm drains. We need to have dark fiber and high-speed Internet as a basic fundamental piece of infrastructure in all communities moving forward.

It is great to see some money in infrastructure, but how that money rolls out is important. In 2014, the Conservatives announced a multi-billion infrastructure program, and none of it made it to us in the municipalities that year, at least in rural areas. In the end, my Conservative colleague at the time, who was our member of Parliament, blamed the province for not getting on board and getting the money out. However, we need to make sure that the infrastructure dollars actually make it into communities.

I want to talk a bit about private sector involvement in infrastructure. We had one project in Cranbrook prior to when I became mayor, which was our recreational complex. It was a private-public partnership. That partnership went bad, and the city had to buy out the private partner. We ended up with about 15-year's worth of loans, locked in at 8% and higher, that we could not get out of, even though as a municipality we could borrow money at about 2% from a special fund in British Columbia. From Cranbrook's perspective, privatization of infrastructure does not work.

The thought of selling airports or bridges to reduce this \$30 billion to \$40-billion deficit is absolutely the wrong way to try to get a deficit under control. We do not sell assets in order to pay down debt.

Those are a few of the ways that the budget could be improved. There are some good things in the budget, but there are many ways to make it better. I hope that we can see a better future for poverty, for small businesses, and the way that infrastructure is handled in Canada, and, of course, in Kootenay—Columbia.

● (1355)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I suspect that the member across the way, as with many of the New Democratic members of Parliament, is having a difficult time with this piece of legislation, for the simple reason that it implements a good news budget that addresses many of the needs of Canada's middle class and those aspiring to be a part of it. It addresses the issue of poverty, whether it is poverty with seniors or with children, literally lifting thousands of Canadians out of poverty. This is all good news.

The member made reference to infrastructure. We have a record amount, billions of dollars going to Canada's infrastructure. Every region of this country is going to benefit by this budget in a profoundly positive way. Why does the member believe that the NDP members are going to be voting against what is likely to be the most progressive budget we have seen in decades?

**Mr. Wayne Stetski:** Madam Speaker, as with many things in life, of course, the devil is in the details. What we would have liked to have seen is a better budget, for example, indexing of the Canada child benefit rather than waiting for five years to increase it. As inflation goes up over the next five years, the value of that contribution will decrease, bringing more people back down into poverty.

On infrastructure, as I said, it will depend on how the money rolls out and whether the government makes it easy for municipalities to access the money. We have a start that will benefit some Canadians, but in the end there are a number of improvements that would have made this budget much better.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Before we go to statements by members, I want to remind the member that he will have about three minutes left for questions and comments when the debate continues.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

### YOUTH IN SACKVILLE—PRESTON—CHEZZETCOOK

**Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand today to speak about the youth in my riding of Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook.

Whether it be the inaugural meeting with the youth constituency council that we had last month, whether it be the visits I made to classrooms since the election, or whether it be my 30 years of experience in education, I can tell members that the young people of today are very engaged and involved and are contributing to our communities.

● (1400)

[*Translation*]

Today's youth are very keen to take part in important public debates. In conversations I have had with them, they have talked about increasing carbon pricing, investing in public transit, making post-secondary education more accessible, and the importance of investing in mental health.

[*English*]

I can tell members—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Markham—Unionville.

\* \* \*

### CHRISTMAS PARADES IN MARKHAM—UNIONVILLE

**Mr. Bob Saroya (Markham—Unionville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last week I attended two wonderful Christmas parades in my riding of Markham—Unionville.

Thousands of families with children lined the streets of Markham to greet the jolly old man himself, Santa Claus. The annual Markham Santa Claus Parade is organized every year by the Rotary Club of Markham. I want to thank Peter Still and his team for doing an outstanding job.

In Unionville, the Olde Tyme Christmas Parade is organized every year by the Unionville BIA. It is an uplifting parade lit by candle lights along beautiful Main Street in Unionville. I want to thank Judi McIntyre and her team of volunteers for, once again, organizing this parade.

May the true meaning of Christmas fill our hearts and homes with many blessings. I want to wish all my colleagues in this House and all Canadians from coast to coast to coast a Merry Christmas.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### OPERATION RED NOSE

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham (Laurentides—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Friday night, two members of my team and I volunteered for Operation Red Nose through the Maison des jeunes de Sainte-Adèle. Last week we did the same thing with the Maison des jeunes de Mont-Laurier. Next week we will help the Fondation de l'école du Méandre de Rivière-Rouge, and on December 23, we will volunteer with the Maison des jeunes de Mont-Tremblant.

I have been volunteering for Operation Red Nose for the past four years because I believe in the cause. Since 1984, all across the country, volunteers have been giving their time until the wee hours of the morning to help get people and their vehicles home safely during the festive season.

I am so proud to count my team members and myself among the 50,000 volunteers who help save lives thanks to this wonderful driving service.

I wish to commend the founders of Operation Red Nose and those who keep it rolling today.

\* \* \*

#### CÉCILE PELLERIN

**Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on November 30, I moved a motion to highlight the great work that is being done by Cécile Pellerin, who is from my riding of Jonquière.

This extraordinary woman is the founder of the Clowns Soleil association, and she has been promoting the benefits of laughter for many years. She visits hospitals two or three times a week to try to get people laughing.

I was honoured to welcome her to Ottawa last spring. She will be going to Paris in 2017 to promote her ideas and practices. Ms. Pellerin places such a high value on laughter because it is a well-known remedy for stress and anxiety.

I would like to commend Ms. Pellerin for her commitment. As she so rightly says, “your smile is the greatest gift of all.”

\* \* \*

#### LEN RIGG

**Mr. Joe Peschisolido (Steveston—Richmond East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Len Rigg of Richmond who was presented with the Legion of Honour, the highest decoration awarded by the French government, for his role in the liberation of France during the Second World War.

#### Statements by Members

[English]

Len Rigg was just 22 years of age when he joined the British Army's Corps of Royal Engineers. He landed on the beaches of Normandy on D-Day and fought his way through to Germany, where he marched in the victory parade through the streets of Berlin.

On December 13, Mr. Rigg will celebrate his 100th birthday and will officially receive this prestigious medal from the ambassador of France to Canada.

We thank Len for his bravery, service, and sacrifice for the cause of freedom and democracy.

We wish him a very happy 100th birthday.

\* \* \*

#### CHRISTMAS EVENTS IN KITCHENER—CONESTOGA

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Christmas is on the way.

This past weekend, I had the wonderful privilege of participating in three Christmas parades, in Elmira, Baden, and New Hamburg. Thousands of children, teens, parents, and grandparents lined the sidewalks as a parade made its way down the street. Shouts of “Merry Christmas” filled the air as children sat on their fathers' shoulders or huddled under blankets in little red wagons.

Before Christmas, I will have the fun of attending four more parades, in St. Agatha, St. Clements, New Dundee, and Wellesley.

This weekend, I also participated in the Christkindl market in Kitchener, the Lioness Club's Christmas tree lighting in New Hamburg, and the Christmas turkey and food hamper drive for the House of Friendship. Dozens of volunteers are finding the joy of giving at Christmas.

On Saturday, at a Christmas concert at Koinonia Christian Fellowship in Bloomingdale, we were reminded again that Christmas is the celebration of the birth of Jesus, the one who was promised hundreds of years earlier, bringing light and hope to our world; the one who would “be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace”.

Merry Christmas.

\* \* \*

● (1405)

#### UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA OKANAGAN

**Mr. Stephen Fuhr (Kelowna—Lake Country, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Kelowna—Lake Country is home to a dynamic local and regional economy supported by world-class tourism, tech, aerospace, agriculture, and academia.

This past week, the Government of Canada invested in our community's university and its new teaching and learning centre. This new facility at the University of British Columbia Okanagan will enhance the student learning experience as well as enable innovative research and partnerships with industry.

*Statements by Members*

UBC is one of North America's largest public research and teaching institutions and one of only two Canadian institutions consistently ranked among the world's 40 best universities.

The Okanagan campus is earning a reputation as an important and respected centre of learning and research.

On behalf of the constituents of Kelowna—Lake Country, I would like to thank the Government of Canada for its support and confidence in our fine post-secondary institution, the University of British Columbia Okanagan.

\* \* \*

**EPHRAIM'S PLACE**

**Mr. Michael Levitt (York Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight an organization at the heart of the York Centre community, Ephraim's Place.

Named in memory of 11-year-old Ephraim Brown, who was tragically caught in the crossfire of a gang shooting and killed in 2007, Ephraim's Place community centre was started seven years ago to provide programs and services for children, youth, and families to give them the tools they need for a successful future.

Through programs like role model moms, which equips single mothers with the knowledge, confidence, and skills to attain their high school equivalency, Ephraim's Place helps families find and fulfill their potential.

Through the leadership and hard work of Bill Sunberg, Kevin Motiram, Donna Fancy-Lyle, and all the volunteers and their dedication to accessibility, collaboration, and a recognition of diversity, Ephraim's Place goes above and beyond in helping to make York Centre a safer, happier, and more peaceful place to live.

\* \* \*

**BURMA**

**Mr. Garnett Genus (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada needs to be a leader when it comes to promoting universal human rights around the world. We have an opportunity to share our domestic experience of human rights and to give voice to those who are voiceless.

*The Wall Street Journal* reported last week that Burma is edging toward ethnic cleansing in its treatment of Muslim Rohingya people. *The New York Times* reports villages being burned to the ground, allegations of the slaughter of children by the military, the denial of access to aid workers, and thousands of people fleeing to Bangladesh.

Despite praise heaped on Aung San Suu Kyi over the years, the treatment of the Muslim Rohingya has continued to get worse under her government. In recent weeks alone, hundreds of Rohingya people have been killed and tens of thousands displaced.

Successive Canadian governments have provided significant development assistance to Burma, and we have a moral obligation to use our position to respond to this crisis. It is time the government sounded the alarm and spoke out clearly and forcefully about this troubling and worsening situation.

**CENTRAL YORK FIRE SERVICES**

**Mr. Kyle Peterson (Newmarket—Aurora, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to pay tribute to some of the outstanding members of Central York Fire Services in Newmarket—Aurora.

On November 3, I was pleased to attend the annual recognition ceremony where firefighters were honoured for their service. I was particularly pleased to present the federal exemplary and long service medals and bars to Tom Hunter, Jason Shepstone, Jonathan Healy, Mike Jacques, Bill Lorimer, Kevin Saunders, Kevin Saxton, Les Chaisson, Rick Roycastle, Jim Allen, and Jim Davis, and the 40-year federal and provincial long service bar to Chief Ian Laing.

Unfortunately, the night did have a sombre tone as Gregg Tremblay, a firefighter with over 30 years of service, suddenly passed away the day before the ceremony. His medal was presented to Jim Allen, a lifelong friend.

Congratulations to all for their dedication.

I would like to thank all the men and women of Central York Fire Services and all first responders in Newmarket—Aurora and across Canada for their service to all of us.

\* \* \*

**ISLAMOPHOBIA**

**Mr. Frank Baylis (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I will be presenting a petition that condemns Islamophobia. In a powerful statement of support, this petition has garnered the most signatures in the history of e-petitions in Canada. Though I stand as a Liberal, this petition was supported across party lines.

I am proud to say that a motion condemning Islamophobia, based on this petition, was passed in the House of Commons with unanimous consent. I thank my colleagues across the aisle for their enduring commitment to the Canadian ideal of religious freedom. At times like these, we are a House united, stronger for our differences.

Let it be known that, while the clouds of hatred and intolerance darken parts of our world, here in Canada the light shines bright. In our country we value diversity. We, as a people, stand together to condemn all forms of religious discrimination.

\* \* \*

● (1410)

**HMCS VILLE DE QUEBEC**

**Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the honour of joining Commodore Baines, Commander LaFrance, and the men and women of the Royal Canadian Navy aboard the *HMCS Ville de Québec* on a voyage from Halifax to Boston.

It was an incredible experience for a prairie girl, not only to be at sea but to see our officers and sailors in action. The professionalism that each member of the crew displayed is a credit to both their character and their training.



*Oral Questions*

I would like to thank the members of the RCN for this tremendous opportunity, and for the work they do each and every day on behalf of all Canadians.

If members have not already done so, say yes to the Royal Canadian Navy the next time its members offer parliamentarians the opportunity to join them on a voyage.

To the crew of the *HMCS Ville de Québec*, Godspeed on their journey home.

\* \* \*

**ISLAMOPHOBIA**

**Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am a young, brown, Muslim, Canadian woman. When I moved to Canada in the 1990s, a young girl trying to make this nation my home, some kids in school would yell as they pushed me, “Go home, you Muslim”, but I was home. I am among thousands of Muslims who have been victimized because of hate and fear.

I am a proud Canadian among hundreds and thousands of others who will not tolerate hate based on religion or skin colour. I rise today with my fellow Canadians to reject and condemn Islamophobia.

On this historic day when petition e-411 is tabled, I am honoured to bring forward motion 103 calling on our government to condemn Islamophobia and work toward eliminating all forms of systemic racism and religious discrimination.

I look forward to the support of all members of this House. We are all Canadian.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**ELECTRIFICATION OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, global warming is a fact, and it is time to require elected representatives from all levels of government to take real action on speeding up the electrification of transportation.

Longueuil is already part of the solution. The smart and sustainable transportation technology hub “IVÉO” is our entrepreneurs’ answer to this industrial revolution. This is something we can be proud of. The greater Longueuil community is a leader in Quebec with TM4 motors, Blue Solutions batteries and the spectacular SORA electric motorcycle.

As citizens, we must demand from all our elected officials an unwavering commitment within a coalition to make our region a champion. At a time when 37% of its young people are living under the poverty line, Longueuil badly needs the long-term jobs that will come with such a system of innovation.

It is with the people’s enthusiasm and support that I pledge to do everything in my power as an MP to build this coalition of elected officials so we can all work together tirelessly to bring these major forward-looking projects to our region.

[*English*]

**ISRAEL**

**Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, most Canadians recognize that, at its extremist core, the boycott, divest, and sanctions movement seeks to eliminate Israel by destroying its economy. That is why, in August, Canadian Jewish community groups were supported by citizens across the religious spectrum in condemning a Green Party resolution to embed BDS as official party policy.

This weekend, the Green Party passed a rewritten so-called compromise resolution that is in fact its most anti-Israel position yet. The Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs, CIJA, said that the resolution confirms that the Green Party has been co-opted by extreme activists who, in an obsessive campaign of prejudice against Israelis, threaten the party’s own credibility and relevance in Canadian politics.

Earlier this year, by a large majority, the House formally condemned the demonization of the state of Israel. I hope MPs will reaffirm that powerful statement today.

\* \* \*

**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

**Mr. Majid Jowhari (Richmond Hill, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, November 25 was the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women. To raise awareness on this issue, our Minister of Status of Women initiated the 16 days of activism against gender-based violence campaign, 2016.

Through this initiative, the minister is inviting Canadians to think about the link between casual sexism and gender-based violence.

To partake in the conversation, I must recognize Yellow Brick House, a not-for-profit charitable organization in Richmond Hill, which has been working with abused women and children in York Region for over 38 years. Last year alone, it assisted more than 5,500 women and children suffering from violence and abuse.

The hashtag for this 16-day period is #actionsmatter.

I attest today in this House that the actions of Yellow Brick House matter for changing lives in my riding of Richmond Hill.

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

●(1415)

[*English*]

**EMPLOYMENT**

**Hon. Rona Ambrose (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has now lost 30,500 full-time jobs since the Prime Minister took office, and it is about to get a lot worse. While the Prime Minister continues to hike taxes and drive up the cost of doing business in Canada, the U.S. is going in the other direction. It is committed to cutting corporate taxes in half and lowering the price of energy.

*Oral Questions*

How many more Canadian jobs need to be lost before the Prime Minister wakes up to this new reality?

**Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, since we formed government, along with industry we have helped create 183,200 jobs from coast to coast to coast. For example, GM Canada is investing in up to 1,000 new engineering and high-tech software positions. Do members know what the GM executive VP of global product development said? He said, “We selected Canada for this expansion because of its clear capacity for innovation, proven talent and strong ecosystem of great universities, startups and innovative suppliers”.

That is why companies are investing in Canada.

\* \* \*

**TAXATION**

**Hon. Rona Ambrose (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development knows full well that the measure that people look at is the number of full-time jobs created. We have lost 30,500 full-time jobs, and the government, the parliamentary secretary, and the Prime Minister have not created one additional full-time job since coming into office.

Now we hear he also wants to tax the health and dental benefits provided by employers, which will mean working Canadians will have to pay even more income tax. Can the Prime Minister now promise in the House that he is not going to tax the health and dental benefits that 13.5 million Canadians rely on?

**Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are making Canada's tax system fairer and more progressive. We have raised taxes on the top 1% so that we could cut taxes for the middle class, and beyond that, we introduced the Canada child benefit, which will mean that the average family will receive \$2,300 more tax free. That will raise 300,000 Canadian kids out of poverty.

We, as a government, are acting to make Canada's system fairer and more progressive and to help Canada's middle class and those working so hard to join it.

**Hon. Rona Ambrose (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, they are working so hard, that is for sure.

[*Translation*]

In the most recent budget, the Liberals cut tax breaks for small businesses and for families. Afterward, they announced Canada Pension Plan increases and the introduction of a carbon tax, which will cost families thousands of dollars each year. Now they want to tax drug and dental plans.

Can the Prime Minister tell Canadians what he intends to tax more to pay for his out-of-control spending?

**Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government has made significant changes to make our tax system more progressive for the middle class. We are going to keep making important decisions to improve conditions for the middle class.

[*English*]

We are doing that because we understand that we cannot have a strong economy without a strong middle class. The previous government did not get that. For 10 years, Canada's middle class fell behind. We are standing with them to build an economy that grows.

\* \* \*

**ETHICS**

**Hon. Rona Ambrose (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the more we learn about the Prime Minister's cash for access fundraising practices, the worse it gets. We were all shocked when the Prime Minister first confessed that he was discussing business at these fundraisers. That is not only unethical, it is illegal. The Prime Minister discussed various issues at his events with Chinese billionaires, including changing Canadian investment rules to directly benefit them.

The Prime Minister's job is to defend Canadians' interests, not to put them up for sale. When is he going to realize that this wrong?

• (1420)

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I have said in the House many times, when it comes to fundraising, Canada has some of the most strict rules. Even the Chief Electoral Officer stated that Canada's political financing laws are the most advanced and constrained and transparent in the world.

This government has undertaken unprecedented levels of consultation with Canadians. We will continue to engage with Canadians to do the good work they expect us to do.

**Hon. Rona Ambrose (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we may have some of the strictest fundraising rules in Canada, but the Prime Minister is breaking them every time he holds one of these events when he is talking about government business. He is actually selling access to himself, the most powerful person in government. Discussing government business to fill Liberal Party coffers is wrong, it is unethical, and it is actually illegal.

When will the Prime Minister come to his senses and end this cash for access fundraising?

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pretty sure that the member opposite is not implying that the Prime Minister would be breaking the law, and if the member is saying it, there is a better place, which would be outside this chamber, to make such an accusation.

When it comes to the fundraising rules—

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

*Oral Questions***JUSTICE**

**The Speaker:** Order. I know the members have very strong feelings on some subjects in question period, but we know that each side gets its turn. I would ask members to listen to the answer from the hon. government House leader, who has a few more seconds.

Order. I would ask the members for Grande Prairie—Mackenzie and Chilliwack—Hope to include themselves in the listening process.

The hon. government House leader.

**Hon. Bardish Chagger:** Mr. Speaker, the member knows very well that when it comes to fundraising, we have some of the most strict rules across this country.

This government will continue to follow the laws so that we can continue to do the good work we are doing for Canadians.

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, let me read a statement dated November 24, just two weeks ago, from the minister for fishy fundraisers:

...at events like this, government business is not discussed

He was talking about a cash for access event involving the Prime Minister. We are now told that the Prime Minister did indeed discuss government business. How do we know this? It is because the host of the fundraiser himself said it was discussed.

Does the minister wish to correct the record with regard to his November 24 statement, which we now know to be false?

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member knows very well that when it comes to fundraising, we have some of the most strict laws across this country. Even the Chief Electoral Officer has said that they are the most advanced, constrained, and transparent in the world.

This government will continue to follow the laws, and we will continue to do the good work Canadians expect us to do.

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I guess he does not wish to correct those false statements. That is reassuring.

[*Translation*]

We have a government that makes the rules and then cheerfully breaks them, that claims to set new standards and then justifies its actions on the grounds that it did not technically do anything wrong, and that tells Parliament that attendees at these exclusive dinners do not discuss government business.

By accusing the event host of lying, is the minister signalling plans to investigate? Or did someone else lie?

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I have told the House several times, we have the strictest fundraising rules in the country. The Chief Electoral Officer also states that Canadian election financing laws are the most advanced, constrained, and transparent in the world.

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the minister just forgot to say that following those rules is important too.

Quite a few Canadians were under the impression that the advent of a Liberal government meant an end to criminal records for simple possession of marijuana. The Liberals have been in power for over a year now, and they are still handing out criminal records by the thousand, especially to young people. The Prime Minister just urged the police to continue enforcing these archaic laws.

This is causing young Canadians a lot of problems, so why does the government not put an end to that by decriminalizing marijuana right away?

• (1425)

[*English*]

**Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, to reiterate, our government is committed to legalization, strict regulation, and restricting access to marijuana to keep it out of the hands of children and the profits out of the hands of criminals. As the member opposite actually once said, it would be a mistake to simply decriminalize.

We are entering into, and are going to undertake, a comprehensive review, taking recommendations from the task force in order to introduce legislation in the spring of 2017.

**Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister led many Canadians to believe that under a Liberal government, the recreational use of marijuana would no longer be a crime.

He used to say very clearly that the current war on marijuana is not working. Well, a year after forming government, he has not only refused to decriminalize possession but he is now urging police to enforce all marijuana laws. He is urging police to crack down on recreational users.

How did the guy who once thought the war on pot was not working become its most enthusiastic general?

**Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak again about our commitment to legalize marijuana with strict access and strict regulation.

I am looking forward to receiving the report from the task force, which will contain recommendations about how we can move forward on this, understanding that it is our government that will decide.

The ultimate objective of legalization of marijuana, restricting access via regulations, is to keep it out of the hands of children and the profits out of the hands of criminals.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**THE ECONOMY**

**Hon. Denis Lebel (Lac-Saint-Jean, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the only plan that seems to work for the Liberals is the marijuana plant. The economic plan certainly is not working.

*Oral Questions*

Canada has lost 30,000 jobs. The Liberals will tell us over and over again that they lowered taxes. What they have done is create future debt, promise money that they do not have, and create illusions. The United States wants to lower corporate taxes.

When are the Liberals going to wake up and realize that their plan is not working?

**Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be part of a strong team that includes about 40 members from across Quebec who are working hard for their constituents.

Let us talk about action our government is taking in Quebec. We invested over \$290 million in CED, and we are helping over 384 businesses and organizations grow through CED. Our government is committed to promoting innovation, fostering the growth of businesses, and developing a clean economy that benefits everyone.

\* \* \*

**SOFTWOOD LUMBER**

**Hon. Denis Lebel (Lac-Saint-Jean, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, he should say that to the people in Quebec's regions who keep contacting our offices because they do not know who to talk to in the government, now that there is no longer a Quebec lieutenant or a minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec.

Let us come back to softwood lumber. Again last week, it was confirmed that in 2006, it was thanks to the leadership of former prime minister Harper that the matter was resolved. It was our American partners who said that.

We are not seeing that leadership now. In fact, this issue was not even mentioned in the mandate letter of the Minister of International Trade. There is not a peep about it, but it is important to us.

Will they be able to resolve the issue?

**Mr. David Lametti (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would remind the hon. member that the softwood lumber agreement expired under the former government and that the latter did nothing to reopen negotiations with our American partners.

Canada is prepared for any eventuality and we will vigorously defend the interests of Canadian workers and producers. In the past, the courts have always ruled in our favour and we are convinced that they will continue to do so.

The minister continued negotiating with Ambassador Froman on the weekend and we are looking for a good agreement for Canada.

\* \* \*

[English]

**TAXATION**

**Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are at it again. Apparently they do not think Canadians are paying enough taxes. Now they are introducing a health care tax.

News reports have revealed that the Liberals are now looking to raise \$2.9 billion by taxing Canadians' health care and dental plans. Do the Liberals not have any shame? They are now forcing

Canadians to pay more for dental care and essential health care services.

When will the Liberals stop attacking hardworking Canadian families and stop charging them more for essential health and dental care?

**Mr. François-Philippe Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me remind the member that the first thing this government did was to reduce taxes on the middle class, and the people on the other side voted against it.

Finance Canada is in the process of reviewing our tax system as a whole, specifically a tax expenditure to ensure tax fairness for the middle class and simplification of the tax code.

We are not looking at any tax expenditure measures in isolation. We are looking at the tax system as a whole to ensure fairness, simplicity, and efficiency across the board. No decision has been made, since we are still very much in the midst of the process and are still consulting Canadians.

• (1430)

**Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there is not a tax the Liberals do not like. What do they not understand? Taxing 13.5 million Canadians on their health benefits is yet another financial burden.

The Liberals are attacking hardworking Canadian families. First, they took away the children's fitness tax credit, then they took the children's art tax credit, then the text book tax credit, and now they want to charge Canadian families and seniors another tax.

The Liberals continue to exploit the middle class to solve their own financial problems. When will the Liberals stop attacking hardworking Canadians and stop their plans for this new health care tax?

**Mr. François-Philippe Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member knows very well that the only government that stood up for the middle class is this government. The people on the other side voted against every measure we presented to defend the middle class in our country. They voted against cutting taxes for the middle class. They voted against the Canada child benefit. They voted against the CPP enhancement in this country. They voted against the GIS top-up for seniors. They voted against our measures for students in this country.

Canadians know who is working for them. It is the government on this side of the House.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are well aware that, if any government is known for creating new taxes, it is the Liberal government.

This government dreamed up the Liberal carbon tax and the new Canada pension plan payroll taxes, and now it is inventing a new tax on health and dental benefits. That is completely unacceptable.

Can someone in this government rise and clearly tell Canadians that there will not be a tax on health and dental benefits?

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. François-Philippe Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we are not dreaming, we are taking action. Canadians across the country know that. Why? It is because we reduced taxes for 9 million Canadians. We are doing tangible things to help Canadians.

We introduced the Canada child benefit, which helps nine out of ten families. We have improved the lives of Canada's seniors, first nations, and youth. Canadians know that the people on this side of the House are working for the middle class.

**Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians have heard this government loud and clear. It refuses to say whether or not it plans to tax health and dental benefits. Some 13.5 million Canadians will be affected by this bad Liberal measure. The Liberals are about to take another \$3 billion out of the pockets of Canadian taxpayers.

Once again, I ask the government, is there anyone in this House who can stand up and tell us clearly whether or not there will be a Liberal tax on these two things that will directly affect 13 million Canadians?

**Mr. François-Philippe Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I just said a moment ago, we are in the process of reviewing the Income Tax Act in its entirety, to make it more acceptable from a fiscal standpoint and ensure fairness for all Canadians.

My colleague even mentioned the millions of Canadians we have helped. I would remind the member that he voted against a measure that helped 9 million Canadians when we lowered taxes for the middle class. He voted against the Canada child benefit, which will help nine out of ten families. He voted against measures that we introduced to support students in this country. He voted against measures for seniors. Canadians know that the only—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie.

\* \* \*

**DEMOCRATIC REFORM**

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, if I were not laughing, I would be crying. The Minister of Democratic Institutions' new online questionnaire is extremely ridiculous and biased. This tool is so crude that nobody could possibly take it seriously.

The Liberals managed to come up with a questionnaire on electoral reform that does not even mention the voting system. They ignored the issue. When they talk about diversity in Parliament, they try to scare people by playing up imaginary radical and extremist parties.

