



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 146 • NUMBER 124 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, May 15, 2012
(Part A)

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, May 15, 2012

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1005)

[*English*]

CANADA-COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Hon. Ed Fast (Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 15.1 of the Canada-Colombia Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act and for referral to the Standing Committee on International Trade, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, copies of the annual report pursuant to the Agreement Concerning Annual Reports on Human Rights and Free Trade Between Canada and the Republic of Colombia.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

HOUSING

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, I have the honour to present a portion of a petition signed by nearly 30,000 Quebecers who are asking the federal government to reinvest in social housing. Many Quebecers and Canadians do not have housing security, yet it is key to their success and their contribution to society. The almost 10,000 people who signed this portion of the petition are asking the government to invest in social housing.

Mrs. Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will present two petitions today.

One of them is part of a petition signed by 27,000 people all across Canada. The part that I am presenting today has over 6,000 signatures, about a quarter of the total number of signatures. This petition asks, first, that the existing budgets, which are insufficient for the renovation, improvement and modernization of social housing, be maintained. Second, the petition asks that the government commit to maintaining the long-term funding granted to social housing units built before 1994, particularly those that subsidize low-income tenants so that they can pay rent calculated according to their income.

The government must therefore maintain existing subsidies and renew them when they expire to provide these people with affordable housing.

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mrs. Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the second petition asks that a vote not be held in the House on Bill C-31 and that the government set the bill aside because it represents a step backwards for refugees and immigrants.

I am very pleased to present this petition, which is supported by a number of organizations, including the Carrefour communautaire de Rosemont, the Organisation populaire des droits sociaux de Montréal and CANA, an organization in my riding of which I am very proud.

[*English*]

ABORTION

Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present a petition from residents in my riding, as well as from across southern Alberta. This petition asks the Government of Canada to enact legislation to restrict abortions. Canada is the only nation in the western world without abortion laws.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition signed by constituents from my riding of Halifax. This petition is a Canadian interfaith call for leadership and action on climate change. The petition recognizes that global warming is a reality and that despite the government's rhetoric of a commitment to decreasing greenhouse gas emissions, Canadian levels have continued to rise.

The petitioners are calling for the implementation of a binding international agreement to replace the Kyoto protocol. This agreement would commit nations to a reduction in carbon emissions and to a national renewable energy policy. If we are serious about ensuring global average temperatures to stay below a 2°C increase from pre-industrial levels, fair, clean carbon emission targets must be set and implemented.

Like so many Canadians, these constituents recognize that the Conservative government is failing to protect our environment. Both the petitioners and I look forward to the minister's response.

Routine Proceedings

AIR CANADA

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to present a petition from individual residents in the province of Manitoba asking the government to take necessary action in order to protect the aerospace jobs that have been lost at Aveos. These constituents and other Manitobans feel quite passionately that the government and, in particular, the Prime Minister, have dropped the ball by not holding Air Canada accountable to the Air Canada Public Participation Act, which would have guaranteed those overall maintenance jobs for the city of Winnipeg, Ontario and Quebec.

[*Translation*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

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

The first pertains to human rights. Most of the petitioners live in Calgary and are concerned about human rights in China.

• (1010)

[*English*]

Particularly, the petitioners speak to the rights of the Falun Gong and Falun Dafa and ask that Parliament and the current Prime Minister do whatever is possible to remind China about the need to progress with human rights, and not just through a Communist form of capitalism.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the next petition relates to the ongoing threat of supertankers and pipelines across British Columbia.

The signators are from British Columbia, from many spots within it, from my own riding, from Victoria, Brentwood Bay, Saturna, Kelowna area, Summerland and also from Ottawa. They call on this House to respect the current environmental assessment process as it exists before Bill C-38 and to have a full, fair and transparent inquiry.

PENSIONS

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions. The first is from Canadians of all ages who are very concerned about the proposed changes to the old age security program. They regard it as a direct attack on the poorest seniors of the present and the future. They are calling on the government to rescind any idea of increasing the age for pensions for Canadians from 65 to 67.

My second petition calls upon the Government of Canada to increase the guaranteed income supplement so that all seniors may be relieved from the poverty they now face. The current government process does not provide adequate GIS so that all seniors are safe from poverty.

FISHING INDUSTRY

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of a large number of Prince Edward Islanders who are very concerned about the fishing industry.

The petitioners want to inform the Prime Minister and the government that the removal of the DFO fleet separation and owner-operator policies form the backbone of the Atlantic inshore and mid-shore fishery would directly affect over 30,000 jobs in the fishing industry, end the independence of our fishery and have a devastating effect on coastal communities throughout the region.

The Conservative government has refused to properly consult with our fishers on this issue. The Conservative government has refused to answer the question on these policies and has voted down a motion to hear from the affected stakeholders, and study what the effects of the removal of the policies would have on Atlantic Canada and coastal Quebec.

Complete corporate control of the fishery has proven, in many areas, to be devastating to the income, economy and social fabric of the coastal regions, such as British Columbia, New Zealand and Iceland.

The petitioners call on the Prime Minister to maintain and strengthen fleet separation and the owner-operator policies.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 564, 568 and 569.

[*Text*]

Question No. 564—**Mr. Pierre Jacob:**

With respect to the Portland-Montreal Pipe Line (PMPL) pipeline between Montréal and Portland: (a) what environmental assessments have been carried out on this project since 2002; (b) what plans are in place to modify or upgrade the pipeline; and (c) as concerns the emergency plan of the company that operates the pipeline, (i) does it comply with existing regulations to minimize the environmental risks resulting from accidents, (ii) has it been reviewed by the National Energy Board?

Mr. David Anderson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), the National Energy Board, NEB, regulates pipelines owned and operated by Montreal Pipe Line Limited. The NEB has not completed any environmental assessments under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act for projects by Montreal Pipe Line Limited since 2002.

However, the NEB continues to monitor the pipeline to ensure that it is safe. For example, as part of the six applications from Montreal Pipe Line Limited for deactivation or decommissioning of pipelines and one application for transfer of ownership of a pipeline received by the NEB, the environmental issues were considered as part of its public interest mandate in its regulatory decision-making under the National Energy Board Act.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to (b), no application to modify or upgrade the pipeline has been submitted to the NEB at this time.

With regard to (c), the current emergency manuals on file with the NEB are as follows: integrated contingency plan—Portland Pipe Line and Montreal Pipe Line Limited—part A; Montreal Pipe Line Limited oil spill specific response plans—part B; emergency response action plan—part C; and Montreal pipeline system and Montreal east terminal and north tank field.

The manuals include information on critical areas to protect, environmental and socio-economic sensitivities and wildlife protection and rehabilitation.

An emergency response manual assessment was conducted by the NEB on June 21, 2010. Furthermore, a critical information check was conducted on January 5, 2012. Based on these assessments, it was noted that Montreal Pipe Line Limited has an incomplete “incident” definition based on NEB reporting requirements, as the company omitted the full definition of “incident” as outlined in the Onshore Pipeline Regulations. In addition, the roles and responsibilities of the NEB were not properly defined.

