



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 147 • NUMBER 164 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

—

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

• (1405)

[*English*]

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

[Members sang the national anthem]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

DAVID WYNN

Mr. Brent Rathgeber (Edmonton—St. Albert, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, on Monday, St. Albert said goodbye to one of its finest heroes. RCMP Constable David Wynn was laid to rest following a full regimental funeral attended by 6,000 grateful mourners.

Constable Wynn and Auxilliary Constable Derek Bond had been shot nine days earlier in the line of duty and are both to be saluted for their bravery.

Some 2,100 first responders from across North America honoured their fallen colleague and thousands of St. Albertans lined the procession route wearing white ribbons and waving Canadian flags in a show of community respect and solidarity.

The entire city of St. Albert has come together to show support for both the Wynn and the RCMP families; 15,000 white ribbons adorned porch lights, lampposts and trees throughout our city.

I would like the family of Constable Wynn, wife Shelly, sons Matthew, Nathan and Alex, and also Auxilliary Constable Bond, who is recovering from serious injuries, to know that they are in our collective thoughts and in our prayers.

A grateful nation salutes Constable Wynn for his sacrifice and thanks him for his service to his community and to his country.

Rest in peace, Constable Wynn.

HEARTHSTONE COMMUNITY CAMPAIGN

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a fundraising effort that started in 2011 to raise \$8 million for a new regional nursing home in Estevan, Saskatchewan reached its goal two years ahead of schedule.

On January 12, 2015, Campaign Chair of the Hearthstone Community Campaign Vern Buck made the announcement that a new nursing home in Estevan was no longer a matter of “if” but “when”, as the required \$8 million had been raised prior to Christmas 2014. There were numerous acts of generosity that raised the funds, such as cutting grass, quilt sales, a car auction and the harvesting of two quarter sections of canola.

Campaign Chair Vern Buck stated, “The generous people of Estevan and surrounding area should congratulate themselves for reaching the fundraising goal so quickly. It reflects the urgency and the need of a new facility for elders in our community”.

To all of the volunteers and members of the community who donated time and money for this project and to Campaign Chair Vern Buck, congratulations on a job well done and on the outstanding effort of reaching the goal in such a quick fashion.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC WINTER CARNIVAL

Mr. Denis Blanchette (Louis-Hébert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite you and all Canadians to Quebec City's 61st winter carnival, which will take place from January 30 to February 15. The carnival president is Isabelle Hurtevent. Last year, 520,000 people attended. This year, there are 200 activities on the program and 1,200 volunteers on board.

Come join the party with your arrow sash, your effigy or your trumpet. Come see the night parades, the ice palace, the snow bath, the canoe race and the snow sculptures.

Do not miss the dogsledding, the peewee hockey tournament, the Hockey Canada century tour, snow golf and festive streets such as du Campanile and Maguire.

Lastly, I would like to wish the duchess of Sainte-Foy–Sillery–Cap-Rouge, Marie-Andrée Boucher, good luck on the evening of the coronation.

Come join the fun at the world's biggest winter carnival together with the king of the party, Bonhomme.

Enjoy the carnival, everyone.

Statements by Members

[English]

NORTH KOREA

Mr. Russ Hiebert (South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we know, North Korea has one of the most brutal regimes on the planet, denying its own people the most basic rights and freedoms. Indeed, those who would dare question the totalitarian regime of Kim Jong-un, or even try to escape from it, are sent to concentration camps, many to die of torture or starvation. Amnesty International estimates there are 200,000 political prisoners in these camps.

This week, the Parliament of Canada will hear testimony from a high profile defector, Jang Jin-sung, who has documented many of the evils of the North Korean regime in his recent book *Dear Leader*.

However, Kim Jong-un is not content to oppress just his own people. His regime also threatens us with nuclear weapons and attacks our right to free speech as the recent Sony hack demonstrated.

Canada will not be intimidated. We will continue to criticize the cruelty of Kim Jong-un and call for an end to his regime.

* * *

DON HARRON

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to the late Don Harron, an unforgettable Canadian actor, comedian, cartoonist and writer. He entertained generations of Canadians with his contagious passion and light heart.

Notably, Don performed as his comic alter ego Charlie Farquharson, a folksy storyteller, poking fun at almost anything Canadian, often making politicians the target. He showed us the joy of laughing at ourselves.

As Charlie, he performed on Canadian radio, TV and a variety of shows like *Hee Haw* in the United States. His serious side had him hosting CBC's *Morningside* and in theatre acting on stages from London, England to Stratford, Ontario. His most celebrated work was helping to bring the Island classic *Anne of Green Gables* alive to the stage, having been performed for 50 consecutive years at the Charlottetown Festival.

As Charlie would say in his tattered sweater, "Hee-haw, on to the next chapter".

On behalf of the House, I thank Don for his wit, his passion and his love for this country.

* * *

● (1410)

JOE ROTMAN

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada lost one of its truest supporters of arts and culture yesterday with the passing of Joe Rotman. A passionate supporter of the arts, he believed that it is our arts and our culture that define our identity as a country.

Rotman served as the chair of the board of the Art Gallery of Ontario and as a member of the board of the Governor General's Performing Arts Awards.

In 2008 Rotman was appointed chair of the Canada Council for the Arts, where he served with distinction until his death. As a major benefactor of the arts, he donated nearly \$100 million to building a more vibrant art sector.

Throughout his life, Joe was guided by the belief instilled in him by his father that the most powerful way to inspire others is for them to see people giving back to their community.

Joe Rotman inspired us all with his generosity. He will be missed.

* * *

JESSE TAIT

Mr. John Rafferty (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today we mourn the loss of Sgt. Jesse Tait of Sudbury. He was a father, husband, son and soldier, serving at CFB Shilo in Manitoba. All of northern Ontario and all Canadians stand with his family at this time of loss.

He joined the Canadian Forces in January 2002 and was posted to the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry. He served in Bosnia in 2003 and in Afghanistan in 2008 as a sniper. His family described him as ambitious, hard-working, a natural leader with a penchant for adventure, who loved nothing more than spending time with his two young boys,

This tragic death serves as another reminder of the commitment and service of our Canadian Forces. It also reminds us of the duty we have as members of the House of Commons to those who serve, to only place them in harm's way after careful consideration, and to be there for them when they return.

We shall not forget Sgt. Jesse Tait.

* * *

DEREK WALTON

Mr. Patrick Brown (Barrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to a very dear friend who unfortunately lost his battle with ALS at age 70. Mr. Derek Walton was diagnosed with ALS in 2002 and had been a passionate advocate for neurological research and ALS ever since.

Although the average life expectancy for those who are diagnosed with ALS is two to five years, Derek quickly earned the nickname "Braveheart" for his continuous fight. He used his tremendous strength and courage to fight a terrible battle that too many Canadians are currently facing.

Derek's many efforts to raise money for ALS research included: launching The Walton Cure 4 ALS Fund at Sunnybrook Hospital, his annual skydiving events he called Jumping 4 PALS, organizing annual ALS walks, and helping spearhead the national neurological charity funding for the Canada brain research fund. His hard work helped raise hundreds of thousands of dollars for ALS research.

My thoughts and prayers are with Derek's family during this difficult time. His dedication to raising awareness and funds for ALS will forever be remembered.

*Statements by Members***MENTAL HEALTH**

Mr. Rick Dykstra (St. Catharines, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the stigma surrounding mental health and recent efforts to address it by Bell Canada and our government.

Today marks the 5th annual Bell Let's Talk Day. For every text, call, tweet and Facebook share of the campaign, Bell is donating 5¢ to a variety of Canadian mental health charities. In just four years, Bell has donated over \$67 million. This is a significant achievement which will effect positive change.

Bell is not alone in its support of mental health initiatives. Our government has taken action and created the mental health commission and a national strategy for mental health and well-being.

We have invested significantly and seriously into mental health and neuroscience research in the past eight years, supporting organizations like the Canada brain research fund and its projects, and an additional \$6 million for research into eating disorders since 2006.

Down in Niagara, Regional Chairman Al Caslin has assured me the regional government is also committed to delivering with us. Our government is focused on supporting initiatives that benefit the health of all Canadians, physically and mentally.

* * *

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Ms. Annick Papillon (Québec, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the work of members of the Fédération des coopératives d'habitation de Québec, Chaudière-Appalaches, also known as FECHAQC.

Co-operative housing provides 27,000 Quebec households with decent, affordable housing. Co-operative housing is a modern, effective and humane solution to housing problems.

Unfortunately, for the past few years, the Conservative government has refused to reinvest in affordable housing. Next year, about 100,000 households will be affected by those cuts. By 2030, the federal housing budget will have been cut by 85%. That is right, 85%.

The NDP believes that everyone has a right to decent housing at a reasonable cost. A roof is a right.

That is why we are calling on the government to maintain the total amount of \$1.7 billion a year currently invested in those agreements.

It is time to bring in a housing strategy, and I will be attending FECHAQC's annual general meeting this Saturday to talk about just that. Everyone is welcome.

* * *

[*English*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mrs. Nina Grewal (Fleetwood—Port Kells, CPC): Mr. Speaker, recent events have clearly demonstrated that the international jihadist movement has declared war on Canada and her allies. This week in

B.C., the trial of accused terrorists John Nuttall and Amanda Korody will begin. Together they are accused of plotting to attack the B.C. legislature's Canada Day celebrations.

Our government believes these threats against Canadians are reprehensible. That is why we have taken concrete measures to end this threat. It is why we have committed the Canadian Armed Forces to the broad international coalition against the so-called Islamic state. No Canadian government should ever stand on the sidelines, while our allies act to deny terrorists a safe haven.

There is work to be done at home as well. We will put legislation before Parliament this Friday that will help authorities stop planned attacks, get threats off our streets, criminalize the promotion of terrorism, and prevent terrorists from travelling and recruiting others.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Ms. Mylène Freeman (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in the days and months ahead, many important issues will be brought before this House. Canadians are concerned about the falling price of oil and what that means for our economy. They are troubled by climate change and the environment, falling income and rising debt. They are worried about health care and their pension, the loss of manufacturing jobs and that there is no federal minimum wage.

[*Translation*]

At the same time, let us not forget that we must include women in all our policies. As the official opposition status of women critic for the NDP, I am committed to working hard for equality for all Canadian women. We must end poverty among women. We need a plan for affordable, universal child care and we need a national action plan to end violence against women.

The NDP knows that when women are overlooked, all of Canada—its people and its economy—suffers. Canadians can count on the NDP to stand up for women, now and when—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Mississauga—Streetsville.

* * *

[*English*]

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Mr. Brad Butt (Mississauga—Streetsville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government understands that manufacturing is a high-tech, high-skill economic engine for Canada. Manufacturing alone employs close to 1.7 million Canadians, including many in my riding of Mississauga—Streetsville.

Statements by Members

However, the Liberal leader told Ontarians last week that he wanted to transition away from a manufacturing economy altogether. Since coming to power, our government has made Canada a low tax environment for Canadian manufacturers, eliminated tariffs on machinery and negotiated trade agreements that will expand market opportunities and create jobs.

Jayson Myers, President of the Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters said, “the programs the Conservative government has put in place...support manufacturing, and do it very well”.

The choice is clear. Our government is focused on establishing the right conditions for success: low taxes, global trade opportunities, investment policies and a skilled workforce.

* * *

MENTAL HEALTH

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one in five Canadians will experience a mental illness in his or her lifetime. Currently, three million Canadians suffer from depression. Suicides account for 24% of deaths in 15 to 24 year olds, and the suicide rate is climbing among men who are 85 and over.

In 2011, all parties in the House voted to support a Liberal motion for a national suicide prevention strategy. In 2013, the Mental Health Commission of Canada made recommendations for mental health policies in the workplace. The government has failed to implement any of those policies.

Last week, the Mental Health Commission gave Canada a failing grade on 12 out of 13 indicators for mental health outcomes. Suicide rates are still above the G8 average, self-harm among students is growing, and workplace stress and anxiety is rising. Stigma still prevents many from seeking help.

I encourage all members to support the Bell Let's Talk campaign today. Each tweet will get a 5¢ donation from Bell.

* * *

● (1420)

TAXATION

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the strong leadership of our Prime Minister, our government is on track to balance Canada's budget, and we are now in a position to help Canadian families balance theirs.

Our plan gives new money to 100% of families with children, and the vast majority of benefits go to low and middle-income families. With the enhancement of the universal child care benefit, moms and dads in Oxford, and across the country, will receive nearly \$2,000 per year for every child under 6, and \$720 per year for every child between the ages of 6 and 17.

The NDP and the Liberals want to take this money away and spend it on big government bureaucracy instead. Instead of giving decision-making power to parents, the NDP and the Liberals want Ottawa bureaucracy telling families what to do. That is not right.

Our government knows that parents know what is best for their kids, and we are proud to be the only party standing up for them.

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Andrew Cash (Davenport, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate reality that Canadians are now used to the Conservatives making policy decisions solely based on political self-interest. However, most Canadians would be saddened and surprised to see the Liberals take the same tack.

Just yesterday, Liberal MPs and officials talked about their approach to the impending Conservative anti-terror legislation. They do not want to be "outflanked" by the Conservatives, so they will support the government's new anti-terrorism bill without even reading it first.

Why would the Liberals give the Conservatives a free ride? Canadians want sound, evidence-based policy, not policies based on political expediency.

Liberals remind me of the old saying, “If you don't stand for something, you'll go for anything”.

* * *

TAXATION

Ms. Joyce Bateman (Winnipeg South Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our Conservative government is delivering an unprecedented package for benefits for hard-working families through out new tax breaks and family tax cut plan. The vast majority of these benefits will be to low and middle-income families. Together these initiatives will directly benefit 100% of the families with children in my riding of Winnipeg South Centre.

We are increasing and expanding the universal child care benefit for children under six. We have increased the child care expense deduction. We have doubled the children's fitness tax credit. We have expanded the universal child care benefit for children aged 6 to 17.

We are proud of our plan that is lowering taxes and providing benefits directly to families for them to reinvest in the Canadian economy. The last thing we should do is put our economy at risk with the high taxes and debt promised by the Liberals and the NDP.

Shame on the Liberals and the NDP for wanting to take these cuts away from families.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today, Statistics Canada announced that 65,000 fewer jobs than forecast were created in 2014.

In Quebec, the number of healthy young people who are looking for work and have had to turn to social assistance increased by 14.4% in 2014. That is scandalous. These are the worst results since the depths of the last recession.

Why is the Prime Minister doing nothing? When will he table a budget?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is quite the opposite. Although Statistics Canada's methods and numbers change from time to time, the trend is clear.

The Canadian economy has created almost 1.2 million jobs since the depths of the recession. This is not the time to increase personal and corporate income taxes. This is not the time to run up large debts and deficits.

This is the time to lower taxes, as we are doing, and ensure that significant investments are made in the Canadian economy.

* * *

• (1425)

TAXATION

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, they are not numbers, they are human beings.

[English]

Canadians are looking for action. They are looking for help for the middle class. Instead, they are getting a Conservative tax proposal that fails middle-class families.

A new report out today shows that middle-class families will benefit the least from the Prime Minister's tax plan. They make enough so that their child care benefits will be taxed back, but not enough to benefit from the Prime Minister's income splitting scheme because it only for the richest.

When will the Prime Minister put forward a practical plan to help middle-class families? When will we see a budget?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, they are human beings, and there are 1.2 million more of them working now than there were. There are nearly 4.5 million households. That is over eight million adults who will be benefiting from the tax cuts and benefits brought in by this government. Those millions of Canadians will fight tooth and nail against every attempt by the NDP to raise the deficit, to raise taxes, and to kill jobs.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a report has confirmed that the Canadian Forces are now

Oral Questions

involved in combat, despite the Prime Minister's formal commitment last fall that our soldiers would not be on the front lines.

American troops are not painting targets for air strikes and are not authorized to accompany Iraqi troops to the front lines. These are the rules of engagement that the Prime Minister promised Canadians.

Why did he mislead Canadians?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is not true.

The truth is that the NDP leader and the entire opposition are opposed to military missions to advise and assist Iraqi forces in fighting jihadist terrorists.

It is true that our troops killed jihadist terrorists who fired on them. That is their mission. We are proud of our troops and we are behind them 100%.

[English]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, American troops are not allowed to paint targets for air strikes. They are not allowed to accompany Iraqi forces to the front lines. This is exactly what the Prime Minister promised would be the case for Canadian soldiers, and yet Canadian special forces are indeed being put on the front lines.

Brigadier General Rouleau said that Canadians were going to the "the forward-most Iraqi fighting positions". That is why they call it "the front".

It is a simple question. When did the Prime Minister decide to send Canadian troops into combat?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have said repeatedly, this is a robust mission to assist and advise the Iraqi forces.

I know the NDP is against that. I know the opposition members think it is a terrible thing that we are actually standing up to jihadists. I know they think it is a terrible thing that some of these jihadists got killed when they fired on the Canadian military.

I do not know what other militaries are doing, but I know that ours is doing exactly what this Parliament asked it to do, and that Canadians are behind it.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, spending \$700,000 a year to fight vets in court—that is not supporting our troops. Closing nine veteran services offices—that is not supporting our troops, either.

Today we learned about the loss of another soldier. Sergeant Jesse Tait, from Sudbury, had served in Bosnia and Afghanistan. Sergeant Tait was struggling with depression. His mother says that when he went for help, he was turned away.

Oral Questions

Will the Prime Minister finally commit to supporting our troops not only in combat but in the battle that comes afterward?

• (1430)

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, obviously I do not know the facts of this particular case, but whenever we lose a serving military officer or a former military member, it is a terrible thing, and our condolences go out to that family.