Will the minister stand up and finally admit that the Liberals are not serious about this and will not change anything?

[English]

**Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise on this traditional Algonquin territory to talk about a new initiative we launched this morning. MyDemocracy.ca is a new, engaging initiative that will allow all Canadians to have an opportunity to have a say in this conversation. As of just a few hours ago, over

8,000 unique users have participated in this conversation about the values they find most dear to them. We look forward to hearing from many more over the course of this month.

• (1435)

**Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, there are 20,000 tweets mocking this minister's survey. The first rule of engagement the Liberals should learn is not to treat Canadians like they are stupid.

Last week, the Minister of Democratic Institutions insulted our committee and the thousands of Canadians who participated with us in this process, because we were not specific enough for her. Yet today we see a pop-psych survey from this minister, and there is no mention of electoral systems whatsoever. Almost 90% of everyone who spoke to the committee recommended a proportional voting system. Yet the minister cannot even bring herself to put the word "proportional" in her survey.

If the minister truly wants a clearer answer, why would she not simply ask the obvious questions?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his hard work on the special committee on electoral reform.

Research around the world shows, as does the report from the committee, that the best way to have an inclusive and accessible conversation about electoral reform with the citizenry is through a values-based approach.

Should there be more diversity in this House? Should there be smaller parties representing a diverse range of voices, or should we have larger parties representing a broad set of perspectives? Should voting be mandatory and online? These are the questions—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston.

**Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, being on MyDemocracy.ca does not feel like a values-based approach. It feels like being on a dating website designed by Fidel Castro. No matter how hard one tries to be against the Prime Minister's preferred electoral system, the survey tells people that they really do support it. It is like magic.

With this website, the government has finally found a way to resolve the problem of Canadians continuing to give Liberals the answers they do not want. Just do not ask those questions. For example, the questionnaire does not ask whether Canadians want a referendum. I wonder why that might be. Would it be because the Liberals do not want to know the answer to that particular question?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I imagine the hon. member has taken the survey. I encourage all Canadians to participate in the survey. I thank all members of the House who have been participating and who have been sharing it on social media.

### Oral Questions

An issue as important as electoral reform deserves to include all Canadians from all walks of life. That is why Canadians cannot only fill the questionnaire out online, but for those in rural and remote regions, for seniors, and for those who are not comfortable online, they are invited to take part by using the telephone.

[Translation]

**Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on October 19 in the House, someone said:

What we did was form a committee that is going to make thoughtful, responsible recommendations, and we are going to pay very close attention to what comes out of the work done by that committee...

Who said that? The Prime Minister himself. The experts, the people, and the committee, which was very clear in its report, agree: if the government wishes to change the voting system, it must hold a referendum.

When will the minister get it? Will she hold a referendum on the voting system, or will she just do as she herself sees fit?

[English]

**Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his hard work on the Special Committee on Electoral Reform. The committee tabled the report in the House on December 1. We are going to reflect on the report, and the government will respond.

However, we all agree in the House that not enough Canadians are engaged in this conversation. There is an opportunity here for every Canadian. Fifteen million households have received an invitation in the mail asking them to be part of this historic conversation. We are counting on all members of the House to encourage their constituents to take part.

\* \* \*

### ETHICS

**Mr. Alexander Nuttall (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last week, the justice minister denied there had been a leak of the marijuana report to Liberal friends, but after Rosy Mondin, a Liberal cannabis crony, donated the maximum allowed by law, she tweeted, “Task-force report being presented to gov’t today. Report won’t be made public (yet) but hope to hear snippets”.

Is the Liberal Party selling insider information to people willing to pay cash for access?

• (1440)

**Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise again to answer these allegations. To be clear, I have not seen the task force report. I will receive the task force report in the middle of December, along with my ministerial colleagues, along with every member of the House, along with the public. We will then review those recommendations and the government will put forward its legislation with respect to the legalization of marijuana.

**Mr. Alexander Nuttall (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the justice minister claimed her marijuana report had not been leaked, but two hours later, details of the leaked report were already appearing in the media. Both the *National Post* and *The Globe and Mail* quoted “sources familiar with the report”.

The report has been leaked. Is the minister in on the deal or just incompetent?

**Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again, this gives me an opportunity to rise to recognize that the task force submitted the report on November 30. That report is being translated. I have not seen the report, nor has anyone else among my ministerial colleagues. The report will be presented in the middle of December.

I am very thankful for the work of the task force which, in a concentrated manner, over the course of over six months, has put together the report that will provide recommendations that will assist us in moving forward with legislation.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### YOUTH

**Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in 2015, the Prime Minister said he wanted to create good jobs for young people, but in 2016, he is siding with his Minister of Finance, who said that young people will have to get used to job churn. In 2015, he told young people that the Kinder Morgan environmental assessment process needed to be reviewed, but in 2016, he approved the pipeline with Mr. Harper's dismantled environmental assessment process.

Then the Prime Minister is surprised to see young people protesting in Toronto or Ottawa. Instead of being so condescending, when will the Minister of Youth listen to young people and keep his own promises?

[English]

**Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, by approving these pipelines, Canada took a step forward in supporting thousands of good, middle-class, good-paying jobs. Unlike the previous government, which failed to get any real action over the past decade, we are protecting oceans and we are pricing carbon pollution, all while finding new markets for our resources. The party opposite has taken almost every possible position, indeed in both official languages, on pipelines.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### PUBLIC SAFETY

**Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the problem is the Prime Minister's arrogance toward protesters.

Let us talk about that arrogance. Last week, the Minister of Natural Resources suggested that the government would call in the armed forces and the police to deal with people protesting the Kinder Morgan pipeline. What a thing to say.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

This statement is clearly a threat against the right to peaceful protest guaranteed by the charter, and specifically against first nations activists. This comes after we have learned that the RCMP has previously spied on indigenous activists.

Will the minister apologize and reassure this House that the government will protect the right to peaceful protest?

**Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the right to peaceful protest is a foundation of our rights and freedoms in Canada. As a government, we respect that right. We confirmed that in our election platform.

As the Prime Minister has said, we would not have approved these projects if they did not meet the highest standards of environmental protection and did not carry the support of Canadians. Our goal right now is to make sure that the projects move forward in order to create jobs and build a cleaner, brighter future for Canadians.

\* \* \*

**DEMOCRATIC REFORM**

**Mr. Shaun Chen (Scarborough North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in October I had the pleasure of engaging with constituents in my riding of Scarborough North on the topic of electoral reform, building on the work of MPs who led town halls, the cross-country tour of the minister and her parliamentary secretary, and the work of the Special Committee on Electoral Reform.

Can the Minister of Democratic Institutions please inform this House on the way forward for our national conversation on electoral reform?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague from Scarborough North for all his hard work and for hosting a conversation with his constituents, as well as all of the members of this House who did the same.

Today we launched MyDemocracy.ca. It will empower all Canadians to take part in a values-based conversation about their democracy, about the way they would like to be governed. The online engagement tool will complement the work of MPs, like the hon. member, as well as the members of the special committee. We encourage all Canadians to spend time this December taking part in the survey.

\* \* \*

●(1445)

**ETHICS**

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we know the Prime Minister does not care one iota about his own ethical guidelines. They are a prop for him and a joke. Everyone knows that. The Prime Minister openly and blatantly takes donations for the Liberals and in return does favours for wealthy individuals so that they can make more money. Everybody gets some grease and the Liberal gravy train rolls on. What will it take for the Prime Minister to have any respect for any laws in this country that may

curb his out-of-control behaviour—a knock on the door from the Ethics Commissioner or maybe the RCMP?

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise in this House and to remind members that when it comes to fundraising, we have some of the strictest rules across the country. This government will continue to follow the rules. When we work with the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, and we follow the rules, no conflict of interest can exist. The member knows that very well. What is clear is that the methods the previous government took and the ones that we are taking are very different because we follow the rules.

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, they are very different. There was no Prime Minister Harper talking business to Chinese communists at Conservative fundraisers.

The Prime Minister today may already be breaching sections 17 and 16, which the House leader may want to familiarize herself with, of the Conflict of Interest Act. The host of this fundraiser said that he did discuss government business with the Prime Minister and he told the Prime Minister what he wanted. Again, is the Prime Minister waiting for the RCMP to come knocking on his door before he stops this unethical behaviour?

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate once again the opportunity to rise in the House and to remind all members of Parliament and Canadians that when it comes to fundraising, we have some of the most strict rules. Even the Chief Electoral Officer said this to Canadians when he stated very clearly that when it comes to fundraising, they are the most strict, “constrained and transparent” in the world.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, an attendee of the Liberal Party fundraiser on November 7 said that he spoke directly to the Prime Minister about government business for the price of a \$1,500 contribution. However, Liberal Party ethics rules state that “Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries and their staff should not discuss departmental business at any fundraising event, and should refer any person who wishes to discuss departmental business to make an appointment”.

Can the Prime Minister confirm that he never discussed government business during that fundraiser?

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is working very hard for Canadians. We have undertaken an unprecedented level of public consultation in order to respond to the real challenges Canadians are facing. As the hon. member knows, when it comes to fundraising we have some of the strictest rules in Canada. Our party is following the rules.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Chinese Anbang Insurance Group is trying to buy up the biggest retirement home chain in B.C. This deal will have to be approved by the Prime Minister and the cabinet. The Prime Minister has been caught being lobbied to approve this type of deal at, guess what, \$1,500 cash for access fundraisers attended by wealthy Chinese investors.

The Prime Minister can no longer stand behind his tired rhetoric of following the rules, when it is clear to everyone that every rule has been broken. When will the Prime Minister start following the rules?

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister always follows the rules and the member knows very well when it comes to fundraising, we have some of the most strict rules across the country. The member knows very well that the rules clearly state that only Canadians can donate to a Canadian political party.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, this week marks the sixth anniversary of the unanimous vote in the House of Commons in favour of a nuclear weapons convention. Unfortunately, a few weeks ago, the Liberal government changed its position and voted against negotiations for such a convention.

The United Nations is soon going to vote on this issue again. Will the Liberal government work with the international community and vote in favour of negotiations for a nuclear weapons convention?

•(1450)

*[English]*

**Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our goal is to convince those countries that have nuclear weapons to be at the table as part of disarmament discussions. We did that when we recently led a UN resolution supported by 177 states. Our resolution has a goal to stop the production of materials used to make nuclear weapons and rally nuclear and non-nuclear states alike toward the realization of a fissile material cut-off treaty. This is the realistic, pragmatic approach to nuclear disarmament and a major accomplishment.

\* \* \*

**DEMOCRATIC REFORM**

**Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the government recently put into legislation Bill C-33, which the Minister of Democratic Institutions said would break down barriers to voting. This is extremely important, but the legislation left out important aspects for people living with disabilities. They still face significant barriers when it comes to participating in elections, including access to qualified assistance during the act of voting itself.

Will the minister keep her word to people living with disabilities and commit to addressing these issues?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for the opportunity to talk about Bill C-33, but also about the passion I have for making sure that more persons with disabilities and exceptionalities have an opportunity to participate in their democratic processes. The Chief Electoral Officer in his report following the 2015 election made excellent recommendations. I met with his advisory body on persons with disabilities with our own Minister of Sport and Persons with Disabilities and I connected with advocates across the country. I am committed to making sure that we address this and I look forward to working with the committee members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs to address this too.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT**

**Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last week, the Minister of Public Services and Procurement indicated that she did not intend to provide Canadians with the financial details of the contract to purchase Super Hornet fighter jets. She said that she wanted to talk to Boeing and the American government about it first.

The minister suggested that her government has not yet entered into discussions with Boeing, which is rather unbelievable. What is worse, Canadians are being treated like a second-class third party in this transaction, even though the minister is accountable to Canadians and Canadians only.

When will she rectify this situation and tell Canadians the unit price of the Super Hornets?

*[English]*

**Hon. Judy Foote (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are going to do what is in the best interests of Canadians from coast to coast to coast. We are going to have an interim fleet that is going to make sure that our men and women have the equipment they need to do the job expected of them so that we can fill the capability gap.

When we are in position to talk about the cost, we will do that. We have an idea what the cost is going to be but nobody shows their hand before negotiations actually are completed.

**Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the procurement minister should talk to the Royal Canadian Air Force before she talks to Boeing.

The Liberal government has relentlessly undermined our military leadership. This weekend, the procurement minister continued to contradict the commander of the Royal Canadian Air Force. She attacked General Hood and torqued up the Liberals' rhetoric on the fake capability gap. As a matter of fact, reports and experts agree that a capability gap would only occur if the Liberals try to extend the life of our CF-18s past 2025.



Instead of playing politics, why will the procurement minister not listen to the Royal Canadian Air Force? It is the expert.

**Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do talk to my chief military adviser General Vance. I do talk to the air force as well.

Our government has commitments to NORAD and to NATO and to satisfy these commitments we cannot do this simultaneously. That is the capability gap that we talk about.

The previous government knew about this gap but it never told Canadians about it and it did nothing about it. This is something we intend to fix.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I will give the Minister of National Defence a hand and set out the facts.

On April 14, 2016, General Hood said that the air force had enough CF-18s to carry out its duties until 2025. On November 15, 2016, Chief of Defence Staff General Vance said that the supposed capability gap was a false deduction.

However, that was before the Liberals changed the rules five minutes before confirming the acquisition of the outdated Super Hornets and withdrew a report that contradicted their rationale. That is an outrage.

When will the Liberals stop hiding the truth from Canadians?

• (1455)

[English]

**Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the truth here. The NORAD commitments and the NATO commitments were commitments made as a nation and every government that comes into power is obligated to meet those expectations.

We are not willing to risk manage the gap. We are not willing to risk manage both our NORAD and NATO commitments simultaneously. We are going to make sure that we have aircraft available for any unforeseen situations. If anybody thinks we cannot have any unforeseen situations, 9/11 was that time. We are going to make sure we fix this gap.

\* \* \*

#### INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mrs. Alaina Lockhart (Fundy Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with the House that last Friday I had the pleasure of announcing over \$13 million for the Fundy Trail connector roads, a transformational tourism project in my riding, which I have been championing since being elected.

Could the Minister of Infrastructure and Communities please explain why projects like the Fundy Trail are so important to New Brunswick and to Atlantic Canada?

**Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Fundy Royal for her ongoing efforts on this project.

#### Oral Questions

Our government is proud to support projects that connect communities, promote tourism, and support economic growth. Along with this project, we also announced 47 water projects and five transit projects in New Brunswick.

We will continue to work with communities from coast to coast to coast to ensure that our new infrastructure meets their needs.

\* \* \*

#### JUSTICE

**Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Wynn's law would require prosecutors to disclose the criminal history of bail applicants, closing a loophole that cost Constable David Wynn his life. The Minister of Justice opposes this common sense legislation.

Will the minister tell Shelley Wynn, the widow of Constable Wynn, why she thinks it is okay for individuals to be let out on bail without their criminal history being disclosed? Why is the minister opposed to closing the loophole that cost Constable Wynn his life?

**Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly recognize the tragic circumstances with respect to Constable Wynn, and sympathies go out to the family.

In terms of what we are doing, we are doing a review of the criminal justice system. We are working in a comprehensive and concerted way with the provinces and territories. I am familiar with the private member's bill, but by having discussions with the provinces and territories, we are proceeding in a way that recognizes that we need to work and coordinate together. That is what we are committed to doing. The measures that are articulated in this bill are measures that are in place at this time.

\* \* \*

#### INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General exposed that the government spent nearly \$1 billion on its border programs, with no known results. Meanwhile, at the Blue Water Bridge, the government will not even come to the table after creating the first significant labour dispute in nearly 80 years of operation. Now, it is even hiring scabs and replacement workers, cracking down on families in Sarnia: a job well done. The result is that traffic is redirected, the roads are less safe, and there is lost revenue to a private American billionaire.

Why is the government stiff-arming workers and families, putting public safety at risk, and increasing border conflict, instead of getting back to the table for the workers and their families?

**Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that traffic is moving on the Blue Water Bridge, and I can also inform the member, of course, that the Blue Water Bridge is under the responsibility of the Federal Bridge Corporation. It is responsible for the operation of the bridge, and that also includes labour relations.

We are certainly following the situation very carefully. What we want to ensure is that traffic continues to move safely, which is the case at the moment.

*Oral Questions***THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Joe Peschisolido (Steveston—Richmond East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on November 5, a private fishing vessel sank off the dock in Steveston Harbour in my riding of Steveston—Richmond East. Could the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard please tell the House about the response from the Coast Guard to limit pollution and remove the vessel from the water?

**Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Steveston—Richmond East for his important work in promoting the safe use of Steveston Harbour and the investments he announced on behalf of our government last summer.

I can confirm to the member that events like this often represent a significant environmental threat to local communities. When the Coast Guard staff received the report of this sunken vessel, it took immediate action to protect the marine environment from pollution. The vessel's owner was identified, but could not respond to the incident. Therefore, the Coast Guard assumed command, and within 24 hours the ship was safely out of the water.

\* \* \*

• (1500)

**INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS**

**Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the minister's first legislation dealing with gender equality for first nations is seriously flawed, and the minister must go back to the drawing board. It has really been mishandled, quite frankly from the beginning. In drafting the bill, she did not talk to the litigants and she did not do proper consultation. She was forced to apologize, publicly admitting that she was embarrassed at how her staff handled the file.

Will the minister end her paternalistic approach and withdraw this piece of legislation?

**Hon. Carolyn Bennett (Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, issues of registration, membership, and citizenship go to the heart of identity in community. Bill S-3 will correct known sex-based discrimination in Indian registration. We know that a real conversation needs to happen on these issues. That is why I have committed to launching a formal consultation on registration, membership, and citizenship early next year to deal with the other issues that are not in this bill. I look forward to hearing from communities from coast to coast to coast.

I am committed to finding a real reform forward, but right now 35,000 people can get their rights if this bill goes through, and—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CONSUMER PROTECTION**

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in Quebec, consumers whose credit card is stolen are liable for, at most, \$50. That is the law.

At the federal level, the credit card issuer can stipulate liability in the contract. If Bill C-29 passes, banks will have free rein to demand that clients pay back every penny spent by a credit card thief.

Does the minister of high finance see the difference between being protected by the law and being at the mercy of the banks?

**Mr. François-Philippe Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we will speak on behalf of consumers.

For my hon. colleague's sake, I would like to review the consumer protection principles underlying Bill C-29. I am sure he will agree with me.

The first principle states that basic banking services should be accessible to all; disclosure of information should enable an institution's customers and members of the public to make informed financial decisions; an institution's customers and members of the public should be treated fairly; and complaints processes should be impartial, transparent, and dynamic. That is what it means to protect Canadians.

**Mr. Simon Marciel (Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I guess Toronto banks are keen to see Bill C-29 passed considering the minister of high finance is imposing closure. He is anxious to legalize hidden fees in Quebec, authorize misleading advertising, allow banks to change our contracts without our consent, and eliminate our recourse or any sanctions.

How far is this government of banks prepared to go to quash consumer rights in Quebec to the benefit of high finance in Toronto?

The day that Quebeckers no longer have rights, will they have to cut a cheque to the government, like the Chinese billionaires did?

**Mr. François-Philippe Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that he is talking to another little guy from Shawinigan.

I speak for the people from the regions and Quebeckers, as do the 40 members who come from Quebec. In Marcotte we were asked to clarify the provisions in effect in order to protect Canadian consumers across the country. That is precisely what we did, but we also took the opportunity to modernize and simplify the legislation in the interest of consumers in Quebec and across the country.

I invite the hon. member to read the bill. He might learn something.

*Points of Order***POLITICAL PARTY FINANCING**

**Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, by her reaction to the special committee's report, the Minister of Democratic Institutions has made it quite clear that Liberal interests matter more than democratic interests. It is Liberal interests that also matter more with respect to political party financing, with \$1,500 cocktails to gain exclusive access to the Prime Minister.

Instead of playing the same worn out old record and feeding cynicism, will the minister restore public funding for political parties based on the votes received or not?

[*English*]

**Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his work on the Special Committee on Electoral Reform, and I can assure him that our government is working hard to strengthen the fairness and the openness of our democratic institutions.

To this end, we recently introduced legislation in this House to engage more Canadians in the voting process and to enhance the integrity of our system. Our ultimate goal with reform is to foster a more inclusive and engaged Canada. We are looking forward to addressing all the recommendations that the Chief Electoral Officer shared with us and with the committee. We will be introducing legislation in this House soon.

• (1505)

[*Translation*]

**The Speaker:** I would like to remind the members that they must name the ministers of the House with their real title.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**POINTS OF ORDER**

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order about a breach of the rules of the House.

We recognize, Mr. Speaker, that you have a challenging job, and it is made particularly challenging when a member breaks the rules of the House in a way that is designed to play to the camera and escape the Speaker's notice. This is something that I do not think came to the attention of members until it appeared in the news.

The rules of the House clearly forbid the use of props. In fact, the Speaker recently reminded members specifically of this rule. However, what happened within the House last week is that a minister of the government, during questions, was holding up her notes as if pretending to use her notes. However, by all indications intentionally, on the backside of those notes was a very large icon. The minister was positioned such that the icon was clearly visible to the cameras, even though it was not visible to the Speaker.

We know that this is a flagrant violation of the rules of the House. It involves the use of props. This was taken by the Minister of Democratic Institutions, who is supposed to be defending our institutions. In fact, it was done in a way designed to escape notice, showing a complete disregard for them.

I do not know if this was her idea or something she was asked to do by the Prime Minister's Office, but this is clearly unacceptable, clearly a violation of the rules of the House, and the member needs to be brought to order.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member is correct. I draw the attention of members to page 612 of the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, which says, "Speakers have consistently ruled out of order displays or demonstrations of any kind used by Members to illustrate their remarks or emphasize their positions."

I have indicated that props are not appropriate. I did not see the writing on the paper on Thursday. I did see it in the paper on Friday and was surprised.

I wonder if the hon. minister wishes to say a few words, because it was inappropriate. The minister came to see me before question period and I explained that to her.

I see the hon. government House leader is rising.

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think we recognize that every member in this House can always do better. I listened to what the member opposite has shared. We are all here to follow the rules. We know that last week we had the opposition House leader rip up a piece of paper. I think we can all raise the bar—

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

**The Speaker:** I want to correct the hon. government House leader and point out that I actually interrupted what happened that day. Had I seen the offending paper on the day in question with the writing on it, I would have done the same thing.

Now I see the hon. Minister of Democratic Institutions is rising.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the close attention he pays to the rules. I can assure him that I am going to work very hard on my sunny ways, and I will promise to do better.

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

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Democratic Institutions.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of sincerity that I repeat what I said in this House on Friday. On Thursday, I used words that I did not intend to use. Also, the member addresses a valid point. I apologize, and I can promise that for as long as I can remember, I will be sure to do better every day in this House.

**The Speaker:** I thank the hon. member for raising this issue, and I thank the minister for the apology.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

●(1510)

[Translation]

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and pursuant to section 7 of the Special Economic Measures Act, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, a copy of the regulations adopted on November 28, 2016, under the Special Economic Measures Act, entitled “Regulations Amending the Special Economic Measures (Ukraine) Regulations.”

\* \* \*

[English]

**GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 10 petitions.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights on Bill S-201, An Act to prohibit and prevent genetic discrimination.

[English]

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with an amendment.

## TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities regarding Bill C-227, an act to amend the Department of Public Works and Government Services Act (community benefit) with amendments.

\* \* \*

**CANADIAN BILL OF RIGHTS**

**Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-325, an act to amend the Canadian Bill of Rights (right to housing).

She said: Mr. Speaker, the government must make housing a priority. In the communities I represent and across Canada, we see a staggering need for proper housing at a reasonable cost. In Canada, people do not have the housing they need.

For this reason, I wish to table today an act to amend the Canadian Bill of Rights. This bill would ensure that the right to housing is firmly recognized as law. This would redefine the way we frame a

national housing strategy and finally allow us to adopt our international responsibilities regarding human rights. When housing needs are met, we as a society can grow much stronger and more prosperous.

I would like to thank the member for Hochelaga for working so hard on the issue of housing. I look forward to the debate, and I hope to see all members in this House support this bill.

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

\* \* \*

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ACT**

**Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-326, an act to amend the Department of Health Act (drinking water guidelines).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today in this House to table this bill, which would require the Minister of Health to conduct a review of drinking water standards in member countries of the OECD, and if appropriate, to make recommendations for amendments to our national guidelines here in Canada with respect to drinking water.

This bill is aimed at ensuring that our drinking water standards are the best in the developed world. It is a way for the federal government to have greater influence in the body that establishes national but provincially implemented drinking water standards in Canada.

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

\* \* \*

●(1515)

**PETITIONS**

## HOSPITAL PARKING

**Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I table petition e-492 that calls upon the Minister of Health and the Minister of Transport to enforce the Canada Health Act, with our provincial partners, to ensure adequate, affordable parking for patients and caregivers at medical facilities.

I am proud to support Collin Kennedy's call for action to allow free parking for people undergoing serious medical treatment. Requiring people who undergo chronic treatment for a range of illnesses to pay for parking is unfair, especially when they may already be unable to work. Other countries and jurisdictions have already figured out ways to do this.

This petition has over 12,355 signatures and is currently the 10th most-signed e-petition of this 42nd Parliament. I am happy to see that so many Canadians across this country have come together to ask the government for action.

*Routine Proceedings*

## ALGOMA CENTRAL RAILWAY

**Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise again to table a petition with respect to the Algoma Central Railway passenger service. The petitioners are from Richards Landing, Echo Bay, Aweres Township, Prince Township, Goulais River, and Sault Ste. Marie.

The train has not been running for some time, and it has caused a major hardship, especially for businesses and property owners. The annual economic impact has been estimated to be about a \$40 million to \$50 million loss in northern Ontario, for a mere \$2.2 million per year subsidy. Members can see that the impact is quite great.

The petitioners speak about the fact that it is also an issue for first nations in accessing remote regions of their traditional territories. They are calling on the Minister of Transport to put the Algoma Central passenger service back on line, in line with his mandate, which is “To serve the public interest through the promotion of a safe and secure, efficient and environmentally responsible transportation system in Canada”.

## FALUN GONG

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions, signed by more than 300 constituents from my riding of Portage—Lisgar. These petitions are regarding Falun Gong. The petitioners point out that Falun Gong practitioners have been arbitrarily detained, including the family members of Canadians.

The petitioners request that the government bring forward measures to stop organ tourism and other concerning practises.

[*Translation*]

## SYRIA

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendès (Brossard—Saint-Lambert, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in order to draw the attention of the House of Commons to the humanitarian tragedy currently unfolding in Syria, I rise today to present a petition to encourage action that promotes peace in that country.

[*English*]

This petition was initiated by members of the Diocese of Saint-Jean-Longueuil, with many signatures from my riding and neighbouring ones.

## INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

**Mr. Geng Tan (Don Valley North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present an e-petition signed by more than 500 citizens, residents of Canada, many of whom live in my riding of Don Valley North.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to conduct a study on equal access to both official languages training services for international students and graduates and on co-operative program policies that encourage and allow more qualified international students to gain work experience in the public sector to maximize the benefits of a culturally diverse workforce and to contribute to a multicultural society.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present two petitions today. They both relate to the issue of genetically modified organisms.

The first is from primarily residents of the Lower Mainland, British Columbia, calling on the government and this Parliament to ensure, by legislation, that products, components, and ingredients that are sold commercially to Canadians have labelling to identify that they contain genetically modified organisms so that consumers will have a choice.

The second petition comes primarily from residents of Ontario.

The petitioners are calling on this Parliament to ensure a moratorium to prevent the release of a newly modified product, genetically modified alfalfa. This concern comes from residents of farming communities who are very concerned that there be a moratorium to allow proper review of the impact on farmers in Canada.