The NEB sent a letter to Montreal Pipe Line Limited, identifying the areas needing correction to satisfy the NEB requirements and requesting that the company file revisions to its emergency manual. In a letter sent to the NEB on April 19, 2012, Montreal Pipe Line Limited stated that it had received the NEB’s request. The company also filed draft revisions to its emergency procedures manual. Once the NEB reviews the proposed changes and is satisfied, Montreal Pipe Line Limited will be notified, and it will file the revised emergency procedures manual with the NEB.

Question No. 568—Hon. John McCallum:

With regard to the government's planned advertising campaign for the budget tabled on March 29, 2012: (a) what is the total estimated cost of planned advertising for the budget; and (b) what is the estimated cost of planned advertising broken down by the mediums of (i) television, (ii) radio, (iii) movie theatres, (iv) online video game environments, (v) internet ads, (vi) trade publications, (vii) billboards or other signage, (viii) print?

Mrs. Shelly Glover (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, no advertising campaign was undertaken for the budget of March, 29, 2012.

Question No. 569—Hon. John McCallum:

With regard to the government's planned advertising campaign for the budget tabled on March 29, 2012, for every instance of an advertisement: (a) what is the medium of the ad; (b) where did or will the ad appear (location, television station, radio station, publication, etc.); (c) what is the duration or size of the ad; (d) when was the ad displayed or when will it be displayed; and (e) what is the cost of the ad?

Mrs. Shelly Glover (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, no advertising campaign was undertaken for the budget of March 29, 2012.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 563, 565, 566, 567, 570, 572, 573, 574 and 575

could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 563—Mr. Rodger Cuzner:

With respect to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA): (a) how many new employees were hired in the last five years, broken down by year; (b) how many ACOA employees over the last five years received full-time French language training, broken down by (i) province of employment, (ii) location where they received the French language training; (c) what is ACOA's policy regarding the length of time for which a job posting should be advertised; and (d) in the last five years, what was the length of time of each job posting for all management positions posted by ACOA?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 565—Hon. Judy Sgro:

With regard to possible tax evasion in Liechtenstein as of March 23, 2012: (a) since receiving the names of 106 Canadians with accounts in Liechtenstein, have any other Canadians been identified as having undeclared bank accounts in Liechtenstein, and, in total, how many Canadians have now been identified as having undeclared bank accounts in Liechtenstein; (b) what actions have been taken by Canadian officials to recover unpaid taxes associated with Canadians' undeclared bank accounts in Liechtenstein; (c) how many identified Canadians have availed themselves of the Voluntary Disclosure Program with the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA); (d) how many identified Canadian accounts have settled with the CRA; (e) how much money has the CRA assessed as a result of investigating these secret bank accounts in Liechtenstein in (i) unpaid taxes, (ii) interest, (iii) fines, (iv) penalties; (f) how much of the money in (e) has been collected; (g) how many of the cases are under appeal; (h) how many cases remain open; (i) how many more cases does the CRA anticipate will be opened; (j) how many cases have been closed (i.e., the full amount of taxes, interest, fines and penalties have been collected); (k) how much money in (j) has been collected in (i) unpaid taxes, (ii) interest, (iii) fines, (iv) penalties; (l) how many account holders in the cases have made a partial payment; (m) of the partial payments made, what was the (i) largest amount, (ii) smallest amount, (iii) average amount; (n) how much does the CRA has yet to collect in (i) taxes, (ii) interest, (iii) fines, (iv) penalties; (o) of the amounts of money contained in the Liechtenstein accounts declared to or discovered by CRA, what was the (i) largest amount, (ii) smallest amount, (iii) average amount; (p) how many of the identified Canadians with bank accounts in Liechtenstein (i) have had their accounts audited, (ii) have had their accounts reassessed, (iii) have been the subject of a compliance action; (q) how many of the identified Canadians with bank accounts in Liechtenstein (i) have not had their accounts audited, (ii) have not had their accounts reassessed, (iii) have not been the subject of a compliance action; and (r) how many tax evasion charges have been laid?

(Return tabled)

Government Orders

Question No. 566—Ms. Kirsty Duncan:

With respect to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the oil sands: (a) what studies, if any, have been undertaken to estimate GHG emissions intensity for the oil sands, and, for each identified study, (i) who are its authors, (ii) what are its dates, (iii) what are its findings, (iv) what are its recommendations; (b) what briefing notes, memos, or any other documentation, if any, have been provided to the Prime Minister, Minister of Natural Resources, Minister of the Environment, their respective Parliamentary Secretaries, their respective Deputy Ministers, and their respective staff members, regarding GHG emissions intensity for the oil sands, and, for each, what were the findings and recommendations; (c) does the government have any information or evidence indicating that a shift towards the use of steam in oil sands extraction is accelerating GHG emissions, and, if so, what is this information or evidence; (d) how does the emissions intensity of mining compare to in situ production; (e) what are the details of the government's projections or of projections it possesses for (i) how GHG emissions will increase over the next decade, the next two decades, and the next three decades, (ii) how GHG emissions from the oil sands will compare to emissions from every other Canadian economic sector over the next decade, the next two decades, and the next three decades, (iii) how GHG emissions from the oil sands will compare to all Canadian economic sectors combined over the next decade, the next two decades, and the next three decades, (iv) how increasing GHG emissions will impact climate change over the next decade, the next two decades, and the next three decades; and (f) what are the findings and any recommendations of the discussion paper, "Estimating GHG Emissions Intensity for the Oil Sands Sector over Time" document DM/146926?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 567—Mr. Scott Andrews:

With regard to the Department of Natural Resources and, more specifically, a contract with Blair Franklin Capital Partners Inc. in the amount of \$898,350.00 that was awarded September 26, 2011, for financial advisory and investment banking services: (a) what are the full terms of engagement for this contract, including the start and end date, the scope of work involved, what specific projects and files Blair Franklin Capital Partners Inc. will review and provide advice on, and what the extent of this advice will be; and (b) if the Muskrat Falls project is one of the projects or files being assessed, has Blair Franklin Capital Partners Inc. received all the information it requested to complete its assessment of the Muskrat Falls project and what is the estimated completion date for this assessment?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 570—Hon. John McCallum:

With regard to search and rescue operations: (a) prior to January 31, 2012, what was the "standard protocol followed by JRCC" (Joint Rescue Coordination Centre) referred to in paragraph 5 of the memorandum from Major-General J.H. Vance to the Chief of Defence Staff, dated February 7, 2012, under file number 3120-1 (WH Ops 1-1); (b) in what document or documents was this standard protocol issued, laid down or promulgated; (c) what are or were the dates and file numbers of the documents in (b); and (d) have there been changes to this protocol since January 31, 2012, and, if so, (i) what is the nature of those changes, (ii) when were the changes made, (iii) when did the changes come into effect, (iv) in what document or documents were the changes issued, laid down or promulgated, (v) what are or were the dates and file numbers of those documents?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 572—Mr. Massimo Pacetti:

With regard to the Apprenticeship Job Creation Tax Credit, how many employers claimed the Apprenticeship Job Creation Tax Credit in each year from 2007 to 2012, broken down by (i) the type of apprentices employed, (ii) the number of apprentices employed, (iii) the total value of the tax credits claimed by each employer?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 573—Mr. Alexandre Boulerice:

With regard to all gifts and benefits with a value of over \$200 accepted, directly or indirectly, by the Prime Minister, all Cabinet Ministers, and their families, since 2006, by first and last name of the Member, in chronological order: (a) what are all gifts or benefits that were not forfeited to Her Majesty by December 7, 2011, and, for each such gift or benefit, (i) what was the date of receipt, (ii) what was the content, (iii) what was the monetary value; (b) what are all gifts and benefits forfeited to Her

Majesty by December 7, 2011, and, for each such gift or benefit, (i) what was the date of receipt, (ii) what was the date of forfeiture, (iii) what is its current location, (iv) what was the content, (v) what was the monetary value; and (c) what is the policy for recipients regarding which gifts are kept and which are forfeited?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 574—Mr. Alexandre Boulerice:

With regard to spending related to the preparation, presentation, and promotion of the March 2012 budget, how much was spent in the following areas, broken down by cost, date, location and description of expense: (a) travel; (b) accommodation; (c) office supplies; (d) promotional materials; and (e) miscellaneous expenses?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 575—Mr. Alexandre Boulerice:

With regard to the new Shared Services Canada initiative, what are: (a) the departmental sources of all budget transfers and of the amounts transferred as outlined in the Main Estimates 2012-2013; and (b) the departmental sources of all personnel transfers and the number of individuals transferred?

(Return tabled)

[English]

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

COPYRIGHT MODERNIZATION ACT

BILL C-11—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

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

That in relation to Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Copyright Act, 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.

[English]

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period. I would invite hon. members to try to keep their questions or comments to about a minute and the responses to a similar time. As we have done in the past, preference will be given to opposition MPs, but government MPs will have some turns in rotation as well.

The hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

Government Orders

•(1015)

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I must say that this is disappointing and discouraging, but not surprising from the government. It has shut down debate on 13 different bills since being election, and eight since January alone.

I think the most powerful thing in politics is to repeat back principles that people once had before they were in government. Therefore, they can understand why we may be frustrated and why Canadians may be frustrated.

I will to quote the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, who said:

These things do not build confidence with Canadians. The government also has a lack of respect for free votes in this place and the treatment of private members' bill.

I would ask government members to remind me if this sounds at all familiar to them. It has a lack of commitment to a democratically elected Senate. It has muzzled political free speech in its own backbenches as it invokes closure yet again.

The Minister of Public Safety said:

If the bill was the right thing to do, why did the Prime Minister do the wrong thing by invoking closure?

Lastly, I will invoke the words of the Prime Minister who said:

The interests of all of Canadians must be served, not the interests of politicians, not partisan interests or political self-interest.

Invoking closure in this manner on such an important bill is wrong. The government knew it when its members sat in opposition. However, they seem to have forgotten those principles about the need to have fair and democratic debate in this place. That is our job. That is the work we do for Canadians. Shutting down debate is wrong. They used to believe that. I would ask them now why they still do not.

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if by quoting me the hon. member is trying to sweet-talk me into supporting his leadership campaign, he is a bit late.

With regard to copyright reform, I would remind the House leader of the official opposition, all the opposition parties in this House, even my colleagues and certainly the public that this effort to modernize Canada's copyright legislation began more than two years ago. This is not legislation that we tabled yesterday and are taking this action on now. This is essential for Canada's digital economy, for our standard on the world scene and to ensure that those who are investing and those who are creating have rights that are clear in the digital age.

It has been 22 years since Canada's copyright regime has been seriously and substantively reformed in this way. We have taken action. We have consulted Canadians widely. We tabled Bill C-32 and re-tabled that legislation as Bill C-11. This debate has been going on for two and a half years. We think it is more than time to move forward. This legislation has been considered more than any other piece of legislation in any one of the last three Parliaments, and it is time to move forward.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is very clear is that the Prime Minister does not believe in

freedom of debate inside the House of Commons. Never before have we seen a majority government take this type of action in order to limit debate.

The government House leader waltzes in and introduces, yet again, time allocation. He does not even have the courage to directly answer specific questions as to why the government continues to limit debate inside this chamber on critically important pieces of legislation.

The government House leader does not have the ability to negotiate in good faith with opposition House leaders and it is at a substantial cost to democracy in Canada. We challenge the government to have the political courage to do the right thing, approach House leaders and sit down and negotiate in good faith. If the government does not have that ability, it is time the Prime Minister changed the government House leader in the House of Commons. What the government is doing is disrespectful—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Order, please. Members are reminded to try to keep questions and responses to approximately one minute.

The hon. Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Hon. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody can credibly stand in this place and suggest that our efforts to modernize Canada's copyright regime have not had substantive debate.

We have had two and a half years of consideration of this legislation. We set up a stand-alone legislative committee, apart from the heritage and industry committees, so that this legislation could be considered in-depth. We heard from tens of thousands of Canadians. We did consultations all across this country. We re-tabled the same legislation from the previous Parliament to continue the debate going forward. We have had days of debate in this Parliament and in a previous Parliament on this legislation.

After two and a half years, after having considered amendments, after having amended our own legislation with 11 specific amendments that came from those consultations, I think it is clear that this copyright bill has had two and a half years of substantive, non-partisan, effective debate, and it is time to move forward.

•(1020)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nycole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that this government, which claims to be democratic and open, is once again moving a closure motion on such an important bill as Bill C-11 on copyright.

I would like to read a 2002 quote from the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages:

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. This is a very important public policy question that is very complex and we have the arrogance of the government in invoking closure again. When we look at the Liberal Party [which was in power at the time] on arrogance it is like looking at the Grand Canyon. It is this big fact of nature that we cannot help but stare at.

Government Orders

I would like to know why, in the past, the Conservatives were completely against limiting debate, whereas today, they are fine with it even though we want to thoroughly debate the bill?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Industry and Minister of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, again, it is not reasonable for hon. members to rise in this House and say there has been no debate on this bill. On the contrary, there has been a tremendous amount of debate on it.

We reintroduced the same bill from the last Parliament in order to continue the debate that was held on Bill C-32 and on Bill C-11. We have been debating this for two and a half years. More than 10,000 consultations have been held across Canada.

My colleague, the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, can confirm that. He and the President of the Treasury Board were in charge of this file in the previous Parliament.

It is time to move into the digital age. What we are hearing in this debate is a skipping record. Vinyl records that skip are a thing of the past. We have to move toward the digital economy. We have to move on to something else and update the legislation.

Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I just heard the Minister of Industry refer to a skipping record. There is a good explanation for that. Despite what he says and all these consultations he mentioned, the government has not heard the message. It is as simple as that.

What we are telling artists again today in Bill C-11 and what we told them in Bill C-32—and the Minister of Industry said himself that the two bills are the same—is that they will not be paid for their work. Whether we are talking about artisans or more or less famous artists, this change has not been made in Bill C-11. That is why we must continue to listen to people, not just here in Parliament, but in committee, to finally make the government understand the situation.

Time allocation always reminds me of a recent ad campaign for a credit card company, or even Club Med, which shows 30 seconds of sunshine and beautiful people strolling down the beach and asks us to imagine spending a week doing the same. With all these time allocation motions that we have had in just one year of this majority government, just imagine what we are in for until 2015. It is unbearable.