That is why we are taking the steps that we are taking, why we have created eight operational stress injury clinics. I do not know why New Democrats voted against that support for our veterans. Why did they vote against the expansion of the road to mental readiness education campaign? Why did they oppose the expansion of the veterans independence program, or the Canada remembers program, or the community war memorial program, or the earnings loss supplement retirement program? We are standing by veterans.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative income splitting plan is most generous to those earning over \$233,000 a year. That is the wrong priority.

Why does the Prime Minister insist on giving families like his and mine a \$2,000 tax break?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. The vast majority of Canadian families cannot rely on a personal trust fund. The reality is that they rely on the creation of jobs, which this government has been supporting, and every single Canadian family that is benefiting from our tax reductions and benefits welcomes those changes. They understand that the Liberal Party would take those things away from them, and they will tell the Liberal Party it is on the wrong path.

[Translation]

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, with income splitting, the government will favour Canadians who earn over \$233,000 per year. That is the wrong priority. Why does the Prime Minister insist on giving families like his and mine a \$2,000 tax break?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, ordinary, hard-working Canadians do not have personal trust funds. The reality is that Canadian families are well aware that all Canadian families will benefit and pay fewer taxes as a result of our measures.

The Liberal Party wants to do away with the universal child care benefit and income splitting for families and seniors. We are in favour of those measures, but the Liberal Party is against them. The Liberal Party's measures do not support Canadian families.

* * *

[English]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Major Mark Campbell lost both legs in Afghanistan fighting the Taliban. Now he is fighting a government that has spent \$700,000 in legal fees to deny him \$35,000 in benefits.

Will the Prime Minister live up to our sacred obligation, end this court battle, and start giving our veterans the help they deserve?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Liberal Party knows full well that the government is not going to comment on matters before the court other than simply to observe that in this case, the government is defending a decision of the previous government, supported by all parties in the House of Commons.

Since coming to office, since the previous government imposed the new veterans charter, this government has enhanced veterans' services and programs to the tune of some \$5 billion, opposed every step of the way by the Liberals and the NDP. We are proud of those actions and will obviously look at what more needs to be done as we continue to support our veterans.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the faltering economy presents budgetary challenges at all levels of government. At the very least, the federal government could sit down with the provinces to coordinate efforts. Instead, the Conservatives have chosen to work alone in their corner by boycotting the Council of the Federation.

Furthermore, they appear to be working on a national pharmacare program. This is a good thing, certainly, but the least they could do is work on it with the provinces.

Why do the Conservatives refuse to see the provinces as true partners?

• (1435)

[English]

Mr. Paul Calandra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and for Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister continuously meets with premiers, and ministers of this government meet with their counterparts at the provincial and territorial level all the time.

This government has brought forward a number of different initiatives, including the largest infrastructure program in Canadian history. It has reinvested in roads and bridges, the infrastructure of this country, which has seen the Canadian economy continue to grow. It will continue to grow in the future.

We are very proud of the fact that we have made these investments, that job creation is over one million people. That is the record we have. We will continue to work with our partners to make sure that our economy grows.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Council of the Federation has been meeting for 10 years without the Prime Minister.

The federal government should work more closely with the provinces to tackle the economic and budgetary challenges we are facing, particularly those affecting innovation. Those challenges are having a negative impact on economic development and job creation in Canada.

Yesterday, our leader unveiled a plan to kickstart manufacturing and small business job creation. The plan includes a major innovation and business modernization component.

When will the government support our Canadian manufacturers, which invest in research and development and create good jobs?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is a good question. We are working with the provinces all across Canada.

Two weeks ago, I was in Detroit with Ontario minister Brad Duguid working with automakers to create jobs in that sector in Ontario.

Last week, I was working with Quebec's Jacques Daoust on Canada's domestic free trade system to create jobs in all regions of Canada.

We are working with Brad Duguid, who is a Liberal, and with Mr. Daoust. We are working on various things with each province to create jobs for all Canadians.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mrs. Sadia Groghé (Saint-Lambert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives' deplorable management and their inability to diversify our economy are really catching up with them.

Since the holiday break, thousands of jobs have been lost: Target, Sony, Mexx, Suncor, Arianne Phosphate in Chicoutimi, Bombardier in Thunder Bay and La Pocatière, Épicia in Quebec City and central Quebec, and now Tim Hortons, which has also announced layoffs, including 50 in Lachine.

When will the government finally start showing some leadership and introduce measures to breathe some life into our businesses, which create jobs?

Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have given employers some breathing room by reducing their taxes to one of the lowest rates in the developed world. That is one of the reasons why about 1.2 million jobs have been created since the global recession.

We continue to lower the tax burden on small businesses, which are major job creators, by reducing EI premiums. We are making significant investments, through various employment funds, to help business owners provide more training, for example.

We remain focused on job creation.

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we cannot simply sit back and do nothing while jobs continue to disappear. We in the NDP are working hard to ensure that more jobs are created for Canadian families.

A year ago, I asked the Minister of Employment whether the government had a plan to save high quality jobs in the Charlevoix region after General Cable shut down. Instead of an answer or concrete action, we have seen nothing but contempt from the Conservatives.

Now, in just a few days, the Resolute Forest Products plant in Clermont will be shutting down a machine, another tough blow for the workers of Charlevoix.

What is the minister's plan to boost employment and the manufacturing sector?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have a number of policies, investments and approaches to stimulate the economy and create jobs in the manufacturing sector.

[English]

We do, indeed, have some good news in that regard. It was just two weeks ago that we announced a partnership with Linamar to create over 1,000 jobs in Guelph, Ontario. We have also worked with Chrysler to make investments in Windsor. We are working with Ford to ensure that we have investments and over 1,200 new jobs being created in the Oakville area.

We have investments that are happening all across the country. The aerospace sector in the province of Quebec is creating thousands of good-paying jobs all across this country. Our policies are indeed working.

[Translation]

Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we see nothing but job losses under this Conservative government.

The government could provide support to the manufacturing sector through procurement contracts.

The Conservatives are showing absolutely no leadership when it comes to protecting local jobs.

Just recently, we learned that some cities are considering using the federal gas tax fund to buy buses in Belgium. As the workers at Nova Bus in Saint-Eustache say, this makes no sense.

What is the government doing to promote buying locally, to protect our manufacturers and to encourage job creation?

● (1440)

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, she is talking about buses and a specific policy. She can raise that issue with me after question period.

When it comes to our manufacturers across Canada, we have good policies in place. That is what Jayson Myers, president and CEO of Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters, says. He talks about the exports, jobs and goods created in Canada that we can sell on the global market.

Oral Questions

We are certainly in the process of implementing policies, investments and approaches that will guarantee good jobs in every region of the country.

[English]

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, those so-called good policies have led to major plant closures at Electro-Motive Diesel, Kellogg's, and Heinz. A proposal to create 1,500 jobs at the former St. Thomas Ford plant is on the rocks. In the past eight years, under the current Prime Minister, the London region has lost a third of its manufacturing jobs. That is thousands of families placed in jeopardy because they are out of work.

New Democrats will always stand up for jobs and families across this country. When will the Conservatives finally get on board?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the deal in St. Thomas fell through, but it had nothing to do with government policy; it was a business deal that did not work.

Here are business arrangements that are working because our government has a low-tax approach that is inviting investment into Canada. For example, as I said, Linamar is creating 1,200 new jobs in Guelph. Wolf Steel in Barrie is expanding by 176 new jobs; Fiera Foods in Toronto has 224 new jobs and a \$146 million investment. Dalton Pharma Services in Toronto is creating new jobs because of its new investment. Glitchsoft Corporation in Kanata is creating new jobs. Patriot Forge in Brantford is creating new jobs. Eclipse Automation is expanding, creating new jobs.

All across this country, the economy is—

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Newton—North Delta.

Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservatives deny reality and delay, the New Democrats propose solutions to help families. The Conservatives like to pat themselves on the back, while Canadians lose their jobs. Target's closure alone will put nearly 18,000 people out of work, affecting families in every community across this country, and many will not qualify for benefits under an EI program that has been cut by both the Liberals and the Conservatives.

Where is the Conservative plan to create and protect Canadian jobs?

Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the results are clear. Canada has one of the best job-creation records in the developed world, with the creation of some 1.2 million net new jobs since the global downturn. We of course regret when anyone loses a job, but the EI system is there for those individuals. In fact, 86% of unemployed people who have paid into the system access EI. We are working with the employees at Target to ensure that they get their claims treated in an accelerated fashion.

At the end of the day, none of those people would be helped by the NDP policy of higher taxes, reckless spending, and huge deficits, which is a recipe for jobs being killed, not created.

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, again the Conservatives are in denial, but the New Democrats have a plan to help Canadian families. The Conservatives' low-wage

strategy has meant not only the loss of 400,000 good manufacturing jobs but lost opportunities to create thousands of new ones. Billions of dollars in new product-line investments have just passed us by.

The New Democrats have proposed a concrete plan to attract investments in innovation and create good jobs for Canadians. When will the Conservatives get on board, stop the decline, and invest in the next generation of good middle-class jobs?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when firms have announced that they are expanding their growth in Canada, like Pratt & Whitney, like Ford, like Chrysler, and like Honda just last week, when it announced that it is expanding its footprint in Canada, they have pointed specifically to the fact that this government has lowered taxes and has made Canada a good place for businesses to come and grow.

It is true that the New Democrats have announced policies. They did once back in September. They did again yesterday. Here is what Dan Kelly of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business said. He said it pointedly, but he said this about the NDP policies. The NDP leader's plan for the economy is “dumb” and “anti-small business”.

● (1445)

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is question after question from the official opposition about when the budget is coming, and we have a Minister of Finance who is riding the bench. With 400,000 lost manufacturing jobs, the Conservatives' response is to deny there is even a problem. With anemic job growth in Canada, the Conservatives' response is to delay their budget, just hoping things get better on their own.

In communities like Thunder Bay, Chicoutimi, London, Toronto, and Montreal, Canadians are losing their jobs, and the response of the Conservatives is to dither away the opportunity to act and to help these families. Delaying, denying, and dithering away their jobs is not helping Canadians. The NDP leader has put forward progressive, concrete proposals. When are the Conservatives going to get on board or get out of the way?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we believe in ensuring that the Canadian economy is growing. The unemployment rate in this country has gone down from 7.2% to 6.6% from last year to this. Close to 1.2 million net new jobs have been created since the recession. We are partnering and ensuring that we are growing businesses all across this country.

The reality is that the NDP's approach is anti-small business, anti-investment, and it hurts Canadian families. Our approach is going to get results for the Canadian economy, as it has so far, with the best job numbers since the recession. We will continue to go in the right direction in partnership, working to create prosperity for all Canadians.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Chrystia Freeland (Toronto Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is united in support of democratic Ukraine, but Canada's actions must match our rhetoric. Sergey Chemezov is a close friend of Putin's from their days in the KGB and he is now the chief of a leading Russian defence company. He has been sanctioned by the U.S. and Europe, but he is not on Canada's list. Igor Sechin, another member of Putin's inner circle sanctioned by the U.S., is still welcome in Canada too.

Could the Minister of Foreign Affairs explain why these two close Putin comrades are banned by our allies, but not by Canada?

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, no government in the world has stood up stronger than Canada in our support of the Ukrainian people. Canadians can be very proud of that leadership.

I will give the facts to the member. In terms of sanctions, Canada has implemented 199 separate sanctions, while the United States has only 127. There is no government in the western world that is standing up against Putin and against his war in Ukraine more than this government and this Prime Minister.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with plummeting oil prices and stagnant growth, Canadians deserve leadership and certainty. Instead they have a Minister of Finance who dithers and delays the budget.

Yesterday the Parliamentary Budget Office warned, "There is... uncertainty right now...and not having a budget may actually add to that uncertainty."

Will the government take the PBO's advice and table a budget in February to provide economic certainty to Canadians during this difficult time?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of what our government has achieved: lower taxes for four million Canadian families, job creation for almost 1.2 million Canadians, a small business rebate for over 90% of businesses, the largest infrastructure program in Canadian history, growth superior to that of most G7 countries, half the debt compared to G7 countries, and a AAA credit rating.

What does the opposition promise? A 45-day work year, a \$20 billion carbon tax, and a bureaucratic daycare program for less than one-third of Canadians. There is a stark choice for Canadians—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Trinity—Spadina.

Oral Questions

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Trinity—Spadina, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian municipalities are tabling their budgets. The do not have the luxury to duck and cover. Budget time for them is budget time.

Municipalities also do not have something else: they do not have the real infrastructure dollars that were announced by the Minister of Finance. This dithering is causing chaos in town halls across the country. As the government hoards away \$2.4 billion for wealthy families and hoards away infrastructure money for five years, cities are left wondering what is coming this year.

The finance minister needs to stop hiding under his desk. He needs to come forward and talk to cities. Will the minister table a budget with infrastructure money for cities today?

Mr. Peter Braid (Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely ridiculous. This Conservative government is making record investments in infrastructure. The new Building Canada plan is the longest and largest infrastructure investment in Canada's history. In addition, over and above that, the Prime Minister announced investments for federally owned infrastructure.

These record investments are creating jobs and prosperity and renewing infrastructure. The opposition will hike taxes, run deficits, and leave a burden of debt to our children and our grandchildren. That is not our approach.

* * *

• (1450)

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, according to local Kurdish news sources, Canada's Chief of the Defence Staff met with Kurdish military commanders in Erbil this week. The Kurds pressed General Lawson for Canadian armoured fighting vehicles and for closer Canadian involvement in attacks.

Would the Minister of National Defence confirm that this is what happened at the meeting? Also, why are we hearing about this from Kurdish news sources instead of from the minister?

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that according to the NDP's security requirements, it wants us to pinpoint exactly where and when our men and women are located and give an update immediately.

In fact, we are in close consultation. We have special forces on the ground. We have provided lethal equipment on behalf of other countries to Iraq and we have provided non-lethal equipment ourselves. We are very much a part of this fight and we are going to continue.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Ms. Éline Michaud (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the minister understood my colleague's question, which was actually quite simple. Have the Kurds asked for armoured vehicles, yes or no?

Why are we hearing about this from Kurdish news sources instead of from the Prime Minister here, in the House?

[English]

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have made it a priority to assist the Kurds and the Iraqis. This is why we are there and this is why the Chief of the Defence Staff was there.

I can indicate to the hon. member that we have sent over non-lethal equipment over the last couple of months. We have sent equipment such as helmets, body armour, logistical support, and vehicles, and we are part of the air strikes that are being conducted out of Kuwait. We are doing our part.

* * *

[Translation]

PRIVACY

Ms. Éline Michaud (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we all support having the Communications Security Establishment closely monitor downloads connected to terrorist activities. However, 10 million to 15 million downloads a day being monitored sounds like an awful lot to me.

Is the government ensuring that Canadians' personal activities are not being monitored—or should I say spied on? How is the government ensuring that Canadians are safe but that their privacy is respected?

[English]

Hon. Julian Fantino (Associate Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, having spent over 40 years on the front lines combatting criminals and terrorists, I am honoured to use my experience to help Canadians who are working hard to safeguard not only our country but also our people.

CSE's foreign signals intelligence plays a vital role in revealing the efforts of foreign terrorists to carry out attacks against Canadians here and abroad. These CSE actions have been sanctioned by the commissioner, who has indicated that its actions are lawful.

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, what we are actually expecting is some real oversight of intelligence operations by this Parliament, the kind that the Minister of Justice was in favour of when he was in opposition.

No one is questioning the need to go after those who download terrorism-related material. However, what we are concerned about is the potential that the Communications Security Establishment may again be going beyond its mandate and monitoring Canadians.

Can the Minister of National Defence say categorically that the CSE is not monitoring the domestic activities of Canadians?

Hon. Julian Fantino (Associate Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this government will track all foreign-based threats that pose a risk to Canadians. In accordance with the law, data

collection is focused on foreign entities to protect Canadians against terrorism and cyberattacks.

The CSE commissioner has found that all of CSE's activities are within the confines of the law and within the authorities provided to it. Canadians expect us to do no less, and we will continue doing so.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Ted Opitz (Etobicoke Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since the onset of the crisis in Ukraine, Canada has stood proudly and firmly with the Ukrainian people. Our Conservative government has implemented tough economic sanctions against those responsible, we have sent record numbers of observers to recent elections in Ukraine, and we are participating in NATO's reassurance mission.

Would the Prime Minister please update this House on Canada's latest efforts to support Ukraine?

● (1455)

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre for his question and for his ongoing interest in and commitment to this particular issue.

Today the government announced additional support to assist Ukraine as it works to rebuild itself into a prosperous country, free from Russian aggression.

[Translation]

This additional support will assist Ukraine's newly elected government to stabilize the economy and stimulate sustainable growth.

[English]

We will continue to condemn the ongoing military aggression by the Putin regime, which is solely responsible for the violence and disruption.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week a federal panel ruled that for tax purposes the Halifax Citadel was worth \$41.2 million. Well, that is \$37 million more than what the Minister of Public Works and Government Services proposed, and get this: she also argued that the Citadel site itself was worth \$10.

This whole situation is absurd. Halifax has been waiting for decades. The Conservatives have stalled and delayed and made incredible claims and started expensive court battles.

Will the Minister of Public Works and Government Services finally give up the games and pay Halifax a fair price, the price it deserves?

Oral Questions

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are committed to ensuring that municipalities do receive fair compensation for federal properties in their jurisdiction.

In this particular case, the dispute advisory panel has examined the situation. The panel is in place to provide unbiased advice to the government over the calculation of the payment. I have just recently received its report; I will be looking at it, and a decision will be made in due course.

[Translation]

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Chambly—Borduas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, municipalities have had enough. For decades, they have been up against a brick wall known as the federal government. The federal government assesses its own property, and the allegedly independent group of experts, who answer directly to the minister, is made up of officials from the minister's own department.