• (1520)

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There is just a bit of background chat that translation is picking up through the audio. Maybe you could provide that information back to them.

**The Speaker:** I appreciate the hon. member raising that. I think he has just provided that information, and I trust that will assist in removing that background in the translation.

## ISLAM

**Mr. Frank Baylis (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I present an electronic petition initiated by Samer Majzoub, of Montreal, Quebec. The petition calls upon the House of Commons to recognize that extremist individuals do not represent the religion of Islam.

Since its founding more than 1,400 years ago, Muslims have contributed, and continue to contribute, to the positive development of human civilization. This encompasses all areas of human endeavour, including the arts, culture, science, medicine, literature, and much more. The petition also calls upon the House of Commons to condemn all forms of Islamophobia.

Canadians from every province and territory have signed this petition, and in a clear statement of support, the petition has garnered the most signatures in the history of electronic petitions, with 69,742 signatures.

## FALUN GONG

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the member for Portage—Lisgar, actually reminded me of a good petition I would like to table.

In July 1999, the Chinese Communist Party launched a nationwide persecution campaign to eradicate Falun Gong. Millions of Falun Gong practitioners have been arrested and put in custody and many have been sentenced to long terms of up to 20 years in prison, where torture and abuse are routine. Tens of thousands are feared dead as a result.

Petitioners are calling on parliamentarians to do what they can to improve public awareness.

*Routine Proceedings*

PHYSICIAN-ASSISTED DYING

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present two petitions. The first highlights the issue of physician assisted dying. Petitioners are calling on Parliament to create legislation that would make it a criminal offence to force any person, against their will, to participate in assisted suicide or euthanasia.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition highlights Families for Justice. It is a group of Canadians who have had a loved one killed by an impaired driver. They believe that Canada's impaired driving laws are much too lenient. They want the crime called what it truly is: vehicular homicide. It is the number one cause of criminal death in Canada, with over 1,200 Canadians dying every year. Petitioners are calling for mandatory sentencing for vehicular homicide and are calling on Parliament to support two bills, Bill C-226 and Bill C-247, Kassandra's law.

Also, Mr. Speaker, if I had a petition to compliment you on your festive Christmas socks, I am sure I would be honoured to present that also.

**The Speaker:** I am sure the member is out of order with that, but I thank him for the compliment.

\* \* \*

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 559 to 567 could be made orders for return, those returns would be tabled immediately.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 559—**Mr. James Bezan:**

With regard to all fuel consumed by the Canadian Armed Forces and the Department of National Defence: (a) for the period of January 1, 2014, to December 31, 2014, in total and broken down by the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Air Force, and the Canadian Army, and also broken down by province and territory, (i) how much gasoline was consumed, (ii) how much money was spent on gasoline consumption, (iii) how much diesel fuel was consumed, (iv) how much money was spent on the consumption of diesel fuel, (v) how much jet fuel was consumed, (vi) how much money was spent on jet fuel consumption, (vii) how much natural gas was consumed, (viii) how much money was spent on natural gas consumption, (ix) how much propane was consumed, (x) how much money was spent on the consumption of propane, (xi) how much high-heat coal was consumed, (xii) how much money was spent on the consumption of high-heat coal, (xiii) how much low-heat coal was consumed, (xiv) how much money was spent on low-heat coal consumption; (b) for the period of January 1, 2015, to January 1, 2016, in total and broken down by the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Air Force, and the Canadian Army, and also broken down by province and territory, (i) how much gasoline was consumed, (ii) how much money was spent on gasoline consumption, (iii) how much diesel fuel was consumed, (iv) how much money was spent of the consumption of diesel fuel, (v) how much jet fuel was consumed, (vi) how much money was spent on jet fuel consumption, (vii) how much natural gas was consumed, (viii) how much money was spent on natural gas consumption, (ix) how much propane was consumed, (x) how much money was spent on the consumption of propane, (xi) how much high-heat coal was consumed, (xii) how much money was spent on the consumption of high-heat coal, (xiii) how much low-heat coal was consumed, (xiv) how much money was spent on low-heat coal consumption; (c) for the period of January 2, 2016, to

present, in total and broken down by the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Air Force, and the Canadian Army, and also broken down by each province and territory, (i) how much gasoline was consumed, (ii) how much money was spent on gasoline consumption, (iii) how much diesel fuel was consumed, (iv) how much money was spent of the consumption of diesel fuel, (v) how much jet fuel was consumed, (vi) how much money was spent on jet fuel consumption, (vii) how much natural gas was consumed, (viii) how much money was spent on natural gas consumption, (ix) how much propane was consumed, (x) how much money was spent on the consumption of propane, (xi) how much high-heat coal was consumed, (xii) how much money was spent on the consumption of high-heat coal, (xiii) how much low-heat coal was consumed, (xiv) how much money was spent on low-heat coal consumption; (d) based on estimates for the 2017 fiscal year, what are the expected levels of consumption, in total and broken down by each province and territory, of (i) gasoline, (ii) diesel fuel, (iii) jet fuel, (iv) natural gas, (v) propane, (vi) high-heat coal, (vii) low-heat coal; and (e) based on estimates for the 2017 fiscal year, in total and broken down by the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Air Force, and the Canadian Army, how much money is expected to spent, and also broken down by each province and territory, on the consumption of, (i) gasoline, (ii) diesel fuel, (iii) jet fuel, (iv) natural gas, (v) propane, (vi) high-heat coal, (vii) low-heat coal?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 560—**Mr. Colin Carrie:**

With regard to grants, contributions, or loan guarantees provided to firms by the government: (a) for each grant, contribution and loan, what is (i) the recipient's name, (ii) location, (iii) date, (iv) value, (v) type, (vi) purpose, (vii) project number; and (b) for each item in (a), are there repayable contributions for each grant, contribution, or loan guarantee provided to firms since November 4, 2015, including, (i) SeaFort Capital, (ii) A. W. Leil Cranes and Equipment, (iii) Cooper Equipment Rentals Limited, (iv) Titanium Tubing Technology Limited, (v) Jardine Transport Limited, (vi) Mandeville Holdings Incorporated, (vii) Portland Holdings Incorporated?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 561—**Mr. Colin Carrie:**

With regard to contracts awarded to firms by the government: (a) for each contract, what is (i) the name of vendor, (ii) the date of contract, (iii) the summary or description of goods or services provided, (iv) the type of contract (competitive or sole-sourced); and (b) for each item in (a), what is the file or tracking number, broken down by department, agency, and crown corporation for each contract awarded to firms since November 4, 2015, including (i) SeaFort Capital, (ii) A. W. Leil Cranes and Equipment, (iii) Cooper Equipment Rentals Limited, (iv) Titanium Tubing Technology Limited, (v) Jardine Transport Limited, (vi) Mandeville Holdings Incorporated, (vii) Portland Holdings Incorporated?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 562—**Mr. Colin Carrie:**

With regard to the acquisition of land by government departments or agencies, since November 4, 2015, for each transaction: what is the (i) location of acquired land, (ii) amount paid, (iii) size of acquired land, (iv) file number, (v) date of transaction, (vi) reason for acquisition, (vii) owner of land prior to government acquisition?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 563—**Mr. Colin Carrie:**

With regard to the acquisition of buildings by government departments or agencies, since November 4, 2015, for each transaction: what is the (i) location of the building, (ii) amount paid, (iii) type of building, (iv) file number, (v) date of transaction, (vi) reason for acquisition, (vii) owner of building prior to government acquisition, (viii) government-wide object code?

(Return tabled)

*Government Orders***Question No. 564—Ms. Marilyn Gladu:**

With regard to management consulting contracts signed by the government since November 4, 2015, broken down by department, agency, and crown corporation: (a) what was the total amount spent; (b) for each contract, what was the (i) vendor name, (ii) amount, (iii) date, (iv) file number; (c) each time a management consultant was brought in, what was the desired outcome or goals; (d) how does the government measure whether or not such goals were met; (e) does the government have any recourse if such goals are not met; (f) for which contracts were the goals met; and (g) for which contracts were the goals not met?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 565—Ms. Marilyn Gladu:**

With regard to expenditures made by the government since November 4, 2015, under government-wide object code 3259 (Miscellaneous expenditures not Elsewhere Classified): what are the details of each expenditure including (i) vendor name, (ii) amount, (iii) date, (iv) description of goods or services provided, (v) file number?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 566—Ms. Marilyn Gladu:**

With regard to government expenditures on membership fees, broken down by department, agency and crown corporation, since November 4, 2015: (a) how much has been spent; (b) what are the details of each expenditure including name of organization or vendor, date of purchase, and amount spent?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 567—Mr. Randall Garrison:**

With regard to Operation IMPACT, for each three month time period beginning in October 2014, and ending in October 2016, for both Canadian special forces troops and other Canadian military personnel: (a) how many were involved in the operation on the field; (b) how many were located in, and operated in, and supported the mission in each of Iraq, Kuwait, Jordan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, or any other country in the region; (c) what proportion was occupied by “training” Kurd forces; (d) what proportion was allocated to “advise and assist” Kurd forces on the frontlines in Iraq; (e) what proportion of their time was allocated to complete the “training” part of the mission; (f) what proportion of their time was allocated to complete the “advise and assist” part of the mission, where Canadian troops are sent to the frontlines to support and supervise Kurdish troops; (g) how many times were they involved in skirmishes or firefights involving ISIS forces in Iraq; (h) how many times did their position come under fire; (i) how many times did they have to fire their weapons at the enemy; (j) how many times did they assist in identifying targets for airstrikes; (k) how many spent more than 50% of their time fulfilling the “training” role; and (l) how many spent more than 50% of their time fulfilling the “advise and assist” role?

(Return tabled)

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2016, NO. 2

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-29, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2016 and other measures, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia has three minutes remaining in questions and comments.

Questions and comments. The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in the last federal election, the NDP made a solid commitment to have balanced budgets. I wonder if the member could comment on whether he believes today that the NDP would have maintained a balanced budget. Does he feel that it would have been warranted to create any form of a deficit?

• (1525)

**Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for the question, because it gives me an opportunity to be more complete in my answer as to why Bill C-29 is not going to be supported.

First, the tax break for the middle class does not include the middle class in my riding, which starts at around \$20,000. There is no national poverty strategy in the bill, which is really needed for Canada.

During the election, the Liberals promised to bring down the tax rate from 11% to 9% for small businesses. That never happened. There is no cap on credit card fees. Privatization of infrastructure is going to increase costs for Canadians. There is no indexing of the Canada child benefit. That is why we are not going to support Bill C-29.

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing the Liberals talk about the middle-class tax cut, and I think what Canadians need to realize is that it is actually a middle-income tax break, that the people who receive the most benefits are those with incomes between \$100,000 and \$200,000 a year. That may be the Liberal middle class, but it is certainly not the middle class I represent, not when we have a median income in Canada of \$31,000 a year.

I just want my hon. friend to talk a little bit about the situation of constituents in his riding and maybe some of the measures that could have been put in the budget to help the most disadvantaged members of our society, because I do not really see many measures in the Liberal budget that actually do that.

**Mr. Wayne Stetski:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his hard work on behalf of his constituents.

As I said in my speech, when I talk to constituents in my riding and tell them that the middle-class tax break starts at \$45,000 and potentially goes to almost \$200,000, they just shake their heads, because that is not middle class in my riding at all. Of course, we put forward an amendment to bring that down to \$20,000 so that people earning between \$20,000 and \$45,000 would be covered, but it was rejected by the government.

Also in my riding, poverty is an issue, as it is right across Canada. There is nothing in here that sets out a national strategy to deal with poverty.

*Government Orders*

On housing, there is hope, I suppose, but we need to see what is actually in the national housing strategy. Finding a home is the number one issue for people living in poverty.

**Mr. Raj Saini (Kitchener Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the importance of culture and diversity in our country and to highlight some of the investments our government is making to ensure that we protect, preserve, and promote our country's cultural institutions and multicultural society.

Our culture, our ideas, songs, and stories give meaning to who we are as Canadians. Our culture and cultural products are the instruments that help us communicate with others and share different views, entertaining and informing us, all the while weaving together a shared sense of identity.

Culture is at the heart of every community across our country and around the world, and Canada is a testament to the ability to include and respect all cultures in one society. Perhaps we are uniquely poised to be welcoming and accepting due to the way our country was founded as distinct societies coming together to found one country. People from other parts of the world quickly joined, adding their cultures and traditions to the fabric of our country, weaving the ever-changing tapestry that is Canada.

Our government has a solemn duty to act as a steward of Canada's cultural institutions and an obligation to promote and foster the institutions, activities, and people that help our culture flourish, grow, and adapt to changing times and circumstances.

Our cultural mediums help us to exchange diverse ideas and experiences, and the conversations they invoke are the greatest celebrations of the diversity that is at the heart of Canadian culture. They also make a significant contribution to our economy.

Over the years, the number of companies and individuals involved in producing cultural products has grown dramatically. One of the companies that has always been at the heart of Canadian content is the CBC. There are some on the opposition benches who would like to see the CBC eliminated. Strikingly, they are some of the same members who seem most out of touch with what true Canadian values are. The CBC not only ensures that all Canadians have access to Canadian content, but that every Canadian can also access local content.

The reality is that in a country as vast as Canada, there will be areas where it does not make financial sense for profit-driven entities to produce local content. Every Canadian deserves to know what is going on in their area of the country, and to partake in the shared experience of cultural exchanges that build communities.

To that end, I am proud to say that our government has invested \$675 million in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation/Radio Canada to disseminate and support world-class Canadian content and to provide Canadians with better access to programs and services in the digital era.

Since I know this question will be coming from my Conservative colleagues, I will address it now. Yes, I am aware that CBC/Radio Canada has asked for an additional \$400 million from the government. The opposition has made great fanfare of this request, decrying it as just a cash grab. What they fail to mention, however, is

that this request comes because CBC/Radio Canada wants to eliminate all ads.

I would like to ask those watching to think about what this means for our national broadcaster. Much like the BBC, our national broadcaster can give strong, stable, well-funded public broadcasts with the primary goal of serving the interests of domestic audiences and diverse communities in helping to promote Canadian content. Agree or disagree, this is an idea worth seriously considering, and I am happy the government is doing just that.

● (1530)

[*Translation*]

Although our cultural industries are a key part of the Canadian economy, our government also recognizes that culture and cultural products are more than just goods that can be bought and sold. Our stories, our songs, our symbols, and our sacred spaces can sometimes generate profits, but they are also precious because of their significance or the sense of belonging and understanding they induce.

Understanding the intrinsic value of our cultural spaces is very important to me. I am therefore very proud that our government has decided to invest in the spaces and institutions that serve as guardians of our cultural objects, including our national museums, our national historic sites, and our parks. Canada's national museums are important cultural institutions that play a vital role in preserving Canada's heritage and educating Canadians.

I am pleased to say that in budget 2016, our government provides up to \$105.9 million over five years to our national museums, and up to \$280.9 million over five years to support the infrastructure needs of three important Canadian cultural institutions: the Canada Science and Technology Museum, the National Arts Centre, and the National Gallery of Canada.

What is more, we are committed to allocating \$168.2 million over two years to the Canada cultural spaces fund, as part of our investments in social infrastructure. Through initiatives like this one, budget 2016 will ensure that the community spaces that preserve, protect, present, and promote our culture, while entertaining and informing us, will be there for us and for our children in the future.

This process is critical not only to ensure that cultural artifacts from our past are protected but also to ensure that the innovators and artists of tomorrow have welcoming, well-funded spaces to help inspire them.

● (1535)

[*English*]

Artists are our country's storytellers. Regardless of the medium they use, our artists capture moments and ideas and weave them into the fabric of our individual and collective identities.

The weaving of this fabric of identity is especially important in a quickly changing and globalized world, as we work within the context of our ever-changing and diverse society to create a sense of what it means to be Canadian.



*Government Orders*

Fostering the development of the arts here at home is an important part of ensuring that those who have stories to tell are given the opportunity to weave their own contribution into this national fabric.

Encouraging this freedom of expression is fundamental to our understanding of ourselves and to ensuring that all voices have the opportunity to be heard in our democracy. However, if art is to flourish, artists need to be able to work in an environment in which their voices can be heard, regardless of how popular the sentiment they express is, and regardless of their viewpoint or background.

Ensuring equal access to the artistic world is why it is so fundamental that our government works to foster the development of the arts in Canada through grants, services, and awards to professional Canadian artists and arts organizations, as well as through scholarly awards.

In budget 2016, our government has committed to ensuring that avenues to expression are open to all Canadians through its investment of \$550 million in the Canada Council for the Arts. Furthermore, our government has made commitments to the industries that support these artists, including a \$22-million commitment to Telefilm Canada and a \$13.5-million commitment to the National Film Board of Canada, as they work to ensure the cultural, commercial, and industrial success of Canada's audiovisual industry.

This funding will work in tandem with our commitment to work with other countries to realize new and creative artistic projects, a commitment demonstrated when the Minister of Canadian Heritage signed an audiovisual co-production treaty with the Republic of Ireland earlier this year.

Working through partnerships like this allows us to tell new stories and achieve new levels of creativity as we support each other in telling our country's stories.

In 2004, the British culture secretary, Tessa Jowell, commissioned a paper on the arts, which argued that the primary purpose of the arts is to communicate perceptions about the human condition that can't be communicated in any other way.

The arts are unique. They are able to help people interact with the world around them by helping them understand, work, and play in that world to enrich their experience by bringing feeling, beauty, and passion to their lives, and to provide a safe place where they can work to build their confidence, self-worth, and self-esteem.

Other efforts can only do some of these things. The arts do all three. That is why we must continue to support them.

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my neighbour from Kitchener Centre for his work in his riding.

I do not think anyone in the House is denigrating the arts. However, we all know that whatever project we want to support, there has to be money to support it. When we are borrowing money on more money on more money to build up a deficit of \$30 billion, adding \$10 billion per year in interest costs alone over the next four years, this is a concern. Could my colleague comment on the costs of his proposals?

Also, there was a question that I asked the Minister of Finance this morning, which we did not receive an answer to. It is found in the Order Paper today. It refers to Bill C-29. Motion No. 1 by the member for Winnipeg North proposes that one of the clauses of Bill C-29 be deleted. Could my colleague explain why a member of the government would move to delete a clause in a government bill?

**Mr. Raj Saini:** Mr. Speaker, I also thank my hon. friend for the work he does in his riding. He has been a great mentor and adviser since I was elected, and so I want to thank him personally.

One of the things I did not get to in my remarks was the importance of the arts and culture community, not only in my riding, where it is very strong, but also in Canada. We know, from the latest analysis by the Conference Board of Canada, that the arts and culture community in Canada provides \$84.6 billion worth of economic benefits to Canada. That represents 1.1 million jobs. Arts and culture are a very important part of the Canadian fabric, not only as an economic multiplier but also as a social multiplier that keeps us all together. Also, as a final statistic, the arts and culture community adds 7.4% to our collective GDP.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

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

I know that it focused on culture, but since we are talking about Bill C-29, I am honour bound to bring up another aspect of this bill, which is just as critical and which seems to be central to the government's plan, and that is infrastructure.

Of course, we have talked about the infrastructure bank, but right now the government is also undertaking initiatives that could potentially lead to the privatization of ports and airports. In fact, the government has already given mandates to Credit Suisse and Morgan Stanley.

I would like to hear what my colleague has to say about the potential privatization of our ports and airports. I think he will agree with me that this infrastructure is key to our economic development. I would therefore like to know what he thinks about his government's idea to potentially privatize ports and airports.

[*English*]

**Mr. Raj Saini:** Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say is that if we look at the economic indicators in the world right now, we know that long-term bond rates are very low in parts of the world. We know that inflation is at 1%. We know the lower bond rate is close to 0%. This is the right time in our country's history to look at the infrastructure projects out there that are important not only for our communities but also for a nation-building exercise. After highlighting those statistics, I am sure that the hon. member would agree with me that now is the best time in our history to make sure that we make those infrastructure investments for the benefit of all Canadians.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Liberal government's budget. It seems to me that we are stuck in a tax-and-spend cycle with the current Liberal government. Every time we turn around, it seems that the Liberals are finding another way to try to increase government spending, with no regard for Canadian taxpayers. Therefore, we see an increase in taxation, and the prospect for future generations of further increases in their taxation, as a result of large deficits and debt left behind by the government through all of this spending.

When the Liberal government released its fall economic update, it confirmed what we already knew. Liberals are spending so recklessly that they are going to have to borrow more money, and they have no plan to return to balanced budgets. I stand here today because on this side of the House we believe that fiscal responsibility, a framework for creating a strong economy, and a plan to create jobs and get Canadians back to work are what Canadians need and what they have asked for. We will continue to be the ones who stand up for the hard-working taxpayers of this country and hold the Liberal government accountable for its out-of-control spending.

In discussions I have had with constituents, through town halls and a survey prior to the introduction of the 2016 budget, along with a number of other methods that we conduct through the year, the one common link, the underlying concern that constituents had, was about ballooning deficits they were seeing from the Liberal government. This is simply not a solution to Canada's economic challenges. In fact, nearly every constituent who was surveyed indicated that a balanced federal budget was important, almost unanimously. This obviously comes in very stark contrast to what we see in the budget implementation act.

When it comes to broken promises, the Liberals ran on a campaign promise to cap deficits at \$10 billion a year and return more to a balanced budget in 2019-20. That frankly was not good enough to begin with, but that was their promise. Instead, they are spending deficits of nearly three times that amount, almost \$30 billion in borrowed money. This is in their first year alone. Through the budget implementation act that we have before us today, the Liberals will continue to run deficits, and with no explanation whatsoever about how or when they will return to a balance.

The Liberals may try to blame higher deficits on a weak economy or lower revenues, but it is very clear from the parliamentary budget officer and the Finance Canada "Fiscal Monitor" that Liberal spending is the real culprit. Hard-working Canadians across the country run their personal finances with fiscal restraint. They know that when they run out of money and keep spending, they are going to have an issue. Why does it seem like the Liberal government has such an issue with this concept? The budget is a steep deficit trajectory with no intention to return to balance and no clear plan to create jobs. That is pretty evident when they have not actually created a single net job since they were elected over a year ago. There is nothing to help get thousands of unemployed Canadians back to work. When it comes to managing an economy, there is no second chance. Clearly, Canadians are worse off today than they were a year ago.

The budget still offers no insights into how the government plans to create jobs. Unfortunately, the forecasting by the Liberals is not reliable either. When our previous government introduced a stimulus package in response to the global financial crisis, we used outside experts to vet our estimate of 220,000 jobs that would be created or maintained. The target was actually exceeded by 28,000 jobs.

In contrast, the parliamentary budget office reported in October that despite their out-of-control spending and their skyrocketing deficits, the Liberals have not created one net full-time job since they took office, not one; not a single job. The report also stated that the number of part-time jobs that were created in the last year is only half the average rate of job creation of the previous five years. All of them were part-time jobs.

• (1545)

Further, in comparison, while Canada's employment rate has been falling, rates in the U.S., G7, and OECD have risen. It is very clear that despite a year of reckless spending, the Liberal plan has done nothing to improve our economy. Instead of supporting real job creators, the Liberals are making it more expensive for companies to hire and raising taxes on the small businesses that employ 95% of Canadians.

For small businesses, the budget reneges on promises to lower the small business tax rate that were planned in the last Conservative budget, from 11% to 9%. Instead, the Liberals will hold the rate at 10.5% and have introduced new conditions around eligibility. I will get to those in a second.

It is not only that, but the budget did not renew the tax credit for EI premiums paid by small business, and over \$1 billion in new EI expenditures points to higher premiums for all employers in the near future.

All of this drives away jobs and drives away investment. Now the Liberals are talking about a federal carbon tax, and we know what impact that will have on every Canadian family's budget. We know what it will mean for businesses and their costs. Again, it is further costs being added to families, further costs being added to businesses who are trying to employ Canadians.

Not only are the Liberals not creating jobs, but they are not even going to enable the private sector to do the job it wants to do, which is to create jobs. They are also saying to some small businesses that they are too small to be small businesses, so they are now going to be increasing their tax bills. For some of these small businesses we are talking about, when they deal with rules around active and passive income, they will see a tripling of their tax bills. This will put people out of business, and it will put more Canadians out of work.

*Government Orders*

I also want to touch on our natural resources industry and the workers it supports. The Liberals have imposed arbitrary, political, and unpredictable regulatory processes at a time when we urgently need to get our resources to new markets and when we should be supporting our natural resource workers. While unemployment in Alberta continues to climb, the Liberal government's budget fails to address support measures for our natural resource workers.

Skilled workers are struggling to provide for their families and are being forced to leave the province to seek better opportunities for employment. The number of unemployed Albertans has nearly doubled since the start of 2015. It went from 112,500 in January last year to 206,900 in August 2016, up 84.6%.

I see the signal you are giving me, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, I have so many points that I want to raise about the nature of this terrible budget that I will have to leave some of them out. Of course, we can thank the Liberal government for that as well. They have indicated that we are going to have a limited debate on this, so unfortunately there is no opportunity to raise all the points we would like to raise.

I want to touch on the point of infrastructure. I think I have already made it clear that the Liberals are completely oblivious to the needs of Alberta energy workers and getting them back to work. The budget certainly reflects that.

When we talk about the infrastructure program, the Liberals claim they are going to create this legacy of infrastructure. However, when we look at it, most of the claims are quite false, because it is in the so-called phase two of the plan where we will see most of the infrastructure. Most of these things will not even be realized for at least six years. Until then, the municipalities are basically out of luck.

The Liberals have taken a huge chunk of this fund and put it into an infrastructure bank, which means small communities across the country are out of luck because they do not have access to any of that. We talk about them having to be massive projects of \$100 million or more.

On top of all that, we have higher taxes. We keep hearing from the government how families are better off. I asked my constituents if they were better off. I went to their doors and asked them in a survey. Over and over again, what I heard was no, that they were worse off. The government has taken away some of their tax credits for income splitting, fitness, arts, education, textbooks, their ability to save through tax-free savings accounts, and that it is forcing new mandatory premiums increases on them for the Canada pension plan.

It goes on and on. Then, of course, the cherry on top is the carbon tax. We are not all looking forward to that one. My constituents are telling me that they are going to be worse off.

• (1550)

Not only is the government taxing Canadian families to death and putting them in huge deficit and debt situations so that their kids and grandkids will be taxed to death, but it is not doing anything to create jobs or to help businesses do the same. It is a terrible budget, and I speak in opposition to it today.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham (Laurentides—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was amused to listen to the member's comments about how much the government has done in a short period. I wonder if the member could remind the House how many years it took for the Conservatives to cause all the damage they caused to this country. They caused quite a bit of damage and, after 10 years, they still had not finished everything they wanted to do.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Mr. Speaker, I am amazed to even hear that comment. We are talking about a government that took us through one of the most difficult economic times that the world has ever seen. Conservatives came out of it with a balanced budget, lowered taxes for Canadians, and somehow that was damage? I can understand why he might think that, because what we are seeing from the Liberals is the complete opposite. There are huge new deficits being created in a very short period of time, and there are massive new taxes being put on Canadians. That, to me, sounds like the real damage, but, of course, Liberals always have it all backward.

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I obviously have some differences of opinion on issues, especially economics. However, there is one thing we actually agree on, which is that the Liberals made a lot of commitments on infrastructure during the election campaign and nothing has been done that was promised during the campaign.

Yes, they talked about the infrastructure bank, but they never explained how it would work. Now we find out that about 80% of that bank will be funded by the private sector, which will obviously have a large role to play in this. It was never mentioned during the campaign. Another thing that was never mentioned was the fact that the government would consider privatizing ports and airports.