Hon. Christian Paradis: Mr. Speaker, once again, taking Bill C-11 and Bill C-32 together, at second reading alone, we had 29 hours of debate and 31 meetings lasting a total of over 65 hours, and we heard from over 110 witnesses.

Yes, Bill C-11 is the same as the former Bill C-32, with 11 amendments made following consultation. What people do not want is an iPod tax. That is clear. Yet that is what my colleague is recommending and he is starting to sound like a broken record.

We need to move on. What we want to eliminate is piracy. When people try to cheat and pirate material in the digital era, it will be prohibited. This legislation will comply with the international standards of the World Intellectual Property Organization. People expect that. The legislation needs to be updated. After so many hours of debate, it is time to move on.

[English]

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my favourite quotation is from the hon. Minister of Public Safety. He said, “For the government to bring in closure and time allocation is wrong. It sends out the wrong message to the people of Canada. It tells the people of Canada that the government is afraid of debate, afraid of discussion and afraid of publicly justifying the steps it has taken.”

Despite Conservative rhetoric, those steps are basically to follow the lead of the United States and make sweeping changes that serve no one, except major rights holders like movie houses and record companies. The real winners in Bill C-11 would be those who hold power.

At the insistence of the Americans, the government has forgotten Canadian consumers and Canadian artists. Why are the Conservatives not standing up for Canadian consumers and Canadian artists?

• (1025)

Hon. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks about standing up for consumers. Then why is it her party that wants to impose a new tax on consumers whenever they purchase a digital device? Frankly, she does not know what she is talking about. She talks about the Americans because she bashes Americans out of habit. The Americans actually wish our government had taken a different track on notice and notice. They wish that we had notice and takedown. They wish we had taken a number of other measures that we rejected because we chose a Canadian approach.

However, the member is clearly just reading quotes that were handed to by her whip's office. Let me furnish her with another quote, not from Americans or big corporate interests but Canadian workers on the front lines in Canada's cultural industry.

The International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, workers on the front lines in Canada's cultural industries, said that it applauds the government for moving forward with Bill C-11. It said that this bill will help keep over 16,000 workers in Canada's entertainment industry employed and that piracy is taking money out of workers' pockets. It said, “Canada needs copyright legislation that will protect and create jobs, stimulate the economy and attract new investment.”

That is from workers on the front lines in Canada's creative industries who support this bill, not Americans or big corporations. I wish the member for London—Fanshawe would do her homework.

Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues I must say that I am not at all surprised that we are now dealing with time allocation for the 21st time in this Parliament. I am saddened, not surprised, but definitely saddened. The government seems to suggest that debate is somehow evil, that it is something of an impediment to its legislative agenda. We would think that the government would have learned that every time it has tried to shut down debate in this Parliament, three times already, it has actually benefited from the deliberative process here in this Parliament and ended up having to withdraw its bills or make significant amendments.

Government Orders

The House will remember the Internet snooping law. After debate in the House that bill never even came back because it was so flawed.

The crime omnibus bill that was before the House needed amendment. The government rushed it through with time allocation. In the end the government had to go to the Senate to have it amended.

What we do in this place is important. It improves legislation. The government has a majority and of course it will get its way. However, the deliberative process here matters. The government should respect Parliament and allow us to do our jobs.

Hon. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, it simply lacks any and all credibility to suggest that we are anti-debate with regard to copyright.

Again, this legislation has been before this Parliament for two years. This debate was started by our government two and a half years ago. There has been an incredible deal of consultation outside Parliament, within Parliament and at two stand-alone legislative committees. We amended our own legislation with 11 substantive amendments that would strengthen this legislation after having debated and consulted with Canadians after we tabled our legislation. This bill has been before this House now for two years. There has been more than enough debate on this. It is time that we move forward.

I am more than pleased to read a number of quotes into the record. Here is what the *Edmonton Journal* had to say about this legislation, "...something had to be done. It's been 13 years since the last changes were made—arguably 22 years since substantive reform —...it's a different universe out there."

This copyright bill is a welcome start. It's time to move forward.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Conservative backbenchers cherry-pick quotes from testimony that I sat through. I had heard a very different set of testimony from all the people they are quoting. However, it is a larger issue. It is the contempt for Parliament that this government shows again and again.

Yesterday, the member for South Shore—St. Margaret's said that our participation in this debate was not legitimate, that there was no legitimacy for members of Parliament to do their job. The fact is that it takes them a day of having to listen again to the problems with this bill. That is what debate is about.

I ask my hon. colleague to at least be truthful on this. The Conservatives did not work with anybody on amendments. They did not listen, so it is our right as opposition to point out the flaws of the bill. That is the democratic process. If he does not like the democratic process, they should just shut this place down.

•(1030)

Hon. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, just because we do not agree with the NDP amendments does not mean we are not open to amendments. In fact, we included 11 amendments in the legislation that did not come from the government. They came from testimony at the legislative committee. We outlined in every single one of those 11 amendments why we put them in, the organizations and

individual Canadians who advocated for them, and why they strengthened the bill. These were ideas that came from outside Parliament into Parliament. It was very democratic.

With regard to respecting Parliament, we offered every opportunity for members of Parliament from other parties to participate in this process. We set up a stand-alone legislative committee in the previous parliament and this Parliament so that work would not be interrupted at the heritage and industry committees. Everybody could come together and focus on this legislation in a substantive way.

We have been debating it for two years. This conversation was had by this Parliament for six months prior to that, so for two and a half years we have been debating and considering it, which is more than any other piece of legislation in my 12 years in public life. Therefore, this legislation more than passes any and all standards with regard to transparency, debate and time considered than any bill that has been seen in my lifetime.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the Minister of Canadian Heritage that the bill has had consideration in contrast to a bill such as Bill C-38 that has had none.

My concern is with the approach that the government House leader has taken. We find ourselves on the day of a vote that was not previously on notice. We had notice yesterday of time allocation but we had no idea if it was two or three or four days. There will be extensive votes tonight because there are a lot of substantive amendments to be reviewed.

It would show more respect to opposition members and to all parties in the House if the government House leader were to allow bills to have proper notice. People have plans, such as a charity event in memory of my daughter's best friend. I am sorry to bring up a personal matter. We all sacrifice things so we can stay in the House for late votes. More notice would have shown more respect.

Hon. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, I feel awful for the personal circumstances of the leader of the Green Party. I compliment her for her substantive approach to this legislation. She tabled her amendments, and we did consider them in previous processes.

To put it bluntly, at some point we have to call the question. After two years, it is time to call the question. Canadians, consumers and organizations require this legislation in order to have certainty in the digital age so that they can move forward.

I have a long list of organizations that support this legislation—not all aspects of the bill, because it is a balancing act but support key elements of this legislation —o ensure that it goes forward. For example, the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations said that the government has demonstrated a commitment to Canada's education community, that students across Canada are greatly encouraged by this legislation and that the government has a clear understanding of how this bill will impact Canada's students, educators and researchers.