The federal government underestimates the value of Fort Chambly and the canal by \$16 million. The people of Chambly are losing out on \$270,000 a year.

Will the government finally acknowledge that the process has become cumbersome after 20 or 30 years? It makes no sense for the government to be judge and jury. We need to improve this process.

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to ensuring that municipalities receive fair compensation for federal government properties in their jurisdiction.

An independent advisory panel is examining each case and advising us. It is still up to us to look at what is proposed and to make a good decision.

* * *

ETHICS

Mr. Mathieu Ravignat (Pontiac, NDP): VIA Rail spent more than \$100,000 on Montreal Canadiens hockey tickets.

While seniors are stuck in snow banks, Canada Post executives are enjoying themselves at the Bell Centre. More than \$200,000 was spent on their hockey tickets. That is indecent.

Not much has changed in Ottawa since Chuck Guité and the Liberals handed out tickets left and right.

How do the Conservatives justify these practices, which are reminiscent of the sponsorship scandal?

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely unacceptable that VIA Rail used taxpayer dollars in order to ensure that it had seats at various sporting events. This practice has stopped.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Conservatives are telling senior citizens that they can walk through the snow for their mail because they need the exercise, and anyway Canada Post just cannot afford to deliver it. However, Canada Post can afford to give out hundreds of pro hockey tickets to their insiders and pals.

Now the Liberals made their name filling the box seats with cronies, but surely to God we have a higher ethical bar than the one used by the Liberals.

Middle-class Canadians would love to go pro hockey games, but they would pay their own way, so I would like to ask the minister why it is that the Conservatives are allowing Canada Post to give out such expensive perks to insiders and pals?

• (1500)

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada Post is no longer utilizing any tickets for any sporting events, and it will not be doing that in the future.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been one year since the closure of nine Veteran Affairs offices across this country, including the one in Sydney that provided essential services to over 4,000 Cape Breton veterans.

This Saturday a rally protesting the closure of these offices is going to be held at the Ashby Legion.

The Conservatives have continuously mistreated our veterans. The new minister states that this is going to change. Will he join me at the rally in Cape Breton on Saturday to announce the reopening of these offices?

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, we are trying to make sure that we are meeting the needs of veterans now and into the future.

As he knows, in Halifax this year we will be opening a brand new operational stress injury clinic to meet the new needs of rising mental health. That will be one of 25 by the end of this year serving that need. We will continue to do that.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government should learn to listen to veterans and not lecture them, veterans like Ron Clarke, who not only continues to wrestle with the demons of PTSD but also continues to fight for young veterans, the new crop of veterans who have to drive six hours up the road to Halifax to be served or to sit in a short-walled cubicle and bare their souls to a Service Canada staffer.

Legion service counsellors know they cannot do the job of full-time counsellors, and the minister knows that the number of counsellors has been cut by 25%.

I ask the minister, will he come to Cape Breton and meet with these veterans to learn the issues?

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, over the last year and a half, I have enjoyed talking to Mr. Clarke on this issue and appreciate his service. In fact, our government listened to his advice and made sure that a trained and experienced case manager was available in the Service Canada office down the street. That is a way we can evolve from meeting the needs those offices have provided for, while also opening new offices to reach mental health needs.

*Oral Questions***DISASTER ASSISTANCE**

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government has made yet another sneaky, back-door move. This time it has done it by tripling the threshold for communities and provinces to be able to access disaster assistance.

We all know that Manitoba has experienced serious flooding over the years. This change will leave Manitobans on the hook for millions of dollars for disaster assistance.

Does the government not care about downloading its responsibilities onto the provinces, or does it just not care about Manitobans?

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this program has been frozen since 1970 and we are catching up with half of the indexation.

What is most important for the communities of Manitoba, where I have been with the member for Saint Boniface, is that we are there to support the communities up to 90%.

When there are big disasters, the federal government stands by those communities. We will stand by those communities, and I invite that member to support the DFA program, which is there to support all communities throughout the country.

* * *

[*Translation*]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Hoang Mai (Brossard—La Prairie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Transportation Safety Board says it is concerned by the Conservatives' lack of action.

They are dragging their feet and refusing to implement several of the TSB recommendations. Transport Canada still does not have an effective monitoring program to ensure that railway companies comply with the law.

Eighteen months after the Lac-Mégantic tragedy, why are the Conservatives finding it so difficult to monitor the railway industry and keep the public safe?

[*English*]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, indeed the chair of the Transportation Safety Board said today that the Minister of Transport and the department have taken strong action to improve rail safety in the wake of the Lac-Mégantic tragedy, and we will continuously build upon that.

We appreciate very much what the TSB has recommended, but they did point out one important fact in the report, that this tragic accident was caused by a single individual who did not follow the rules. We have to remember that, but at the same time the department must ensure that they continue to work on safety.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Chris Warkentin (Peace River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today we woke up to the horrendous news that Israel has once again been the target of terrorist attacks.

The brutal terrorist organization, Hezbollah, fired a missile at Israel's military near Lebanon, causing death and injuries. This is just another example of the threats that Israel faces, from Gaza to southern Lebanon and Syria, all of where there are proxies funded, trained, and supported by Iran.

Can the Minister of Foreign Affairs please tell the House what the Government of Canada's position is on these latest attacks?

● (1505)

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada condemns the terrorist attack by Hezbollah on northern Israel. We stand with all of the Israeli people after this terrorist attack.

Far too often the Jewish people and the Jewish state are on the front lines in the battle against terrorism. That is why this government unequivocally stands against terrorism and stands in support of the only liberal democracy in the region, the state of Israel.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Ms. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians deserve to know the truth, that the Prime Minister has shamefully refused to explain how and when the role of Canadian troops went from not accompanying, as he promised last October, to a de facto combat role now.

Canadians, through Parliament, did not agree to put our Canadian soldiers into front-line combat, so why is Canada the only coalition country with ground troops under fire?

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have been very clear throughout this. The Liberals, in voting against all of these measures, probably missed all of this, but we are taking on an advise and assist role on the ground with the Iraqis, and we are conducting air strikes with our allies out of Kuwait.

We will never take the position of the Liberal Party that we will not get involved in something unless they are guaranteed a success. I can tell the hon. member that if we took the Liberals' position, the terrorists would always succeed. We will never do that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Ms. Annick Papillon (Québec, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as part of the celebration of the 150th anniversary of Confederation, Quebec City would like to host about 40 tall ships in 2017. Quebec City submitted its proposal to the government in May 2013 but has not heard a thing since then. The organizers need an answer within the next few days, otherwise the event may not go ahead.

Will Quebec City have to cancel another major international event because of the Conservatives' inaction? Could the minister pick up the phone and do something about this?

Points of Order

Hon. Shelly Glover (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada's history is one of risk, sacrifice and determination. Canadians have triumphed over all manner of adversity to build a strong, proud and free country.

As we approach our 150th anniversary in 2017, our Conservative government will join Canadians in celebrating this important historic moment, and Quebec City will be part of that.

* * *

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my constituents, and indeed all Canadians, are concerned about the short sentences received by some individuals convicted of heinous crimes. When terrorists and murderers are handed a life sentence, they should not be back walking among law-abiding Canadians a few short years later.

Canadians know that change is needed and are shocked to hear the Liberal member for Malpeque advocating for the early release of dangerous criminals and sticking with the status quo.

Could the Minister of Public Safety please tell the House what our Conservative government's position is on this issue?

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is shocking, but we should not be surprised to see both the Liberals and the NDP opposing legislation they have not seen, they have not read, and that has not been tabled.

However, I can tell members one thing. We stand with the people of Ancaster and the Canadian people who do not want serious, violent, and repeat criminals taking others' lives once they go back into society after not having served their sentences properly. We will make sure that those who get a sentence for life stay in prison for life.

* * *

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, federal funding for the Algoma Central Railway will expire on April 1. Without that funding, hundreds of jobs will be lost from Sault Ste. Marie to Hearst and between \$38 to \$48 million in annual economic benefits for the region will vanish.

Time is of the essence. Why has the minister failed to meet with stakeholders and failed to respond to a proposal that will preserve passenger service in northern Ontario, reduce operating costs, and transition away from a subsidy in five short years?

[Translation]

Why is she not doing anything to protect northern Ontario's fragile economy?

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we acted decisively on this file last year. I recognize that I have not met with stakeholders, but as the hon. member may have noted, I was not actually in the House for the last four months.

I do take her point. I will meet with the stakeholders and we will get an update on the situation.

* * *

•(1510)

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Bruce Hyer (Thunder Bay—Superior North, GP): Mr. Speaker, eastern Canada imports 80% of its oil from places like Arabia and Venezuela, the world's most expensive and risky oil, while we export twice as much as we import, as well as the jobs that go with it, as raw crude to the U.S.A. at a 20% to 30% discount.

Why do we buy high and sell low, and why are we the only member of the G20 with no national energy strategy?

Hon. Greg Rickford (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister for the Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario, CPC): Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there are solutions for that. They come in the form of pipelines.

A viable option and solution would be for Canada to find ways to diversify its markets around the world. We know there are demands in Europe and Asia. It sounds like I can count on the support of the member for Thunder Bay—Superior North for those kinds of projects moving forward.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in a moment I will be asking for unanimous consent to table an important document.

The Minister of Industry in question period referenced Dan Kelly, who is president and CEO of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. Here is the real quote from Dan Kelly on the NDP plan. "Cutting the small business tax rate by nearly twenty percent will provide a big boost to—"

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to table the document?

Some hon. member: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of rules of procedure, I do not know that anyone can judge unanimous consent. I did not hear what the hon. member wanted to read out. Surely, the rules allow reading the statement.

The Speaker: It seems like some members did not need to hear the whole quote to decide that they were not going to grant consent. I heard that clearly expressed.

Therefore, at the risk of getting further into debate, we will move on to tabling of documents.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS***[English]***FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

Mr. David Anderson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and pursuant to Standing Order 32 (2) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, two treaties entitled: “Protocol between Canada and The Kingdom of Spain Amending the Convention Between Canada and Spain for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Ottawa on 23 November 1976” done at Madrid on November 18, 2014; and the “Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the People’s Republic of China on Cooperation and Mutual Administrative Assistance in Customs Matters”, done at Beijing on November 8, 2014.

An explanatory memorandum is included with each treaty.

* * *

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

Mr. Phil McColeman (Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities. The committee has studied and has decided to report back to the House.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé (Saint-Lambert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the dissenting opinion of the NDP, the official opposition, regarding the study on the renewal of labour market development agreements.

This dissenting opinion presents the many relevant recommendations made by labour market stakeholders for creating good jobs for the middle class, recommendations that the committee did not include in its report. The purpose of this dissenting opinion is to make the government aware of these recommendations so that it can respond to them.

*[English]***HEALTH**

Mr. Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Health in relation to Bill C-608, An Act respecting a National Day of the Midwife. The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House without amendment.

● (1515)

*[Translation]***PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES ACT**

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Chambly—Borduas, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-650, An Act to amend the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act (independent assessment).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Halifax for seconding my bill. This is an issue that affects many, an issue about which we were able to pressure the minister during question period.

In fact, the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act was passed in the 1970s because the federal government cannot be taxed by a local authority. Nonetheless, in the interest of fairness to taxpayers, money must be given to a municipality where the federal government has property. The federal government must pay its fair share just like businesses and taxpayers.

Unfortunately, over the past few years, the government has turned a deaf ear to the municipalities, resulting in cases that have gone all the way to the Supreme Court and revealing the fact that some property values have been underestimated.

My bill seeks to ensure that the government and local municipalities can agree on independent assessors who will set the amount. Then, the minister would be required to accept that amount. This would ensure taxpayer fairness. That is what is essential here.

Again, I want to thank my colleague from Halifax, and I am very pleased to be able to improve this process for the good of the taxpayers of Chambly, Halifax and all the municipalities in Canada where a national historic site is located.

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

* * *

CANADIAN RAILWAY MUSEUM ACT

Mr. Sylvain Chicoine (Châteauguay—Saint-Constant, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-651, An Act to amend the Museums Act in order to establish the Canadian Railway Museum.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher for agreeing to second this bill. I am particularly pleased to rise in the House on behalf of the people of Châteauguay—Saint-Constant in order to introduce my second bill, entitled An Act to amend the Museums Act in order to establish the Canadian Railway Museum.

The Canadian railway museum, known as Exporail in Saint-Constant, is the largest railway museum in Canada. Moreover, according to several museum curators, it is one of the best in the world. Given the pivotal role played by railways in the creation of the Canadian federation, I believe that it is important for Canada to have its own official museum dedicated to telling the history of the country and the role of trains in creating this federation. I would also like to remind members that in 2007, the House voted in favour of the 13th report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, which recommended that Exporail be officially designated as the national railway museum and that it be allocated long-term funding.

Routine Proceedings

Clearly, the current government has always refused to act on the motion and recognize Exporail as the Canadian railway museum.

The museum is in dire need of stable, predictable funding in order to maintain its collection. It would also be an important means of celebrating Canada's 150th anniversary.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

CANADA POST

Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present a petition with dozens of pages signed by people from Beauport—Limoilou who are concerned about the cuts at Canada Post. They are worried about the future and the survival of home mail delivery, a service that is very beneficial to my constituents. I am pleased to give them a voice here today.

[*English*]

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the first petition I am honoured to present sadly highlights that 22-year old Kassandra Kaulius was killed by a drunk driver.

Families for Justice, a group of people who have also lost loved ones to impaired driving, believes that the current impaired driving laws are much too lenient. It is calling for new mandatory minimum sentencing for people who have been convicted of impaired driving causing death. It also wants the Criminal Code to be changed to redefine the offence to what it is, vehicular homicide.

● (1520)

SEX SELECTION

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I am honoured to present highlights that 92% of Canadians believe that sex selection should be made illegal.

The U.K. Parliament is dealing with this issue and there is a bill to make it illegal. The Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada vehemently opposes sex selection.

The petitioners call on Parliament to condemn the practice of discrimination against girls through sex selection.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé (Saint-Lambert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by over 150 people from the south shore of Montreal. They are concerned about the threat that patenting seeds could pose to biodiversity and farmers' ability to freely use the seeds that are produced by their work.

The petitioners are therefore calling on the government to take action to support small-scale farmers and protect their right to save, use and exchange their seeds as they wish.

[*English*]

ABORTION

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present three petitions.

The first petition is signed by a great number of constituents from Central Alberta who outline the fact that Canada has no abortion law in line with that of Korea and China.

The petitioners call upon the Parliament of Canada to enact legislation that restricts abortion to the greatest extent possible as demanded by the Supreme Court of Canada.

SEX SELECTION

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls upon Parliament to condemn the discrimination against girls through sex-selective abortion, and to do all it can to prevent sex-selective abortions from being carried out in Canada.

The petition is signed by a large number of constituents in my riding.

FIREARMS REGISTRY

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last but not least, I have a petition from firearms owners, hunters, fishermen, trappers, sport shooters and so on, in my riding who call upon the Government of Canada to pass the common sense firearms licensing bill as quickly as possible.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Alex Atamanenko (British Columbia Southern Interior, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions.

The first petition is from over 70 residents of Rossland and Trail, also from Alberta and Ontario, who call on Parliament to refrain from making changes to the Seeds Act and to ensure that we enshrine in legislation the inalienable rights of farmers and other Canadians to save, reuse, select, exchange and sell seeds.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Alex Atamanenko (British Columbia Southern Interior, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition has over 250 names from Nelson, Grand Forks, Midway, Greenwood, Rossland, Trail, and surrounding areas.

The petitioners call on the government to adopt international aid policies that support small family farmers, especially women, that recognize their vital role in the struggle against hunger and poverty, that ensure Canadian policies and programs are developed in consultation with small family farmers and that they protect their rights in the global south to preserve, use and freely exchange seeds.

Privilege

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Bruce Hyer (Thunder Bay—Superior North, GP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from people across Canada who are concerned about the use, for the past 70 years, of tens of thousands of chemicals, many of them cancer causing, which resonates with me as a cancer survivor.

The petitioners are concerned that these chemicals are ubiquitous, that they are in our air, water and food. They ask for two things: that there be a royal commission on the environment and health to look at the full suite of new chemicals and to make recommendations regarding them; and to apply the precautionary principle when dealing with new chemicals.

CBC/RADIO-CANADA

Mr. Matthew Kellway (Beaches—East York, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to present a petition to the House with respect to the future of the CBC.

The signatories to the petition note that since 1936, CBC/Radio-Canada has been a core Canadian cultural institution, broadcasting our nation's unique identity and linguistic realities. They note further that the Conservative government and the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages have imperilled our public broadcaster when they should be doing the exact opposite.

Finally, the petitioners call upon the government to guarantee stable, adequate, multi-year financing for our public broadcaster so it may continue its work in all regions of our country.

HOUSING

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

The first petition is from residents of Saskatoon and Vernon, B.C., who are calling on the House to take action toward affordable housing.

We know there is a housing crisis across Canada. In my riding, the Saanich Peninsula Chamber of Commerce has identified as its number one issue that we do more on housing.

The petitioners call for immediate steps to ease the crisis of homelessness.

• (1525)

SECURITY CERTIFICATES

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition goes to the issue of security certificates.

The petitioners, all from within Saanich—Gulf Islands, Mayne Island, Salt Spring Island, Victoria and Sidney, call on the government to end the use of security certificates as they are open to abuse and violate the right of individuals to a fair trial.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

STATEMENTS BY PRIME MINISTER REGARDING CANADIAN FORCES IN IRAQ

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a most serious question of privilege pursuant to Standing Order 48 of the House of Commons. This is a question of grave importance because it concerns misleading information that the Prime Minister has provided to this House regarding the Canadian military engagement in Iraq.

This is an extremely serious matter. Misleading statements are not only a breach of the privileges that MPs must rely on in the carrying out of their duties as parliamentarians but they are also a breach of the trust of Canadians who elected this Parliament to govern responsibly.