I would like my colleague to comment on what should and should not be said during electoral campaigns. It seems that Liberals are under the misguided assumption that platforms count for nothing and are only to engage citizens.

• (1555)

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Mr. Speaker, that is a great question. The answer is that when a party makes promises during an election campaign, it should keep those promises. We have definitely seen very little of that from the Liberal government. As the member said, that is the one thing we can certainly agree on, that it is not keeping any of its promises. It promised what I think was a terrible promise to begin with, which is that there would be a \$10-billion deficit, but it certainly did not keep that promise. It has blown way past that already.

The member talked about infrastructure. The Liberals claim they are going to create all of these jobs with all this infrastructure, and that is why they need to run these deficits. Not only are they running this deficit and taxing Canadians, they are not even providing the promised infrastructure or the jobs. No jobs have been created, and the infrastructure is deferred until way into the future. What we are getting from the government is nothing but new taxes and a massive new debt. That is what we are getting from the government. That is going to be its legacy: taxes for us, our children and grandchildren, and a huge hole that it dug for the entire country. That is its legacy, and it is shameful.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I know there are not many who talk to their constituents more than my colleague. I believe that he was previously voted as one of the hardest-working members of Parliament for his constituents.

I am curious about his thoughts. The many times that he has been at people's doors, has he heard that a carbon tax is the answer? Has he heard that infrastructure spending is actually creating jobs? I am not hearing that at the doors that I knock on. He lives in a different part of the province of Alberta, and I am curious if he is hearing something different than I am hearing.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member that I am certainly not hearing anything different from what he is hearing. There was recently a huge rally in my riding that was organized by citizens who are opposed to a carbon tax. There were probably thousands of people who showed up. I noticed that cars going by were honking their horns in support. People are hugely concerned. It is like being kicked while we are down. There are thousands of workers out of work, and while needing support and wanting something that offers them hope, the government offers a carbon tax, which would tax everything.

When I knock on doors, in addition to hearing concerns about this carbon tax, I hear about the measures that the government claims will somehow help middle-class Canadian families. I asked my constituents at their doors, and they said they are worse off. I also did a survey in which I asked constituents if they are better or worse off, and 65% of them said they are worse off under the current government. That was 65%.

**Mr. Shaun Chen (Scarborough North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been exactly one year and a day since the Governor General of Canada delivered the Speech from the Throne, opening the 42nd Parliament, and setting in motion our government's plan to make real change happen throughout this country. When I look back over the past year, it is apparent that real change is happening across Canada from coast to coast to coast. It is the result of hope and hard work, values that continue to build our great nation, and it began with the faith and trust that Canadians put in our party.

I am proud to speak today to Bill C-29, the budget implementation act, because the budget is the centrepiece of our government's plan for change. This budget represents the hopes and dreams of so many Canadians who believe in a better and brighter future, not only for each and every Canadian today but for generations to come, that they will inherit a greener planet and a world of opportunities.

In my riding of Scarborough North, which straddles the edge of the city of Toronto and the beginning of the Rouge Urban National Park, hard-working Canadians want to know that their government is hard at work for them. The hard-working father wants to know if public transit will be improved so that commuting to work downtown from Malvern does not take up two hours of his precious time each day. After working two long shifts, he can think of no greater joy than to be at home in time to tuck his three-year old into bed. The hard-working single mother wants to know that the federal government is committed to a national strategy on inclusive, sustainable, and affordable housing. After living with her two children in unsafe and overcrowded housing for many years, she has finally saved up enough money to carry a modest mortgage for a Habitat for Humanity townhouse unit currently under construction at

the 140 Pinery Trail site. The hard-working Tamil immigrant family wants to know that their children will receive a good education and a fair chance to succeed. After fleeing the Sri Lankan civil war, there is nothing more important than to see their next generation live in a peaceful society, with the opportunities that the previous generation never had.

I feel humbled and privileged to represent the people of Scarborough North and to make sure that their priorities are heard here in Ottawa. I am proud to stand in support of Bill C-29, which will help implement a budget that is making real change happen for Canadians, change that will result in new investments for much needed infrastructure, such as public transit and affordable housing, as well as clean water, and the expansion of trade and transport.

Now is the time to invest, while interest rates are low and Canada's debt-to-GDP ratio is the lowest of any G7 country. Over the next decade, our government plans to invest over \$180 billion in infrastructure, helping residents not only in Scarborough North but all across our country.

After raising taxes on the wealthiest 1% so that we could cut them for the middle class, this budget further helps Canadian families with the high cost of raising kids. Through the new Canada child benefit, nine out of 10 families will receive more money each month, lifting hundreds of thousands of children out of poverty.

This budget also ensures that post-secondary education is affordable and accessible, especially for students from low- and middle-income families.

This budget will help seniors. Through increased benefits, our elders will now have greater comfort and dignity in their retirement years.

This budget is there to support our veterans. For all that they have done to serve our country, Canada's veterans deserve respect and better access to government services.

These are just a few examples of how real change is happening all across Canada, and today we are continuing this theme with Bill C-29.

Our government remains fully committed to growing the economy and strengthening the Canadian middle class. That is why certain provisions in this bill are designed to ensure tax fairness and a strong financial sector. Hard-working Canadians, like the people in my riding of Scarborough North, want a government that will uphold fairness for all taxpayers. The vast majority of Canadians work hard each and every day. They pay a fair share of taxes, hoping that in return the government provides the programs and services they need. However, there are some wealthy individuals who continue to abuse the system. That is precisely why this bill seeks to combat underground economic activity, close tax loopholes, and prevent tax evasion here in Canada and abroad.

*Government Orders*

•(1600)

When the rich elite benefit from unwarranted and unintended tax advantages, it is hard-working, everyday Canadians who have to pay the price. When wealthy individuals inappropriately use private corporations to reduce or defer taxes, for example, it is simply wrong that they are not paying their fair share.

That is why our government will ensure effective administration and enforcement of Canada's tax laws, making the necessary changes to improve the integrity and fairness of our tax system.

Hard-working Canadians also expect that our financial institutions remain strong. Banks are indeed where Canadians typically go to cash their paycheques, to deposit their retirement savings, and to take out their mortgages. We know that Canada's strong banking system is well-respected all around the world. The robustness of our large and diversified financial institutions was proven during and after the global financial crisis in 2008. That is why our government is strengthening Canada's financial sector, in order to support stable economic growth. By keeping our financial institutions robust, through a strong regulatory framework, our government will ensure that the needs of Canadians and Canadian businesses are met.

We are also making it clear that it is not the taxpayers but, instead, the shareholders and creditors of large banks who will be responsible for any risks taken by their respective institutions. That way, hard-working, everyday Canadians will not be left with the bill when economic turmoil hits.

It is evident that this budget implementation bill is there to provide both help and protection for Canadians. That is why I stand today in support of Bill C-29, and all of its provisions.

We must continue to build Canada's economy because we all know that a strong economy starts with a strong middle class. There is no other national project more important at this time. When middle-class Canadians have more money in their pockets, it means they can feel confident to spend more, to save more, and to invest more. This grows the Canadian economy. It grows Canada's future. I cannot think of anything more crucial than creating opportunities for both today and tomorrow.

When I think about the hopes and dreams of hard-working Canadians in my riding of Scarborough North and, indeed, across Canada, I think about what it is we want to leave behind for our future generations. The choice is ours to look ahead and ensure that we work toward a future for our country that we can all be proud of. When we invest in the economy and build a stronger middle class, Canada becomes a country that works for everyone. That is why our government is laying the groundwork today for a strong and productive economy that will last for generations to come.

I will be voting in favour of Bill C-29. I encourage all of my colleagues in this House to stand together with me for real change today and in the months, years, and decades ahead.

•(1605)

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the member. What he said actually sounded quite nice. However, in reality, taxes are increasing on Canadians.

The rich, as he said, are not paying their fair share. The fact is Canadians are being overtaxed by the government.

My particular concern is for seniors. We have Canadian seniors who are living in poverty. We have heard from the government that it is increasing the guaranteed income supplement, the GIS. We applaud that. The fact is it should be more than what it is doing. It is minuscule and it should be more.

The government has also said that it has lowered the age for OAS back to 65. Again, we are supportive of that. However, that is all that it is doing. It is not doing anything else for seniors. Seniors are struggling.

And, now, the new carbon tax is a tax on everything: medicine, food, housing, heating.

Does the member support the grief that the government's policies are creating for Canadian seniors?

**Mr. Shaun Chen:** Mr. Speaker, indeed, we have raised taxes on the wealthiest 1% so that we can cut them for the middle class.

Specifically, for seniors, we are working hard to make sure that we provide the support that is needed. For low-income single seniors, we are increasing their GIS top-up benefit up to \$947 each year. We have rolled the eligibility age for GIS and OAS benefits back from 67 to 65.

These measures, along with the investments that we are making into infrastructure, will help grow the economy; they will help create jobs; they will create a brighter future, not only for our seniors, but for each and every Canadian across this great country.

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not doubt the sincerity of my colleague when he talks about families. When I talk with a lot of families in my riding, especially young ones with young children, the biggest issue they bring to my attention is the fact that there is a lack of affordable child care spaces. Even if a family member were to get a job, that job actually would not pay for the child care, so there is no upward mobility for families.

That being said, there was an attempt made at committee with the bill to bring the indexing of the child benefit to January 1, 2017. That amendment was rejected. It was ruled out of order, and I do not see any action coming from the government to fix this problem. As a result, families will have to wait for 2020 to see if the benefits actually keep pace with inflation.

Why is the member's government not indexing the benefit starting next year? Why is it forcing low-income families to wait until 2020?

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Shaun Chen:** Indeed, Mr. Speaker, when I speak with families in my riding of Scarborough North, they are happy because the new Canada child benefit is a better benefit. It gives more money to families. It gives families who need it the most the greatest benefit.

This program will lift 300,000 children out of poverty, starting with the benefits that began last July. For example, a family with a child who is under the age of six will receive up to \$6,400 a year. For older children, they will receive \$5,400. These families will benefit from that increased benefit, money they can use to help buy school supplies, to buy winter jackets, and to provide the things their children need to have a bright future, a good education and a good start to the day as they continue to grow and become Canadians who will eventually contribute back into our society.

● (1610)

**Mr. Matt DeCoursey (Fredericton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague had the chance just now to answer a question about the work we are doing for seniors and the work we are doing for families with young children.

Could he talk about how we are helping middle-class families through our investments in infrastructure, whether it is enhanced productivity in communities like the community he represents, and/or enhanced quality of life? Could he take a moment to explain how the government is working to improve both the economic situation and the quality of life for middle-class Canadians?

**Mr. Shaun Chen:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend and colleague for his incredible work on this file and for continuing to advocate for his community.

In fact, it is such a wonderful thing when we invest in infrastructure to build public transit, to build affordable housing, to make sure that bridges and roads are repaired, and to make sure that Canadians have the infrastructure they need. It will help create jobs, and those jobs will help grow the economy. It will create a brighter future for all Canadians and it will create the conditions for success that we need so desperately.

**Mr. Dave Van Kesteren (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise to speak to the budget bill, but I do it with a heavy heart because I am concerned about the direction the government is taking. I want to talk about the government's record first, and I want to contrast the two records that we have seen in the House lately as well as over the past few years.

Take for instance the Conservative record, with a balanced budget in 2015. Contrast that today to the Liberal budget with a \$30 billion deficit.

In terms of the economy, we saw a modest growth over the last number of years, and I will get to that with a little history lesson later, whereas we have seen no growth with the Liberal government in the past year. There has just been stagnation.

Speaking of employment, during the time of the great recession, the Conservative government saw the growth of 1.5 million new jobs, most of them full-time jobs. Members will notice that I did not say we created those jobs; far from it. Far be it from any one of us to say that we create jobs. The only jobs governments create are ones in the public sector. We are talking about jobs that were grown in the

private sector. Contrast that to today's Liberal government, where we see no new jobs being created. Full-time jobs have been lost and the only added job numbers are part-time jobs.

I want to talk about deficits, but first of all I am going to give a little history lesson. I want to take members back to when the Conservative government was elected in 2006. Those were pretty good days. We saw something that we do not see a lot of now, and that is surpluses in government. During the years 2006, 2007, and partially into 2008, the Conservative government saw fit to tackle the deficit. It was not a great deficit, but any deficit is not a good thing. The Conservative government had the good sense to fight the deficit, to bring the deficit down.

Our Conservative government did that while at the same time lowering the GST by two points. We also lowered other areas of government revenue and paid down the deficit by \$37 billion. Contrast that to the 2015 budget. When our Conservative government delivered the budget to the Liberals, we delivered it with the lowest tax rate in 50 years. The typical family was paying \$7,000 less in taxes. It was the best record in the G7.

In 2015 the Liberals were elected. They told the electorate that they had a better way of doing things. Did Harper say? They said it was not true, and it almost sounded like a biblical story. The Liberals introduced a new concept of spending more, and they told folks that if they spent more money they could grow the economy. Canadians were used to lower taxes and lower deficits. They had been promised a balanced budget by the Conservatives and that is what they received, and the Liberals were introducing this whole new concept of spending money to improve our lives. This was suspect. The Liberals did say the deficit would be only \$10 billion, but that modest deficit ballooned to \$30 billion, and it did not stimulate the economy or create any new jobs; no new jobs, no growth.

I want to go back to the deficit and ask a simple question. Why would somebody go into a deficit position? I would suspect possibly Gerald Butts, the Prime Minister's chief of staff and also the former chief of staff to Dalton McGuinty. There seems to be a pattern here. The Ontario government did the same thing. It said, if it spent more money, that it could do a lot of great things, that it could grow the economy.

● (1615)

It is interesting to note that the Prime Minister's first trip was to Davos, Switzerland. It is an obscure little town in Europe, but it is the seat of the world banking system, which is interesting. These folks had heard that the Prime Minister was going to spend money and go into a deficit situation.

*Government Orders*

On his second trip, he made great friends with the President of the United States, Mr. Obama. Mr. Obama was well versed in that kind of ideology too. As a matter of fact, he doubled the deficit in the United States. It went up from \$9 trillion to \$18 trillion. I remember the first time we started talking about a trillion dollars, and I had to get my mind around that. I just know it is an awful lot of money. The Prime Minister went to Mr. Obama and they became great friends.

I have to give the Liberals credit. I went over their record on their candidates and team, and I just wanted to introduce myself to the team. However, I have never seen more doctors, more lawyers, more Ph.D.s, or Rhodes scholar. I feel a little intimidated, because I am just a farm boy. I think we have more commoners on this side of the room.

I can tell members that I am just a farm boy who had some modest success in the auto industry. However, in 1993, I had a lesson in debt. The banks came around and they pulled my line of credit. It brought me to my knees, but it taught me a valuable lesson. I learned that I would never be indebted to a bank again.

Members can ask most business people if they would rather have a huge debt or no debt at all. I do not think there is a person in the House who would not say the latter. That lesson was something I needed to learn, because it helped me become a better businessman. Yet, the current government is telling us that debt is not a bad thing, and that we can borrow our way to success. I am here to tell members that it will not happen and it will not work.

Now, central banks are a whole different subject. Maybe I will have the opportunity to talk about central banks at some point. They know there is no better customer than a nation, especially a rich nation. Do members know why? It is because they will always pay their bills. They have a method of payment that is unequalled on the planet, and it is called taxes. They will just tax their citizens. Members should understand that there is no other means for a government, for a country, to raise revenue. It is just taxes.

Members might ask what about borrowing money. Well, that is just deferring the inevitable. Eventually, we are going to pay the piper, and banks know this. Banks know that they are always going to get their two points, whatever that is. The bank rate is at 3%, but they will get 5%. We like to say that if bank rates are at 0%, then that is a whole different discussion. I know that one day we are going to have that discussion, because it is a non-reality. However, if we assume that is the rate, banks will always get their 2%.

God help us if we ever go to traditional rates. Can members imagine, if we are paying at this point about \$35 billion on an interest rate at 2%, if that were to spike to 4%, 6%, or 8%? Some of the younger folks here are surprised at 8%. I remember mortgages when we thought we were getting a real good deal when we paid 12.75%.

The Speaker is telling me I do not have much time left, but I do not think the current government has much time left either if the Liberals continue on this trajectory. If they continue this avenue of free spending and they continue to put this country, the people, and especially our children into a position where they are indebted and they can no longer pay that debt. I do not want to paint a picture that is unreal. Far be it from me to do that.

• (1620)

I will close by saying that the idea of spending money to get richer is foolhardy at best, and it is a mistake for the government to continue in that direction. I would ask that the Liberals look again at the direction they are going and reverse this terrible direction.

**Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith (Beaches—East York, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member could speak to the different kinds of debt. It is an unfortunate thing when we talk about debt to Canadians as just debt. There is capital infrastructure debt, operating expense debt that we might incur, and there are very different—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** There is a rule that you can be in the House and you can vote in the House without a tie, but unfortunately, I am going to cut it off. I just noticed the hon. member does not have a tie, I am going to have to ask him to sit down. I am sure it was a great question.

The hon. member for Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rémi Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservative member's presentation was an interesting one. He contrasted the previous government with the Liberal government. I can assure the House that the contrast is obvious with our Liberal government, since it is a government that is here for the regions. The member also spoke about the debt, in reference to what my colleague said earlier.

I would like to hear more from the member on how the Canada child benefit has improved the lives of 9 out of 10 families, on the fact that it has lifted 300,000 children out of poverty, with all of these new measures being tax free. I would like to hear his thoughts on how the Canada child benefit is making it easier for families to break the debt cycle.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dave Van Kesteren:** Mr. Speaker, I have to be honest. I have kids with kids. They tell me it is neat to get that cheque. However, I remind them that they have to pay it back and their kids will have to pay it back too. Had the Liberal government been honest with the Canadian public and said it was going to really increase this but it would cost them, that it was not going to pay for it, but it was going to charge it, I wonder if Canadians would have had the same response.

I repeat, when it is Christmastime and mom and dad come home with piles and piles of presents, the kids will be delighted, but in the same breath if they tell the kids that they charged it and the kids will have to pay for it, it would really make for a crummy Christmas.

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the member for Beaches—East York. If he wants to borrow a tie, we have some very stylish ones in the NDP lobby.

*Government Orders*

I wanted to bring to the attention of my Conservative friend that, in March 2016, there was an advisory council on economic growth that was struck by the Liberal government and Michael Sabia was one of the members of this council. That was right around the same time that he appeared on March 3 before the Toronto Board of Trade and stated that:

For long term investors, infrastructure offers something that's not easy to find today: stable, predictable returns in the 7 to 9 per cent range with a low risk of capital loss—exactly what we need to meet our clients' long term needs.

When we hear the private investment industry making those kinds of claims, about 7% to 9% return on investment, where does my friend think those returns are going to come from and how do they compare with what the government could offer or what the government did promise with low interest rates?

• (1625)

**Mr. Dave Van Kesteren:** Mr. Speaker, I wish I had more time. I think it was Nathan Hale who spoke about having another life to give, but I wish I had another hour to give; we could talk about those things, but the long and the short of it is this. I would be the first to say that I am not an economist, but I am a businessman. I would say there are a lot of folks here who are not economists and yet they have learned to balance their own chequebook. When we do those things, we know that what is coming in had better be equal to what is going out. We always like to make one a little more than the other. However, it is just common sense that we cannot spend our way to prosperity. There are times when governments have invested. We use that word so freely and everything seems to be an investment nowadays. Nevertheless when we go to the bank and we borrow money, we have made a loan and we have to pay back that loan.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** The hon. member for Mount Royal is rising on a point of order.

\* \* \*

**POINTS OF ORDER**

## DECORUM IN THE HOUSE

**Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in 20 seconds or less, I was just wondering if I could clarify your ruling with respect to the member for Beaches—East York.

My understanding is that the rules say “contemporary business attire” in the House. I think today—

**Hon. Peter Van Loan:** Which is accepted to be a tie.

**Mr. Anthony Housefather:** Mr. Speaker, excuse me, but the rules are for contemporary business attire. The rules have changed in workplaces since 1987, the last time the Speaker, I believe, ruled on this issue. I am wondering if the Speaker would consider reviewing this rule and sending it to the procedure and House affairs committee to revise it, as many workplaces today no longer require men to wear ties.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** I appreciate the suggestion. I will bring it back and suggest it to a meeting. We will get back to the member if anything changes.

Now we will resume debate. The hon. member for Mississauga East—Cooksville.

**BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2016, NO. 2**

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-29, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2016 and other measures, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

**Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I take this opportunity to speak to Bill C-29, the budget implementation act. This budget will have such a profound, progressive, and positive impact on the families, kids, students, and workers in my riding. It will make a tremendous difference in their lives.

However, by their nature, budget bills are largely collections of various budget-related matters, and many of these matters can be very technical in nature and mind-numbing, I would say. However, other parts of these bills pertain to matters of substantive policy, including the important policy choices made by governments. I will address you on the parts of this bill that pertain to the important policy decisions made by this government.

The first policy decision made by this government that I will speak to is the Canada child benefit. I refer to its indexing to inflation, the maximum benefit amounts, and the phase-out thresholds under the Canada child benefit beginning in the 2020-21 benefit year. This decision will keep the Canada child benefit up to date, effective, and relevant, regardless of any future inflation.

The Canada child benefit is a critical program for Canadians, now and into the future. Our Canada child benefit is responsible for lifting over 300,000 Canadian children above that poverty threshold. In a stroke, it reduced Canada's child poverty rate from 11% to 6%. It cut our child poverty rate nearly in half. That is outstanding. It is something that many of us have talked about for decades and never seen done. To see this happen before our eyes is truly amazing. This is the sort of societal-changing action we all entered into politics to effect.

Moving over 300,000 children out of dire need means nearly one-third of a million Canadian children will eat better, will be better clothed, will be better educated, and will benefit from the opportunities many other Canadian children can take for granted. These opportunities might include soccer lessons, music lessons, or science camps. Not only is this program, which this legislation underpins into the future, the right and decent thing to do, it is the clever thing to do.

Children raised out of poverty have better health outcomes. These better outcomes will save us untold billions of dollars in health costs in the future. Children not burdened by poverty get better educations. These better educated Canadians will result in a more productive Canadian economy in the future.



*Government Orders*

The increased productivity from this poverty-reduction program will contribute billions in extra Canadian economic growth and Canadian government revenues. Children not haunted by poverty have better life outcomes. They are less likely to suffer from debilitating social problems, such as crime and addiction. Reducing such social problems will not only prevent untold personal grief and tragedy but will save all levels of government more billions of dollars.

Poverty reduction might even have a surprising effect on our democratic system. There is some evidence that increased income increases the likelihood of voting. This makes intuitive sense. If we feel our society has cared about us and our children, we will tend to care more about our society. Therefore, we are likely making more engaged and better citizens with this measure.

It is no wonder that the Canada child benefit has been described as “one of the most ambitious social policies to be implemented in Canada in decades”. Bill C-29 supports this progressive and ambitious societal change.

Bill C-29 also makes post-secondary education more affordable for low and middle-income families. Further, it makes it easier to repay any student debt incurred to obtain that post-secondary education. These are yet more progressive and forward-thinking government measures to position Canadians and Canada for the future.

Successful world citizens in the future will not be working harder, but will be working smarter. It is our duty to ensure that Canadians are overrepresented in the future cohort of successful, highly educated world citizens. These budget measures are some of the ways we are fulfilling that duty.

The measures I have addressed so far relate to our duty to the youngest Canadians and future generations. The measures I now address concern our duty to the most vulnerable of our oldest Canadians, our seniors.

● (1630)

Currently, these vulnerable seniors—i.e., those couples receiving the guaranteed income supplement under the Old Age Security Act—are penalized when one or both of them become so ill that it requires the couple to split up for health reasons. While they are forced to incur the extra costs of living as two single people, they are not each entitled to the single-person supplement. Currently, they are restricted to the couple supplement only. The couple supplement is less than that for two single persons.

The amendment in the budget would correct that unfairness by allowing each involuntary single to claim that single-person supplement. This would recognize their increased costs, which are beyond their control.

CARP is a 300,000-member national, non-partisan, non-profit organization advocating for financial security and improved health care for Canadians as they age. It “applauds the government for the proposed amendment to the Old Age Security Act, contained within Bill C-29”, and our earlier increase in the guaranteed income supplement. While certainly wanting us to do more, CARP further states, “these amendments have our unconditional support”.

This measure is a part of our commitment to ensuring that Canadian seniors have a dignified, comfortable, and secure retirement.

The bill would also implement the part of the election platform that Canadians voted for last year regarding increases in infrastructure spending, some \$180 billion over 12 years. Canada, like the rest of the world, has realized that monetary policy, including the low interest rates that we find ourselves with now, is no cure for sluggish growth. It cannot fix everything. These needed investments are not necessarily made because of the low interest rates. That is why, with government intervention, we are able to get some of that needed infrastructure built. We are in such a situation right now.

We also realize that there is an infrastructure deficit in Canada. Sewer systems, bridges, railroads, social housing, and rural high-speed Internet are but a few of the areas in which we must invest more. The timing is right for this infrastructure push right now. As the British magazine, *The Economist*, said on October 4, 2014, there are concrete benefits as a result, because “Public investments in infrastructure do the most good at times like the present”.

Municipal leaders, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, are raving about the leadership that we have taken on infrastructure and the improvements that will come to municipalities coast to coast to coast.

Our current prosperity did not come out of thin air. We have to realize this. It came out of investments and hard work. Canada's most iconic infrastructure investment was the “National Dream”, that is, the building of the transcontinental railway. That investment helped make Canada. It created untold wealth and knitted us together. It is a classic example of the far-sighted infrastructure investment that we need.

We must be equally far-sighted today. There is a myriad of new infrastructure opportunities that exist in public transit, local and regional airports, disaster mitigation, community energy systems, health care facilities, and I could go on and on.

Many societies around the world are confronting new tensions and perhaps even a questioning of the traditional bonds between citizens and their leaders. This legislation would address those strains by emphasizing the inclusive nature of our Canadian democracy.

I am concerned about the state of our democracy and the world's democracies. To that end, I allude to the broader positive societal impact of the measures to help Canadian children whose families are struggling.

I have also highlighted the long-term nation-building implications of infrastructure investment.

*Speaker's Ruling*

We are determined to ensure a strong economy based on a strong middle class. When middle-class Canadians have more money to save, invest, and grow the economy, everyone benefits. These benefits are not only economic, but democratic, social, and cultural.

•(1635)

I think about Canadian parents, who are struggling to join the middle class, and working hard. This bill is a concrete, monthly, and effective demonstration of Canadian societal concerns for them. I support this legislation wholeheartedly, and encourage everyone in this House to vote in favour of Bill C-29.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. I would like to raise two things.

First, we know that our economy's biggest job creators are small and medium-sized businesses, which generally create about 80% of new jobs. This is the case in Montreal, especially in Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie.

During the election campaign, the Liberals promised to help small businesses to give them some breathing room. Unfortunately, in their first budget, there is no hint of this promised tax break for small businesses. I would like to hear my colleague's comments on that.

Second, I heard my colleague's concerns about infrastructure. In Montreal it is pretty catastrophic and there is a lot of catching up to do. Personally, I am deeply concerned to hear the government referring to privatization and the new infrastructure bank, which will attract a great deal of private capital. They will guarantee a return to provide for dividends.

Why will we guarantee this bank a return or a profit of 7% when we could borrow at an interest rate of 2%?

[*English*]

**Mr. Peter Fonseca:** Mr. Speaker, small businesses are the lifeblood of our economy. They are the engine. I have so many small businesses in my riding of Mississauga East—Cooksville.

I can tell the member that they have come to me. The Canada child benefit has made a difference to those businesses. That extra spending money that those families now have means they can buy that winter coat at this time of year, or put their kids in soccer or in music class, or provide more for their children. It is an investment, and that investment also moves in to those small and medium-sized businesses.