Government Orders

I have a great deal of respect for the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands in the way that she has approached this legislation in a substantive way. After two and a half years of consideration, two years of debate on the specific bill, it is time to call the question.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the minister is talking out of both sides of his mouth. If he had respect for the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands he would have allowed debate on these amendments. Independent members of the House who did not sit at committee came forward with amendments. Our party looked at them and found some of them interesting and others very problematic. The problematic elements deserve to be debated. That is the role of Parliament.

The Conservative government is dismissive of the role of parliamentarians. It ridicules the work of parliamentarians. Time and time again the Conservatives have shut down debate. Thank God we have principled opposition here. The Conservative bill on snooping accuses average Canadians of supporting child pornographers because they had the temerity to challenge the government.

Why does the hon. member show such disrespect for the issue of debate?

Hon. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, two years of debate is not disrespect for debate. Two years of debate is the most substantive debate that Parliament has seen on any bill in the last 12 years. That is disrespect for debate?

The member and I both know that, with regard to the amendments put forward by the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, none of them were new. All of those proposals were seen in the consultation before we drafted the bill, after we drafted the bill in the last Parliament or in consideration of Bill C-11 in this Parliament. There were no new ideas there. We had seen them all before. We decided that was not the right balance that we represented and presented in our legislation.

In terms of respecting Parliament, we did not ram it through heritage or industry committee. We established a stand-alone legislative committee chaired by an NDP member of Parliament. It was hardly us ramming something through when an NDP opposition MP chaired the committee that considered the legislation.

We have debated this for two and a half years. The bill has been before this Parliament for two years. We have considered different points of view. We arrived at our legislation. There is a five year reconsideration of this legislation built into the law in order to bring it back to Parliament for further debate on a go-forward basis. The idea that we are not respecting Parliament when we have involved Parliament all through the process and will in the future is ridiculous.

• (1035)

Ms. Chris Charlton: Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the Minister of Canadian Heritage now for almost half an hour and he consistently says that there has been debate for two years, two and a half years. That seems to be his yardstick for when it is reasonable to bring in time allocation.

On Bill C-38, the government just rammed through in six days of debate an omnibus bill of 425 pages, dealing with everything from gutting environmental regulations to old age security to changing EI, fundamentally changing how we govern this country.

Would the Minister of Canadian Heritage agree with me that two years may seem to him adequate debate, but if that is the standard then certainly six days is not enough?

Hon. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, the point has been made by the Liberal Party, our party, the Green Party, and even the Bloc that if the NDP members want to have substantive debate in the House of Commons on all issues, including copyright, then they might want to be honest with themselves in terms of how they approach legislation. The NDP had its finance critic consume three days of debate in a mindless filibuster, the only purpose of which was to shut the Liberals out of the debate. That was the game the NDP played. If the NDP really wants to have substantive debate, one member of Parliament taking up 13 hours of debate, which is about equal to the time for 50 members of Parliament to speak on legislation, is not the way.

In this Parliament, that was the greatest act of games on the budget that I have seen in years. It was done by the NDP frontbench finance critic, who proudly stood in the House of Commons and played games with the budget debate, which the member for Hamilton Mountain now says is so important that we get into the details on these things. If that is the case, then why did the NDP have one member of Parliament speak for three days' worth of debate in a cynical game just to block others from having an opportunity to speak? That was the NDP approach. Before the NDP throws stones at others, the member should realize she is standing in a very large, fragile glass house.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I agree on that last point in regard to the budget tactic, if one wants to call it a tactic. I do not quite understand it myself.

I bring to the attention of the minister a list of some of the bills where time allocation has been brought in: Canada Wheat Board; the pooled pension plan; copyright; gun registry; back-to-work legislation, not once but twice; financial system review act; and the budget bill itself. The government is using time allocation in order to pass all of its legislative agenda and tries to come up with some rationale to justify what is inappropriate behaviour.

Does the minister not recognize there is a role for the government House leader to sit down with opposition House leaders and try to time things so the government does not have to bring in time allocation? Time allocation puts severe limitations on opposition members.

Hon. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, the government House leader does negotiate and has negotiated on these matters. He does it all the time, through two minority Parliaments and now this majority Parliament.

Government Orders

On the substance of what we are talking about right now, copyright, we have considered opposition voices. We did not invoke time allocation. We had stand-alone legislative committees. We brought in individual Canadians to consult on this legislation before we even drafted the bill, because we realized that in our first Parliament, in 2006-08, copyright was approached in the wrong way. We took a new approach with Bill C-32, now Bill C-11, the bill before us.

We asked Canadians at the front end what ought to constitute effective copyright reform. Those consultations came in. Tens of thousands of Canadians participated. It was an open, incredibly democratic process where Canadians could freely discuss this legislation, and we arrived at Bill C-32.

We negotiated with the opposition House leaders. The government House leader reached out to the opposition House leaders. We created a stand-alone legislative committee to debate the bill for the past two years. Call the question.

• (1040)

Mr. Ron Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the great work of my hon. colleague on this file. As a member of the international trade committee for the past six and one-half years, I know the importance of bringing archaic legislation into the 21st century.

We have had ample debate. I will mention the opposition's tactic last week of moving to adjourn. If it was so important to have debate on the budget, why would the opposition move to adjourn?

On this specific issue, I think it is important that the minister inform the House of why we need this legislation to be brought in accordance with WIPO and to meet our international trade agreement and obligations in the future.

Hon. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, this is about what is in the best interests of Canada, Canadian consumers, Canadian creators and their rights, needs and obligations in a digital environment.

As I said at the outset, it has been essentially 22 years since Canada has had sweeping amendments to Canada's copyright law in the way this bill proposes. We believe in a system that will best serve Canadians' interests. As I have said a number of times, individuals and organizations have come forward and spoken out in favour of this legislation for their own purposes. This is a balancing act. Certainly there are those who wish they had amendments a little different from the way our government has designed the bill, but we think we have an effective and responsible balance that will serve Canadians well into the future.

The Canadian Media Production Association, which represents thousands of jobs across the country, said it applauds the government's copyright reform. The Entertainment Software Association of Canada, which is responsible for Canada's video game industry and roughly 15,000 high-paying jobs across the country, many of them in Montreal, congratulated the government on its copyright legislation. It said that it will help protect Canadian creators and that it is good public policy and is essential to our economy.

This bill is critical to the success of Canada's digital economy. It works. Let us get it done.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, first, almost as an aside, I would like to offer my condolences to the Liberal Party, because when the Minister of Canadian Heritage reaches out and says that he feels bad for the Liberals, I think those guys are in a really rough spot.

We are talking about 23 amendments that were brought forward by the independent members who were not able to sit at the committee, and we are talking about one day of debate.

The minister said he has heard all these amendments before and he is not interested, so we should just shut down the debate. However, every individual member of Parliament has the right to participate and bring forward legislative amendments, and these are worthy of debate. There has been a single day of debate. That is what it has been. It might go a couple more hours before we go through them.

As I said, the New Democratic Party went through these very carefully. Some of them are very interesting and some of them we think are very problematic, but that is our role.

This is not about obstruction. This is about allowing every member of the House to participate on a substantive piece of legislation that affects all Canadians.