Therefore, I will be asking that you find that a prima facie case of privilege exists, so that the matter can be further investigated in committee.

I want to point out that this is the first opportunity that I have had to raise this issue since it became clear that the Prime Minister had indeed misled the House last fall.

New facts have been uncovered every day this week to illustrate how Canadians were deceived, but only yesterday, under questioning by the Leader of the Opposition, myself and the member of Parliament for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, did it become clear that the Prime Minister and his defence minister have no explanation as to why he misled the House ahead of last year's vote to send our troops into battle.

Let me take a moment to remind the House of the facts surrounding the engagement of Canadian ground forces against ISIL, as well as the clear contradictions of those facts against the Prime Minister's statements last year.

We have to remember that the mission to Iraq consists of two elements, the actual air combat mission involving Canadian Forces CF-18s as well as the other air assets, and the ground forces of the special operations forces in northern Iraq who are engaged in what was called an advise and assist training mission. We are talking here about the action of the ground forces.

Privilege

This week, Canadian military officials and indeed the defence minister confirmed that Canadian Forces ground personnel have been supporting Iraqi forces in the following ways: regularly accompanying them to the front line; calling in air strikes; painting targets, which is accepted by the military community as a combat role; and engaging in return of fire with ISIL fighters.

On September 30, in the days before members of Parliament were asked to authorize sending Canadian Forces personnel into Iraq, the Prime Minister faced direct, detailed and intense questioning from the Leader of the Opposition.

The NDP leader asked:

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said that the rules of engagement are to advise and assist the Iraqis, but the question is, assist them how? For instance, are Canadian soldiers currently going on patrols with Iraqis or Kurds?

The Prime Minister responded very clearly, even switching from French to English in order to say precisely what he intended.

He stated:

Mr. Speaker, I said advise and assist the Iraqis. If I could just use the terminology in English, it is quite precise. It is to advise and to assist. It is not to accompany.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister informed the House in the days before the vote on the most sacred duty that MPs have, which is a decision to send our brave men and women in uniform into harm's way in the name of our country.

When the NDP leader asked this simple six-word question, "Are they going into combat zones?", the Prime Minister again responded very clearly, "Mr. Speaker, I just said that Canadian soldiers are not accompanying the Iraqi forces into combat."

● (1530)

We must remember the vote was on October 7 and this is questioning on September 30 and beyond.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that during these days of intense questioning in the House and by the media, the Prime Minister was in possession of the best and most accurate information on Canada's proposed military deployment. Perhaps he was even setting the terms of the deployment himself. There can be no doubt that the Prime Minister knew exactly what parameters were set out for our armed forces being sent into a theatre of war.

Today we know that the Canadian military ground troops have been involved in multiple firefights with ISIL forces and are the only coalition partner reported to have been involved in any at all. We know that they have regularly accompanied Iraqi forces to the front lines, not under extraordinary circumstances but as a matter of routine duty. We know that they are conducting duties that the international military community routinely defines as combat roles, including painting targets.

The Canadian Armed Forces ground forces are engaged in activities that our Prime Minister explicitly ruled out when this Chamber was making its decision on whether or not to authorize the mission. He misled the House and Canadians in a deliberate attempt to downplay Canada's level of engagement as well as the risk involved to our brave men and women in uniform.

Canadians, including the loved ones of our soldiers, had a right to know the truth and the Prime Minister withheld that from them and instead provided information that we now know was false.

Parliamentarians had a right to know the truth too as each and every MP in this place made our individual decision to support or oppose the mission according to our consciences and influenced heavily by the answers and assurances of the Prime Minister.

I ask you today, Mr. Speaker, to defend these rights and our democratic institution of Parliament by finding that there is a prima facie case of privilege and contempt of Parliament.

For the sake of clarity, let me remind everyone here of the rights afforded to members of Parliament to carry out their duties on behalf of Canadians. These are the rights afforded to members of Parliament. They are spelled out on page 75 of the 23rd edition of Erskine May's *A Practical Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament*. Parliamentary privilege is defined as:

...the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively...and by members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions.

Parliamentary privileges are of utmost importance not only for our parliamentarians but also for Canadians who have put their trust and faith in Parliament to legislate on their behalf and to hold their government to account. In other words, it is a fundamental aspect of our democratic society.

Canadians trust that we can perform these tasks unimpeded and unobstructed. They trust that their government will provide truthful answers in the House. These are basic principles of paramount importance for Canadians to continue to believe and engage in our democratic process.

Breaches of these privileges can take many forms, but the one we are dealing with today, misleading the House, is one of the most serious and citing the Prime Minister for this action is the most serious of all.

On page 111 of Erskine May it states that "The Commons may treat the making of a deliberately misleading statement as a contempt".

The second edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* by O'Brien and Bosc also tells us on page 111 that the provision of deliberately misleading information constitutes a prima facie case of privilege.

I will quote further from page 63 of Erskine May which states:

It is of paramount importance that Ministers give accurate and truthful information to Parliament, correcting any inadvertent error at the earliest opportunity.

● (1535)

It is important to note here that no explanation has been given either by the Prime Minister or the Minister of National Defence as to why the information given to Canadians by the government on the mission was so blatantly false.

Privilege

Mr. Speaker, you gave a ruling on a previous incidence of the Prime Minister blatantly providing misleading information to the House, and I am referring to the information he provided about who in his office knew that his former chief of staff, Nigel Wright, was paying a sitting parliamentarian \$90,000 to help to promote the Prime Minister's Office's version of events on the Senate spending scandal.

When the NDP brought that matter up in the House as a question of privilege, as I am today, Mr. Speaker, you ruled that while the Prime Minister had obviously given the House information that was not true, his own assertion that he simply did not know what all his staff was up to was enough to get him off the hook. I hate to use the vernacular, but that is essentially what the ruling was.

However, in that ruling you cited Speaker Fraser's December 4, 1986 assertion, found on page 1792 of Debates, October 30, 2013, that:

Differences of opinion with respect to fact and details are not infrequent in the House and do not necessarily constitute a breach of privilege.

You also cited *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, second edition, at page 510:

In most instances, when a point of order or a question of privilege has been raised in regard to a response to an oral question, the Speaker has ruled that the matter is a disagreement among Members over the facts surrounding the issue. As such, these matters are more a question of debate and do not constitute a breach of the rules or of privilege.

However, I would contend here that there is no possible way to interpret the current contradiction as a difference of opinion. Canadian ground troops are accompanying Iraqi forces to the front line and the Prime Minister said they were not.

You also made it very clear in that ruling, Mr. Speaker, that the Chair has an important role to play, however limited, when allegations are made that the House has been misled. You stated in a separate ruling that three elements were to be met before the Chair could rule that a prima facie case had been made. Your ruling said that:

One, it must be proven that the statement was misleading; two, it must be established that the member making the statement knew at the time that the statement was incorrect; and three, that in making the statement, the member intended to mislead the House.

On element number one, there is no doubt that the Prime Minister told the House things that have now clearly been shown to be false with respect to the nature of the Canadian Forces mission in Iraq.

On element number two, did the Prime Minister know that the statement was incorrect? I think that is an important matter. The Prime Minister is the head of the government and is required to know the details of military engagement.

Indeed, we have heard today in this House and yesterday from the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence that the military in Iraq have been acting on the mandate given to them by this House. If that was the understanding of the mandate by the Prime Minister at the time the debate and vote took place, that is the time he was saying in this House that ground troops would not be involved at the front line, they would not be involved in the combat zone, and they would not be painting targets.

On element number three, that the member intended to mislead the House, we believe, and there can be little doubt, that the Prime Minister misled this House and Canadians in order to minimize the risk that public opinion or the consciences of parliamentarians would turn against him ahead of the vote to authorize the mission. I think we all remember in this House, and Canadians remember, the discussion about no boots on the ground engaged in combat. We would not have that.

Therefore, it was clearly intended to make members of this House believe and understand that our troops, the people who were being sent to Iraq in the training mission to advise and assist, would not in fact be engaged in combat because the government knew, the Prime Minister knew, and the House knew that Canadians would not favour such a position.

● (1540)

Mr. Speaker, in your ruling on the Prime Minister's false statements on the Mike Duffy affair, you also emphasized the importance of the time-honoured tradition of accepting a member's word in the House. That is what members on this side of the House, and indeed members on all sides of the House, would have accepted when the Prime Minister made those statements in the House on September 30 and at other times during the debate leading up to the vote on October 7.

This, I submit, is the very tradition of accepting the word of an hon. member, in particular the word of the Prime Minister, that we are at risk of losing under the watch of this Prime Minister. Obfuscation, omission of facts, bluster, bravado, and simple refusal to answer questions are all time-honoured traditions of this House as well, and they are tactics that have been mastered by previous Conservative and Liberal governments for decades. However, and this is very important, providing false information is quite a different matter. Not only is it unethical, it is clearly against the rules of this place.

What we do know is that clear and easily avoidable false statements have been made to this House by the Prime Minister, which not only is a prima facie breach of the privileges of all members but also of all Canadians who have put their trust and faith in Parliament. These Canadians include the husbands and wives, the mothers and fathers, and the sons and daughters of Canada's courageous soldiers, who were clearly and repeatedly told that their loved ones would not be engaged in ground combat in the Iraq theatre. Now the Canadian people and the families of those soldiers have no reason to trust the current Prime Minister when he proclaims that their loved ones are not meant for combat duty against ISIL.

Mr. Speaker, as has been done in the past, as you will likely note, I want to leave the final word to the current Minister of Justice and former Minister of National Defence. He made a remarkable statement, which I think is worthy of repeating. In 2002, he said the following:

I would suggest in the strongest possible terms that members of the House of Commons must be able to rely on the information they receive in response to questions placed to ministers. This goes to the very cut and thrust of the responsibilities of members of the House of Commons. A high standard has to be met....

He later said:

Privilege

Integrity, honesty and truthfulness in this Chamber should not ebb and flow like the tides. This should be something that is as solid as the ground we walk on and as solid as the foundation of this very building in these hallowed halls. Every time we come into this Chamber, we should be reminded of that.

For whom is this rule more important to follow than the Prime Minister himself?

That is my submission, Mr. Speaker, and I ask that you find that there is a prima facie case of contempt of Parliament and a question of privilege that should be therefore referred to committee. If you so find, I would be prepared to move the appropriate motion.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all members of this privileged House have been afforded the opportunity to be here through their constituents with the expectation that they will be straightforward and honest in the responses and statements they make in the House. It was not all that long ago, when I was first elected, that I was told about the importance of being honest in replies to answers and straightforward with respect to questions.

It would appear that the Prime Minister has intentionally misled the House. If it is found to be the case, through the Chair, that is a very significant occurrence, and Canadians need to be aware of that.

The New Democratic Party has put forward a fairly strong case. I would like to go over question period from yesterday. We gave both the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence the opportunity to provide clarification on the matter.

Let me read the actual question put to the Prime Minister yesterday by the leader of the Liberal Party. This is from yesterday's *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, last fall the Prime Minister said that our mission on the ground in Iraq was, and I quote, "to advise and to assist. It is not to accompany."

Yesterday, the Minister of National Defence clearly stated the opposite.

Would the Prime Minister like to take this opportunity to correct his minister?

If we read the response that was given, it was a sidestep. There was no acknowledgement whatsoever.

Later on in question period, the Liberal critic for defence, the member for Vancouver Quadra, asked:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House, the Minister of National Defence justified front-line combat by saying, "I am not sure we could train troops without accompanying them."

Yet on September 30, the Prime Minister explicitly ruled out combat on the ground. He said in question period, the mission "is to advise and to assist. It is not to accompany."

Why is the defence minister directly contradicting the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister, today covering for him?

Do CanadianIs not deserve the truth?

That is where we afforded both the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence the opportunity yesterday to provide clarity on what it was that the Prime Minister meant to say back in 2014. At no point did the Prime Minister or the Minister of National Defence attempt to clear up what is obviously a significant discrepancy. That discrepancy needs to be addressed.

We believe that this is very serious, and we might request another opportunity to provide further comment on it. Ultimately it would be nice to see either the Prime Minister or the Minister of National

Defence stand in their places and provide the clarity that we have been asking for for the last couple of days.

• (1545)

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the point raised by the opposition, I think at the outset or at least partway through, was an effort to identify the three-part test you must apply. In this matter, not even the first step in that test is satisfied. Simply put, there is not a question of the House being misled. There is a question of a debate, a debate with an opposition that thinks that self-defence is combat.

We respectfully disagree. We think self-defence is not combat. We think it is common sense. We think it is what anyone would expect their troops in the field to be able to undertake. The mission is a mission to advise and assist. There is nothing in that mission to prevent our soldiers from defending themselves if they should come under fire.

The opposition, keeps using some funny terms that seem very odd to me. One is "front lines". Another is "combat zone". The opposition seems to think that the advise and assist mission means that our forces will never be on the front lines of the combat zone. "Front lines" is an archaic image. This is what we had in World War I, when soldiers were in trenches. There is nothing like that right now. Right now, in a place like Iraq, where our special forces are on the ground, everything is the front line. Everything is the combat zone.

In fact, today in the war on terrorism in which we are engaged, in this struggle we are engaged in, the combat zone is not just in Iraq. The front lines are not just in Iraq. The combat zone, the front lines, are in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, where a Canadian soldier was killed. They are at the National War Memorial. Those are the front lines now. It is a terminology I frankly do not understand from the opposition.

I heard the hon. member say that he expects that Canadian soldiers will be "behind the wire". They are in Iraq. There are no Canadian bases in Iraq. There is no wire to be behind. It shows a remarkable lack of understanding of what our forces are doing there.

The fact is that they are in a dangerous place, and in that dangerous place, doing the dangerous work of advising and assisting, they have, and should have, every right to defend themselves. No one has ever told this House of Commons or suggested, not this government at least, that our soldiers should go there with their hands tied behind their backs, restricted from doing that. That is the fundamental difference in this debate, and that is what it is. It is a debate.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what misleading the House would look like. It would look like a situation where perhaps a member of the government knew that these occasions of shooting in self-defence had occurred, and then once asked about them, denied to the House that they had taken place.

Privilege

Nothing like that has happened here. In fact, on the contrary, this government has been most forthright. In fact, after every successful bombing mission, the minister of defence has stood in this House and reported it to the House. The government has been forthcoming. It is the government and the Canadian Forces that in fact made public the occasions of self-defence by our special forces on the ground. There has been no evidence at all or any suggestion that our Canadian Forces have undertaken any combat offensive measures, only that they have defended themselves when they came under fire.

There is some suggestion from my hon. friend that the government has downplayed the risk to our forces. I think that is actually absurd. On the contrary, our government has gone out of its way to identify how dangerous the situation is in this part of the world, how dangerous the mission is against Islamic State and why it is so important that we undertake it.

We are not there in that part of the world because it is a picnic. We are there because it is a very dangerous terrorist threat, one that has sought to be exported to our shores, that needs to be taken on. It is precisely because it is dangerous that we are there. There has been no effort to downplay that.

We quite respect the skill and ability of our special forces, all our armed forces, but particularly our special forces. That is why they are there.

The reason we want to be there, despite those dangers, is so we do not again see those dangers come to our shores, so that we do not allow what happened in Afghanistan to occur and allow a terrorist group that has stated its desire to bring terrorism to our shores to establish a geographic state, a base of operations from which it can engage in that export. That is the reason for that mission.

• (1550)

The real issue we face, and we see it through the lens from which the opposition look at these matters, is that their problem is not that our soldiers might have defended themselves or not, but that they are there at all, that we are engaged in this mission against ISIL. They voted against it in the House of Commons, and now they are doing everything they can to oppose and bring an end to that mission.

That is a perfectly legitimate position to take. We in the government respectfully disagree with it, but it is their right as an opposition to take that position. That does not extend to the fact that our disagreement with it and with their perspective on what should be done constitutes in some way a breach of the privileges of the House. It is not. It is anything but that.

That disagreement should not now lead to an effort to do what they are doing. It should not lead to a reason to abandon this effort to combat the terrorist fight, even though that is what they would like us to do. At its core, it is a disagreement, a debate, and we do not believe there is any evidence whatsoever that anyone in the House has ever suggested that our troops should not be able to defend themselves in this field, certainly not the government. The opposition may not wish to see them do that. We certainly believe they should be able to do it, and over that there may be a debate. It may be a legitimate debate, but I am quite confident that our side of the debate is supported by the public.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the opportunity, if possible, to review in more detail the comments made by my friend. However, I think you should be able to dispense with this matter in fairly short order as falling short of even the first test of the three-part test you must apply.

• (1555)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the intervention by the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons only reinforces the argument that the member for St. John's East just made.

[*English*]

I say that because it is not about the rhetoric that the House leader for the government applied, who seemed to think this was some kind of debate, but a very serious consideration of the breaches of the privileges of the House. At no point did he really contradict the essential arguments put forward by the member for St. John's East.

I will briefly refer back to the facts of September 30, which are important, when the Prime Minister said in the House that the role of our soldiers would be to advise and assist. It was not to accompany, meaning to be in combat zones. He later responded to the leader of the official opposition, the leader of the NDP, by saying, "I just said that Canadian soldiers are not accompanying the Iraqi forces into combat".

That was a clear, factual statement that he made, and in the last few days we have had equally and completely contradictory factual statements made in which the Prime Minister has very proudly said that they are engaged in combat, that they are engaged in killing.

It is not an issue of debate around the question itself. There is a very clear breach, as the member for St. John's East has said very eloquently. There is a very, very clear contradiction between the facts as laid out by the Prime Minister back on September 30 and the facts that he has been announcing to us. There has never been any explanation of that.