The same thing happened with our middle-class tax cut. That means more money in the hands of more people in the middle class, and being able to spend that money within the local economy, because these businesses are local, and they make such a difference. They are employers of many people in our community.

I say to the member that these are investments that will have a major impact on our small and medium-sized businesses.

•(1640)

**Mr. Dan Vandal (Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, budget 2016 was very well received in Manitoba, both in the rural areas and in the city areas. In fact, in the riding of

Provencher in the village of St-Pierre, we received \$3 million for a lagoon expansion. In the city of Winnipeg, we received \$55 million for transit improvements, something that is direly needed for Winnipeg.

I am wondering if the hon. member could speak to the importance of transit improvements in large urban centres and how so very important that is for the future of moving people, moving goods, and increasing productivity for cities.

**Mr. Peter Fonseca:** Mr. Speaker, the member is so right. I want to thank him for all he does for his community and understanding the importance of those buses, trains, roads, that help move people and goods so that they can get to work a little quicker and get home a lot quicker and be able to spend more time with their families. There is also the productivity impact. I think of what that means to those businesses.

We talk about our carbon footprint and the reduction in the amount of emissions we have by having more people on buses and therefore better service. We also have a bigger uptake in terms of people using public transit. I often hear that if there were more buses, if there was better, more frequent service, more people would then use public transit.

That is happening right across the country, especially in the member's riding and in Manitoba. I know the type of impact that makes, especially for the middle-class working families and those working hard to reach the middle class.

\* \* \*

**POINTS OF ORDER**

## DECORUM IN THE HOUSE—SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** Before resuming debate, I would like to speak to a point of order that was raised earlier. On page 605 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* regarding attire it says:

...Speakers have ruled that all Members desiring to be recognized at any point during the proceedings of the House must be wearing contemporary business attire. Current practice requires that male Members wear jackets, shirts and ties. Clerical collars have been allowed, although ascots and turtlenecks have been ruled inappropriate for male Members participating in debate.

I just wanted to clarify that in case anyone was wondering. I would not want anyone to miss their opportunity to speak, but even if they come to the House without a tie, we have staff here who are really willing to help, and we have some ties sitting up front. They may not like the look of them, but they are ties and they would fit the bill.

*Government Orders***BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2016, NO. 2**

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-29, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2016 and other measures, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

**Ms. Karina Gould (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to take this opportunity to rise in this place to speak in support of this legislation and to discuss the international assistance provisions outlined in budget 2016, as well as provide some additional insight into the direction our government is taking with regard to Canada's international assistance overall.

In terms of new funding, budget 2016 allocated an additional \$256 million over two years, 2016-17 and 2017-18, to the international assistance envelope, the IAE. The international assistance envelope is the Government of Canada's primary planning tool for managing official development assistance and for funding our international assistance activities. Though the majority of the resources in the IAE are programmed by Global Affairs Canada, it is truly a whole-of-government mechanism for implementing the government's international assistance agenda.

The budget 2016 infusion of new resources complements the significant steps we have taken to address key global challenges, including climate change, instability, and humanitarian crises in Iraq, Syria, and the surrounding region, as well as ongoing development challenges, particularly those facing women and girls.

In the last year, our government has committed \$2.65 billion over five years to help developing countries tackle climate change, provided over \$1.1 billion over three years in development and humanitarian assistance to address the needs of people affected by the ongoing crisis in the Middle East, and increased our contribution to The Global Fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria by 20%, to \$785 million from 2017 to 2019.

• (1645)

[*Translation*]

The international aid commitments that the government has recently made are a reflection of our desire to help implement the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

We have leveraged our significant commitments to encourage other donors to dig deeper. During the event hosted by our Prime Minister in Montreal last September, donors pledged over \$12.9 billion over the next three years to the fifth Global Fund Replenishment Conference to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. This is a tremendous global commitment to end the spread of AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria once and for all.

Under the leadership of the Minister of International Development and La Francophonie, we launched a review of Canada's international assistance, including development, peace, security and humanitarian aid.

This means that we are reviewing what we do, where we are targeting our efforts, our operating practices, and the partnerships we must forge to make our contribution.

[*English*]

At the core of our review is a commitment to refocus our assistance on the poorest and the most vulnerable, including in fragile states. We will channel our efforts on advancing the empowerment of women and girls as powerful agents of change. By investing in their social, economic, and political empowerment, we can promote dramatic and positive change in the lives of entire communities.

As a recent UNDP report highlighted, the future of the world will depend on us doing everything in our power to ignite the potential of a 10-year-old girl today. That commitment to a feminist and human rights-based approach will also be a catalyst for achieving all 17 goals of the 2030 agenda for sustainable development.

To ensure that we get this right, we consulted broadly and transparently with Canadian and international partners, seeking to build on areas of Canada's success, examine evidence and best practice, and strengthen the partnerships, mechanisms, and tools needed for improved delivery on the ground. More than 15,000 Canadian and international stakeholders in over 60 countries took the time to contribute to these consultations. I thank them for their thoughtful, engaging responses.

We know that the global development and security context has changed and Canada's international assistance needs to adapt to this new reality. In our response to crises in the Middle East, we are ensuring that our security, humanitarian, and development assistance is part of an integrated response in the region.

To move forward, the Government of Canada will need to forge new partnerships with Canadians, NGO partners, international organizations, research institutions, and the private sector to ensure that the best ideas and minds are brought together to develop innovative solutions to the most enduring problems. We will need to look beyond official development assistance and make use of different types of financial flows to overcome financing gaps.

Most important, we will continue to engage with stakeholders and local populations, including the poorest and the most vulnerable, to ensure that their voices are heard and form part of the decisions that affect their lives and livelihoods. In the coming months, we look forward to sharing our new international assistance vision that will support Canada's engagement on the world stage, thus contributing to a more stable and prosperous world for all.

I am pleased to be supporting this legislation to achieve those objectives.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for her fine speech. Everyone in the House is quite aware of what is happening in other countries. That is all well and good, but what about Canadians who today are struggling to support themselves?

*Government Orders*

I would like the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development to tell me, above and beyond the ideals of helping others, why are we not starting at home?

•(1650)

**Ms. Karina Gould:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question.

I believe that it is clear in the budget that we presented to the House that we are starting by helping Canadians. Take for example, the tax cut for the middle class; the Canada child benefit, which will help nine out of ten families and lift 300,000 children out of poverty; and our programs and strategies to increase the guaranteed income supplement for seniors. We are doing a lot for Canadians. As a party and as a government, we understand that we need to start here at home in Canada.

However, we also have global responsibilities. We are part of an international system. We have the responsibility to contribute to it to build a better future, not only here in Canada but also in other countries around the world.

[*English*]

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would tend to disagree with the hon. member's last comments, that we are helping back home first. In Alberta, we have a massive jobs crisis that is occurring, we have a carbon tax implemented, and we have CPP increases on top of that.

As part of the member's speech, she indicated that she is helping young families. Could the member comment on how those initiatives would help young families, because, quite frankly, I do not think they would.

**Ms. Karina Gould:** Mr. Speaker, I of course recognize the struggles that Alberta and the member's fellow Albertans are going through. Our government has been very clear in giving concrete assistance in terms of infrastructure dollars that are making an impact right now, in terms of approving the pipeline that will not only get our resources to market but will also help put many people in Alberta and across this country into well-paying, middle-class jobs.

In addition, I have spoken to many individuals in my community. The member questioned whether these measures would help young families. I can tell him that the Canada child benefit is having a real, meaningful, and tangible impact on the bottom line of families. It is helping them make ends meet. It is helping with the costs of raising children. It is really making a tangible difference in their lives. I am proud of the work that our government is doing to ensure that we are raising kids across this country out of poverty.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. parliamentary secretary appears to be misinformed about the jobs impact of Kinder Morgan. The National Energy Board refused to hear evidence on jobs and the economy. Unifor, the largest union representing the oil sands workers, wanted to make it clear to the National Energy Board that the expansion would come at the cost of all the jobs currently in the Chevron refinery in Burnaby, as it will likely close if Kinder Morgan is expanded. I would like the hon. parliamentary secretary to clarify the lack of information on which the government was operating.

**Ms. Karina Gould:** Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to creating an environment in which we can have well-paying, middle-class jobs. We know that infrastructure projects, whether social infrastructure such as housing or child care, green infrastructure like waste-water treatment plants or other important infrastructure projects, or infrastructure that is going to help us get resources to markets is going to create jobs. Building is going to require new jobs.

There are many different areas in which jobs will be created. Jobs are an important factor for our government in making these decisions for all of Canada.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** 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 Essex, Steel Industry; the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, Health.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House. "Pleased" might be a bit of an exaggeration, but I always like talking about bills in the House.

When it comes to Bill C-29, it is sad to see that Canadians have been taken for a ride, and I am not talking about a ride in Santa's sleigh. The Liberal government omitted some things. Opposition members here in Ottawa are not the only ones questioning Bill C-29. Members of the Quebec National Assembly are too. The Quebec National Assembly even passed a unanimous motion, which is saying a lot because it means that friends of both the Liberals and Conservatives supported it. I know a member of the National Assembly in Quebec City who is probably not very impressed at having to work against his natural friends.

The motion of the National Assembly reads as follows:

That the National Assembly reiterate the importance of preserving the strong consumer protection regime enacted in the Quebec Consumer Protection Act;

That the National Assembly call on the federal government to remove the provisions of Bill C-29, A second act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2016 and other measures, that would render inapplicable the provisions of the Quebec Consumer Protection Act that govern the relationship between banks and their clients.

This comes from the Quebec National Assembly. So it is not just the opposition here in Ottawa that has questions about Bill C-29.

At the launch of the campaign in 2015, the Liberals promised us just a small deficit of \$10 billion. This has now become an enormous deficit of \$34 billion. It is surely going to skyrocket yet again, because the Liberals forgot to tell Canadians and Quebecers that, when they were given power, they were also given the power to spend like drunken sailors.

They are not consulting us. They spend, and then they say they have made a mistake that is going to prove expensive. They should have thought of that before, or consulted Canadians to see whether it was the right thing to do.

*Government Orders*

It is a shame, because today's Liberals have not changed much from the Liberals of 10 or 11 years ago. One need only think of the preferential access to ministers at a cost of \$1,500. I am not sure the people in my riding are prepared to pay \$1,500 just so that a business can get the help it so badly needs.

The Liberals had promised to reduce the small business tax rate. That is another broken promise. The Liberals are still telling us many wonderful things, but it is what the Liberals do not say that is dangerous. That is what they fail to tell Canadians every day. Not everyone reads the fine print.

We are here in the House and we watch them in action, but Canadians watch the news and learn that there are fewer and fewer full-time jobs available for our young people. However, the Liberals promised a year ago to create a whole raft of new jobs. We have a job, but our young people need full-time jobs. Not all young university graduates want to go to work at McDonald's, even though it may be just fine to do so.

• (1655)

They took courses and got their degree, and they want to work in their field. However, thanks to the taxes and surtaxes imposed by the Liberals, they have no employment. There has been a decline in full-time youth employment.

People everywhere are asking questions. The president of Option consommateurs has wondered whether Bill C-29 is not perhaps a way for the federal government to open the door for the banks to circumvent Quebec law. There are Quebeckers sitting opposite us, on the other side of the House. The 40 elected Quebeckers—they can hear the people of Quebec. Can they rise in the House to defend Quebeckers?

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

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** I am pleased to see you want to stand up for them. However, they have to stop telling Quebeckers fairy tales. The other day I was talking about unicorns, and today I am talking about fairies. What I am trying to say is that at some point you have to stop dreaming and start being honest with people. It's fine to consult with them, but you also have to listen to them. A consultation is not a monologue. On the contrary, it is a dialogue with the people.

The Liberals are holding consultations all over the place, but they are not listening to anyone. They are not listening to anyone because they are the best. The Liberals are the good guys, until it all blows up in their face. Before getting to that point they should think about the ordinary Quebeckers and Canadians who are having trouble making ends meet. Thanks to the Liberals, those people find themselves cut adrift.

Let us just consider the infrastructure bank. Who will benefit from it? The Liberals' friends and those who can invest \$100 million. You do not see too many \$100-million projects in a little community like Saint-Urbain or Saint-Irénée. However, it is the small communities that need help. We can help the big cities like Montréal, Vancouver, Ottawa, or Québec, but we also have to help the regions.

The Liberals have forgotten one thing. Unfortunately, I must be honest and say that every political party for the last 25 or 30 years has forgotten it as well. It is the country that feeds the city, not the other way around.

Today, our small communities are being choked in the interests of the big communities, of friends who have money and millionaires. I am truly proud to be a member of a political party that cares for the regions and the smaller municipalities, a party that works for ordinary Quebeckers and for those who don't have millions of dollars in the bank. I am a member of a party that also takes care of those who do community work, but who come from the same place as the people sitting here today. I salute them.

I remember a time when I myself was poor and in need of money. I have to vote against this bill being proposed today, because it will not help poor people, just the opposite. There is a lot of talk about the middle class, but they are in the process of bleeding it white.

The Liberal Party will make the middle class of today into the poor of tomorrow. I think that is unacceptable. One need only visit the food banks and volunteer at Christmas dinners for the less fortunate to realize that the face of poverty has changed over the last 20 years. Poor people are no longer just those who live on the street; they are also people who work and struggle to pay for electricity, rent, or anything else. They are taxed and squeezed dry again and again.

I must therefore vote against Bill C-29, because it offers no solution to the problem of poverty and the problems of the rural world, from which I come.

• (1700)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** Before we go on, I would like to remind members that they must not address anyone directly using the second person pronoun. I am sure that the hon. member was not talking about me as the Speaker. In the House, members must use the third person.

The hon. Minister of Transport.

**Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech even though it made me scratch my head a few times.

Since she raised the subject of poverty, has she asked poor people in her riding who are now receiving the Canada child benefit, an extremely generous, tax-free benefit that will lift 300,000 children out of poverty, whether that benefit has made things better for them? Has she told seniors who receive the guaranteed income supplement that they will receive nearly \$1,000 more thanks to our government?

She is welcome to speak passionately about poverty and people, but she needs to acknowledge that this government has done some good things.

• (1705)

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

Of course my constituents have talked to me about those things. I even know some people who put the money aside because they do not know when they will have to pay it back. That is a fact.

*Government Orders*

Since my colleague mentioned seniors, I will talk about my mother, who will not benefit from this measure at all because it will cost her more since she has Alzheimer's. The Liberals did not consider that. I know what things are like for seniors and lots of people.

The Liberals, like the Conservatives, have certainly done some good things. However, you have to admit that, by breaking promises, you have hurt Canadians. It would be nice if you could admit that because, for middle-class people, there is a big difference between \$10 billion and \$34 billion.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** Again, I would remind the hon. member that I did not do those things. I imagine she was addressing the government members.

The hon. member for Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques.

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. I will not say the name of her riding, because it is one of the few whose name is longer than that of my riding.

My colleague talked about the changes being made by Bill C-29 to the Bank Act. At the Standing Committee on Finance, of which I am a member, a representative from the Public Interest Advocacy Centre said that adopting an out-of-court settlement provision or a provision to prevent class action lawsuits is prohibited under the Consumer Protection Act.

It is ironic because the government wants to make changes in response to the ruling in Marcotte, which stemmed from a class action lawsuit having to do with foreign currency conversion fees.

Contrary to what the government is saying, power is being shifted from the consumer to the banks, which, unfortunately, have no regard for Quebec's jurisdiction over consumer protection.

What does my colleague think of that?

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

Quite frankly, it is appalling that the consumer is the loser here. Canadian consumers should have been the ones to benefit from Bill C-29.

As for the Consumer Protection Act, that is a Quebec law, and we do not want to lose it. The government and the members across the aisle who are from Quebec are very aware of how things work in Quebec. This bill undermines Quebec jurisprudence, and that is wrong.

What I think is even worse is that consumers are the ones who lose here, because if they are ever dissatisfied, they have no recourse under Bill C-29.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham (Laurentides—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I once again have the great pleasure of rising to talk about how successful the Liberal 2016 budget has been, along with Bill C-29 to implement it. It is a budget that plans for the future, invests where investments are needed, helps our seniors, returns science and innovation to its rightful place, lays the groundwork for our youth, and addresses the priorities of our regions.

At 19,694 square kilometres, my riding, Laurentides—Labelle, is the 46th largest riding in Canada. Our smallest municipality has 41 permanent residents; our largest has about 13,000. My home town of Sainte-Lucie-des-Laurentides, where I still live, is the median of our 43 municipalities with 1,024 residents.

Our communities are aging. In 2011, the average age was 49.5. This year's census data will be released shortly, and I can only imagine that the average age will be over 50, so this budget and the initiatives that will affect our region are important.

In this bill, we are making it easy for senior couples no longer able to live together to receive greater old age security benefits. We are helping seniors in the short term, and we are planning for future issues involving seniors through the changes we have already rolled out for a significant 10% increase to the guaranteed income supplement for single seniors; through lowering the eligibility age for old age security from 67 to 65; and also through Bill C-26 on the future of the CPP.

We have been here for only a year and we did all that. The three budgets remaining in this mandate can only be even better.

• (1710)

[English]

Speaking of the future, I want to take this opportunity to talk about our innovation agenda. Our budget puts billions of dollars into social, transport, and green infrastructure. Our investments in scientific research are finally back on, after years of having a creationist minister of science. We understand the importance of research, of science, and of being truly progressive. Progressive comes from progress. Progress is a forward or onward movement. Moving forward is what we do.

While the official opposition objects to even the most basic progress, when even the notion of switching to digital clocks in this chamber was pooh-poohed by the Conservatives when we had a debate on Standing Order 51, the rest of society moves ever forward.

Mr. Speaker, 2016 marks the 25th anniversary of Linux, the open source operating system started by Linus Torvalds and developed into a world powerhouse by tens if not hundreds of thousands of contributors from all walks of life and all corners of the globe.

I have been involved in the Linux and open source community for most of that time, mainly through the open and free technology community SourceForge and its predecessor organizations, Software in the Public Interest and the Debian community. It symbolizes to me what a community can do when it works together. Indeed, DebConf17 will take place next year in Montreal, and it is an excellent and concrete example of what that looks like.

We in rural Canada are still trying to figure out how to reduce packet loss on our TCP-over-smoke signal Internet connectivity and our UDP-over-carrier pigeon cell phone service. The rest of the world is not waiting.

Amazon, Google, and Facebook built their empires on Linux. Linux now runs 498 of the world's 500 fastest supercomputers, only one of which is in Canada. Even Microsoft recently finally joined the Linux Foundation this fall.

I believe it is very important to understand the lessons of the open source community.

In 25 years, Linux went from a university student's hobby to the software backbone of the Internet. Many people became very wealthy because of it, with it, and through it, yet all the while, the software, the product, was free for anyone and everyone to use, to modify, to take apart, and to understand.

While some people refuse to use a web browser other than Internet Explorer because its proprietary nature is seen as the only possible avenue to being secure, I see it as the other way around. Open source software, with its peer-reviewed scientific approach to development, tends to be the most secure option available. Getting open source logic into government can only see innovation improve.

With our innovation agenda, the options are there, but to get there, we need communications infrastructure. That we only have one of the world's top 500 supercomputers, and that it is 196 on the list, speaks to the need for infrastructure and investment in innovation. After a decade of the previous government dismissing science as an inconvenience, unhelpful facts in the way of an ideological agenda, the government we have today clearly believes in researching and preparing our way into the future.

In rural Canada, as I mentioned, Internet is our big file. Of the 43 municipalities I mentioned earlier, all 43 see the lack of proper, competitive, high speed Internet as among the top priorities. Without it, our average age will continue heading north. When our average age reaches retirement age, the social structure of our region will necessarily change.

To address this, we need to address the issues that are keeping youth away.

[*Translation*]

When I asked high school seniors who among them will stay in the region after they graduate, it was rare to hear one of them say yes.

When I ask them why they leave, the answers are always the same. They say that there is no post-secondary education, that there is not a lot of public transit, that the regional service covers 35 municipalities with a couple of retired school buses, and that there is substandard Internet and cellular service. Without these, not much is going on. When newcomers see that their cellphones do not work, they do not think about buying a house in our region, moving there or making their lives there.

Internet access is only through slow and unreliable satellite service or by telephone. Surely members can remember that noise old modems used to make. Unfortunately, it is still the case for many

### *Government Orders*

of our residents. For the luckiest, it is a blurry image at the end of a Skype call with their grandchildren.

Our budget is beginning to tackle these problems. We are investing \$500 million in digital infrastructure to help bridge this technical gap. The lack of internet means fewer young people, less immigration and fewer opportunities for those who stay.

In investing a half a billion dollars in digital infrastructure to begin with, we are creating opportunities for those who stay and some appeal for newcomers. We are also helping to keep young people in the region.

The bill also aims to improve the lives of our seniors and to even out the average age of our regions over the long term. It is a budget that plans for the future, that invests where investment is needed, that helps our seniors, that reinstates science and innovation to their rightful place, that paves the way for our young people, and that examines the priorities of our regions. I am proud to support it.

What I am most proud of in this budget is the Canada child benefit. It helps thousands of people in the country. Over 300,000 people will find more money in their pockets.

When I tour my riding, people will often stop me and say they have never been interested in politics, but they really appreciate what we have done for families.

Last Friday evening, someone told me that she became a single parent just before the change in policy, and that it has helped her directly. It also provides concrete assistance to the region's youth and families. I am proud of everything we have done. We have be proud of this budget. I am proud to support it.

• (1715)

[*English*]

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued by the opening comments by my colleague, who listed a number of so-called achievements. Then he said that all of this was done in only one year.

I would like to list a few other things from only one year. The Liberals promised a \$10-billion deficit. Now it is over \$30 billion, all in one year, resulting in interest-cost increases of \$10 billion per year. Big spending; no results. There are fewer full-time jobs than a year ago. The cost of living has increased. It is harder for Canadians to qualify for or afford a mortgage. The Liberals also forgot to index the Canada child benefit. Now to index it, we find that it would cost \$42 billion over five years. That is all in one year.

My really big disappointment is to see the Prime Minister not allowing us to have full debate on this bill in the House. This budget implementation bill is important for the future of Canada. It should have a more complete and full debate.

*Government Orders*

I wonder if my colleague would comment on why he thinks the Prime Minister is not allowing full debate on Bill C-29.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** Mr. Speaker, with nine days of debate, we are not facing a major debate deficit.

If the Conservatives want to go after us on deficits, they have quite a record. The Conservatives have passed maybe four budgets since 1900 that actually had a surplus. I am not going to take any great lectures from the Conservatives.

There is a huge deficit in our infrastructure. There is so much work that needs to be done. The member wants to put the deficit in our infrastructure and in our communities instead of in our line items.

It is important that we do this correctly. We need to invest in our country, in our communities, to build for the future.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the hon. member for Laurentides—Labelle comes from Quebec.

With Bill C-29, we are facing a situation where the government wants, unilaterally of course, to appropriate consumer protection powers, where banks and financial institutions are concerned.

The problem is that what we see in Bill C-29 is much weaker than what is now in Quebec's Consumer Protection Act. Not only that, but it is a recognized fact that consumer protection falls under provincial jurisdiction.

I acknowledge that the Bank Act is a federal law, but we are talking about consumer protection here. What is more, if there are amendments made by Bill C-29 in connection with this issue, that is because of the Marcotte ruling, which dealt with currency conversion fees. That matter went before the Supreme Court, notably after a class action suit.

Incidentally, this Bill C-29 would no longer permit class action lawsuits against banks. I think there is a sort of contradiction here. Quebec organizations generally recognize that Bill C-29 is going to reduce the level of consumer protection.

As an MP from Quebec, why does he not rise in the House to protest this situation and to defend his riding's consumers, especially bank users?

• (1720)

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham (Laurentides—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have heard that question several times today.

The Marcotte decision asked us to clarify things, and that is exactly what we are doing with this bill. It is important to heed court rulings, and I do not see how this can be a bad thing.

**Mr. Michel Boudrias (Terrebonne, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleague from Laurentides—Labelle about what was said in the House today. Quebec's National Assembly passed a unanimous motion.

I do not know if he is aware of this, but Quebec's Consumer Protection Act is 45 years old and was passed by Robert Bourassa's Liberals. According to the Canadian Constitution, the Consumer

Protection Act falls under Quebec's exclusive jurisdiction because of its powers under the Quebec civil code.

I would like to know what my colleague thinks of that as the member for Laurentides—Labelle. Is he comfortable with the federal government's bulldozer-style intrusion into a matter under Quebec's exclusive jurisdiction?

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** The hon. member for Laurentides—Labelle has 30 seconds to respond.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** Mr. Speaker, I do not need 30 seconds. The question was already asked, and I answered it.

[*English*]

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it truly is an honour to stand today on behalf of the hard-working residents of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford to debate Bill C-29 at report stage. It is very unfortunate that I am doing so under the yoke of time allocation. I feel that today's motion to limit the ability of members of Parliament to give viewpoints on behalf of their constituents was truly a reprehensible motion. The government brought down a guillotine to cut off our ability to speak on behalf of our constituents. When it comes to budget implementation acts, they are vast pieces of legislation. They cover so many different areas. If any bill deserves close scrutiny, it is this type of legislation.

We have had some odd occurrences in this debate. On Friday, one of the first motions moved by the government was a motion to delete the short title. It was moved by the member for Winnipeg North. I am not sure why the committee had not decided to do that, but the government found the wisdom to do it. There have been some strange occurrences with this bill.

I find that when members of Parliament move to that side of the chamber, they tend to suffer from short-term memory loss. The Liberals used to be the most vocal opponents; they used to scream with moral outrage every time time allocation was invoked. I think it is helpful to go back to some actual quotes to help to remind them.

On February 8, 2012, the member for Winnipeg North said:

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

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

I would love to ask that question of him today. I wonder what answer he would give, the 2012 version versus the 2016 version.

Report stage is a particularly important time in the legislative process. It gives members of Parliament who were not able to participate at the committee stage the chance to move important amendments. The fact that we have only had Friday, and now cutting it off today, I think shows an extreme disrespect.

That being said, I want to move on to talk about some of the substantive measures of the bill and my views on it.



*Government Orders*

The Liberals ran strongly on extolling the virtues of their middle-class tax cut. What I have to keep reminding my constituents, and indeed all Canadians is that this is not a middle-class tax cut. They will not see the full benefits unless they are earning a six-figure income. That is certainly not members of the middle class in my riding, and indeed in Canada. When the median income is \$31,000 a year, those people are not receiving any benefit. Even if they had a decent income in the \$60,000 to \$70,000 range, their benefits would certainly not be as much as someone earning \$150,000, or even up to \$199,000. It is important to bring that up. The Liberals like to sell this as a middle-class tax cut, when in fact it is anything but.

I also want to speak up on behalf of the hard-working small business owners in my riding of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford. They really are fantastic people. Over the last seven years, I have had a lot of opportunities to work with small businesses when they have had problems with their taxes. I was given the very privileged position, in my former life as a constituency assistant, to see the details of small business tax returns. I know how difficult it is for them to survive in today's environment. Often, small business owners are paying themselves very meagre salaries and cutting corners for themselves personally to ensure their employees have jobs and that the business continues to be a source of employment for the local community. That is a pattern that we see across Canada. Therefore, it was quite disappointing to see that the Liberals did not move ahead with their promised small business tax cut.

Also, I think there was a real opportunity in the budget implementation act to take some meaningful action on credit card fees. Credit card fees can be an enormous expense for businesses. If they do not have the machines that take credit cards, they are not going to get customers, but there are huge fees for using that service. There was a missed opportunity to take some meaningful action on that measure, and it would have done some great work for businesses across the country.