Hon. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, the member said it is not about obstruction. Right, and that is why the NDP put forward one speaker for three days, 13 hours and blocked others from speaking. That is not obstruction from the NDP, but with—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have been on the copyright issue since 2004. We have never put a single speaker up. He is talking about another bill. Will he just speak to the issue of shutting down the independent members?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): There have been references to other bills that are before the House in a relative sense in terms of time allocation. I think that has been part of this half-hour debate.

The hon. Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Hon. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, the NDP can reference Bill C-38 and other things, but when we do it, it is against the rules. Anyway, whatever, that is the member for Timmins—James Bay.

The reality is, the amendments that were put forward, particularly those from the leader of the Green Party, were serious and substantive amendments, and I understand that. However, the ideas represented therein were not new. They were considered by our government and had been considered over the past two and a half years, throughout this entire process.

We certainly do respect that, but if the NDP's idea concerning debate is just ongoing, never-ending, continuous debate and members can keep putting forward amendments to change "us" to "them" and "we" to "they", and then condemn us for not considering sometimes frivolous amendments, it is nonsense. We have been debating this for two and a half years. We have considered the ideas. They are thoughtful ideas. They are just reasonable differences of opinion with some of the amendments that were put forward by the leader of the Green Party.

Government Orders

It is not obstruction to say we have had two and a half years of debate, and now two years of debate on a specific piece of legislation. We have considered it. We have thought about it. We have tabled our legislation. We gave signals to Canadians in the election campaign. We put it in our throne speech. We put forward the legislation. We invited Canadians in at the front end through our consultations.

Let us just get on with it, pass this legislation and serve Canadians' interests.

• (1045)

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

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

• (1125)

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

(Division No. 196)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Ashfield	Aspin
Baird	Bateman
Benoit	Bezan
Blaney	Bloch
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinooge	Butt
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Chisu
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Daniel
Davidson	Del Mastro
Devolin	Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dykstra
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)

Flaherty	Fletcher
Galipeau	Gallant
Gill	Glover
Goguen	Goldring
Goodyear	Gosal
Gourde	Harper
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer
Hoback	Hoepfner
Holder	James
Jean	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kent	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lauzon
Lebel	Leaf
Lemieux	Leung
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Mayes
McColeman	McLeod
Menegakis	Menzies
Merrifield	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Nicholson	Norlock
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Obhrai	Oda
Oliver	Opitz
Paradis	Payne
Penashue	Poillievre
Preston	Raitt
Rajotte	Rathgeber
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Richardson
Rickford	Ritz
Saxton	Schellenberger
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Storseth
Strahl	Sweet
Tilson	Trost
Truppe	Tweed
Uppal	Valcourt
Van Loan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)	Zimmer— 148

NAYS

Members

Andrews
Ashton
Aubin
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevington
Blanchette-Lamothe
Borg
Brahmi
Brosseau
Caron
Cash
Chicoine
Chow
Cleary
Comartin
Cotler
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Foote
Freeman

Government Orders

Garrison	Genest
Genest-Jourdain	Giguère
Godin	Gravelle
Groguhé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Hassainia
Hsu	Hughes
Hyer	Jacob
Julian	Karygiannis
Kellway	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larose
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	MacAulay
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mourani	Mulcair
Murray	Nantel
Nash	Nicholls
Nunez-Melo	Papillon
Patry	Péclet
Perreault	Plamondon
Quach	Rae
Rafferty	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Savoie
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Scrog
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	St-Denis
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sullivan
Sitsabaiesan	Toone
Stoffer	Trudeau
Thibeault	Valeriote — 130
Tremblay	
Turnel	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from May 14 consideration of Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Copyright Act, as reported with amendments from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North has seven minutes left to conclude his speech. I will recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg North now.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have a right to be quite concerned about Bill C-11 and what is actually happening and about the government's inability to make a number of amendments, which many would argue are dictated by common sense and which could have been made to alleviate some concerns that Canadians as a whole would have in regard to Bill C-11.

An example occurred yesterday when the member for Lethbridge stood and answered a question I specifically asked in regard to a constituent. I will repeat the question, and I suspect members will be surprised by the answer. The question I posed yesterday was this. If one of the member's constituents were to purchase a CD and take it home and it happened to have a digital lock, should his constituent have the ability to put his favourite song from that CD onto an MP3

player? From a consumer's point of view, should he have the right to be able to do that, given that he has already purchased the song?

The member for Lethbridge answered very specifically, and I give him full credit for being very precise with his answer. His answer was no, and then he sat down.

At the time, I believed that most consumers and Canadians would be very concerned about that particular answer. It begs the question as to whether the member for Lethbridge is right. As a consumer, if I go and purchase a disc and on that disc I have identified a song that I feel quite attached to, I bring it home and put it on an MP3 player. I must confess I have three MP3 players and I have legitimately purchased a copy of some music and I put the same song on all three of my MP3 players, because these are the songs I appreciate. I have one in my office, one in my house and one in the apartment I have here in Ottawa. The member for Lethbridge would suggest that if Bill C-11 passes in its current form, it would be illegal for me to have that song on all three, even though it is for specific personal use.

I do not think I am alone. I would suggest there are hundreds, if not thousands, of constituents who the member for Lethbridge and all of us represent, who would likely do something similar. I have spoken in the past in regard to music and how individuals, in an era in which we used to have records, would identify the songs they liked and they would record them onto a cassette and they would be able to play that cassette.

Times have changed and now we have this digital format, and it is important that we respect the artist and recognize the incredible contribution Canadian artists make to our economy and our heritage. However, we also need to be concerned in regard to the type of laws and the ramifications of those laws on all Canadians. I would be first to my feet to defend and protect the interests of those artists, but on the other hand I am also going to be first to my feet to protect consumers and their right to take personal ownership of something they have legitimately purchased.

● (1130)

That is something on which I would challenge the government to add further comment, to provide more clarification as to what the consumer rights are in regard to that digital lock. I do not believe I am alone in wanting to be able to provide assurances.

Should the bill be amended to make it okay to circumvent a digital lock, if the purpose is to use it for personal reasons such as having a backup? For individuals who have two MP3 players, should they have the right to be able to take that song they have acquired and put it on both of their MP3 players?

I think those are legitimate consumer-oriented questions that are worth debate and discussion. We know the government put limitations on that particular debate today through time allocation. It is not the first time it has used time allocation, which is most unfortunate, and it does cause concern.

The idea of copyright is something that, in principle, we have supported in the past. Going forward we continue to support intellectual knowledge and the ability to protect it and those creative ideas. We have industries doing exceptionally well across Canada, and we need to protect those industries. One of the ways we do that is through copyright laws.

Government Orders

There is a need to continue the debate. I will end my comments there and would be more than happy to provide further comment—

• (1135)

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments. The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, the questions the hon. member raises about the day-to-day activities of Canadians that are perfectly legal are echoed in a prominent textbook on intellectual property law by David Vaver, who talked about the problem of digital locks being applied in ways that actually limit a person's legal right to material for which they have already paid.

He points out that what is called technological property protection measures or digital rights management has often met with consumer resistance. He says that buyers of compact disks found they could not copy them to play on their computer or in their car. They bought a video disk in England and moved to Canada. They found it would not play on North American disk players. Users found copyright holders had sometimes invaded their privacy and compromised the security of their computer to monitor what was being done with the copyright material.