I will end just by reciting what the member for St. John's East said. It is from Erskine May at page 63:

...it is of paramount importance that ministers give accurate and truthful information to Parliament, correcting any inadvertent error at the earliest opportunity.

There has been no correction. There has been no explanation, and the merits of the argument advanced by the member for St. John's East, I think, have just been enhanced by the reaction of the leader of the government in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope you will give serious consideration to what is a very well-thought-out argument by the member for St. John's East on the breaches of the privileges of the House.

The Speaker: I thank hon. members for their contribution on this, and of course we will come back to the House in due course with a decision.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[English]***PROTECTION OF CANADA FROM TERRORISTS ACT**

BILL C-44—TIME ALLOCATION.

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

That, in relation to Bill C-44, An Act to amend the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act and other Acts, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill and, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the day allotted to the consideration of the report stage and on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

The Speaker: There will now be a 30-minute question period.

The hon. member for Burnaby—New Westminster.

*[Translation]***Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, sadly, this is the 85th time that the government has invoked time allocation and closure.

● (1600)

[English]

We are now talking about a sad record that we hope will never be repeated in Canadian parliamentary history. Invoking time allocation and closure seems to be the only thing the government has been able to run up.

We have lost 400,000 jobs in the manufacturing sector. There has been a lack of respect for Parliament by the government. The government has managed to outdo the former Liberal government by invoking time allocation and closure 85 times, showing its lack of respect for Parliament, which so many Canadians are seeing.

Bill C-44, which is very controversial, heard only four hours of witness testimony in committee by experts who came forward and identified problems with the bill. Only a handful of members of Parliament have been able to speak to this bill and, already, after only a handful of speakers, the government wants to ram the bill through.

As we know, the government also has another record, having more recalls of bad pieces of legislation than any other government in Canadian history.

My question for the minister is very simple. Why does the government not get it right? Why does it not listen to experts, and look at and entertain the kinds of amendments that have been brought forward by members of the opposition? Why is the government always trying to ram through legislation that has controversial aspects and should be fixed?

*[Translation]***Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

I must say that I feel a sense of relief to be preparing for debate this afternoon on the final stage of Bill C-44, which seeks to protect Canadians against terrorists.

Our government had originally planned to introduce this bill on October 22, the very day that this place was targeted by a terrorist attack. I am sure that my New Democrat colleague would agree with that, since that is what John Kerry, the U.S. Secretary of State, as well as President François Hollande called the incident.

Obviously, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police also said that this act of violence against a symbol, the house of the Canadian people, was committed for extremist and ideological purposes.

Canadians want us to take action. We have a responsibility to take action against the terrorist threat, and the proposed measure will give our intelligence services tools to better track high-risk travellers who pose a threat to our society.

*[English]***Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, time allocation is a form of closure and can be a very effective tool in the right situation.

What we have found is that other administrations, whether they be provincial New Democrats or federal Liberals or other levels of government, have used time allocation or some form of closure to get legislation through.

What makes the government unique is the number of times it uses time allocation. Ever since the Prime Minister was given a majority, he has demonstrated a lack of respect for the House by constantly bringing in time allocation after time allocation on virtually all pieces of legislation, whether for the budget or a rather nominal bill that all parties would support. They are all time allocated.

It has become a part of the process, and that is wrong. My question is not for the minister responsible for the bill, but for either the government House leader or the Prime Minister, who should explain to Canadians why the government has chosen time allocation as a tool of standard practice to pass legislation.

It is undemocratic and a type of abuse, as a rule, of the House of Commons of Canada.

● (1605)

[Translation]

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, Parliament has already taken 20 hours to consider this bill on protecting Canada from terrorists. During that time, we have seen that this is a very clear and simple bill. It seeks to confirm the ability of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service to operate abroad and make sure that witnesses—an essential source of intelligence—are protected. It also includes very clear provisions to protect privacy.

Government Orders

A debate was held at first reading. The bill was sent to committee. Every clause of the bill was discussed for nearly 92 minutes. Elected officials must ensure that our law enforcement agencies have the tools they need to protect us against terrorism. We are taking that step. It is not the last. This bill will have to be introduced in the Senate as well, and it will once again go through a legislative process. It will be once again debated and examined in committee.

That being said, from what we heard in debate—and my opposition colleagues were there—the political parties believe that this bill is well founded in principle and that it is based on a solid legislative argument. That is why I hope that we can count on their support to quickly pass this bill so that the Canadian Security Intelligence Service will have the authority it needs to continue to protect Canadians and respond to the invitation made by the courts to clarify its mandate. That is what this bill does. We need it. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill in order to ensure that it is quickly passed because it is necessary tool.

[*English*]

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am a bit astounded by this debate. First we have the Liberals endorsing the concept of time allocation, and now we have the minister telling us not to worry, that it can be debated in the Senate.

When this bill was introduced, time allocation was used at second reading. At that time, the minister told us that there was time to fully debate and consider the bill, and that was at committee. Then the parliamentary secretary and the majority on the committee limited debate severely. When he said there were 92 minutes for each clause, we were left with about a minute and a half per amendment and limited to four expert witnesses.

I think the government is afraid of a couple of things that came up. One was that some expert witnesses said that some parts of this bill might be unconstitutional and that if these were declared unconstitutional by the courts we were wasting time here.

The other issue we raised was this. Is the government providing sufficient resources to agencies like CSIS and the RCMP to make use of the tools they already have?

The government is afraid of debating those two questions. I think that is why it is introducing time allocation.

Therefore, my question for the minister is this. If it is not the time to debate the bill at report stage, at second reading, or at committee, when is it time for a full public debate of this bill?

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the member is wrong. First, this bill is not addressing the police or the RCMP, but clarifying the role of our national security agency. It is to clarify and make sure that CSIS, our Canadian security service, continues to do what it has always done, which is to share information with our partners. We do not need a decade of debate to say that it is quite logical that CSIS shares information on Canadian-born individuals who represent a threat, whether they are abroad or return.

I am sure that Canadians and constituents across the country are telling politicians to make sure that our national security agency has the appropriate tools to do its job and protect us. What is in front of us is a fairly clear bill that has two main goals, to clarify—which is

probably something that should have been done when we created CSIS, but at that time it did not seem necessary—that CSIS has a mandate to operate, and to be able to track and share information on those individuals who are either in Turkey or Iraq and willing to commit terrorist attacks, or even worse, who are willing to come back and commit terrorist attacks elsewhere and on our own ground.

That is a fairly good reason to proceed, to move forward, and to have this bill adopted by the House so that CSIS can have the tools needed to protect and keep Canadians safe.

● (1610)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, as we have now had the 85th motion for time allocation in the House, breaking all historic records, with all due respect to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, this is now a debate on the anti-democratic tendencies of the Conservative administration to consistently shut down debate time after time.

Last week in my riding of Saanich—Gulf Islands, when the Right Hon. Joe Clark addressed a non-partisan event sponsored by my riding association, he said that the Canadian Parliament and the Canadian Prime Minister are currently in violation of the Magna Carta. We have violated our fundamental connection to representative democracy, and it is evidenced by the continual use of measures to shove through bills without adequate debate, particularly to the detriment of members such as myself, who are not able to have time in debate to present a speech.

It is not the minister's decision. I know that. This decision was made by others within the Conservative administration.

It is time to stop shutting down debate. A free and democratic society is what terrorists do not want. Shutting down debate is not in the interests of democracy.

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, let me reassure the member that I am fully comfortable that there is a balance between debate and action. Canadians expect politicians from all parties to debate in a democracy, and we are all going to debate. We are not done. Once we adopt this motion, hopefully, we will have time to debate. We are just saying that we will not debate over and over or time and time again. Why? It is because we need action.

We have CSIS at this point in time. We do not want those who protect us to be blind. We want them to share information. Actually, that is one principle of democracy. To protect our democracy, we have to provide those who protect us with the legal authority, and that is exactly what this bill would do.

Government Orders

I will mention again, though I have mentioned it over and over again through the previous 20 hours of debate, that there are provisions not only to protect witnesses but to protect their privacy. This bill fully complies with the Constitution, contrary to what I would call the ridiculous assumption made by my colleague in the NDP. I can reassure the member that when the government tables legislation, it makes sure that it complies with Canadian law.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Blanchette (Louis-Hébert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is the 85th time allocation motion.

Once again, the government is disrespecting the people's house. In the parliamentary process, there are steps we have to follow. I do not understand why a minister would not want to listen to the experts and accept amendments to improve his bill. I do not understand what he is trying to achieve with all of this. He says there has to be a balance between action and debate. That is great, but only if there is a real debate.

My question for the minister is therefore very simple. What is he afraid of that is prompting him to prevent and restrict debate? What is he afraid of?

• (1615)

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Louis-Hébert for his question.

I am certain that this bill will allow the Canadian Security Intelligence Service to allay Canadians' legitimate concerns over the terrorist threat. This bill will allow our protective services to share information and will confirm their ability to operate outside Canada. It is quite simple. I am pretty sure my colleague agrees with the substance of the issue. That is what is at the heart of the bill.

The other part of the bill is about ensuring that the Canadian Security Intelligence Service has reliable sources. There is always a bond of trust that is established between the source and the service, and it is important to protect that because those people put their lives at risk when they agree to turn over information that can save lives here and elsewhere.

This bill clarifies the role of the service and confirms its ability to operate abroad and, more specifically, and I want to repeat this, share information about and track people, potentially Canadians, who may have left the country for terrorist purposes.

We will share this information with our partners and allies, such as the French. All nations throughout the world are bringing in measures in keeping with their constitutional framework in order to protect democracy. That is the purpose of this bill.

This bill will help allay Canadians' legitimate concerns over the terrorist threat. I am sure that the people of Louis-Hébert will be pleased and will sleep better at night once this bill passes, because these services will then have the legal authority they need to protect Canadians.

[*English*]

Hon. Laurie Hawn (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this place is all about process. I do not just mean Parliament, but Ottawa. It is all about process. That is important. There needs to be process, but there also need to be results and action, especially when

something is critical and especially when Canadians are demanding something like their personal safety.

October 20 and October 22 were wake-up calls. They should have been wake-up calls for even the sleepest of Canadians. It could have been so much worse on both of those days, especially on October 22, if the people involved had been better organized, better equipped, and so on. They were not, and we are thankful for that, but they were bad enough.

There is a whole bunch of other people out there who are probably better organized and better equipped, and the clock may be ticking. We do not know that. We know that there are at least 140 out there. If CSIS and others say that there are 140, we can bet that there are a whole lot more than that.

I would like to ask the minister about the urgency of this matter. In the American experience after 9/11, one of the biggest problems the Americans had was that there so many silos and disconnects between all of the different parts of the apparatus of the American security system. When they looked back on it, it was all there. Everything about 9/11 was there, but they just had not talked to each other. They just had not shared.

I know that the same situation exists among Canada's security services, whether it is CSIS, CSEC, the DND, or the CRA. Those disconnects exist.

I would like to ask the minister about the urgency and the timeliness that is required to connect those disconnects, because the clock is ticking.

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Edmonton Centre for his question and also tell this House I feel privileged to sit with a member who is not only serving his constituents now as a remarkable member of Parliament but who has also served our country under the flag and has had a remarkable career in the Royal Canadian Air Force.

I was given the privilege of travelling with the member. He is a strong advocate not only of the Canadian Armed Forces but of the men and women who wear and have worn the uniform. He is very involved with veterans, especially with those who fought and flew during the Second World War.

As of today, Mr. Cauchy is in Quebec. He is a proud Quebecker who flew during the Second World War and fought for liberty and freedom. He is not that young, but he is in pretty good shape, and friends of mine were able to give him a tribute today.

My concern now is that when our law enforcement agency and our national security agencies do not have the tools necessary to protect us, every day that passes in this country is a concern. This is a concern for this House. This is a concern for all Canadians, and it is also a responsibility for politicians of all party stripes to take action.

We have been given an opportunity to take action. At the end of this day, this bill will not have been adopted. We still need to get it through the Senate and get royal assent. However, this is an important bill to protect Canadians, and I believe we should do our utmost to get it through.

Government Orders

We will have a fair debate, but once we have a debate, we need action, and it is time for action in this country to fight terrorism.

•(1620)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a problem having the Senate act as a safeguard because of the number of empty seats at present.

First, I am going to correct the minister because he obviously has a short memory when it comes to the speech given by French President François Hollande in the House on November 3. Mr. Hollande absolutely did not say what the minister reported. He spoke about a terrorist-inspired attack, which is a very important nuance.

I hope that the minister will recognize that. I believe that the minister is twisting words in order to take a very simplistic approach to a very important debate.

The right of all Canadians to be properly represented in the House and to have a full debate on fundamental issues that will truly affect their lives is being violated for the 85th time.

Bill C-44 will profoundly change Canadians' ability to understand the extent to which secret activities are carried out and the consequences this will have. This could lead to very serious abuses.

Clearly, the minister is dismissing the concerns people may have about the consequences of actions taken by a government agency.

How can the minister once again justify this time allocation and the end of debate in the chamber that represents the people, the chamber of the truly elected, here in this Parliament?

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleague that the purpose of the motion is not to put an end to the debate but to manage and limit it. That being said, it is urgent that we pass this bill. Since the tragic incident in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu in mid-October and the events here in Ottawa, which resulted in the death of Mr. Cirillo, we have unfortunately seen terrorist attacks in Australia and more recently in Paris.

We are working closely with the French authorities. Obviously, President Hollande is working with our Prime Minister. My counterpart, Minister Cazeneuve, is taking action on the ground. We have seen it. The minister has proposed legislative measures and arrests have been made recently in southern France.

Like us, the French are working together to combat terrorism. More specifically, we are working together on the ground in Iraq, using air strikes to eliminate this terrorist threat. It is a threat on all fronts. We have law enforcement agencies and a national security agency to protect Canadians and Canadian soil. It is important to give those agencies the tools they need, restore their abilities and make sure that they are not completely in the dark when working outside the country. This bill gives those agencies the tools they need to protect Canadians.

I encourage my colleague to do the right thing this once by setting aside partisanship and supporting a bill that will reassure Quebecers and all Canadians.

•(1625)

[*English*]

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, those were great remarks by the Minister of Public Safety. The problem is that the remarks do not relate to Bill C-44, on which the government has introduced closure. The bill he is talking about sounds to me more like the bill that may be coming on Friday.

This bill really does nothing to address the national security concerns that have been raised as a result of the Quebec activity, the incident in Ottawa, or what has happened in Paris. We expect that to be in a new bill. This bill basically brings into law some of the practices that CSIS is now utilizing and protects CSIS sources. What the minister is trying to put urgency on is not in this bill.

This is advice for the government. If the government would work with us at committee and seriously look at some of the recommendations and the amendments we make, take them seriously to improve the bill and allow us to bring in more than just a couple of witnesses to try to satisfy our needs, bring in witnesses with expertise, then it might find the opposition parties more accommodating. It would allow Parliament to operate like it is supposed to rather than running roughshod over the opposition parties with closure when it wants.

My key point, Mr. Minister, is the bill is not talking about the issues you have been talking about in response to the last questions. It is different from that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Before I go to the minister, I would just remind the hon. member and others to address their questions to the Chair rather than to the minister.

The hon. minister for Public Safety.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

I agree with him on one point, which is that this is an important bill. This bill targets high-risk travellers and terrorists who could be abroad. The bill also increases our ability to monitor them, so that if they return to the country, we will be in a position to intercept them and prevent them from carrying out terrorist attacks. This bill is very relevant.

However, I agree that other measures are needed, and we intend to propose legislative measures in the House that comply with Canadian laws and that will ensure that our police forces are better able to crack down on this evolving terrorist threat.

I want to take this opportunity to inform my hon. opposition colleague that a technical briefing will be given on these legislative measures. We will contact the offices of the members of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security to offer them a technical briefing, as we did with this bill.

Furthermore, during the discussions we had in committee, I noted that the members were knowledgeable about the ins and outs of this bill, which is very clear.

I would like to remind the hon. member for Malpeque that the purpose of this bill is to clarify the role of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. Frankly, this is something we should have done long ago.

In my opinion, the service has the right to operate and conduct its activities outside the country. I do not think we need to spend hours debating that, and the same goes for witness protection. This is a basic principle of justice. Having held very senior positions, the member for Malpeque can see that for himself.

All that being said, I am eager to see this bill move forward so that it can become law in Canada. People sent us here to protect their safety. We have to make sure that they are absolutely safe. We will do that by passing effective laws, and this one is eminently justifiable.

• (1630)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasung, Health; the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis, Health.

[English]

It is also my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Call in the members.

• (1710)

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

(Division No. 312)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anders
Armstrong

Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allison
Ambrose
Anderson
Aspin

Government Orders

Baird	Barlow
Bateman	Bergen
Bernier	Bezan
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Crockatt
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Egliniski	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Grewal	Harper
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mayes	McColeman
McLeod	Menegakis
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Nicholson	Norlock
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Payne	Perkins
Poillievre	Preston
Raitt	Rajotte
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Rickford
Saxton	Schellenberger
Seeback	Shea
Shipley	Shory
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Strahl	Sweet
Tilson	Toet
Trost	Trottier
Truppe	Valcourt
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Zimmer— 144

NAYS

Members

Andrews	Angus
Ashton	Atamanenko
Ayala	Bélangier
Bennett	Benskin
Bevington	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Boivin
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Brison
Brosseau	Byrne
Caron	Casey
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm

Government Orders

Choquette	Christopherson
Comartin	Côté
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dubé	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Easter	Eyking
Freeland	Freeman
Fry	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Godin
Goodale	Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu	Hughes
Hyer	Julian
Kellway	Lamoureux
Latendresse	Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leslie	Liu
MacAulay	Mai
Marston	Masse
Mathyssen	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Patry	Péclet
Plamondon	Quach
Rafferty	Rankin
Rathgeber	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Rousseau	Sandhu
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
St-Denis	Stewart
Stoffer	Sullivan
Toone	Tremblay
Trudeau	Turmel
Valeriotte	Vaughan— 118

PAIRED

Nil

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): I declare the motion carried.