• (1725)

The next thing I want to talk about is the child benefit, which is another program extolled by the Liberals. I would agree that it is a good thing any time we can provide families with money, because I know very well that families struggle a lot.

We do not want to overextend ourselves in praising this benefit, considering the situation that many families are going through with the lack of affordable child care spaces and the maximum child benefit being around \$6,400. That is only going to meet parents halfway when they are looking for child care spaces with how expensive it is.

Furthermore, if there are no good full-time jobs out there with a standard living wage, then a lot of parents will not be able to afford a second job because the cost of child care completely outweighs their income. There is no chance for upward mobility, and that is the main thing. It has been proven time and again that if decent affordable child care is provided, then families will be able to make their way up. Furthermore, a strong, safe minimum wage is an added benefit.

I am disappointed that families will have to wait until 2020 until the child benefit gets indexed to inflation. That leaves a big question for me: Why is the Liberal government not taking action and implementing indexation next year? I have not yet received an

adequate answer to that simple question, and I will remind my constituents of that point time and again.

The next part that I want to talk about goes to the infrastructure bank proposal. We first heard about this in budget 2016, earlier in the spring, when the government started talking about asset recycling. I am always wary when new terms, new technical jargon, come up. It usually means trying to change the meaning of something so people get confused about what is really going on.

Andrew Coyne had this to say in one of his columns earlier this year. He stated that asset recycling “can finance capital projects like roads and bridges by charging the people who use them. Once these would have been known as user fees or road tolls; in the language of today’s technocrats, it’s called “asset monetization” or “asset recycling.”

When private investors make these substantial investments in infrastructure projects, they are going to want a good rate of return. When Michael Sabia appeared before the Toronto Region Board of Trade on March 3, 2016, he said he was looking for stable, predictable returns in the 7% to 9% range. Canadians were not acquainted with that during the Liberal campaign promise. For 7% to 9% rates of return, we would have to look at charging tolls and user fees to ordinary Canadians and residents. That goes way above and beyond the kind of interest rates that Canadians were hoping for when the federal government can use its borrowing power at extremely low interest rates to finance these kinds of capital projects. That is a far cry from the 7% to 9% that private investors are going to be looking for.

Those are some of the major concerns overall. There were some incredible missed opportunities in this legislation. We in the New Democratic Party have been raising this consistently. There were some real opportunities that could have been made use of to help lower-income members of our society move forward, such as showing leadership on a federal minimum wage, providing child care spaces, and making sure the federal government uses its borrowing power to make those much-needed investments in infrastructure, rather than relying on the private sector and the tolls and user fees they are going to extract. We also hope the child benefit will be indexed to inflation starting next year.

I will leave it at that because I have made my points. I appreciate this opportunity to speak on behalf of the amazing constituents of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

• (1730)

**Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague about a question that was asked previously by his colleague related to the consumer protection aspects of Bill C-29. Would the member not agree that a national framework for consumer protection, with rules and regulations relating to the banking industry, would be a step forward for his constituents in British Columbia?

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:** Madam Speaker, in the course of debate on Bill C-29, and even in its predecessor, the previous budget implementation act, there are measures in this budget that we can support. Whenever we are looking out for consumers and making sure they are being protected against nefarious business practices, we can absolutely get behind measures like that.

*Government Orders*

It is for the reasons I outlined earlier, because it is such a wide-ranging bill and there are so many areas that we believe could have been improved, and because this bill has to be passed in its present form with all of the measures, that those are the reasons we will have to be voting against it.

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the member neglected to talk about two things that we talk about on this side of the House. There is the carbon tax, which we will see in about 26 days in Alberta and the impact that will have. However, I am also curious to hear the member's thoughts on the pipeline approval that was just announced. I know that in his area in B.C., people probably have some opinions on that. I am curious to know what he would think. I know that back home in my province, the provincial premier seems to be saying that she did a lot of it. I am curious to know what the hon. member thinks.

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:** Madam Speaker, when we talk about a carbon tax, or indeed any kind of a price on pollution, if we look at the realities of today and going on in the 21st century, almost everyone I know of agrees that a price on carbon has to be instituted if we are going to change our behaviour.

With respect to pipelines in British Columbia, I will absolutely echo my constituents' extreme disappointment. It is not only because the pipeline is being built; it is because the Liberal government completely betrayed British Columbians when it made a promise to institute a new environmental review process. We have always sought value-added products. In shipping raw undiluted bitumen, we are not getting any value out of that product. I would like to see some refining capacity expanded in Alberta so that we can sell a value-added product and use that to fund our transition to a renewable energy future. That is where the future is. I owe that to my children, and I think we all owe that to the next generation.

• (1735)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the New Democrats talk a lot about the middle class, but they do not necessarily do it in a positive way. We look at the middle class, and the vast majority of the middle class who are working hard and deserve the tax break. The NDP is voting against the tax break, ultimately saying it would not help the poor. Yet we are helping the poorest of our seniors and the poorest families in terms of children, through wonderful enhancements like the Canada child benefit and the GIS.

I wonder why the New Democrats do not recognize the other benefits. They just focus on the middle class tax cuts. People such as health care workers and factory-floor workers are the bulk of those who would get the advantage of the tax break. They are voting against that, but they are also excluding the benefits for families with young children and for our seniors who are the most vulnerable. Why is that?

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:** Madam Speaker, I did actually point out that the child benefit is going to have some benefits. As the NDP's critic for seniors issues, I did welcome an increase in the GIS. However, I also want to point out for the member for Winnipeg North that I was very pointed in my criticisms of the Liberal tax cut, because it would benefit people the most who have six-figure

incomes. The people earning the median income in Canada of \$31,000 a year are not going to see any benefits.

I will reiterate that what Canadian families need, especially the low-income ones, is affordable child care spaces to be built because that is the true cost to Canadian families. Unfortunately, the child benefit does not allay that gigantic cost to Canadian families.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it has been interesting to sit and listen to the debate. I have heard a lot of good ideas.

There is more work to be done. I can that about even my own portfolio. However, I really have to share the good news. We are heading in the right direction. Is it all done yet? No, it is not. However, we have taken some major steps forward. A lot of them involve the financial stability and security of veterans. To me, that is something really near and dear to my heart.

We can talk about the difference it is going to make in veterans' lives when we increase the disability award from \$310,000 to \$360,000, which is part of this budget, and when we increase the earnings loss benefit for injured veterans, so that instead of their getting just 75% of their pre-release salary, they will now get 90% of their pre-release salary. That will make a big difference in their lives.

There is also an upcoming change in the permanent impairment allowance. We are going to change it and call it "career impact allowance". The eligibility criteria for the permanent impairment allowance were so narrow that hardly anyone could get access to that particular benefit. By making it a career impact allowance—and this is something that is particularly important for young veterans—if they are injured when they are very young, we will give them the financial security they would have had if they had not left the military early due to their injuries. That will make a big difference in the lives of very young veterans. That is one place where there have been significant shortfalls and gaps.

There is a lot of work to do. The start that we have made is to improve the service that Veterans Affairs Canada is providing to veterans. Are we there yet? No, we are not. Opening 10 new offices is a huge step in the right direction, because it is much easier to get things done face to face than online or by telephone. We have heard again and again that a high-touch kind of system, in which people can go to talk to someone face to face instead of waiting on the telephone for a long time, makes a big difference.

It is the same when we talk about hiring new caseworkers or service agents. There was a huge backlog of cases. The service standard for Veterans Affairs was not even close to being met. Now that we are hiring new people, who are now in the middle of being trained, we will be able to deal with those disability requests a lot sooner than we had in the past. We started with this backlog. It is coming down. However, it takes time, because we need to train new people.

*Government Orders*

There have been shortages at Veterans Affairs Canada over the last few years. There was a loss of 900 employees. The rest of the employees who were left behind really care about veterans. They want to make sure they are well-served. However, because there were so few of them, a lot of them ended up suffering burnout. These veterans mattered to them. However, there were so few of them and they were carrying so many cases that they could not help the veterans and they, the people who were supposed to be helping others, have ended up being injured because of the shortfall of workers at Veterans Affairs Canada.

We know it is never an easy thing to change government departments and how they are structured and move forward. However, we have a wonderful group of people who really are committed to these veterans and to providing them with the kind of service they need and deserve. Part of this budget implementation act is to get these things moving.

• (1740)

There is a lot left to do. There is absolutely no doubt about it, but we are on the right track. I can say the same thing about looking after veterans as with looking after Canadians. Have we got it all done yet? No we have not. Are we heading in the right direction? Yes we are.

I was out knocking on doors on Sunday, and people were telling me what a difference the Canada child benefit is making to their lives already, especially for those who do not have a large income. For example, I heard that they now have the money they need to have their son play hockey, or that they now have the money they need to get him involved instead of sitting in the basement playing with his iPad or watching television and videos. Now he is participating in sports. Now he is involved and getting that social interaction with other people in his neighbourhood. They are celebrating. Now small communities are working to get their kids involved and get them active. Now they have the money and opportunity to do that.

It is the same thing with the middle-class tax cut. There is huge opportunity out there, and I do believe that if the middle class is doing well, everyone will end up doing well, because it creates opportunity. It creates jobs. Did members know that here in Ontario retail sales are up by 7%? This creates jobs. It creates opportunities, because people have more money to spend. We can see the absolute evidence of that here in Ontario.

If we look at our economy as a whole, investments are happening and starting to show results. Do the results happen overnight? No, they do not. They take a bit of time. However, we are now seeing that people have more money in their pockets.

If the middle class is given more money, it will be spent here at home. It is going to be spent and invested here in hockey equipment, in opportunities for children, in community events, and in making their lives just a little bit better. That is what this first budget bill is about. It is about improving the lives of Canadians and knowing that if we make these targeted, strategic investments, there will be opportunities created by others.

I prefer to talk about it in terms of employment generally. While I talk about employment for veterans and others talk about employment for young people and seniors, we need to talk about

employment across a broad spectrum. We need to talk in terms of innovation, job creation, and creating new jobs, the ones that we need for the future. This is what we are trying to do, not to look at things just in one particular silo, but to look across the spectrum and to create those kinds of benefits and opportunities for all Canadians.

• (1745)

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I listened closely to my colleague's comments, and a number of times she said something to the effect that we are on the right track. A number of times she said that we are heading in the right direction. I would like to point out a number of areas where the current government is absolutely not heading in the right direction.

In the budget book, on page 234, members will find that the interest cost alone between today and 2020 will increase by \$10 billion per year. Added to that, in the fall fiscal update, on page 66, we clearly see that an additional \$5 billion in interest costs per year by 2020. That is \$15 billion per year that Canadians will be spending simply on paying interest. A number of times we have asked the finance minister when we will return to a balanced budget, but there has been no answer.

How can we say that we are heading in the right direction and that budget 2016 is good for our kids and grandkids, when they are going to be the ones saddled paying this debt down? It does not add up, and I would like my colleague to answer that question.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** Madam Speaker, it is a discussion that we need to have. I know what the fiscal update is. It is a snapshot in time. The previous government, depending upon who one listens to, added \$150 billion in additional debt. When I knock on doors and hear that people are concerned about the debt, I get it. I tell them it is like having a beautiful house that has a leaky roof and basement and infrastructure in the house that is not working. What do we do? Do we go into debt to fix the roof and the basement so we do not lose the entire investment?

While I understand the concern about debt, the things we are doing now to enhance, promote, and preserve our infrastructure are really important.

**Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I would really like the member to help me out with something, because I am quite confused. With the average income being \$31,000 across Canada, how did the Liberal Party decide that \$45,000 to \$190,000 describes the middle class in Canada for purposes of this tax break?

Second, if you truly want to benefit children and families living in poverty, why would you not have agreed to index the Canada child benefit annually so that people can keep up with inflation over the next five years?

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I would remind the member that he is not to address his questions directly to another member. It has to be done through the Speaker. I would suggest that members do not use the word "you" to avoid that situation.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

*Government Orders*

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I cannot give you a specific answer to your first question, but I think I understand why. As I said, we are not finished yet. This is just the first step to get the money flowing into the economy and to make sure that the most vulnerable are looked after. We will continue to grow from there.

There is some thought that if we get the middle class going, it will create opportunities for others. As I said, I know there is definitely more to do. When we talk about indexing to inflation, etc., just because it is not done now does not mean it is not part of a plan for later. I do not know the answer to that, but if that ends up being something that needs to be done, I am sure it will be discussed.

• (1750)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Similarly, I would remind the parliamentary secretary not to use the word “your” when she was addressing the question directly to the member. It has to go through the Speaker.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain.

**Mr. Robert Kitchen (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased that I am not denied, like so many of my colleagues, the opportunity to rise today in the House to speak to Bill C-29, the budget implementation act, 2016, No. 2.

The provisions in the bill will have a wide range of effects on my constituency and all of Canada, and it is important that the Liberals understand how their decisions truly impact Canadians.

I will start off by giving a bit of background about the current issues facing my riding, located in southeast Saskatchewan. It is a rural riding, and many people are employed in either the agricultural sector or the energy sector. In fact, my hometown of Estevan is known as the energy city. Because of this, the downturn in the oil and gas industry has been devastating, particularly in the smaller communities.

There are thousands of laid off workers who are looking for employment. These men and women are wondering how they will feed their families. It is unfortunate that the government seems to be unable or unwilling to provide them with the help they so sorely need.

The trickle-down effect is also happening in my riding. Small businesses, such as retail stores and restaurants, are closing their doors for good, because the customers simply are not there. It is difficult for a family to justify going out for a nice dinner when they have not received a paycheque in months. My constituents need their government to help them in their time of need, but they are seemingly being ignored.

As I said, the biggest issue currently facing my riding is lack of jobs. The Conservative Party understands that jobs are created by small and medium-sized businesses. We need to support these businesses in every way we can to ensure that our economy continues to thrive in the future.

There are hundreds of farms in my riding, and there are thousands of people employed in the agriculture industry. These farms are small businesses. Many are owned and operated by families that have been farming for over a hundred years. They are essential to both the cultural and economic fabric of Canada. Farmers feed the

world, and Saskatchewan farmers are known for producing some of the best agricultural and agri-food products available worldwide.

When the Liberals were campaigning, they promised that they would lower the small business tax to 9% from 11%. Somehow this did not seem to make it into the budget. Unfortunately, I am not shocked by this omission. The Liberals have broken promises time and time again, and the failure to lower the small business tax is no exception.

Farmers in my constituency are extremely disappointed. At a time when jobs are scarce, the government is essentially telling them that they do not need the help that tax cuts would provide. It is despicable that the Liberals would mislead Canadians so blatantly, but thus far, it is what we have come to expect.

The bill also increases contributions to the Canada pension plan by small businesses. Not only did the government neglect to fulfill its promise to lower the small business tax rate, but now it is making these businesses pay even more for their employees' pension plans. For a small business that employs 15 people, this is an additional \$15,000 per year that an employer has to pay. That is a huge amount for a small business. It could be the difference between keeping the business open and closing it down for good.

Not only did the government mislead small business owners about a reduction in the tax rate, it will also add to their financial burden by increasing the amount of CPP contributions. That is astounding.

Changes to the CPP are not helping my constituents. One gentleman from my riding has attempted to bring attention to this issue through petitions, but nothing has happened. My office wrote to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour on his behalf, sharing his concern that an increase in the cost of medication has meant that his CPP payment does not even cover his basic necessities, like food and heat. The response from the minister's office outlined the government's plan for changes, stating that fully enhanced benefits will generally become available after about 40 years of making contributions. Not only are the Liberals refusing to make a payment increase for those in need, they are touting changes to the CPP that my constituent will not see in his lifetime.

The Liberals like to talk a lot about helping the middle class. They say that they want to help those who are struggling to join it. The bill does not do that. The government has taken away measures that were making Canadians' lives easier, such as the children's fitness tax credit.

I am the official opposition critic for sport, a role I am very proud of. I have seen first-hand the importance of getting children involved in sport at an early age and have witnessed the benefits that come from participation in sport. Sport improves social skills, leadership skills, and confidence and it promotes health and fitness.

*Government Orders*

• (1755)

However, this can get expensive, and the children's fitness tax credit was a way to ease that financial burden on parents who just want what is best for their children. Now they will not get that extra help.

The Liberal plan has failed Canadians with tax hikes and red tape. This is not helping families, and it is not helping the middle class.

Speaking of benefits, I must touch on the government's Canada child benefit, or CCB, which is essentially just an expensive reinvention of the wheel. Under the previous Conservative government, there were three measures put in place to help Canadian families with children: the universal child care benefit, the Canada child tax benefit, and the national child benefit supplement. Those three programs worked. They kept more money in the pockets of hard-working families, which should be the goal of any government.

When the Liberals announced the Canada child benefit, they forgot one important issue, indexation. Bill C-29, the second budget implementation bill, now confirms that the government will index the Canada child benefit to inflation, beginning in 2020. According to the parliamentary budget officer, the estimated cost of indexing and enriching the CCB will cost \$42.5 billion over the next five years. This is an expense the government did not budget for. Canadian families simply cannot afford another tax hike. That is exactly what will happen to pay for the current government's lack of oversight. My constituents do not need to pay more taxes, and Canadians in general do not need that either.

I have spoken about jobs many times in this speech. I feel as though I need to so the Liberals can start to understand just how dire the situation is.

Due to the lack of available work in the oil and gas sector, many of my constituents have had to use employment insurance. Under the previous Conservative government, reforms were made to the EI system that actually helped Canadians get back to work. The changes made EI more efficient, focused on job creation, eliminated disincentives to work, and helped to support unemployed Canadians by helping match workers with jobs. These changes are now being repealed.

On this side of the House, we know that the best cure for unemployment is job creation. Employment insurance is meant to be a temporary support that helps unemployed Canadians through a difficult situation. It is not a permanent situation, which is why the changes introduced by the Conservatives were so beneficial. These people want to work. My constituents want to work. They do not want to sit at home. They want to earn their paycheques. Anything the government can do to assist in finding jobs for these people, they should be doing. Instead, the Liberals are repealing measures that were truly helpful. Again, it shows how out of touch they are with the current needs of Canadians.

One way the government can create jobs is through investments in infrastructure. The Liberals say that their infrastructure will be the biggest and best that Canada has ever seen. They are spending billions of dollars, all of which needs to be paid back by the taxpayer, and most likely by our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren. Yet in my riding, there is virtually nothing to

show for it. With the millions of dollars available to enhance public transit in urban areas, small rural communities and their applications for infrastructure funding are being ignored. This is unacceptable at a time when job creation should be a main focus of the government.

Simply put, infrastructure projects create jobs. They need these jobs. However, it appears that the Liberals are forgetting about rural Canada once again.

The record in Saskatchewan is plain to see. The Library of Parliament provided me with the figures on federal infrastructure spending in Saskatchewan over the past 20 years. From 1994 to 2005, total spending was \$222.2 million under the Liberal government. From 2006 to 2015, under the previous Conservative government, total infrastructure spending in Saskatchewan was \$1.256 billion. That is a huge increase in spending, and it came at a time when the province needed help. Why is it that now, when the people of Saskatchewan need their government's assistance in creating jobs, they are being left out in the cold?

The budget will not balance itself. The spending by the current government will affect Canadians for generations to come. The Liberals' only solution to the problems facing Canadians seems to be to borrow and spend even more money than the budget initially set out, money that will have to be paid back by Canadian workers, families, and job creators.

This bill does not help the middle class, and it certainly does not help my constituents. We need jobs. We need support. We need the Liberals to show confidence in the agriculture industry and in the oil industry. We need them to show confidence in innovation and recognize the value of carbon capture to the coal and power industry. We need it to come now.

For these reasons, I cannot support this budget.

• (1800)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I believe the member could not be more wrong.

This bill, through the implementation of the budget, would in fact be of great benefit to Canada's middle class. This bill, as I have pointed out on numerous occasions, would bring literally thousands of children out of poverty and thousands of seniors out of poverty. This bill would put more money in the pockets of Canadians, which would allow for a larger disposable income, thereby providing more business for small businesses. If we have a healthy middle class, we will have a healthier economy.

The Conservatives talk about supporting tax cuts, yet they are going to be voting against nine million Canadians who would be receiving a substantial tax cut. The question is why.

**Mr. Robert Kitchen:** Madam Speaker, I have had a chance to walk around my riding and talk to all these people who are getting the CCB payments.

*Government Orders*

Many of them are asking who is going to pay for this. All this money is fine, but who is going to pay for it? They are asking how to turn it back, because the bottom line is that they say that it is not helping them, it is not going to help their children, and it is not going to help their grandchildren.

They are asking how the government is going to pay for it. It is not going to balance itself. Budgets do not do that.

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I keep hearing from the Liberal side that their budget is actually great for the middle class.

I have a very simple question, because I have never heard a single Liberal member of Parliament define it. What is the middle class? Why do we have a tax cut that only starts at \$45,000, which is fully accessible once people reach \$90,000? That is considered by the Liberals to be the middle class, when the median income in Canada is \$31,000.

**Mr. Robert Kitchen:** Madam Speaker, it is a question I have. What is the middle class?

My understanding, and Canadians' understanding, of what is middle class is totally different from what the government's idea of what the middle class should be. The middle class needs to have the opportunity to work. That is what they want. They want jobs. They want the opportunity to step up and have those jobs and to get out there and do something.

The government is not creating jobs. It has not created one single full-time job since it came to power.

**Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I was a little astounded when I heard the member's comments about the Canada child benefit and that the people in his riding who are receiving it are telling him that they cannot understand why they are getting this money and that it will not help them. They are asking how they are going to pay for it.

As we know, in the previous incarnation of the family allowance, all people of all income levels received it. Now the Canada child benefit is essentially going to people who need it the most. I have not had one person in my riding who is now getting it telling me, "Oh my goodness, I really should not be getting this".

I am wondering how the member reconciles the idea that the richest used to get this. Now it is mostly going to the people who need it the most, and somehow they are coming to him and telling him that they do not really need it. I do not understand.

•(1805)

**Mr. Robert Kitchen:** Madam Speaker, a lot of times, what we have is Liberals inventing words. The reality is, you are taking one thing and giving another. Here is a word for you, "dispocketnesia"—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I would remind the member to address comments to the chair and not to individual members, please.

**Mr. Robert Kitchen:** Madam Speaker, I apologize.

Here is a word that I think needs to be put in the dictionary. It is "dispocketnesia". It is a very simple word. It means, from "dis pocket to dat pocket." That is what the Liberal government is doing. It is taking it from one hand and putting it in the other.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in today's debate on Bill C-29, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2016 and other measures.

When I got into politics a few years ago, I had one objective in mind, and that was to help my community and my riding, Rivière-des-Mille-Îles. With our first budget, presented in March 2016, our government took direct action to help middle-class Canadians and those who need it most. Today Canada has the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, and our interest rates are at all-time lows. Now is the perfect time for Canada to invest in its own future success.

As a mother of four children, two girls and two boys, I want to ensure they have the same opportunities, and only by investing now will we create long-term, sustainable economic growth.

Strengthening the middle class will also help ensure a better quality of life for Canadians, who work hard, as well as better future opportunities for our children.

By creating the right economic context for the middle class we can build a country where everyone has the opportunity to succeed. I was very proud of our commitment to help the middle class during the last election campaign.

One of the first things we did as a government was implement a tax cut for the middle class and increase the tax rate by 1% for wealthier Canadians. Those changes are putting more money in the pockets of middle-class Canadians by making taxes fairer for everyone.

The Canada child benefit falls under that same line of measures. Thanks to this benefit, nine out of ten families will receive more in monthly benefits, which will help lift hundreds of thousands of children out of poverty. The benefit will be indexed as of 2020. In my riding, Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, 10,300 families and 18,870 children will receive more money. Many people are very happy, contrary to what my colleague was saying. My constituents are very happy to receive the Canada child benefit.

When I meet with my constituents in Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, they tell me that they feel supported by our government's measures. However, I know that the work has just begun. In Canada and elsewhere in the world, there is a growing consensus that governments need to invest to stimulate short-term economic growth and pave the way for long-term economic growth. That is why people across the country welcomed the big investments that were announced in the November 1 economic update.

*Government Orders*

The fall economic update proposed new commitments of \$81.2 billion between now and 2027-28 in green infrastructure, social infrastructure, public transit, and of course transportation infrastructure that supports trade and rural and northern communities. In short, over \$180 billion will be invested in community infrastructure across Canada.

We are investing today to build 21st century infrastructure because our government understands that infrastructure plays a key role in helping members of the middle class find good jobs and live in welcoming communities with clean air to breathe and clean water to drink.

The investments we are making will help reduce commute times for the middle class. This is one of the most important issues in my riding of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, in the northern suburb of Montreal.

Finally I would like to reiterate my support for Bill C-29. Its progressive measures will help Canada's middle class and ensure that no one is left behind. We are laying the foundation for a more prosperous future for our children and grandchildren.

● (1810)

**Mr. Simon Marciel (Mirabel, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I understand that my colleague is happy to read the lines her party wrote for her.

She is telling us that she wants to pave the way for the future and for economic development and to invest in infrastructure. The problem is that the Liberals are doing it with our tax dollars and that the government wants to save money and protect its banking buddies from losing money. My colleague here voted against motion M-42, which is completely at odds with what she just told us.

I would ask the member to explain to us why she voted against this motion. As well, why is what she is saying inconsistent with her actions?

**Ms. Linda Lapointe:** Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague from Mirabel, whose riding is north of mine.

The middle class and young families are thriving in his riding. He should be happy with the Canada child benefit and support Bill C-29.

[English]

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Madam Speaker, a number of times today we have tried to find an answer to the question of when the Liberal government will actually tell us when it intends to return to balanced budgets, to discontinue its deficit upon deficit spending.

I pointed out that in the budget book itself, it clearly indicates that another \$10 billion per year in interest alone will be added over the next four years. The fall economic update added another \$5 billion per year in interest. That is \$15 billion per year in interest going out the window, just for interest, let alone paying down the debt.

I would like my colleague to answer the question as to when she sees the Liberal government returning to balanced budgets.

[Translation]

**Ms. Linda Lapointe:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

As I said in my speech, interest rates are at record lows. Now is the time to invest in infrastructure, in order to pave the way for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

It is green, social and transit infrastructure that will help stimulate economic growth and help the middle class.

[English]

**Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I have a question about the infrastructure bank. The budget includes \$15 billion to initially fund that bank. There is another \$20 billion that would be generated by leveraging up assets that Canada owns. On top of that, we are going to invite foreign investment into our country to fund public infrastructure, to the tune of \$180 billion, and give them a rate of return of 7% to 8%. Why would we not offer that to Canadians, perhaps by way of an enhanced Canada savings bond program, or something else where the money could stay here in Canada?

I do not think anyone disputes the necessity of funding infrastructure projects, but let us leave the money in Canada instead of sending it across the water.

[Translation]

**Ms. Linda Lapointe:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

As I said earlier, now is the time to invest. Interest rates are at record lows. Now is the time to invest and do what has been neglected for several years now. It is time to develop the economy, green and social infrastructure and highway infrastructure.

[English]

**Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the small business tax is critical in my riding. We have a tremendous number of small businesses that are suffering. If that small business tax were to decrease, those are the businesses that really help support our community. What is your opinion of not having reduced that small business tax?

● (1815)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Again, you are doing that through me.

The hon. member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.

[Translation]

**Ms. Linda Lapointe:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

I come from the small business community, so I am glad he asked me that question. If we want small businesses to do well, people need to have money in their pockets so they can spend that money at local businesses and in the secondary economy.

If people are supported by the Canada child benefit and all the other measures we are providing, they will help stimulate the economy, which is good for small businesses.

*Government Orders*

[English]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Before I go to resuming debate, I know there has been a couple of questioning looks about how I am picking members. Therefore, I want to remind members that the Deputy Speaker on November 3 indicated that “we recognize that the time for questions and comments is often the most valuable time for an exchange between members”. He went on to say that “time is generally afforded to the members of the parties who are not associated with the member who has just spoke but not to the exclusion of that party.”