This is a very significant area of corporate control over things that a consumer has bought in good faith, with no prior notice. I would like my hon. colleague to comment on this issue further.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the leader of the Green Party and I agree in principle in regard to how the consumer appears to be overlooked in Bill C-11.

The member raises a valid concern. That is why I took the last few minutes I was provided to bring it to the attention of the government. I believe that the government is vastly underestimating the number of Canadians who would be and should be concerned if Bill C-11 passes without amendment dealing with something that most Canadians, 90%-plus, believe they have the right to do. That is to be able to have that music CD, to bring it home and use it to its full extent if it is for personal use.

This legislation has the potential to make those consumers criminals, because of the way this legislation is worded. The government needs to make note of that before it passes third reading. Otherwise we might have to obligate our Senate, once again, to clean up the mess or the sloppy legislation the government is trying to force through the House today.

Mr. Mark Adler (York Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today to speak to Bill C-11, the copyright modernization act.

Let me start by reminding my colleagues that we are now closer than we have been in the last 15 years to modernizing the Copyright Act. During that time new technologies have fostered new ways to create and use copyrighted material, as well as new distribution models and consumer products.

Digital technologies have changed the way Canadians work, live and engage locally and globally. The emergence of the Internet has blurred the lines between users, creators, producers and distributors of copyrighted materials. All this has created a new world that the Copyright Act must adjust to and reflect.

Just some 15 years ago, many of the works protected by copyright were primarily available in physical formats such as paper for printed books, VHS cassettes for movies, or cartridges for video games; today, creative works are becoming increasingly available to consumers in digital formats over the Internet. Consumers can buy an e-book, stream a movie or download a game directly to their game console.

Given this new reality, it is important to pass the copyright modernization act. The copyright modernization act includes provisions that are technology-neutral and reflect the reality of an ever-evolving media and technological landscape.

Effective copyright protection is key to creativity, innovation, citizen engagement and economic growth. Modernizing Canada's Copyright Act just makes sense.

We need to make sure our copyright law is responsive to today's digital reality so that we continue to benefit from the rapid expansion of the knowledge-based economy. This is why modernizing the Copyright Act is a priority for our government.

The Copyright Act is a complex legal framework. There are many perspectives to be heard and balanced when modernizing it. The Copyright Act affects consumers, creators, publishers, producers, Internet providers, educators and students. It relates to the books and websites that we read, the movies we watch, the music we listen to, the video games we play and the computer programs that we use.

Our government has listened to and considered all these different perspectives as we have worked toward modernizing the Copyright Act. We heard the perspectives of thousands of Canadian businesses and stakeholder organizations on copyright modernization. This includes all the Canadians we heard from during the nationwide consultations we held in the summer of 2009. More than 1,000 Canadians attended live events across the country. An additional 8,000 written submissions were also received.

This also includes all the Canadians who attended or made submissions to the two legislative committees that studied the copyright modernization act. Combined, the two committees heard testimony from over 120 organizations and received over 250 written briefs.

Finally, it includes all of the Canadians who have informed the many hours of debate on the bill in this House and in the one before it.

We now need to deliver concrete results to all these Canadians by passing the bill.

The copyright modernization act returns to us today with a number of technical amendments that were adopted by the legislative committee. The committee adopted these amendments to improve the clarity and intent of certain provisions of the copyright modernization act. The committee adopted these amendments after an extensive review of the bill, along with all the testimony and submissions it received.

I would like to take this opportunity to tell the House about two sets of technical amendments the committee made to clarify and strengthen the bill.

The first set of amendments I would like to highlight are technical amendments the committee made to the measures that address the role of Internet service providers in facilitating the enforcement of copyright on the Internet.

One of these amendments included a change to the provision addressing the notice and notice regime for Internet service providers. It amends the obligations providers have for forwarding notices received from rights holders. These amendments will ensure that Internet service providers can continue to support efforts to fight online copyright infringement without fear that events outside of their control could unintentionally expose them to liability.

The second amendment I would like to mention is an amendment that provides not-for-profit organizations with greater certainty in their mission to support the distribution of adapted works for the visually impaired. Bill C-11 would allow a not-for-profit organization acting for the benefit of persons with a print disability to make and send adapted works outside of Canada as long as the author of the work is either a Canadian or a national of the country to which it is sent. This amendment will protect not-for-profit organizations that make a good-faith mistake from being unreasonably sued for monetary damages.

• (1140)

These technical amendments are intended to improve certain provisions of the copyright modernization act. As a result, these amendments would make it easier to implement the intent behind Bill C-11.

All of the amendments adopted by the committee are consistent with the balanced approach our government has taken to copyright modernization. It is now time to make this approach a reality for Canadians by passing the copyright modernization act.

Canada's path toward this round of copyright modernization has lasted more than 15 years. We have heard from thousands of Canadians and have debated the bill extensively. We need to deliver concrete results for Canadians. By swiftly moving forward with a copyright modernization act, our government is delivering on our commitment to protect Canadian jobs, stimulate our economy and attract new investment to Canada.

I invite all members in this House to deliver results to Canadians by ensuring the swift passage of the copyright modernization act.

• (1145)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. friend for his speech and his defence of the bill.

I think that it needs to be understood that this copyright modernization act has moved in the right direction in most ways. Unfortunately, the balance is not right in relation to consumer rights and those of device manufacturers and copyright holders.

I want to return to a passage I put earlier to the member for Winnipeg North and put it to the member opposite. In relation to copyright law, let me mention that I have permission to read from *Intellectual Property Law: Copyright, Patents, Trade-Marks* text, second edition, published in 2011, by David Vaver. Allow me to continue with this real-life example of how this legislation would put

Government Orders

consumers at risk of breaking the law. Here is a real-life example that I am quoting from this text:

Buyers of video game consoles found they were tied in to the console makers' games. TPMs

—that is, digital locks—

barred third-party games, improvements, and imports. Users found themselves unable to exercise fair dealing and other rights the *Copyright Act* gave them. The consumer was often given no prior warning that rights he thought he had were being negated. The situation was ripe for hackers for surmount such obstacles, and cat-and-mouse games ensued as copyright holders tried to keep one step ahead of circumventers. The public sided largely with the circumventers, who enabled buyers to enjoy the usual rights of ownership of property that had been bought and paid for.

I am looking to the Conservative members of the House. We were not all members in this House, in this place or in committee. I do understand committee has rejected a number of the amendments or ones like it, but, please, let us fix this now.

Mr. Mark Adler: Madam Speaker, I assume there is a question in there.

However, I was recently in Washington, meeting with a number of congressional leaders. We were talking about this very piece of legislation, the copyright modernization act. They were very pleased to learn that we are now bringing our copyright and intellectual property regime into the 21st century. They were quite concerned about the older regime that we were existing under.

By improving our intellectual property regime, we would be creating an opportunity to create more jobs in Canada, create investment and long-term prosperity for companies that would like to invest in this country, and create jobs for Canadians, so it is imperative that we pass the bill as expeditiously as possible.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Beauharnois—Salaberry, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is completely irresponsible to limit debate today for the 21st time in a little over a year, especially since this debate will not strike a balance between authors' rights, the industry's rights and consumers' rights.