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

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from December 8, 2014 consideration of Bill C-44, An Act to amend the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act and other Acts, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

Mr. Daryl Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am not only pleased but proud and privileged to be with a government that has an unwavering commitment to protecting Canadians from radical jihadi terrorists. I am proud of our government's decision to stand with our allies in an international mission to combat the threat ISIL poses to the Middle East, and by extension, to the world. I am proud that when our government says it is committed to giving our security agencies the tools they need to keep Canadians safe, we follow through with decisive action.

In that spirit, I am pleased to rise today in support of the protection of Canada from terrorists bill. As all hon. members know, this bill contains two main measures.

First of all, it will make technical amendments to Canada's Citizenship Act to allow revocation of citizenship provisions to come into force earlier than anticipated. These provisions, which are part of an act that has already received royal assent, include expanded grounds for revocation. This includes authorizing the revocation of the citizenship of individuals engaged in armed conflict with Canada as well as those who have been convicted of terrorism, high treason, or spying.

The bill also provides for a streamlined decision-making process. It will authorize the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration or the Federal Court to make decisions on revoking citizenship from traitors or terrorists.

The second part of this legislation, and what I will focus my remarks on today, are the changes being proposed to strengthen the CSIS Act.

For the last 30 years, CSIS has played a vital, and I would say, valuable role in ensuring a safe and secure Canada. The threats we face as a country today have changed significantly since then. I think all we have to do is look at world events to realize that we do not live in the world of yesterday.

The CSIS Act and the legislation that governs CSIS activities has not changed. With the bill before us, we are taking a critical step toward ensuring that CSIS is well positioned.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1715)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Order. Could members of the chamber who would like to conduct conversations take them outside so that your colleague, the hon. member for Prince Edward—Hastings, could have the attention of the House? If members would like to talk, please take it outside the chamber.

The hon. member for Prince Edward—Hastings.

Mr. Daryl Kramp: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we are taking a critical step in this government toward ensuring that CSIS is well positioned to confront the terrorist threat as it exists in 2015.

I think it is useful to provide a bit of context about CSIS's work and the associated sections of the CSIS Act that govern that work. Section 12 of the CSIS Act mandates CSIS to collect and analyze intelligence on threats to the security of Canada, and in relation to those threats, to report to and advise the Government of Canada. These threats are specifically defined in the CSIS Act as espionage or sabotage, foreign-influenced activities that are detrimental to the interests of Canada, activities directed toward the threat or use of acts of serious violence, and activities directed toward undermining the system of government in Canada.

Section 16 of the CSIS Act authorizes CSIS to collect within Canada foreign intelligence related to the capabilities, intentions, or activities of any foreign state or group of foreign states. This is subject to the restriction that its activities cannot be directed at Canadian citizens, permanent residents, or corporations.

Government Orders

Sections 13, 14, and 15 authorize CSIS to provide security assessments to the Government of Canada, provincial governments, and other Canadian and foreign institutions, to provide advice to ministers of the crown on matters related to the Citizenship Act and the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, and to conduct investigations required to perform all these functions.

Clearly, all of these are very challenging mandates. Fulfilling these mandates means that CSIS has to use a suite of investigative techniques that can include, for instance, open-source research, physical surveillance, interviews, and analyzing intelligence from a wide variety of sources, among others. What is particularly important to note here is the importance that human resources play in allowing CSIS to fulfill its mandate to investigate and to advise on threats to Canada's security.

Other techniques used by CSIS are more intrusive in nature. These techniques may include, among others, searches of a target's place of residence and analysis of financial records or telecommunications intercepts.

CSIS is required to obtain warrants under the CSIS Act to pursue intrusive investigative techniques. In order to obtain a warrant, CSIS must satisfy a designated Federal Court judge that there are reasonable grounds to believe that a warrant is required to enable CSIS to investigate a threat to the security of Canada or to perform its duties and functions under section 16 of the CSIS Act. The CSIS Act also requires the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness to approve warrant applications before they are submitted to the Federal Court, which is a very solid failsafe method. In addition, co-operation with domestic agencies is also critical.

Section 17 of the CSIS Act authorizes CSIS, with the approval of the minister, to co-operate with any department of the Government of Canada or the government of a province or any police force in a province. Therefore, CSIS works closely with the RCMP, the Canada Border Services Agency, other government departments, and police forces across Canada.

When it comes to investigating threat-related activities occurring outside of Canada, CSIS's relationship with the Communications Security Establishment Canada, or CSE, is particularly important. CSIS relies heavily on the capabilities and the expertise of CSE to conduct telecommunications intercepts outside of Canada. CSE's legal authority to provide assistance to CSIS stems from subsection 273.64(1)(c) of the National Defence Act.

The CSIS Act authorizes CSIS to enter into an arrangement or to otherwise co-operate with the government of a foreign state, or an institution of that state, with the approval of the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness after consulting with the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Co-operation with foreign entities is critical to CSIS's ability to fulfill its mandate. Individuals being investigated often leave Canada to engage in a range of threat-related activities, and no country can assess the full range of threats on its own. CSIS must be able to work with foreign partners, subject to oversight by the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness and review by the Security Intelligence Review Committee.

● (1720)

Now that I have outlined some of the important work that CSIS does and how the CSIS act allows for it, I will speak to how this bill would allow CSIS to more effectively operate in the evolving threat environment.

Specifically, this bill would confirm CSIS' authority to conduct investigations outside of Canada related to threats to the security of Canada and security assessments. It would also confirm that the Federal Court can issue warrants for CSIS to investigate, within or outside Canada, threats to the security of Canada. It would also give the Federal Court the authority to consider only relevant Canadian law when issuing warrants to authorize CSIS to undertake certain intrusive activities outside of Canada. It would protect the identity of CSIS human resources from disclosure, and it would protect the identity of CSIS employees who are likely to become involved in covert activities in the future.

These are all measured changes that would amend the legislation governing CSIS' activities so that it has the clear ability and authority to investigate threats to the security of Canada wherever and whenever they may occur.

It is clear that our Conservative government does take the protection of Canadians most seriously. Unfortunately, it seems that some of the other parties do not share our view that these are most serious issues in need of most serious solutions.

The leader of the NDP has determined that our government is playing politics with the issue of terrorism, and he is not convinced that Canada was the victim of two terrorist threats in late October. It is incredible. These views, offensive as they may be—and I do find them offensive personally—are certainly predictable. Remember, this is the same NDP leader who said he did not believe that the U.S. military had really killed Osama bin Laden.

Where can we start with the Liberal Party? It was the Liberal Party leader who recently said we should not fight to destroy and degrade ISIL because he does not believe that we can win against a barbaric group of deranged jihadists.

Despite all of this, I believe that we, as a government and as parties respectively, can come together. I urge all members to support this legislation to allow us to move to the earlier implementation of certain changes to Canadian citizenship laws and to allow CSIS to carry out its vital work in the threat environment of the present day.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech, despite the insults that he threw in at the end.

The really important thing about this bill is that in the committee process, the NDP proposed a number of very reasonable amendments that the government could have accepted or at least discussed or debated. As things stand now, in fact, CSIS cannot legally conduct extraterritorial surveillance activities. This bill aims to correct that.

Government Orders

There is another important aspect. The amendments we proposed were meant to make the director of CSIS accountable for secret surveillance activities conducted abroad. This will not be the case, because under the bill as it stands, an employee designated by the minister will be accountable for those activities.

I would like to ask my colleague why it is not the director of CSIS who would be accountable for secret activities conducted abroad, and why a straw man should be chosen to do it instead?

[English]

Mr. Daryl Kramp: Mr. Speaker, with all respect, the member is wrong. There would be three levels of accountability that can and will and must take place.

First of all, there has to be a warrant from the Federal Court. The judge must rule that there is valid evidence to conclude that it would be beneficial. It also has to be approved by the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness. Of course, it is also subject to the scrutiny of the Communications Security Establishment.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened closely to the remarks by the member for Prince Edward—Hastings, who is also chair of the public safety committee. I enjoy working with him, and he did a good analysis of the various authorities that CSIS has.

I would say that he took a lot of liberty in his remarks about the Liberal leader's comments, and the things he quoted are simply not true. It does not do much for the integrity of the member or his party when they constantly misquote people in the House.

The question I want to raise with the member is a serious concern. As he knows, the Liberal Party will be supporting this bill. Wesley Wark, when he was before the committee, had this to say about Bill C-44:

Bill C-44 does not add any new provisions to the CSIS Act to ensure proper consultation between the service and its minister, the Minister of Public Safety, and the two departments most likely to be impacted by expanded CSIS overseas operations—the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development and the Department of National Defence.

Liberals proposed an amendment. With the additional protection of sources and the additional powers granted in this act for work overseas, does the member not see it as a problem if activity takes place by CSIS abroad that could impact our trade relationship or the Minister of Foreign Affairs? If CSIS folks are caught in illegal activities, or whatever, as a result of a warrant issued in Canada, does he not see the dangers that situation could cause, such as trade and diplomatic problems? Why not put into the act a requirement that consultation has to take place?

● (1725)

Mr. Daryl Kramp: Mr. Speaker, I will also give the member for Malpeque the courtesy of stating that I enjoy working with him. Quite frankly, I take significant counsel from his tremendous experience coming from his many years in Parliament, having worked as a former solicitor general and being involved with the administration of justice and the realities that we all have to face in various legislation.

I think he would also admit, quite frankly, that in dealing with the direction of government, he, as a former cabinet minister, under-

stands that complete dialogue takes place on a consistent basis. Not only do CSIS and Public Safety have to confer with Foreign Affairs, but on cabinet decisions all cabinet ministers talk on a consistent basis. Whether we are talking about trade or foreign affairs, they absolutely interact on a consistent basis, and the communication lines are always open. Whether it is defence, foreign affairs, or trade, the member for Malpeque knows full well that communication happens on an ongoing daily basis. He suggests it does not; maybe it did not happen in the Liberal Party, of which he is a member, and I cannot comment on that, but if it did not happen, it sure as heck should have.

[Translation]

Mr. Jonathan Genest-Jourdain (Manicouagan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this speaking time I have been given allows me the opportunity to share my initial thoughts on the routine nature of the government's surveillance activities. Why routine? It is simple. In the past few years, we have been introduced to a number of government initiatives that would allow the government to intrude into Canadians' private lives. It has become recurrent, hence the routine nature. It has become so routine that even in the north, environmental activists came to see me recently for some legal and political advice on the chances of their being investigated and followed simply because of their actions during demonstrations and their environmental activism. Slowly but surely, Canadians have become paranoid. In a way, that paranoia is justified and has been fuelled by these initiatives that have been gradually introduced over the past few years. I have seen a number of them, and this bill, this initiative before us today, is no exception.

Bill C-44, An Act to amend the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act and other Acts, contains amendments that will considerably enhance the power of our intelligence agencies to act abroad in the context of investigations related to threats to Canada's security.

I will now stress that certain isolated incidents are hastily labelled as terrorist acts so that they can be fitted into a narrative to instill fear in the population for electoral purposes.

I will provide a very simple example of an event that was hastily labelled an act of terrorism. The day after the October incident in the House of Commons, I was invited to a televised debate at a television station. I was accompanied by a Liberal colleague and a Conservative colleague. The Conservative colleague did not hesitate, at every turn, barely 24 hours after the incident, to label it terrorism. He already had speaking points, a prepared and spoon-fed message. It was already deemed an act of terrorism.

We should also realize that although there was media hype and biased reporting by some media, one English newspaper reported the information a few days later and mentioned that the person who had gone to Parliament Hill with a hunting rifle was first and foremost a drug addict. I think that should be mentioned. In fact, he was a crack user. Crack is a crystallized form of cocaine that is made using ammonia.

Government Orders

This is my bailiwick. At the risk of repeating myself, as hon. members know, I am a criminal lawyer and I worked mainly with mental health-related cases. The vast majority of my clientele was made up of hard drug users. They can be unpredictable at times. During a court appearance, a client might decide to sing, cry, shout or utter threats. Even judges in our legal system are used to seeing that. When you see thousands of people like that in a single year, you start to get used to it. When a client like that is put on trial, the defence lawyer will often tell the judge that he thinks that his client is currently in a fragile state of mind and that he is not necessarily in full possession of his faculties. The lawyer then suggests that the hearing or trial be postponed for a few days to give his client enough time to come back down to earth, because he will utter threats to everyone and he is currently aggressive. It often takes a number of police officers to control these people. Clients on freebase, or crack, are hard to control.

Accordingly, regardless the individual's allegiance, origin, or even religion, he was above all a hard drug user who had mental health problems. I think we also have a societal duty, because the individual is in very good company. I have been in Ottawa for four years, and I have seen that there are countless hard drug addicts. A few minutes' walk from Parliament Hill, in front of the shopping centre, you will see people selling crack in front of McDonald's in broad daylight. Young people can see this go on all day long. Hard drugs are being sold near Canada's Parliament. We have seen situations like what happened here, where an individual blows a fuse—if I can put it that way—and decides to wave a shotgun around in public.

We have seen others in Ottawa. It is not limited to this city. You can see this kind of thing everywhere. However, a distinction needs to be made here.

• (1730)

Rather than talking about terrorism, we should be talking about addiction to hard drugs and mental health. That is a lot more relevant. People living in Ottawa who see that on a regular basis will probably agree. This is a social problem.

What measures and resources would help drug addicts? The media reported that the individual in question used a shelter not far from here and that he was in contact with other drug addicts. This is a societal issue that deserves a little more thought than labelling something terrorism 24 hours later.

The Conservatives have used recent events to justify giving the Canadian Security Intelligence Service more powers. They claim that this bill is necessary to prevent terrorists and violent extremists from carrying out attacks in Canada.

Still, we should consider the warning that Justice Iacobucci issued about the spillover effects that rushing to expand police powers can have on freedom of religion, freedom of association and freedom of expression; the possible tainting of Canada's Muslim community; and the risk of overreaching by the Canadian Security Intelligence Service when sharing information in a global fight against terrorism.

I just want to point out that Justice Iacobucci, a former Supreme Court judge, is studied in law faculties across the country. I studied him for six years, and he is highly respected. He says that there is a risk of tainting Canada's Muslim community because that informa-

tion is sensationalized by media outlets of dubious repute just to sell copies. Some people try to blame everything bad in the world on the Muslim community, and because of Islamophobia, we end up with situations like the one going on in Sept-Îles right now.

There are not many Arabs or Muslims in my home town. There is one who is trying to build a mosque, and a few times now, some misguided individuals have smashed the walls of his building. He was forced to put up a barbed wire fence. We are talking about the 51st parallel. It is -25 degrees Celsius there today. While conditions are already difficult for someone from the Middle East or the Arab world, he also has to put up with the fact that the local media and our own government are misinforming the population and trying to demonize that community. This is not good for Canadian unity or for the intellectual evolution of our country and our youth. We need to put an end to this kind of discourse.

• (1735)

[*English*]

Ms. Roxanne James: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been listening to the full context of this member's speech and I have yet to hear any correlation to the bill we are debating before the House. There is absolutely zero relevance. I am still waiting. Time is almost up. I see you have given the member the final couple of minutes to go, Mr. Speaker, and I honestly have no idea whether the member even knows what we are debating here in the House right now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary for her intervention. I have been listening, albeit in French, to the remarks by the hon. member for Manicouagan and assuredly the member is speaking to the topic in broader terms as it relates to the question before the House.

The parliamentary secretary will know that members are given lots of latitude in terms of how they can direct their arguments relating to the question. I am sure the hon. member for Manicouagan will bring those arguments around to the question before the House before the end of his remarks.

The hon. member for Manicouagan.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jonathan Genest-Jourdain: Mr. Speaker, I will briefly address the need to prevent our media and politicians from descending into xenophobia and populism.

The gunman here in Ottawa, regardless of his ethnic origin or religion, was first and foremost a drug addict. There are some real risks associated with giving CSIS these new powers without proper oversight. Rather than clarifying things, this bill opens the door to a number of legal problems and could very well be struck down by the courts. In addition to legal problems, this initiative exploits a certain social malaise fuelled by a populist, sensationalist narrative that feeds the gutter press and the most base form of politics.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Ms. Roxanne James (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I still did not hear a whole lot to do with the bill and so perhaps I can help the member out.

The bill before the House today that we are debating was actually to be tabled on the day of the attacks here in Ottawa on Parliament Hill and against our Canadian Armed Forces. It was not a knee-jerk reaction as some in the opposition have said. It was actually a bill that was to be tabled that day. It was in direct relation to recent court decisions that called into question the authority of our security agencies to actually be able to operate overseas, communicate with our allies, and have the ability to provide their informants with the same protection that law enforcement agencies have across this country. I thought I would add this as general information for the member, possibly for his answers.

However, I am not surprised that NDP members voted against this legislation. They voted against it in committee and will certainly vote against it again. They have not supported a single measure that we brought forward.

This is common sense. It was in the works prior to the attacks. The attack on Parliament on that day is a clear indication that this legislation is needed and why it is needed quickly.

The member's party was not able to support the Combating Terrorism Act. It certainly did not support revoking citizenship from those who commit acts of terrorism against our allies or here in Canada. NDP members are voting against this bill and voting against standing shoulder to shoulder with our allies in the global fight against terror.

My question is very general. Does the member even understand the severity of terrorism in this world, the direct threat that groups like ISIL and those who have created a jihadist movement pose against our country, and what that means to Canada?

• (1740)

[Translation]

Mr. Jonathan Genest-Jourdain: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question.