Therefore, it is to give an opportunity for people from the opposition or from the government to be able to ask questions to those who are delivering the speech.

Resuming debate, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister.

**Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Intergovernmental Affairs), Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is a great honour to speak on behalf of the government on this bill in front of us, in particular to focus on the accomplishments that are contained within our budget implementation bill that we are debating and will be voting on soon.

I think my proudest moment remains looking up at the Assembly of First Nations chief as he heard the budget commitments to truth and reconciliation, and renewing and creating a new partnership with our first nations people, Métis, and Inuit. There is work to be done on that. The pressure that the opposition delivers to us to do more and to do it faster is welcomed pressure, and anything we can do to forward this is critical.

I remember in the summertime, as well, another very proud moment. I was stopped in the street by a single mom who almost broke into tears as she said “thank you”. The support through the child tax benefit had delivered her not only substantial resources with which to contend with some of the challenges in her life, but she said it gave her the first opportunity to think that she could actually save for her kid’s post-secondary school.

The idea that this tax benefit not only provided immediate relief, but long-term and future relief and a vision for a better tomorrow, I think is reason enough for this budget to be passed immediately. Those benefits have already started to flow to people, and I am proud of that.

Another area is for single seniors. We know that women quite often are left alone without a full pension. We have moved on pension reform, but the move for the guaranteed income supplement to be boosted by 10% is lifting largely older women in this country into a better position financially so that they can take care of themselves. When their partners pass on and they are left alone, quite often their bills stay the same but their incomes change. Therefore, this is a step that we think is tremendously important, as is the CPP reform negotiated with the provinces, as is the EI reform, which is also under way and being delivered, especially to workers in Atlantic Canada and Alberta who are suffering as commodity prices turn in the wrong direction.

At the end of the day, this budget is about one thing and one thing only. It is about jobs. It is about delivering economic opportunity to every corner of this country to get people back into the workforce.

The phrase that we hear the Prime Minister use, “supports the middle class and those aspiring to join it”, is what this budget is all about. Nowhere is this delivered in a more pronounced way than on the issue of infrastructure, which is a program that I have a great deal of pride in. I look at this budget and see extraordinary accomplishments.

I left municipal government and came to Ottawa to get exactly this kind of budget put in place, exactly this kind of support for Canada’s municipalities, large and small, northern and southern, rural and urban, the whole mix. The agreements that we have with every province now mean that money is flowing to places like Alberta.

Alberta had next to no infrastructure investment, because there had been no agreement between the province and the federal government for the last two years. Imagine if the two years of spending commitments announced but not delivered to municipalities were under way in Alberta. Imagine the unemployed tradespeople who would be working on infrastructure as the oil patch recovers. It could sustain that economy in a totally different way. However, instead what we had from the previous government were a lot of announcements. In the case of Prince Edward Island, the billboard was more expensive than the actual infrastructure project in Charlottetown. The Conservatives cut a lot of ribbons; they just did not cut any cheques, which was problematic for municipalities right across the country.

The most important investment, from my perspective, is in social infrastructure, which is primarily housing. The \$2.3 billion delivered for new housing in this country over the last six to eight months has been transformational in so many communities. It is supporting the most vulnerable Canadians, but, again, it is also putting people back to work, building, repairing, and sustaining our public housing stock.

The biggest investments that have come to major cities are around transit. That is going to change the way that people move in our cities. It is going to allow goods and services to get to market faster, and allow people to get to work, to play, to school, and back home again, that much more effectively. It is going to change the way we generate greenhouse gases, by reducing them, by creating modal shifts as transit becomes more plentiful.

On green infrastructure and flood proofing our cities, a few hundred million dollars in Calgary five or six years ago would have prevented the \$600 million in flood remediation. The investments we have to make around storms of the century are fundamental, and we need those agreements put in place and delivered to cities across this country as quickly as possible.



*Government Orders*

We have also stepped up for rural Canada, recognizing the needs and capacity limitations that smaller towns have in accessing government funds. We have increased the federal contribution. We have made it an easier process to get at money, and we are supporting the rural projects in the small communities that need special attention in order to become healthier and stronger places. As I said to our rural caucus chair in the Liberal Party, my job is to make their small towns bigger towns. This infrastructure money is aimed at doing exactly that.

● (1820)

Broadband access investment is required not just in the last mile but in the core needs of so many communities, to knit them into the modern economy, to ensure economic development opportunities and kids' ability, quite frankly, to connect to learning, to research, and to a wider world. All of these things are critical. This government has stepped up and put the dollars down, \$2 billion in rural and \$500 million in broadband, with more to come. Wait for next year's budget.

Universities were not in our platform and nobody criticized us for it, but universities are one of the most important economic drivers in many communities across this country. The investment in construction projects, science, and research have bolstered those institutions' capacities. Again, that is part of this budget, one more reason it should be supported.

The infrastructure spending is about building Canada, building strong communities and stronger families, and contributing to the GDP, the employment numbers, and the economic growth we need to succeed as a nation.

Finally, I want to talk about the infrastructure bank. The infrastructure bank is a revolutionary idea for this country in terms of what possibilities exist if it is done properly. I have heard the concerns raised about public-private partnerships or joint ventures, if it makes it more palatable for my friends on the left. I have understood the risks. Of course, there are risks. There is risk in any expenditure government makes. There are risks in 100% publicly financed projects right across this country. We can check local provinces' or cities' auditor general reports to see that even publicly funded projects with no private partners go off the rails sometimes. If we are going to avoid risk, we are going to avoid infrastructure, and that is too big a risk to avoid. We have to find new ways to do it.

All the hue and cry does not really tell the whole story. Only 8% of the \$180 billion put down for the next decade is tied to this idea. Ninety-two per cent of the \$180 billion is going to flow to traditional infrastructure programs, and not just traditional ones. There is a modification that is also critically important. For small communities, the federal input is 50%, leaving it to the province for 30:20 or 25:25 splits, which means that it is cheaper to access federal money for smaller communities. That is part of our infrastructure program.

On the infrastructure bank, smaller communities can bundle projects together and move together with expertise housed in Ottawa and financed in joint ventures with public and private partnerships. There is nothing bad or irregular about that. It happens all over the country.

We can also look at big Canadian projects that require financing. Instead of using municipal funds to fund big Canadian projects, like the Great Lakes seaway, which needs to be repaired as it was built with the same concrete as the Gardiner Expressway and is falling apart in the same timetable, we need major Canadian investments made and the infrastructure bank is just the vehicle to do that, to protect the traditional infrastructure money for municipalities, smaller communities, and large cities across the country.

We will also in-house the expertise. By in-housing the expertise, such as smaller communities that may have hockey rinks to build, which have a rate-supported funding system built in as everyone pays for ice time in this country, those sorts of projects are ideal for public-private partnerships, ideal for the kind of community development we want to do, great job creators right across this country. What will happen is that smaller communities that have those aspirations will not have to generate their own bureaucracy in order to manage joint ventures. They can lean into the infrastructure bank to both access the capital and structure the deals. This is part of what the infrastructure bank would accomplish on behalf of municipalities and communities right across the country.

I got criticized because I said opposition to this idea is stupid, but it does not mean that the people expressing that opposition are stupid. They just have not heard good ideas expressed about the benefits. Therefore, the criticism was not of the people, it was that the opposition idea, in and of itself, is good or bad. The reason this is such an important idea and the reason criticism is so short-sighted is that when I talked about flood protection, it is absolutely vital if we are going to preserve major metropolises and small towns. We cannot wait until the money accrues or wait to borrow, or wait to do that. We have to do it quickly. To not do it is irresponsible, to not do it is stupid.

Utilizing this methodology in order to put flood protection in place is smart. If we want to do it faster, and sometimes we have to do it faster to protect cities, sometimes the borrowing costs are different, but we can figure that out with an infrastructure bank in the way that smaller cities might not be able to on their own.

I will leave everyone with one last good idea. There is a guy called Mike Layton. Members might recognize the last name. There is another guy called Joe Cressy, someone I ran against. Both are New Democrats in Toronto and support public-private partnerships and toll roads in order to build infrastructure in Toronto. It is called the Don Valley Expressway and the Gardiner Expressway. The NDP is pushing this idea and I hope the party can follow the lead of some guy called Layton because—

● (1825)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Questions and comments, the hon. member for Beloeil—Chamby.

*Government Orders*

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I think the parliamentary secretary may have failed to grasp the criticism, since he mentioned P3s only in a general sense, when we are talking specifically about the plan the government presented with regard to the infrastructure bank.

Let us look at a firm like *Crédit Suisse*, for example, which has built its reputation on privatizing airports. That is the kind of thing that worries us. It is also a foreign investment. All of these issues put taxpayers in a very precarious position.

We understand that some private investment is necessary to get certain projects done. The problem here is that the government's proposal is going to create a situation in which people who work for Chinese firms, for example, will be the ones to be invited to Liberal Party fundraising galas, and those firms will purchase that infrastructure. I want my colleague to understand this nuance and to answer my question.

If I take the Champlain Bridge in my home province, for instance, are the Liberals going to bring in a toll if it is sold to a private firm?

[*English*]

**Mr. Adam Vaughan:** Madam Speaker, direct questions have been asked of the ministers responsible. There was no confirmation to the member's question a few days ago that we are selling off anything. Ideas have been circulated. We are thinking about things, but we are not thinking about doing them. We are just trying to understand what the propositions are as they come in from different sources. As for the source of foreign capital, I am not sure why the Chinese keep getting singled out in this conversation, but I find it a little disturbing.

I will tell the House about an idea that would benefit from this sort of project. Near the Toronto Island ferry docks on Bay Street, a street my friends opposite like to reference quite a bit, a ferry terminal that serves millions of Torontonians is currently being rebuilt. The funding for that is coming from a public-private partnership. It involves selling a parking lot to a pension fund from Quebec, building a new park, building new office towers, and building a new bus and GO terminal in the heart of downtown Toronto. Profits from that are being invested in the new ferry terminal. It is a joint venture, a public-private partnership. The name of that terminal is the Jack Layton ferry terminal. If members want to cancel P3s, then that ferry terminal should be cancelled first and that nomination put to rest.

**Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the reality of the situation is far more dire than the member opposite has portrayed.

He talked about job creation. As we heard from Statistics Canada the other day, the reality is that we have lost 31,000 jobs over the last year in spite of Liberal promises, with hands over hearts, that they were going to create jobs. The reality is that more part-time precarious employment has been created as a result of government policy.

What scares us the most is the fact that when the Liberals spoke about debt and deficits, these were going to be teeny-weeny deficits. The member for Louis-Saint-Laurent has been quite vocal about this.

He has asked the finance minister at least 12 times in the House when we are going to get out of deficit. There has been no answer.

In the member's idyllic view of the way things Liberal are going to be, when are we going to get out of our deficit?

● (1830)

**Mr. Adam Vaughan:** Madam Speaker, listening to Conservatives' lecture anyone about debt is a bit like listening to those southern ministers talk about sins of the skin and then getting found in a brothel the next day.

When do we pay off the Conservatives' \$150 billion of debt? We have to pay that \$150 billion from the Harper government first before we even start talking about whatever debt we may incur. If we add to that the debt that Mulroney dumped on us, it is magnificent. The only government that has left a surplus of any note in the last decade, let alone the last 25 years, is a Liberal government.

I can assure the member that is the direction this government is heading in. We are going to get there by investing in building a strong country. The Conservatives talk about balancing the books, but they did not do it. As soon as they get finished paying off their \$150 billion in debt, I will give the member an answer on how we are going to play with our money.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I would just say to the member for Barrie—Innisfil that he had the attention of the House when he was asking his question, and I would anticipate that he would be as respectful to the parliamentary secretary while he is answering. I expect that from everyone in the House.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Louis-Hébert.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Joël Lightbound (Louis-Hébert, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I think I will continue along the same lines as the hon. parliamentary secretary, since we have been criticized repeatedly in the House by the Conservative Party, which formed the previous government—

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

[*English*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Order. I just want to remind the parliamentary secretary and the other members on the other side that it is the member for Louis-Hébert who has the floor.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Joël Lightbound:** Madam Speaker, we are often criticized by the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent and other members of the Conservative Party for running deficits. We know that interest rates are at historic lows, that the IMF and the World Bank recommend that we invest and run deficits precisely when interest rates are low and when there are pressing needs in infrastructure, as we see from coast to coast to coast in Canada.

It is a bit surreal to hear the Conservatives criticize us for running deficits when, for eight consecutive years, they did not table a single budget that was in the black. The budget was in the red every year and they keep telling us without fail that they had to invest in that way because of the financial crisis in 2008.

*Government Orders*

First they invested because they were told to, it was an important thing to do to stimulate the economy. It was the right thing to do at the time. One of the main reasons we fared so well in 2008 after the financial crisis in Canada was precisely because the previous Liberal government, that of Paul Martin and Jean Chrétien, refused to regulate our financial industry, which is what the Conservatives wanted and Mr. Harper got all worked up about in the House.

If we had listened to the Conservatives at the time, we would have ended up much worse off than we did in Canada. We did not listen to them then, fortunately, and we are not listening to them now. Thank God, we are very careful about taking their economic advice. With the \$150 billion in deficit they left us, we ended up with the worst job growth in 69 years and the worst economic growth since the Second World War. When it comes to taking lessons from my hon. colleagues across the way on managing public finances and the Canadian economy, thanks, but no thanks.

One of the most important things about the budget and budget implementation Bill C-29 is that they reduce inequality. When our Conservative colleagues talk about the deficit, they say that we need to think about future generations. Were they thinking about future generations when they increased the TFSA limit from \$5,500 to \$10,000? No. When asked that question, even the finance minister at the time, Joe Oliver, said the following:

[*English*]

“leave that to Prime Minister Stephen Harper's granddaughter to solve”. That is not our attitude. That is not our philosophy. We are dealing with the issues we are facing today, and doing so in a manner that is conscious of future generations.

When they raised the TFSA limit to \$10,000, it is worth noting that the inventor of the TFSA, Mr. Kesselman, was against raising the limit so high. Even the Americans do not go that far. It would be the equivalent of putting this country in a fiscal straitjacket for generations to come, because of all the revenues it would be deprived of.

● (1835)

[*Translation*]

One of the good things about this budget is that it cancels that increase in the TFSA limit, which, according to the parliamentary budget officer, would benefit only the wealthiest 10%. We think that most Canadians need to benefit from wealth in this country. We think that a country where inequalities are consistently being reduced is a good thing. That is exactly why we changed those policies, including the increase in the TFSA limit. They were unfair and unjustifiable from both a moral and a tax perspective.

The increase in the TFSA limit was not the only problem. There were many other tax policies put forward by the previous government that also benefited only the wealthiest 10%. Take for example income splitting. In my riding, as in most others, this would have only benefited the wealthiest 5% or 10%, not all Canadians.

Rather than forging ahead with policies that increase inequality, which is what the former government was bent on doing, we introduced the Canada child benefit. To give an example, when I was a child, I was raised by my mother in a small Quebec City apartment with my brother. She was a single mother. We did the math this

summer. That would have given us an extra \$1,066 per month tax free. I can say that that would have made a big difference in our lives back then, just like this is making a big difference in the lives of thousands of Canadian families today. When I am not feeling as motivated to come here to do my job, I think about the Canada child benefit and I can say that I am very proud to defend this budget, on this side of the House, because it is lifting 300,000 children out of poverty.

I would have encouraged my colleagues, whom I salute by the way, to vote in favour of such a socially progressive and revolutionary policy for Canada, but no, they voted against it, just like they voted against the middle class tax cut that benefits 9 million Canadians across the country.

They also voted against increasing the guaranteed income supplement, which helps 900,000 seniors across the country by giving them almost \$1,000 more per year. That is not peanuts. When I went door to door in my riding, especially in low-income housing areas, seniors told me that their income was not keeping pace with the rising cost of living. That is exactly what we are trying to address via the guaranteed income supplement, which had not seen a significant increase in years, certainly not under the previous government. That government was more interested in the well-off, the richest 10%. That is what it did for 10 years with policies such as increasing the TFSA limit and income splitting. I am very proud that we have overturned those changes.

With respect to infrastructure investment, the IMF and the World Bank concluded that austerity in times of slow growth is not good policy, so they asked all countries to invest in infrastructure to stimulate growth and innovation. That is exactly what our government is doing by investing \$180 billion over the next 12 years. We believe that our unprecedented investment will address Canada's growing infrastructure deficit and stimulate the economy.

Whether it is in public transit or social housing, we have some catching up to do in terms of investing in infrastructure. There is no better time to do it than when interest rates are low and the economy has slowed down. It is in fact one of the tools that Prime Minister Paul Martin used when he was minister of Finance. Back then he decided to invest in infrastructure by creating deficits. When we see growth, it is much easier to balance the budget and return to surplus.

This is what the government is banking on. The idea is to stimulate growth so we can eventually reduce the size of the debt and balance the books. That is what we are hoping for and so is everyone else. It is a target we can reach when there is growth, and for that we need to invest in innovation, science and infrastructure. This is what our government is doing.

*Government Orders*

When I think of the investments we are making in science and innovation, I think about how, over the past 10 years, as the innovation train was picking up steam, Canada was stuck at the station eating dust. Université Laval is in my riding, and I meet with researchers and scientists practically every week who tell me that we are finally emerging from the little Conservative darkness. Some people would call it a great darkness. I certainly would, and so would a lot of scientists.

Who could forget that Prime Minister Harper appointed a prominent creationist? That was just the tip of the iceberg. His government then adopted policies to disengage our investment in science and innovation just as European countries and the United States were making massive investments. Canada stood by and did not invest in science.

With budget 2016, our government is trying to make up for lost time in science and innovation investment.

That concludes my speech. I am eager to take questions from my hon. colleagues across the aisle, and I know they are also very eager to ask them.

● (1840)

**Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his speech. I was only able to hear the end, so I hope my question is relevant.

I have spoken with my colleague many times, and he is very professional. He is a lawyer with a large Montreal firm. However, I never thought he would be so partisan as to portray the Conservative era in such a negative light, when we gave the most substantial tax breaks in 50 years thank to 63 successive measures. We also created 1.2 million jobs after the recession.

As a lawyer, my colleague from Louis-Hébert should stick to the facts. Does he not find it odd that he and his government are talking about a tax cut for the middle class, when in reality, it applies only to people who earn over \$140,000 a year? A Conservative senator, Larry Smith, did some excellent research that proves it. In other words, this tax cut does not at all apply to those who need it most.

**Mr. Joël Lightbound:** Madam Speaker, it is quite something to have a Conservative member criticize me for being partisan. After campaigning in the same region during the election campaign, I can assure hon. members that I definitely have no lessons to learn about partisanship from the members across the way.

That being said, I can say that this tax cut will affect nine million Canadians. I thank the hon. member for giving me the opportunity to reiterate that. This tax cut will affect the \$45,000 to \$90,000 tax bracket. However, let us look at the budget as a whole. The Canada child benefit will lift 300,000 children out of poverty.

When my colleague rises to speak, I have the following questions for him. How many people benefited from the increased TFSA limit? How many people benefited from income splitting? I can count them on one hand. How many people can my colleague name?

The parliamentary budget officer did the math and answered that question. It was always the wealthiest 10% of Canadians, or those for whom the Conservatives were working. On this side of the House, we are working for all Canadians.

**Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

I would like to ask him a question about an issue concerning his riding. In the last Parliament, we asked questions about the Quebec Bridge and the Conservatives showed no interest. Now all of a sudden, they are interested. I imagine it is because they got some seats back. We know how this wishful thinking works when in government. When you have a riding, you help; when you do not, you ignore it. At least that was how things were during the past four years.

The issue is still unresolved, even though it attracted some attention in the Quebec City area during the last election campaign, as I understand it. With respect to the infrastructure bank, is the member at all concerned that privatization will be one of the proposed solutions along with the negative effects that this would have on the Quebec City area and its residents?

**Mr. Joël Lightbound:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for Beloeil—Chambly. This gives me the opportunity to highlight the positions of the various parties during the last election campaign.

We know that for 10 years the Conservatives hid behind the courts regarding the Quebec Bridge. When Stephen Harper came to Quebec City, he jokingly asked if the Quebec Bridge was still standing. I can say that it is very important for us to find a solution for the Quebec Bridge.

Meanwhile, the NDP had another position, which was to impose special legislation in an attempt to force CN to paint the bridge. However, for years CN has been winning in the courts, saying that it has no aesthetic obligation. This would mean once again going back to court.

On this side of the House, we are prepared to put \$75 million on the table. We are in discussions with various stakeholders in the Quebec City area, including CN, the provincial government, the municipal government, the chamber of commerce, and Laval University. We did not see as much progress on this file over the past 10 years as we are seeing right now under a Liberal government, with only two Liberal MPs in the Quebec City area working as a team. We have five or seven Conservatives who are issuing fine press releases, holding press conferences, and getting all worked up about anything and everything every week, yet they never do anything constructive.

● (1845)

[English]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** It being 6:45 p.m. pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*Government Orders*

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** The recorded division is deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 3.

The next question is on the Motion No. 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** The recorded division on Motion No. 5 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 6 to 23.

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

Call in the members.

● (1910)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 169*)

## YEAS

## Members

Aboultarif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Ambrose	Anderson
Arnold	Barlow
Bergen	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Boucher	Boudrias
Brassard	Brown
Calkins	Carrie
Clarke	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Egliniski	Falk
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Harder	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lebel	Liepert
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacKenzie	Maguire
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Plamondon
Poilievre	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Shields	Shipley
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Sweet
Thériault	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vecchio
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Watts
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 83	

## NAYS

## Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissomault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brisson

*Government Orders*

Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings	Caron
Carr	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger	Champagne
Chan	Chen
Cormier	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Di Iorio
Donnelly	Drouin
Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dusseault
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Foote
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hardeastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hehr
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Kang
Khalid	Khera
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Lemieux	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathysen	
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
McCallum	McCrimmon
McDonald	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Medicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Moore	Morneau
Morrissey	Mulcair
Murray	Nantel
Nassif	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Rankin	Ratansi
Robillard	Rodriguez
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Saganash
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Stetski	Tan
Tassi	Tootoo

Trudeau	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Weir	Whalen
Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Young
Zahid — 205	

## PAIRED

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 1 defeated.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 2. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 3.

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

The hon. chief government whip is rising on a point of order?

**Hon. Andrew Leslie:** Mr. Speaker, I believe if you were to seek it you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the previous vote to this one, with Liberal members voting against.

**Mr. Gordon Brown:** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote, and will be voting yes.

[Translation]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet:** Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.

**Mr. Luc Thériault:** Mr. Speaker, my party agrees to apply the vote. We will be voting against the motion.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote, and I am voting against the motion.

[English]

**Hon. Hunter Tootoo:** Mr. Speaker, I will be voting with the government on the motion.

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

(Division No. 170)

## YEAS

## Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Ambrose	Anderson
Arnold	Barlow
Bergen	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Boucher	Brassard
Brown	Calkins
Carrie	Clarke
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Doherty
Dreeshen	Eglinski
Falk	Gallant
Généreux	Genius
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Lebel
Liepert	Lobb
Lukivski	MacKenzie
Maguire	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson

*Government Orders*

Nuttall  
Poilievre  
Reid  
Richards  
Shields  
Sopuck  
Stanton  
Sweet  
Van Loan  
Wagantall  
Warkentin  
Waugh  
Wong  
Zimmer — 77

Paul-Hus  
Rayes  
Rempel  
Saroya  
Shipley  
Sorenson  
Strahl  
Van Kesteren  
Vecchio  
Warawa  
Watts  
Webber  
Yurdiga

May (Cambridge)  
McCallum  
McDonald  
McLeod (Northwest Territories)  
Mendicino  
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)  
Monsef  
Moore  
Morrissey  
Murray  
Nassif  
Oliphant  
O'Regan  
Paradis  
Peschisolido  
Petitpas Taylor  
Picard  
Poissant  
Qualtrough  
Rankin  
Robillard  
Romanado  
Rudd  
Rusnak  
Sahota  
Sajjan  
Sangha  
Scarpaleggia  
Schulte  
Shanahan  
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)  
Simms  
Breton  
Sorbara  
Ste-Marie  
Tan  
Thériault  
Trudeau  
Vandal  
Vaughan  
Weir  
Wilkinson  
Wrzesnewskyj  
Zahid — 211

May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)  
McCrimmon  
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)  
Mendès  
Mihychuk  
Morneau  
Mulcair  
Nantel  
O'Connell  
Oliver  
Ouellette  
Pauzé  
Peterson  
Philpott  
Plamondon  
Quach  
Ramsey  
Ratansi  
Rodriguez  
Rota  
Ruimy  
Saganash  
Saini  
Samson  
Sarai  
Schiefke  
Sgro  
Sheehan  
Sikand  
Sohi  
Spengemann  
Stetski  
Tassi  
Tootoo  
Trudel  
Vandenbeld  
Virani  
Whalen  
Wilson-Raybould  
Young

**NAYS**

## Members

Aldag  
Alleslev  
Anandasangaree  
Arya  
Aubin  
Badawey  
Bains  
Beech  
Bibeau  
Blaikie  
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)  
Bossio  
Boulerice  
Bratina  
Brison  
Caesar-Chavannes  
Caron  
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)  
Champagne  
Chen  
Cullen  
Dabrusin  
Davies  
Dhaliwal  
Di Iorio  
Drouin  
Dubourg  
Duguid  
Dusseault  
Easter  
El-Khoury  
Erskine-Smith  
Eyolfson  
Fillmore  
Fisher  
Foote  
Fraser (West Nova)  
Freeland  
Fuhr  
Gerretsen  
Goodate  
Graham  
Hajdu  
Hardie  
Hehr  
Housefather  
Hussen  
Iacono  
Joly  
Jordan  
Kang  
Khera  
Lamoureux  
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)  
LeBlanc  
Lefebvre  
Leslie  
Lightbound  
Long  
Ludwig  
MacGregor  
Malcolmson  
Marcil  
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)  
Mathysen

Alghabra  
Amos  
Arseneault  
Ashton  
Ayoub  
Bagnell  
Baylis  
Bennett  
Bittle  
Blair  
Boissonnault  
Boudrias  
Boutin-Sweet  
Breton  
Brosseau  
Cannings  
Carr  
Chagger  
Chan  
Cormier  
Cuzner  
Damoff  
DeCoursey  
Dhillon  
Donnelly  
Dubé  
Duclos  
Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
Dzerowicz  
Ehsassi  
Ellis  
Eyking  
Fergus  
Finnigan  
Fonseca  
Fragiskatos  
Fraser (Central Nova)  
Fry  
Garneau  
Goldsmith-Jones  
Gould  
Grewal  
Harcastle  
Harvey  
Holland  
Hughes  
Hutchings  
Johns  
Jones  
Jowhari  
Khalid  
Lametti  
Lapointe  
Laverdière  
Lebouthillier  
Lemieux  
Levitt  
Lockhart  
Longfield  
MacAulay (Cardigan)  
MacKinnon (Gatineau)  
Maloney  
Masse (Windsor West)

**PAIRED**

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare motions Nos. 2 and 3 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 5.

A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 6 to 23.

● (1920)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 171*)

**YEAS**

## Members

Aboultouf  
Albrecht  
Ambrose  
Arnold  
Aubin  
Bergen  
Bezan  
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)  
Boucher  
Boulerice  
Brassard  
Brown  
Cannings  
Carrie  
Cooper  
Davies  
Diotte  
Albas  
Allison  
Anderson  
Ashton  
Barlow  
Berthold  
Blaikie  
Block  
Boudrias  
Boutin-Sweet  
Brosseau  
Calkins  
Caron  
Clarke  
Cullen  
Deltell  
Doherty

*Government Orders*

Donnelly	Dreeshen	Hutchings	Iacono
Dubé	Dusseault	Joly	Jones
Eglinski	Falk	Jordan	Jowhari
Gallant	Généreux	Kang	Khalid
Genuis	Gladu	Khera	Lametti
Godin	Gourde	Lamoureux	Lapointe
Hardcastle	Harder	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	LeBlanc
Hughes	Jeneroux	Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Johns	Kelly	Lemieux	Leslie
Kent	Kitchen	Levitt	Lightbound
Kmiec	Lake	Lockhart	Long
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Laverdière	Longfield	Ludwig
Lebel	Liepert	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Lobb	Lukiwski	Maloney	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
MacGregor	MacKenzie	May (Cambridge)	McCallum
Maguire	Malcolmson	McCrimmon	McDonald
Marcil	Masse (Windsor West)	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mathysen	May (Saanch—Gulf Islands)	Mendès	Mendicino
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Moore	Motz	Monsef	Morneau
Mulcair	Nantel	Morrissey	Murray
Nater	Nicholson	Nassif	O'Connell
Nuttall	Paul-Hus	Oliphant	Oliver
Pauzé	Plamondon	O'Regan	Ouellette
Poilievre	Quach	Paradis	Peschisolido
Ramsey	Rankin	Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Rayes	Reid	Philpott	Picard
Rempel	Richards	Poissant	Qualtrough
Saganash	Saroya	Ratansi	Robillard
Shields	Shipley	Rodriguez	Romanado
Sopuck	Sorenson	Rota	Rudd
Stanton	Ste-Marie	Ruimy	Rusnak
Stetski	Strahl	Sahota	Saini
Sweet	Thériault	Sajjan	Samson
Trudel	Van Kesteren	Sangha	Sarai
Van Loan	Vecchio	Scarpaleggia	Schieffe
Wagantall	Warawa	Schulte	Sgro
Warkentin	Watts	Shanahan	Sheehan
Waugh	Webber	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sikand
Weir	Wong	Simms	Sohi
Yurdiga	Zimmer— 116	Sorbara	Spengemann
		Tan	Tassi
		Tootoo	Trudeau
		Vandal	Vandenbeld
		Vaughan	Virani
		Whalen	Wilkinson
		Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
		Young	Zahid— 172

**NAYS**

## Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Breton	Brisson
Caesar-Chavannes	Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Chagger
Champagne	Chan
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCoursey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Di Iorio	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Foote
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hardie	Harvey
Hehr	Holland
Housefather	Hussen

**PAIRED**

Nil

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 5 defeated.

I therefore declare Motion Nos. 6 to 23 defeated.

*[English]***Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.)** moved that the bill be concurred in.**The Speaker:** The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.**Some hon. members:** No.**The Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.**Some hon. members:** Yea.**The Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.**Some hon. members:** Nay.



*Government Orders*

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

*And five or more members having risen:*

**Hon. Andrew Leslie:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe if you seek it, you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the previous vote to this one, with Liberal members voting in favour.

**The Speaker:** Is it agreed to apply the vote?

**Mr. Gordon Brown:** Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet:** Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

**Mr. Luc Thériault:** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote, and we will vote against the motion.

[*English*]

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Mr. Speaker, our caucus remains somewhat split but, on balance, we will vote no.

**Hon. Hunter Tootoo:** Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and I will be voting in favour.

• (1925)

[*Translation*]

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

*(Division No. 172)*

## YEAS

## Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Breton	Brisson
Caesar-Chavannes	Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Chagger
Champagne	Chan
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCoursey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Di Iorio	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Foote
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hardie	Harvey
Hehr	Holland
Housefather	Hussen

Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Kang	Khalid
Khera	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Lemieux	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)	McCallum
McCrimmon	McDonald
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Soeurs)	
Monsef	Morneau
Morrissey	Murray
Nassif	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ratansi	Robillard
Rodriguez	Romanado
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Rusnak
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe
Schulte	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Tassi
Tootoo	Trudeau
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Whalen	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskij
Young	Zahid — 172

## NAYS

## Members

Abouttaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Ambrose	Anderson
Arnold	Ashton
Aubin	Barlow
Bergen	Berthold
Bezan	Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Block
Boucher	Boudrias
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brassard	Brousseau
Brown	Calkins
Cannings	Caron
Carrie	Clarke
Cooper	Cullen
Davies	Dellert
Diotte	Doherty
Donnelly	Dreeschen
Dubé	Dusseault
Eglinski	Falk
Gallant	Généreux
Genius	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Hardcastle	Harder
Hughes	Jeneroux
Johns	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Laverdière
Lebel	Liepert

*Adjournment Proceedings*

Lobb	Lukiwski
MacGregor	MacKenzie
Maguire	Malcolmson
Marcel	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathysen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore	Motz
Mulcair	Nantel
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Plamondon
Poilievre	Quach
Ramsey	Rankin
Rayes	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saganash	Saroya
Shields	Shipley
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Strahl
Sweet	Thériault
Trudel	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vecchio
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Watts
Waugh	Webber
Weir	Wong
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 116

## PAIRED

Nil

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

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

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

[*English*]

## STEEL INDUSTRY

**Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I previously rose in this House to bring attention to a serious issue in our country: the unfair dumping of Chinese steel and the need for Canada to have a strong, effective response. Dumping drives down the price of steel and is having a significant impact on Canada's steel industry and the thousands of workers it employs.

My riding of Essex is home to a world-class steel plant, Atlas Tube, which produces top-quality Canadian products, while providing good family-sustaining jobs in our Harrow community. In fact, the steel industry employs 22,000 working-class Canadians in steel production and an additional 100,000 Canadians indirectly. Steel accounts for \$2.6 billion a year in GDP.

The NDP echoes the calls of industry and labour groups for a modernized trade remedy system that effectively addresses issues like steel dumping.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce and local chambers like mine in Windsor—Essex have urged the federal government to act by passing resolutions in support of ending unfair steel dumping. The United Steelworkers have also been actively urging the government to act.

In October, the Standing Committee on International Trade adopted my motion to study this important issue. I am very much

looking forward to this study resuming in the New Year. Action is urgently needed.

Canada has fallen behind in our sanctions, making us an easy target for dumping.

On the other hand, countries like Australia have strengthened their trade remedies.

By not having our sanctions in line with other similar economies, Canada risks inviting even more dumping in the future. We need improved data collection, better transparency, more robust and frequent analyses of foreign subsidies, stiffer penalties, and improved legislation.

Canadian steel has been the backbone of Canadian infrastructure projects for decades. Our plants have an excellent reputation for producing high-quality steel products, while upholding strong labour and environmental standards.

The government's planned investments in infrastructure should represent a big opportunity for Canada's steel industry, but it may not be able to capitalize if Canada continues to allow cheap imports from China to undercut our producers.

Barry Zekelman, CEO of Atlas Tube, has said, "Think of the consequences of our infrastructure, our factories, and our defence all relying on foreign-made steel if our industry shuts its doors."

Every day that Canada does not act, our steel industry is losing money and jobs.

There is another serious issue that we have yet to address in this House. We know that the Liberal government is talking to China about a potential FTA. However, there is a foundational issue with this relationship that needs to be addressed in a timely manner. Canada currently treats China as a non-market economy, but we know China is pushing to be granted market economy status. Canada is going to have to make a decision.

I can tell members that Canada's steel industry is very concerned about the implications of granting China this new status. It will make it more difficult to address trade issues like dumping.

The Canadian Steel Producers Association has estimated that granting China market economy status would result in the loss of 60,000 highly skilled middle-class jobs, a permanent reduction in GDP of over \$9 billion in the short term, \$7.6 billion over the long term, and significant reductions in federal and provincial government revenues.

I would like to ask the parliamentary secretary, what concrete measures will the government take to tackle the very worrisome issue of unfair steel dumping by China; and are the Liberals considering granting China market economy status?

*Adjournment Proceedings*

• (1930)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. David Lametti (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for her question.

The steel industry in Canada and around the world is feeling the effects of flagging investment in the energy sector, the economic slowdown in China, uncertainty in several regions, and the inter-related global problems of overproduction and overcapacity.

As everyone knows, I was born in Port Colborne, Ontario. Algoma Steel was around then, as was Atlas Steels in Welland. They no longer exist by those names.

Steel production is a major economic activity in Canada. In 2015, the sector had nearly 17,000 Canadian jobs, generated \$11 billion in revenue, and accounted for \$2.6 billion of Canada's GDP. Canadian steel mills make a significant contribution to local economies, but they are also part of the North American integrated supply chain.

The government is determined to support this industry and ensure its viability using a number of tools.

One of those tools, a strong trade remedy system to prevent unfairly undervalued or subsidized products from entering the Canadian market, is essential. The system enables Canada's industry to compete with others on a level playing field and attract investment in North America. Canada has implemented trade measures for 12 steel products in order to protect our producers.

The government responded to the administrative and legislative proposals made by the steel industry to enhance Canada's trade remedy system. Two proposals were implemented in the budget implementation act and others were subject to consultations, which were completed on June 29. The government is currently analyzing the requests that came out of those consultations. What is more, the Standing Committee on International Trade is committed to conducting a study on the steel industry.

On an international level, the issue of global overcapacity was discussed during the G20 summit in Hangzhou on September 4 and 5. As part of that event, the Prime Minister and other leaders recognized the problem of overcapacity in the steel industry. This acknowledgement was an important step since China, the world's leading steel producer, agreed to work on increasing its efforts on exchanging information and co-operation. In light of the leaders summit, the G20 countries and the OECD are making efforts to establish a global forum on steel overcapacity. The Minister of International Trade is following this file closely, because she is aware of the need to take action quickly regarding this problem. Preparations for the first meeting are going well and Canada will attend.

The government has been working hard at home and abroad on resolving trade problems affecting Canadian producers in order to create an environment where the steel industry can continue to make an important contribution to Canada's economy.

[*English*]

**Ms. Tracey Ramsey:** Madam Speaker, I am hearing very little in the way of concrete answers in the government's response. To be

aware of the issue and not act is cold comfort to the steel producers in Canada and those who work in this important sector. We will lose jobs if we do not act. It is good to hear that the government understands the issue, but without action we are not going to be able to ensure that these jobs are going to stay safe inside of Canada.

Supporting this industry must include the important consideration that I mentioned, and that is whether Canada will grant China market economy status. This decision is coming up on December 11. It is very pressing, and it is urgent for the steel producers to understand what they will be facing if the government makes the decision to give that granting to China.

Again, can the parliamentary secretary outline when his government will implement changes to Canada's trade remedy system, and how will the government deal with China's request to be granted market economy status?

• (1935)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. David Lametti:** Madam Speaker, I should add that the government and the industry are taking part in meetings of the North American steel trade committee whereby Mexico, Canada, and the United States are discussing the issues that matter to the steel industry and coordinating their efforts.

For instance, the Canada Border Services Agency and the U.S. Customs Service recently increased their joint enforcement of anti-dumping measures. I can only reiterate that the government is using every possible mechanism to protect Canadian producers against these undervalued goods and to ensure that steel producers in regions like Sault Ste. Marie, Hamilton, and Nanticoke remain the pillars of their communities.

## HEALTH

**Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the recent process to fund community organizations as part of the community initiatives fund specifically for HIV/AIDS and hepatitis C, targeted specifically at HIV/AIDS advocacy, awareness, and prevention organizations.

This process has completely shocked people across the country, and with good reason. People are speaking out. Many people have talked to me about this, including individuals from my own riding of Laurier—Sainte-Marie, which I am proud to represent, as well as members of national organizations.

As part of this process, many well-known organizations, and some that have even been recognized for their work with an especially vulnerable population, have had their funding taken away. Many will have to either eliminate large portions of their activities, or in some cases, shut down altogether.

The process in question is riddled with problems. First of all, we are told that the funding has not changed. Theoretically, that is true, except that by lumping all networks related to HIV and hepatitis C together with all other sexually transmitted diseases, this ultimately reduces the funds available to each network.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

What is more, even if that were not the case, we are still being told that the funding has not changed. That is also a problem because the funding has not changed for years and has basically been frozen. Rent, wages, and all the rest have continued to increase during that time, which means that, in reality, people have to do more with fewer resources. We are talking about community organizations, not organizations that have access to jet planes and limousines. There are many community organizations in my riding of Laurier—Sainte-Marie, and they are already working extremely hard with very limited resources.

There is also a problem with the process. Funding criteria used to be public, but not this year. Yes, consultations were held. What the organizations are telling me is that the consultations were all over the map. I guess that is what this government likes to call a conversation. The organizations also told me that the consultations did not produce any tangible results. Afterward, the organizations were left in the dark, until, all of a sudden, they were given the bad news.

Speaking of consultations, it is interesting to note that consultations were held to discuss the priorities and objectives of the Public Health Agency of Canada, yet the decisions that were made do not correspond with those priorities. As I was saying, there are well-established organizations that are known for their work that had their funding drastically reduced.

Many of these organizations have been working on the ground for about thirty years. The government is suddenly, without warning dismantling an entire network. I see this happening and, of course, I feel bad for the organizations, but mostly I worry about the people they serve. When the government reduces or eliminates funding for organizations, it is the people that those organizations help—

• (1940)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I apologize to the hon. member, but her time has expired.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Health.

[*English*]

**Ms. Kamal Khera (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, our government is committed to addressing HIV and hepatitis C in Canada and recognizes that community-based organizations are central to the Canadian response to these infections.

Achieving our goal requires a comprehensive approach that includes a strong focus on vulnerable populations, with interventions that have the greatest potential to make an impact. Canada has made great progress in addressing HIV and hepatitis C over more than three decades of responding to these epidemics. However, there is still work to do.

As members may know, Canada has committed to meeting the global UNAIDS 90-90-90 HIV targets by 2020, meaning that 90% of HIV-positive people know their status, that 90% of people who know their status receive treatment, and that 90% of those on treatment have suppressed viral loads.

The Government of Canada continues to work closely with the provinces and territories, community organizations, and scientific and medical communities to reach the 90-90-90 targets and those for

viral hepatitis by engaging with communities to strengthen prevention and access to testing and treatment services, by enhancing surveillance to monitor progress, and by providing screening and testing guidance to help professionals.

As part of these broader efforts to address HIV and hepatitis C, the Public Health Agency of Canada recently announced its decision related to funding of community-based organization projects under its new HIV and hepatitis C community action fund.

The development and implementation of the fund has been a significant but necessary undertaking to refocus our efforts in preventing and controlling HIV and hepatitis C. These funding decisions followed an open and competitive solicitation based on priorities set in collaboration with provinces and territories, community-based organizations, people living with HIV or hepatitis C, and other stakeholders and partners.

I would like to reiterate that the funding our government provides to community-based organizations has not diminished. It remains steady at \$26.4 million annually and continues to support time-limited projects across Canada. While 124 organizations were successful in the application process for the community action fund, including 41 new organizations, others were not. These included some organizations that had been funded previously under the program. For some of these organizations, the loss of project funding for the next year was disappointing. For others, this represents the loss of an important source of funding, which could impact the sustainability of the organizations and their work.

Our government has heard the concerns of these organizations, and in an effort to help those organizations through the transition, PHAC has been directed to provide up to one year of transitional project funding on a case-by-case basis, which would end on March 31, 2018.

PHAC will work closely with each organization to determine the funding amount that will be provided and the work that can be achieved over one year. Furthermore, PHAC is working with organizations that were approved at lower amounts than previously, in comparison to the current funding, to help them transition as well.

The fund is designed to ensure that funding supports areas where there is the greatest burden based on current rates of HIV and hepatitis C.

We still have a lot more to do if we are going to stop the spread of these serious but preventable diseases. That is why it is important that we continue to work hand in hand with provinces and territories, as well as with stakeholder partners and people living with HIV and hepatitis C, to have the greatest impact possible.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Hélène Laverdière:** Madam Speaker, the parliamentary secretary is pleased that more and more people know their HIV-AIDS status. Perhaps this is thanks to the longstanding organizations that the government decided to abolish. If the formula is working, I do not understand why they are going ahead with these cuts.

She also talked about vulnerable populations. However, of the groups affected by the cuts, such as aboriginal peoples, there are also injection drug users. The only organization left in Quebec to work with these people is in Quebec City, while the problem is particularly acute in Montreal.

Also affected are groups working with African immigrant women, as well as huge segments of the population being left out, including francophones. However, among the new groups funded are a number of so-called national organizations that do not deliver services in French.

● (1945)

[*English*]

**Ms. Kamal Khera:** Madam Speaker, the changes to community-based funding were intended to identify initiatives that addressed populations in areas of Canada with the greatest need, and to allow us to prevent HIV, hep C, and other sexually transmitted and blood-borne infections in Canada.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

PHAC does not question the contribution of currently funded organizations and did not base its decision on their current work. The organizations that were invited to submit full proposals were those that clearly demonstrated, through evidence, that their project had potential to reduce rates of HIV, hep C, and other sexually transmitted and blood-borne infections in Canada, and to reduce barriers to diagnosis and treatment.

We understand that we have a lot more to do. It is why it is important that we continue to work hand in hand with provinces and territories, as well as stakeholders, partners, people living with HIV and hep C, in order to have the greatest impact possible.

[*Translation*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** 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 7:46 p.m.)

---



# CONTENTS

Monday, December 5, 2016

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

### Holidays Act

Bill C-311. Second reading .....	7607
Ms. Malcolmson .....	7607
Mr. MacKinnon .....	7608
Mr. Berthold .....	7608
Ms. Trudel .....	7609
Mr. Samson .....	7611
Mrs. Wagantall .....	7612
Mr. Fraser (Central Nova) .....	7613
Mr. Fraser (West Nova) .....	7613
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee) .....	7614

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Budget Implementation Act, 2016, No. 2

#### Bill C-29—Time Allocation Motion

Ms. Chagger .....	7614
Mr. Deltell .....	7614
Mr. Morneau .....	7615
Mr. Rankin .....	7615
Mr. Doherty .....	7615
Mr. Dubé .....	7615
Mr. Strahl .....	7616
Mr. Cullen .....	7616
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7616
Mrs. Wagantall .....	7617
Mr. Blaikie .....	7617
Ms. Bergen .....	7617
Mr. Boulerice .....	7618
Mr. Dreeschen .....	7618
Mr. Weir .....	7618
Mr. Albrecht .....	7619
Mr. MacGregor .....	7619
Mr. Vandal .....	7619
Motion agreed to .....	7620

#### Report Stage

Bill C-29. Report stage .....	7621
Mr. Strahl .....	7621
Mr. Champagne .....	7622
Mr. Cullen .....	7622
Mr. Vandal .....	7623
Mr. Champagne .....	7623
Mr. MacGregor .....	7624
Mr. Albrecht .....	7624
Mr. Plamondon .....	7624
Mr. Stetski .....	7625
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7626

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Youth in Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook

Mr. Samson .....	7626
------------------	------

### Christmas Parades in Markham—Unionville

Mr. Saroya .....	7626
------------------	------

### Operation Red Nose

Mr. Graham .....	7627
------------------	------

### Cécile Pellerin

Ms. Trudel .....	7627
------------------	------

### Len Rigg

Mr. Peschisolido .....	7627
------------------------	------

### Christmas Events in Kitchener—Conestoga

Mr. Albrecht .....	7627
--------------------	------

### University of British Columbia Okanagan

Mr. Fuhr .....	7627
----------------	------

### Ephraim's Place

Mr. Levitt .....	7628
------------------	------

### Burma

Mr. Genuis .....	7628
------------------	------

### Central York Fire Services

Mr. Peterson .....	7628
--------------------	------

### Islamophobia

Mr. Baylis .....	7628
------------------	------

### HMCS Ville de Quebec

Mrs. Block .....	7628
------------------	------

### Islamophobia

Ms. Khalid .....	7629
------------------	------

### Electrification of Transportation

Mr. Nantel .....	7629
------------------	------

### Israel

Mr. Kent .....	7629
----------------	------

### Violence Against Women

Mr. Jowhari .....	7629
-------------------	------

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Employment

Ms. Ambrose .....	7629
Mr. Bains .....	7630

### Taxation

Ms. Ambrose .....	7630
Mr. Brison .....	7630
Ms. Ambrose .....	7630
Mr. Brison .....	7630

### Ethics

Ms. Ambrose .....	7630
Ms. Chagger .....	7630
Ms. Ambrose .....	7630
Ms. Chagger .....	7630
Mr. Mulcair .....	7631
Ms. Chagger .....	7631

Mr. Mulcair.....	7631
Ms. Chagger.....	7631
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Mulcair.....	7631
Ms. Wilson-Raybould.....	7631
Mr. Mulcair.....	7631
Ms. Wilson-Raybould.....	7631
<b>The Economy</b>	
Mr. Lebel.....	7631
Mr. Bains.....	7632
<b>Softwood Lumber</b>	
Mr. Lebel.....	7632
Mr. Lametti.....	7632
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Carrie.....	7632
Mr. Champagne.....	7632
Mr. Carrie.....	7632
Mr. Champagne.....	7632
Mr. Deltell.....	7632
Mr. Champagne.....	7633
Mr. Deltell.....	7633
Mr. Champagne.....	7633
<b>Democratic Reform</b>	
Mr. Boulerice.....	7633
Ms. Monsef.....	7633
Mr. Cullen.....	7633
Ms. Monsef.....	7633
Mr. Reid.....	7633
Ms. Monsef.....	7633
Mr. Rayes.....	7634
Ms. Monsef.....	7634
<b>Ethics</b>	
Mr. Nuttall.....	7634
Ms. Wilson-Raybould.....	7634
Mr. Nuttall.....	7634
Ms. Wilson-Raybould.....	7634
<b>Youth</b>	
Ms. Quach.....	7634
Ms. Rudd.....	7634
<b>Public Safety</b>	
Mr. Dubé.....	7634
Ms. Rudd.....	7635
<b>Democratic Reform</b>	
Mr. Chen.....	7635
Ms. Monsef.....	7635
<b>Ethics</b>	
Ms. Bergen.....	7635
Ms. Chagger.....	7635
Ms. Bergen.....	7635
Ms. Chagger.....	7635
Mr. Godin.....	7635
Ms. Chagger.....	7635
Ms. Gladu.....	7636
Ms. Chagger.....	7636

<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Ms. Laverdière.....	7636
Ms. Goldsmith-Jones.....	7636
<b>Democratic Reform</b>	
Ms. Hardcastle.....	7636
Ms. Monsef.....	7636
<b>Public Services and Procurement</b>	
Mr. Clarke.....	7636
Ms. Foote.....	7636
Mr. Bezan.....	7636
Mr. Sajjan.....	7637
Mr. Paul-Hus.....	7637
Mr. Sajjan.....	7637
<b>Infrastructure</b>	
Mrs. Lockhart.....	7637
Mr. Sohi.....	7637
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Cooper.....	7637
Ms. Wilson-Raybould.....	7637
<b>Infrastructure</b>	
Mr. Masse (Windsor West).....	7637
Mr. Garneau.....	7637
<b>The Environment</b>	
Mr. Peschisolido.....	7638
Mr. LeBlanc.....	7638
<b>Indigenous Affairs</b>	
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo).....	7638
Ms. Bennett.....	7638
<b>Consumer Protection</b>	
Mr. Plamondon.....	7638
Mr. Champagne.....	7638
Mr. Marcil.....	7638
Mr. Champagne.....	7638
<b>Political Party Financing</b>	
Mr. Thériault.....	7639
Ms. Monsef.....	7639
<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Oral Questions</b>	
Mr. Genuis.....	7639
Ms. Chagger.....	7639
Ms. Monsef.....	7639

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Ms. Goldsmith-Jones.....	7640
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux.....	7640
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Justice and Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Housefather.....	7640
<b>Transport, Infrastructure and Communities</b>	
Ms. Sgro.....	7640



<b>Canadian Bill of Rights</b>	
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River).....	7640
Bill C-325. Introduction and first reading .....	7640
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	7640
<b>Department of Health Act</b>	
Mr. Scarpaleggia .....	7640
Bill C-326. Introduction and first reading .....	7640
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	7640
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Hospital Parking</b>	
Mr. Ouellette .....	7640
<b>Algoma Central Railway</b>	
Mrs. Hughes .....	7641
<b>Falun Gong</b>	
Ms. Bergen .....	7641
<b>Syria</b>	
Mrs. Mendès .....	7641
<b>International Students</b>	
Mr. Tan .....	7641
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	7641
<b>Islam</b>	
Mr. Baylis .....	7641
<b>Falun Gong</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7641
<b>Physician-Assisted Dying</b>	
Mr. Warawa .....	7642
<b>Impaired Driving</b>	
Mr. Warawa .....	7642
<b>Questions Passed as Orders for Returns</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7642

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Budget Implementation Act, 2016, No. 2</b>	
Bill C-29. Report Stage .....	7643
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7643
Mr. Stetski .....	7643
Mr. MacGregor .....	7643
Mr. Saini .....	7644
Mr. Albrecht .....	7645
Mr. Caron .....	7645
Mr. Richards .....	7646
Mr. Graham .....	7647
Mr. Caron .....	7647
Mr. Jeneroux .....	7648
Mr. Chen .....	7648
Mr. Warawa .....	7649
Mr. MacGregor .....	7649
Mr. DeCoursey .....	7650
Mr. Van Kesteren .....	7650
Mr. Erskine-Smith .....	7651
Mr. Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) ..	7651
Mr. MacGregor .....	7651

<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Decorum in the House</b>	
Mr. Housefather .....	7652
<b>Budget Implementation Act, 2016, No. 2</b>	
Bill C-29. Report Stage .....	7652
Mr. Fonseca .....	7652
Mr. Boulerice .....	7654
Mr. Vandal .....	7654
<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Decorum in the House—Speaker's Ruling</b>	
The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota) .....	7654
<b>Budget Implementation Act, 2016, No. 2</b>	
Bill C-29. Report Stage .....	7655
Ms. Gould .....	7655
Mrs. Boucher .....	7655
Mr. Jeneroux .....	7656
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	7656
Mrs. Boucher .....	7656
Mr. Garneau .....	7657
Mr. Caron .....	7658
Mr. Graham .....	7658
Mr. Albrecht .....	7659
Mr. Caron .....	7660
Mr. Graham .....	7660
Mr. Boudrias .....	7660
Mr. MacGregor .....	7660
Mr. Housefather .....	7661
Mr. Jeneroux .....	7662
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7662
Mrs. McCrimmon .....	7662
Mr. Albrecht .....	7663
Mr. Stetski .....	7663
Mr. Kitchen .....	7664
Mr. Lamoureux .....	7665
Mr. Caron .....	7666
Mr. Housefather .....	7666
Ms. Lapointe .....	7666
Mr. Marcil .....	7667
Mr. Albrecht .....	7667
Mr. Falk .....	7667
Mr. Shields .....	7667
Mr. Vaughan .....	7668
Mr. Dubé .....	7670
Mr. Brassard .....	7670
Mr. Lightbound .....	7670
Mr. Clarke .....	7672
Mr. Dubé .....	7672
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred .....	7673
Division on Motion No. 2 deferred .....	7673
Division on Motion No. 5 deferred .....	7673
Motion negatived .....	7674
Motions Nos. 2 and 3 negatived .....	7675
Motion Nos. 6 to 23 negatived .....	7676
Mr. Morneau .....	7676
Bill C-29. Motion for concurrence .....	7676
Motion agreed to .....	7678

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

**Steel Industry**

Ms. Ramsey .....	7678
Mr. Lametti .....	7679

**Health**

Ms. Laverdière .....	7679
Ms. Khera .....	7680



Published under the authority of the Speaker of  
the House of Commons

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

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 House of Commons website at the following address: <http://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

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 de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.noscommunes.ca>