The problem is that the Conservatives are twisting the concept of terrorism to suit their own interests. They are doing so quickly and abruptly, simply for election purposes.

They have trademarked themselves as the “tough on crime” party. Now they are using terrorism to pursue their agenda, because it fits in nicely with the narrative they have presented. A large portion of the Canadian population responds to that kind of message.

However, using this kind of concept in such a twisted sense and for purely elitist and election purposes is highly questionable and reprehensible.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the critic for the Liberal Party, has had an opportunity to address the House regarding why the bill does have some value. It is a bit of a step forward, but there is also an argument to be made

that the government has lost an opportunity in terms of the whole idea of parliamentary oversight. When we think of the Five Eyes security nations, of which Canada is one, there was the idea of having a parliamentary oversight committee to deal with security services.

I wonder if the member might provide the House with the NDP position on parliamentary oversight for an organization like CSIS.

[Translation]

Mr. Jonathan Genest-Jourdain: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his question.

According to information that has been brought to my attention, members of civil society must be allowed to contribute and really examine the powers given to the authorities—powers that ultimately allow them to infiltrate and intrude into the private lives of Canadians.

It is essential that a third party ensure that this system works properly and that no wrongdoing is committed in this type of situation.

Mr. Raymond Côté (Beauport—Limoilou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his eloquent remarks and for enlightening us about this bill.

With regard to CSIS's activities abroad, various federal courts have already ruled that section 12 of the act does not contain extraterritoriality provisions that cover covert surveillance. This issue has been brought before the courts on a number of occasions.

It is troubling that, ultimately, CSIS is still conducting extraterritorial activities. Clearly, rather than remedying the situation by reining CSIS in, the government is trying to condone that behaviour by amending the act and establishing such provisions.

Would my colleague care to comment on that?

Mr. Jonathan Genest-Jourdain: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. He clearly has more information and knows much more about this topic than I do.

Could my colleague repeat his question? There were too many details and I cannot remember them.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Resuming debate. We have one minute left for the hon. member for Medicine Hat. He may want to use his minute at least before the end of the time allocated for government orders for today.

Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today for one minute and add my voice to the protection of Canada from terrorists act. Recently, we have seen acts of terror not limited to troubled areas of the world, such as Syria, Algeria, Iran and Iraq.

I listened to the previous member's speech who thought this was a Conservative ploy. I would ask that member in particular why it was that his leader asked for 24/7 protection from the RCMP if this was not a terrorist act? That is really beyond my comprehension.

Government Orders

These individuals are carrying out these acts in groups in cities right across the globe. All of these actions are done for different motives and different means but have a common goal: to strike terror and fear into the hearts of governments and citizens.

That is why our Conservative government has pushed ahead with the legislation before us because nothing is more important than keeping Canadians safe from harm and fear, whether it is in the streets of their communities, when travelling, or when living abroad. That means our Conservative government makes every effort to prevent, detect, deny and respond to terrorist threats.

● (1745)

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

The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 2.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 1?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. Therefore, I declare Motion No. 2 defeated.

(Motions Nos. 1 and 2 negated)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): The question is now on Motion No. 3. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 4 and 5.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 3?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

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

● (1825)

[*Translation*]

And the Clerk having announced the results of the vote:

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that my vote was properly recorded, which is what I was trying to tell you earlier. I am in favour of the amendment and I think my vote was recorded against the amendment. Is that correct?

The Speaker: I do not think that the hon. member for Ahuntsic rose when the clerk called on the members in favour to rise. The member missed her chance to vote.

The member for Saanich—Gulf Islands is also rising on a point of order.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I am in the same position as my friend, the member for Ahuntsic. When the members in favour were called upon to rise, the vote was cut off to move to the members opposed. A number of members were not able to rise. It is difficult to rise to vote in this corner. I would like to record my vote and the vote of the member for Thunder Bay—Superior North. We support the NDP motion.

[*English*]

The Speaker: I can assure the members of the House that the table officers take every effort to make sure that they conduct the vote at a pace where members have the opportunity to vote, but it is incumbent on members to follow along and make sure they do stand at the appropriate time. In the spirit of generosity, this being the first week back, maybe there will be unanimous consent to allow the members to have their vote cast as yes. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

● (1830)

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

(*Division No. 313*)

YEAS

Members

Angus	Ashton
Atamanenko	Ayala
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Boivin	Borg
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Brousseau
Caron	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Choquette	Christopherson
Comartin	Côté
Crowder	Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dewar
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseau
Freeman	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Godin
Groguhé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Hughes
Hyer	Julian
Kellway	Lapointe
Latendresse	Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	Mai

Government Orders

Marston
Mathysen
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Mourani
Nantel
Nicholls
Papillon
Péclet
Plamondon
Rafferty
Ravignat
Rousseau
Scott
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Stewart
Sullivan
Tremblay

Masse
May
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Mulcair
Nash
Nunez-Melo
Patry
Perreault
Quach
Rankin
Raynault
Sandhu
Sellah
Sitsabaiesan
Stoffer
Toone
Turmel — 90

Murray
Norlock
O'Neill Gordon
O'Toole
Payne
Poilievre
Raiitt
Regan
Rempel
Rickford
Scarpaleggia
Seeback
Shea
Shory
Sopuck
St-Denis
Sweet
Toet
Trottier
Truppe
Valeriote
Van Loan
Vellacott
Warawa
Watson
Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Zimmer — 179

Nicholson
Oliver
Opitz
Pacetti
Perkins
Preston
Rajotte
Reid
Richards
Saxton
Schellenberger
Sgro
Shipley
Smith
Sorenson
Strahl
Tilson
Trost
Trudeau
Valcourt
Van Kesteren
Vaughan
Wallace
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allison
Ambrose
Anderson
Armstrong
Baird
Bateman
Bennett
Bergen
Bezan
Block
Braid
Brisson
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Butt
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Chong
Clement
Cuzner
Davidson
Devolin
Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra
Eglinski
Falk
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fortin
Fry
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Goodyear
Gourde
Harper
Hawn
Hillyer
Holder
James
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kent
Komarnicki
Lake
Larose
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leitch
Leung
Lukiwski
MacAulay
Maguire
McCallum
McGuinty
McLeod
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anders
Andrews
Aspin
Barlow
Bélanger
Benoit
Bernier
Blaney
Boughen
Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Barrie)
Byrne
Calkins
Carmichael
Casey
Clarke
Crockatt
Daniel
Dechert
Dion
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Eyking
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Fletcher
Freeland
Galipeau
Gill
Goguen
Goodale
Gosal
Grewal
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes
Hoback
Hsu
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lamoureux
Lauzon
Leef
Lemieux
Lobb
Lunney
MacKenzie
Mayes
McColeman
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Menegakis

Nil

PAIRED

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 4 and 5 also defeated.

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1835)

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

(Division No. 314)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allison
Ambrose
Anderson
Armstrong

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler
Anders
Andrews
Aspin

Business of Supply

Baird
Bateman
Bennett
Bergen
Bezan
Block
Braid
Brison
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Butt
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Chong
Clement
Cuzner
Davidson
Devolin
Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra
Egliniski
Falk
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fortin
Fry
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Goodale
Goodyear
Gourde
Harper
Hawn
Hillyer
Holder
James
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kent
Komarnicki
Lake
Larose
LeBlanc (Beausejour)
Leitch
Leung
Lukiwski
MacAulay
Maguire
McCallum
McGuinty
McLeod
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Murray
Norlock
O'Neill Gordon
O'Toole
Patry
Perkins
Poilievre
Raitt
Rathgeber
Reid
Richards
Saxton
Schellenberger
Sgro
Shipley
Smith
Sorenson
St-Denis
Sweet
Toet
Trottier
Truppe
Valeriot
Van Loan
Vellacott
Warawa
Watson
Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Williamson
Woodworth

Barlow
Bélanger
Benoit
Bernier
Blaney
Boughen
Breitkreuz
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Barrie)
Byrne
Calkins
Carmichael
Casey
Clarke
Crockatt
Daniel
Dechert
Dion
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Eyking
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Fletcher
Freeland
Galipeau
Gill
Goguen
Goodale
Gosal
Grewal
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes
Hoback
Hsu
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lamoureux
Lauzon
Leaf
Lemieux
Lobb
Lunney
MacKenzie
Mayes
McColeman
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Menegakis
Nicholson
Oliver
Opitz
Pacetti
Payne
Plamondon
Preston
Rajotte
Regan
Rempel
Rickford
Scarpaleggia
Seeback
Shea
Shory
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Tilson
Trost
Trudeau
Valcourt
Van Kesteren
Vaughan
Wallace
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Wilks
Wong
Yelich

Young (Oakville)
Zimmer — 183
Angus
Atamanenko
Benskin
Blanchette
Boivin
Boulerice
Brahmi
Caron
Charlton
Choquette
Comartin
Crowder
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Freeman
Genest
Giguère
Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)
Hyer
Kellway
Latendresse
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Marston
Mathysen
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Mourani
Nantel
Nicholls
Papillon
Perreault
Rafferty
Ravignat
Rousseau
Scott
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Stewart
Sullivan
Tremblay

Young (Vancouver South)

NAYS

Members

Ashton
Ayala
Bevington
Blanchette-Lamothe
Borg
Boutin-Sweet
Brousseau
Cash
Chicoine
Christopherson
Côté
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dewar
Donnelly
Dubé
Dusseau
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Godin
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hughes
Julian
Lapointe
Laverdière
Leslie
Mai
Masse
May
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Mulcair
Nash
Nunez-Melo
Péclet
Quach
Rankin
Raynault
Sandhu
Sellah
Sitsabaiesan
Stoffer
Toone
Turmel — 88

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—ECONOMIC SITUATION

The House resumed from January 27 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion relating to the business of supply.

● (1845)

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

(Division No. 315)

YEAS

Members

Andrews
Ashton
Ayala

Angus
Atamanenko
Bélanger

Private Members' Business

Bennett	Benskin	Daniel	Davidson
Bevington	Blanchette	Dechert	Devolin
Blanchette-Lamothe	Boivin	Dreeschen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Borg	Boulerice	Dykstra	Eglinski
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi	Falk	Fantino
Brison	Brosseau	Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Byrne	Caron	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Casey	Cash	Galipeau	Gallant
Charlton	Chicoine	Gill	Glover
Choquette	Christopherson	Goguen	Goldring
Comartin	Côté	Goodyear	Gosal
Crowder	Cullen	Gourde	Grewal
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day	Hawn	Hayes
Dewar	Dion	Hillyer	Hoback
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly	Holder	James
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Dubourg	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseau	Kerr	Komarnicki
Easter	Eyking	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Fortin	Freeland	Lauson	Leaf
Freeman	Fry	Leitch	Lemieux
Garrison	Genest	Leung	Lobb
Genest-Jourdain	Giguère	Lukiwski	Lunney
Godin	Goodale	MacKenzie	Maguire
Groguhé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Mayes	McColeman
Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu	McLeod	Menegakis
Hughes	Hyer	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Julian	Kellway	Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Nicholson	Norlock
Larose	Latendresse	Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	Opitz	O'Toole
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie	Payne	Perkins
Liu	MacAulay	Poilievre	Preston
Mai	Marston	Raitt	Rajotte
Masse	Mathysen	Reid	Rempel
May	McCallum	Richards	Rickford
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Saxton	Schellenberger
Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Seeback	Shea
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Shipley	Shory
Mourani	Mulcair	Smith	Sopuck
Murray	Nantel	Sorenson	Stanton
Nash	Nicholls	Strahl	Sweet
Nunez-Melo	Pacetti	Tilson	Toet
Papillon	Patry	Trost	Trottier
Péclet	Perreault	Truppe	Valcourt
Plamondon	Quach	Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Rafferty	Rankin	Vellacott	Wallace
Rathgeber	Ravignat	Warawa	Warkentin
Raynault	Regan	Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Rousseau	Sandhu	Sky Country)	
Scarpaleggia	Scott	Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Sellah	Sgro	Williamson	Wong
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan	Woodworth	Yelich
St-Denis	Stewart	Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Stoffer	Sullivan	Zimmer— 147	
Toone	Tremblay		
Trudeau	Turmel		
Valeriotte	Vaughan— 124		

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Aspin	Baird
Barlow	Bateman
Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Bezan
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Crockatt

Nil

PAIRED**The Speaker:** I declare the motion defeated.**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS***[English]***AMENDMENTS TO THE STANDING ORDERS**

The House resumed consideration from December 10, 2014 of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 535, under private members' business.

● (1855)

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

*Private Members' Business**(Division No. 316)***YEAS**

Members

Fortin	Hyer
Larose	May
Patry	Perreault
Plamondon	Rathgeber — 8

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Angus	Armstrong
Ashton	Aspin
Atamanenko	Ayala
Baird	Barlow
Bateman	Bélanger
Bennett	Benoit
Benskin	Bergen
Bernier	Bevington
Bezan	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Blaney
Bloch	Boivin
Borg	Boughen
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brison
Brosseau	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Butt	Byrne
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Caron	Carrie
Casey	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Clarke
Clement	Comartin
Côté	Crockatt
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Daniel
Davidsen	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day	Dechert
Devolin	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dreeshen	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault	Dykstra
Easter	Eglinski
Eyking	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finlay (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Freeland
Freeman	Galipeau
Gallant	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Gill
Glover	Godin
Goguen	Goldring
Goodale	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Grewal	Groguhé
Harper	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	Hsu
Hughes	James
Julian	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kellway
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki

Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Latendresse	Lauzon
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leslie	Leung
Liu	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacAulay	MacKenzie
Maguire	Mai
Marston	Masse
Mathysen	Mayes
McCallum	McColeman
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McLeod	Menegakis
Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Mourani	Mulcair
Murray	Nantel
Nash	Nicholls
Nicholson	Norlock
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Pacetti	Papillon
Payne	Pécellet
Perkins	Poillievre
Preston	Quach
Rafferty	Raitt
Rajotte	Rankin
Ravignat	Raynault
Regan	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rickford	Rousseau
Sandhu	Saxton
Scarpaleggia	Schellenberger
Scott	Seeback
Sellah	Sgro
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	St-Denis
Stewart	Stoffer
Strahl	Sullivan
Sweet	Tilson
Toet	Toone
Tremblay	Trost
Trottier	Trudeau
Truppe	Turmel
Valcourt	Valeriotte
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vaughan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Zimmer — 260

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

*[Translation]***REDUCING THE EFFECTS OF URBAN HEAT ISLANDS
ACT**

The House resumed from December 11, 2014, consideration of the motion that Bill C-579, An Act to reduce the effects of urban heat islands on the health of Canadians, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Private Members' Business

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-579, under private members' business.

● (1905)

[English]

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

(Division No. 317)

YEAS

Members

Andrews	Angus
Ashton	Atamanenko
Ayala	Bélangier
Bennett	Benskin
Bevington	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Boivin
Borg	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Brison	Brosseau
Byrne	Caron
Casey	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Choquette	Christopherson
Comartin	Côté
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dubé	Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseauit	Easter
Eyking	Fortin
Freeland	Freeman
Fry	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Godin
Goodale	Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu	Hughes
Hyer	Julian
Kellway	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larose
Latendresse	Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leslie	Liu
MacAulay	Mai
Marston	Masse
Mathysen	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Patry	Péclet
Perreault	Plamondon
Quach	Rafferty
Rankin	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Rousseau	Sandhu
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
St-Denis	Stewart
Stoffer	Sullivan
Toone	Tremblay
Trudeau	Turmel
Valeriote	Vaughan— 122

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Allison	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Aspin	Baird
Barlow	Bateman
Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Bezan
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Crockatt
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Devolin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Eglinski
Falk	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Galipeau	Gallant
Gill	Glover
Goguen	Goldring
Goodyear	Gosal
Gourde	Grewal
Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mayer	McColeman
McLeod	Menegakis
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Nicholson	Norlock
Oliver	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Payne	Perkins
Poillievre	Preston
Raitt	Rajotte
Rathgeber	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rickford	Saxton
Schellenberger	Seeback
Shea	Shiple
Shory	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Strahl
Sweet	Tilson
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Truppe
Valcourt	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Zimmer— 148

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

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

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[English]

HEALTH

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago, maternal health outcomes on Nishnawbe Aski Nation were more in line with the results we see in third world locations. The institution of the mobile ultrasound program has brought those outcomes in line with the successes we enjoy across Canada. The program can be characterized as a real success story and is something we can be proud of.

In November, I raised a question about the program, which was struggling to acquire appropriate equipment that would also have a positive cost benefit. Put another way, we could be getting more bang for our buck. This issue is coming to the forefront, as the current sonographer expects to retire in the next few years, and any replacement will inherit an aging and burdensome system that must be lugged from community to community.

The minister informed me that she would be happy to look into the issue and would get back to me. Officials in her office contacted mine, and we put them in touch with the stakeholder who had flagged the problem with me in the first place. It seemed that there would be movement on the issue, and the ministry would make some headway on a problem that, if addressed, could save taxpayers a significant amount of money over time while ensuring that positive maternal health outcomes were protected in the remote communities of the Nishnawbe Aski Nation.

In December, an official in the minister's office contacted the current sonographer and suggested he contact the director of nursing in Ontario to see if that office could provide funding or had other ideas about where money might come from. I think that is called downloading.

Although it sounded as if everyone was supportive of the project and might be able to access funds through a provincial body, a meeting that was arranged for the period leading up to Christmas was cancelled and was supposed to be rescheduled for some time in January. So far, nothing has happened, and the month is almost done.

While the outcomes have improved, the job of the sonographer is truly taxing. The current and only sonographer to date carries hundreds of pounds of specialized equipment into remote communities to meet with expectant mothers. As I mentioned earlier, this person is planning for his retirement and is attempting to modernize the equipment to create a deeper pool of potential replacements. The equipment used is effective but heavy.

Adjournment Proceedings

Much has changed in 19 years, including the design of mobile ultrasound equipment. Now it is possible to have two-part machines with a heavier base and detachable computer type components that have been described to me as a brain the sonographer carries from location to location.

The last time the program needed equipment replaced there was a six-month gap during which Health Canada spent half a million dollars moving patients to permanent machines in Sioux Lookout.

The best option may be to equip these communities with the two-part scanners at a one-time cost of \$15,000 each. It would allow the program to carry on with a larger pool of eligible replacement sonographers and to maintain the best health outcomes at the same time.

It is a solution that would best protect these communities and our precious tax dollars. Will the Minister of Health decide to save taxpayers money and buy the scanners?

• (1910)

Ms. Eve Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I stand in the House today to speak to our government's continued support for sonograph services to ensure better maternal and child health outcomes for first nations in northwestern Ontario.

This year alone our government is investing over \$23 million to support healthy child development programming and services in first nation communities in Ontario. The maternal child health program specifically has received \$4 million in the 2014-15 fiscal year.

In addition to the maternal child health program, Canada also invests \$2 million per year in the Canada prenatal nutrition program for first nations in Ontario. This program focuses on pregnant women and women with infants up to 12 months of age, supporting activities related to nutrition screening, education and counselling, maternal nourishment and breastfeeding promotion and support.

Our government also supports a number of other programs and services related to maternal and child health for first nations in Ontario. These include the aboriginal head start on reserve program, the fetal alcohol spectrum disorder program and the children's oral health initiative.

This support is paying off. Indeed, we are seeing significant improvements in first nation communities with this programming, such as higher proportions of first nation children being breastfed for longer than six months, and increased screening for developmental milestones, prenatal risk factors and existing health conditions.

Specifically on the issue of the provision of ultrasounds, through the maternal child health program, Health Canada funds the Sioux Lookout Meno Ya Win Health Centre to provide ultrasound services to remote communities in northwestern Ontario, including travel for a sonographer to perform the ultrasounds.

Adjournment Proceedings

In response to the questions posed by the official opposition's deputy critic for aboriginal health, under the arrangement with the health centre, if the current sonographer retires, it is expected that the health centre will undergo a recruitment strategy to ensure continued ultrasound-sonography services.

Further, the deputy critic had concerns over the weight of the equipment, suggesting that it could adversely affect qualified women from being recruited. I understand that the previous mobile unit weighed in excess of 100 pounds. However, Health Canada invested in a new unit in 2013, which weighs approximately 10 to 15 pounds.

Regarding concerns about the weight of additional supplies that are also carried from community to community, I understand that it is possible that a stock supply of support items, such as paperwork, ultrasound bags and scan gel, be sent to the communities in advance and that Health Canada's nursing stations are willing to hold these supplies for the sonographer's use exclusively.

I understand that the sonographer must also carry a cart, which holds the ultrasound equipment during a procedure, from community to community. To further reduce the weight burden for the sonographer, my departmental officials will open a dialogue with the Sioux Lookout Meno Ya Win Health Centre to explore options for purchasing sonography carts which can remain on site in high volume communities.

Regarding options other than having the sonographer travel, the option of bringing clients to a central location for scans is not an ideal resolution to this issue. For example, in 2013-14, through funding provided by Health Canada, the sonographer made 35 trips to remote communities in northwestern Ontario and conducted 634 ultrasounds. It would be more cost-effective and efficient for the sonographer to travel than for the clients to travel.

Purchasing ultrasound equipment for each of the remote communities would also not result in actual savings, as a sonographer would still be required to travel to the community to perform the procedure. Moreover, there would be costs associated with maintaining the equipment.

The current system of having the sonographer carry the equipment to the community, even though it may result in overweight baggage charges, is still more cost-effective.

In closing, our Government remains committed to working with our partners to improve the health outcomes for these women.

• (1915)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the suggestion I made or the sonographer made is a practical solution that most people would like the government to adopt. We recognize that there is a great deal of bureaucracy in this process. However, at the end of the day, the federal government is responsible for the health of aboriginal people and first nations.

[*English*]

The government has spent much money moving patients to permanent scanners, which costs more than this solution does.

Additionally, when the program seeks a replacement sonographer, the pool, as I indicated, will be limited to those who can both perform the specialized work and lug around a couple of hundred pounds of equipment too.

Finally, equipment available today may not be in the future, and costs only go in one direction for highly technical machines.

As I said before, we could be proud of the outcomes we have achieved on the Nishnawbe Aski Nation, but we should also look to achieve those at the best possible price. To have additional machines in these communities is the one that makes more sense, because the more we lug machines around, the more chances there are that something will break.

Will the Minister of Health find a way to address this issue and ensure best maternal health outcomes at the best possible price?

Ms. Eve Adams: Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify that our department will continue to support mobile sonography services to northwestern Ontario.

Through budget 2010, a five-year funding cycle for the maternal child health program was announced. At this stage of the funding cycle, our government is demonstrating strong stewardship in reviewing all the evidence and outcomes from those investments.

This year alone, our government is investing over \$23 million to support healthy child development programming and services in first nations in Ontario. This includes approximately \$4 million for the maternal child health program in Ontario, and \$2 million specifically for the Ontario region first nations and Inuit component of the Canada prenatal nutrition program.

In closing, I assure the member that these programs and services support healthy pregnancies, healthy births, and healthy child development for first nations in Ontario.

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has good drinking water generally, though we do face challenges with emerging contaminants.

That said, not all Canadians enjoy the same quality of drinking water. As we know, there are no enforceable national drinking water standards in Canada. Drinking water quality thus varies by province. Within provincial boundaries, there are problems with drinking water in rural areas, where accessibility to quality drinking water does not match what is available in urban Canada. Rural drinking water advisories are fairly commonplace.

Adjournment Proceedings

As we know all too well, drinking water quality on first nation reserves is nowhere near what it should be in a country like Canada. Instead of implementing legislation, regulations, and standards that would bring first nations' drinking water to the highest national standards, the government has opened the door to allowing drinking water on reserves to meet only provincial standards, which vary across the country and are not uniformly the highest possible.

My earlier question period intervention, which we are debating this evening, was in response to the 2014 summer Ecojustice report card on the state of Canadian drinking water.

The report begins with the question:

What country is doing the most to ensure its citizens have the safest glass of water?

Australia? Canada? The Netherlands? If you guessed Canada—unfortunately—you're wrong.

That is what the report said.

To quote further from the report:

In dozens of instances, the Canadian Guidelines are weaker than those in other jurisdictions and at risk of falling farther behind. In many more cases, Canada has no standard for substances where other countries do.

What is the government doing, even within the current framework for governing voluntary drinking water standards, to ensure Canada has the best drinking water in the world, nationwide?

• (1920)

Ms. Eve Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, safe drinking water is essential to the life and health of every Canadian every day, and our drinking water is among the safest in the world.

While drinking water is primarily an area of provincial and territorial jurisdiction, Health Canada also plays a central role in helping Canadian jurisdictions ensure the safety of drinking water supplies from coast to coast by working in close collaboration with all provinces and territories to establish the guidelines for Canadian drinking water quality. These guidelines are developed to be protective of public health. They are based on robust science and take into consideration the ability to measure and treat the contaminant in drinking water.

The guidelines are developed for specific drinking water contaminants through the federal-provincial-territorial committee on drinking water. They are intended to apply to all drinking water supplies in Canada, whether public or private, from surface or groundwater sources. Provinces and territories use them as a basis to establish their own requirements for drinking water quality and implement them in accordance with their priorities for protecting public health. They are also used as a reference in federal legislation to ensure the safety of drinking water in areas of federal jurisdiction.

Health Canada has scientists and other professionals dedicated to the development and review of drinking water guidelines. The process to determine priorities for guideline development is rigorous and includes biannual reviews conducted in collaboration with the provinces and territories. In addition to review of new and emerging science, the priority-setting process takes into consideration the needs of individual jurisdictions and Canadian exposure levels.

The development of drinking water guidelines also relies on international partnerships. Health Canada is a World Health Organization collaborating centre on water quality and has a longstanding partnership with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in the area of drinking water quality.

The quality of drinking water depends on the quality of water in the environment. A drinking water contaminant in Australia, for example, is not necessarily a concern in Canada or the United States. This means that the substances that need to be monitored and controlled in drinking water will vary from country to country.

Our approach is to establish guidelines for contaminants that are likely to be found in drinking water supplies at levels that could pose a risk to human health for people living here in Canada. There are other differences that need to be taken into consideration.

While in some cases other jurisdictions may have very stringent standards, it is important to note that they are not necessarily based on scientific evidence. Our government understands the importance of ensuring that critical decisions about the health and safety of Canadians must always be based on the best available science. That is why Health Canada always stays up-to-date on the latest evidence regarding drinking water quality and ensures that our guidelines live up to the highest international standards for safety and quality. We encourage all jurisdictions to do the same and are pleased to partner with countries that also take a science-based approach.

Although the guidelines are considered to be non-regulatory, they are adopted and enforced as standards by all Canadian jurisdictions, either through specific legislation and regulations or through permitting of treatment plants. This collaborative approach respects regional and local differences related to the presence of certain contaminants and provides national consistency and economies of scale while reducing duplication. Our collaborative system also provides the flexibility needed to address emergency situations such as spills or leaks.

Health Canada can develop drinking water screening values for contaminants for which there is no existing drinking water guideline. This is done at the request of a provincial or territorial agency or federal department using the scientific information available at the time of the request. Such screening values can be developed over a period of 24 hours to two weeks, depending on the urgency of the request and the availability of the data. Over the past five years, Health Canada has developed approximately 30 drinking water screening values to address such issues.

The Government of Canada is committed to safe drinking water for all Canadians. Drinking water in Canada is among the safest in the world, and this is built on effective collaboration with all of our provincial and territorial partners.

Adjournment Proceedings

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia: Mr. Speaker, as pointed out in the Ecojustice report and in my question period intervention, there are 189 substances regulated in other countries for which Canada has no standard. It is of concern, for example, that Canada has the weakest standard for the common herbicide 2,4-D, even though long-term exposure can damage the nervous system, liver, and kidneys, and it is considered a possible human carcinogen.

In addition, Canada has no goal, guideline, or standard for styrene, whereas the U.S., Australia, and the World Health Organization have set a maximum allowable limit for this substance in drinking water.

Why is the government not taking these contaminants more seriously? What is lacking? Is it resources, political will, or both?

• (1925)

Ms. Eve Adams: Mr. Speaker, the quality and safety of drinking water in Canada cannot be understood by comparing the number of guidelines in a given jurisdiction. It has been stated that there are 189 substances for which Canada has no guideline. However, it is important to note that this number does not take into consideration

the number of substances that are not in use, that are banned in Canada, or that are simply not found in our drinking water.

I also note that the same report that identified the 189 substances also indicated that 78 of those substances are not in use in Canada, and that another six are banned.

Our guidelines are protective of health, respect our jurisdictional responsibilities, and are complemented by the flexibility to address emergency situations. We also need to remember that drinking water quality is more than just drinking water guidelines. It also requires the adoption and implementation of multi-barrier approaches to prevent the contamination of drinking water sources in the environment, as promoted by Health Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:28 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS			
David Wynn		Mr. Harper	10731
Mr. Rathgeber	10727	Mr. Mulcair	10731
Hearthstone Community Campaign		Mr. Harper	10731
Mr. Komarnicki	10727	Veterans Affairs	
Quebec Winter Carnival		Mr. Mulcair	10731
Mr. Blanchette	10727	Mr. Harper	10732
North Korea		Taxation	
Mr. Hiebert	10728	Mr. Trudeau	10732
Don Harron		Mr. Harper	10732
Mr. Easter	10728	Mr. Trudeau	10732
Joe Rotman		Mr. Harper	10732
Mr. Kent	10728	Veterans Affairs	
Jesse Tait		Mr. Trudeau	10732
Mr. Rafferty	10728	Mr. Harper	10732
Derek Walton		Intergovernmental Affairs	
Mr. Brown (Barrie)	10728	Mr. Caron	10732
Mental Health		Mr. Calandra	10732
Mr. Dykstra	10729	Mr. Caron	10733
Affordable Housing		Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	10733
Ms. Papillon	10729	Employment	
Public Safety		Mrs. Groguhé	10733
Mrs. Grewal	10729	Mr. Kenney	10733
The Economy		Mr. Tremblay	10733
Ms. Freeman	10729	Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	10733
Manufacturing Industry		Ms. Liu	10733
Mr. Butt	10729	Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	10733
Mental Health		Ms. Mathysen	10734
Ms. Fry	10730	Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	10734
Taxation		Ms. Sims	10734
Mr. MacKenzie	10730	Mr. Kenney	10734
Liberal Party of Canada		Ms. Nash	10734
Mr. Cash	10730	Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	10734
Taxation		Mr. Cullen	10734
Ms. Bateman	10730	Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	10734
ORAL QUESTIONS		Foreign Affairs	
Employment		Ms. Freeland	10735
Mr. Mulcair	10731	Mr. Baird	10735
Mr. Harper	10731	The Economy	
Taxation		Mr. Brison	10735
Mr. Mulcair	10731	Mr. Oliver	10735
Mr. Harper	10731	Infrastructure	
National Defence		Mr. Vaughan	10735
Mr. Mulcair	10731	Mr. Braid	10735
		National Defence	
		Mr. Harris (St. John's East)	10735
		Mr. Nicholson	10735
		Ms. Michaud	10736
		Mr. Nicholson	10736

Privacy

Ms. Michaud	10736
Mr. Fantino	10736
Mr. Harris (St. John's East)	10736
Mr. Fantino	10736

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Opitz	10736
Mr. Harper	10736

Public Works and Government Services

Ms. Leslie	10736
Ms. Finley	10737
Mr. Dubé	10737
Ms. Finley	10737

Ethics

Mr. Ravignat	10737
Ms. Raitt	10737
Mr. Angus	10737
Ms. Raitt	10737

Veterans Affairs

Mr. Eyking	10737
Mr. O'Toole	10737
Mr. Cuzner	10737
Mr. O'Toole	10737

Disaster Assistance

Ms. Ashton	10738
Mr. Blaney	10738

Rail Transportation

Mr. Mai	10738
Ms. Raitt	10738

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Warkentin	10738
Mr. Baird	10738

National Defence

Ms. Murray	10738
Mr. Nicholson	10738

Canadian Heritage

Ms. Papillon	10738
Mrs. Glover	10739

Public Safety

Mr. Sweet	10739
Mr. Blaney	10739

Rail Transportation

Mrs. Hughes	10739
Ms. Raitt	10739

Natural Resources

Mr. Hyer	10739
Mr. Rickford	10739

Points of Order**Oral Questions**

Mr. Julian	10739
Ms. May	10739

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**Foreign Affairs**

Mr. Anderson	10740
--------------------	-------

Committees of the House**Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities**

Mr. McColeman	10740
Mrs. Groguhé	10740

Health

Mr. Lobb	10740
----------------	-------

Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act

Mr. Dubé	10740
Bill C-650. Introduction and first reading	10740
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	10740

Canadian Railway Museum Act

Mr. Chicoine	10740
Bill C-651. Introduction and first reading	10740
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	10741

Petitions**Canada Post**

Mr. Côté	10741
----------------	-------

Impaired Driving

Mr. Warawa	10741
------------------	-------

Sex Selection

Mr. Warawa	10741
------------------	-------

Agriculture

Mrs. Groguhé	10741
--------------------	-------

Abortion

Mr. Calkins	10741
-------------------	-------

Sex Selection

Mr. Calkins	10741
-------------------	-------

Firearms Registry

Mr. Calkins	10741
-------------------	-------

Agriculture

Mr. Atamanenko	10741
----------------------	-------

International Development

Mr. Atamanenko	10741
----------------------	-------

The Environment

Mr. Hyer	10742
----------------	-------

CBC/Radio-Canada

Mr. Kellway	10742
-------------------	-------

Housing

Ms. May	10742
---------------	-------

Security Certificates

Ms. May	10742
---------------	-------

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Lukiwski	10742
--------------------	-------

Motions for Papers

Mr. Lukiwski	10742
--------------------	-------

Privilege**Statements by Prime Minister Regarding Canadian Forces in Iraq**

Mr. Harris (St. John's East)	10742
------------------------------------	-------

Mr. Lamoureux.....	10745
Mr. Van Loan.....	10745
Mr. Julian.....	10746

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Protection of Canada from Terrorists Act

Bill C-44—Time Allocation.

Mr. Van Loan.....	10747
Mr. Julian.....	10747
Mr. Blaney.....	10747
Mr. Lamoureux.....	10747
Mr. Garrison.....	10748
Ms. May.....	10748
Mr. Blanchette.....	10749
Mr. Hawn.....	10749
Mr. Côté.....	10750
Mr. Easter.....	10750
Motion agreed to.....	10752

Report Stage

Bill C-44. Report Stage.....	10752
Mr. Kramp.....	10752
Mr. Côté.....	10753
Mr. Easter.....	10754
Mr. Genest-Jourdain.....	10754
Ms. James.....	10756
Mr. Lamoureux.....	10756
Mr. Côté.....	10756

Mr. Payne.....	10756
(Motions Nos. 1 and 2 negatived).....	10757
Motions Nos. 3, 4 and 5 negatived.....	10758
Mr. Blaney.....	10758
Motion for Concurrence.....	10758
Motion agreed to.....	10759

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Economic Situation

Motion.....	10759
Motion negatived.....	10760

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Amendments to the Standing Orders

Motion No. 535.....	10760
Motion negatived.....	10761

Reducing the Effects of Urban Heat Islands Act

Bill C-579. Second reading.....	10762
Motion negatived.....	10763

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Health

Mrs. Hughes.....	10763
Ms. Adams.....	10763
Mr. Scarpaleggia.....	10764
Ms. Adams.....	10765

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>