Howard Knopf, a lawyer who specializes in copyright, says that this bill does not encourage innovation and that, in fact, it inhibits it. He wonders how making it illegal to bypass a regional code in order to watch a legally imported Bollywood DVD that is not available in Canada is going to encourage innovation.

Thus, there is no consensus and no respect for authors' rights or consumers' rights, and furthermore, the bill does not encourage innovation. How can this government move forward on the bill at this stage and limit debate when the bill still contains several controversial elements?

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Adler: Madam Speaker, I am really not surprised to hear from the NDP that anyone's creation should not have any property rights attached to it.

Government Orders

The creator has, by creating a piece of property, a legal and moral obligation to receive compensation for it. It is not a Wild West situation in which anything in the public domain belongs to everybody. That is just not true, and creators of intellectual property deserve the full protection of the law.

We are now in the 21st century, and there are new opportunities and new technology. They must be protected, and the creators of these must be protected.

● (1150)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marie-Claude Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Madam Speaker, as I said in my previous speech—and it bears repeating—shutting down debate is becoming a tradition. This is the 21st time this year. I do not know what more to say, but I thought it was worth pointing out.

First of all, this bill is exactly the same as Bill C-32 from the previous Parliament. Artists were very critical of it. Now that the Conservatives have a majority, they are bringing it back. This is another perfect example of them shutting down debate. This bill creates powerful new anti-circumvention rights for content owners, who are not necessarily the creators or developers of the content. This prevents access to copyrighted works. These new provisions are backed by fines in excess of \$1 million and up to five years in prison.

An hon. member: Unbelievable.

Ms. Marie-Claude Morin: Yes, my colleague is absolutely right.

This means that digital locks, for example, will, for all practical purposes, take precedence over all other rights, including fair dealing rights for students and journalists. People are being muzzled yet again. This is really becoming a tradition with this Parliament, and it is problematic for a number of reasons. Obviously, there is the very real possibility that consumers will not be authorized to use content they have already paid for. This government claims that it stands up for consumers' rights, so I find this whole thing a little paradoxical and contradictory.

Digital locks take precedence over all other rights guaranteed by the Charter. Take, for example, format shifting for individuals with vision or hearing loss. These people might not be able to exercise their rights. That is discrimination. I do not think that is news to anyone here.

Furthermore, where a digital lock has been used, copies made for educational purposes must be automatically erased after five days and course notes must be destroyed within 30 days of the course concluding. That would lead to serious problems for students enrolled in distance education courses. In my opinion, it is not an appropriate use of the copyright rules. A student who pays copyright fees for course materials often needs the materials even after the courses end. This is completely unacceptable.

The bill also creates new limited exceptions to the fair dealing provision of the Copyright Act, including the exceptions for educators, and exceptions for parody and satire, which once again limit freedom of expression. The exceptions do not adequately recognize the rights of creators. In fact, the exceptions facilitate

consumers' access to copyright-protected content without providing new methods to compensate creators for their work.

It is also interesting to note that, in this bill, the Conservatives have deliberately avoided addressing the issue of a possible extension of the private copying exception. It has been proven that this exception has been very effective in the past for cassettes, CDs and DVDs. However, the Conservatives do not want to apply it to new technology. Instead, the Conservatives have tried to put a populist face on all this by scaring consumers. I find this quite unacceptable.

Clearly, the NDP is in favour of modernizing the copyright rules. It is something that needs to be done, but there are too many major problems with this bill. In some cases, it even creates problems where there were none before. In my opinion this is not an approach that balances the rights of creators, who obviously must be paid for their work—their job is to create—and the right of consumers to have reasonable access to content.

● (1155)

It is therefore our duty to vote against this bill, which contains far too many provisions that will have very serious consequences for the way in which Canadians obtain and share protected content.

The bill includes provisions that create powerful new anti-circumvention rights for content owners, which have absolutely nothing to do with the creators and content developers and prevent access to copyrighted works.

These new provisions are supported by fines of \$1 million. I think it is important to point this out because I do not understand how the average consumer could be fined such a large amount. It is completely inappropriate and unacceptable.

This measure is modelled directly after the United States' controversial Digital Millennium Copyright Act. Digital locks would trump all other rights. I really do not see how this is useful for the consumers that the Conservatives claim to want to protect.

There are two fundamental problems with this approach. First, there is a real danger that it will prevent consumers from using content for which they have already paid, which is ironic given that the Conservatives claim to be working for consumers. The approach also seriously infringes on the rights of artists and creators.

The work of artists and creators is very important in our society. Indeed, it is very important for a society to have a lively arts and culture sector in order to reflect that culture on the world stage. These creators may no longer have the means to continue creating and will be forced to do other work. This is not going to benefit our country in the end.

We know that the government is accusing us of voting against a number of its bills, but we cannot not vote against this type of bill, which is harmful to consumers and artists alike.

Government Orders

The NDP has fought every step of the way for a balanced approach to copyright. We participated in the committee, even without support from some of the opposition members, that studied this bill. We listened to the concerns of a number of groups with regard to the scope of this bill. At committee stage, we proposed 17 amendments that could have made this bill more balanced and fair for the artists and consumers. Nonetheless, the government did not listen to us or the many groups of artists and writers who came before the committee.

That is why it is impossible for us to support this bill, which penalizes Canadian families and artists.

I would be pleased to answer my colleagues' questions.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her excellent speech.

I think we all agree that Canada's copyright legislation needs to be updated. However, we also need to protect consumers' rights. So many amendments are needed because the technical protection measures are too strict. I hope the NDP will support those amendments during this evening's vote.

I would like to know the member's thoughts on eliminating technical protection measures that are too strict, in order to allow consumers to legally use copyrighted material they have legally purchased.

• (1200)

Ms. Marie-Claude Morin: Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for the question. Indeed, what is really important to remember about this bill is that the NDP is proposing a balanced approach that does not discriminate against consumers and allows artists and creators to be properly paid for the work they do for our society.

Many organizations agree with our position. For instance, Michael Geist, a technology commentator, supports our position, and so do the Writers Guild of Canada, the Canadian Internet Policy and Public Interest Clinic, the Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada, copyright lawyer Howard Knopf, the Society for Reproduction Rights of Authors, Composers and Publishers in Canada, and I could go on. All of these people and organizations share the NDP's position and have made their position clear to this government, but it refuses to listen.

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé (Saint-Lambert, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for her remarks. She talked about how this bill creates an imbalance between consumers and authors.

What does she think about the fact that this bill does not focus on innovation sufficiently, if at all?

Ms. Marie-Claude Morin: Madam Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my speech, this bill is more or less a carbon copy of Bill C-32, which was rejected by many artists' groups and by the opposition.

Now that the Conservatives have a majority, they are marching in, imposing this unacceptable bill on us once again. As the hon. member said, there is a lack of innovation. In addition, there is no openness on the part of the government, which does not listen to

artists, writers, musicians and all those whose work reflects our Canadian culture and identity. The government's lack of vision in modernizing copyright is a real problem.

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Saxton (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board and for Western Economic Diversification, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to speak today in support of Bill C-11, the copyright modernization act. As many of my colleagues know, we are the closest we have ever been in the last 15 years to modernizing the Copyright Act. We are on the verge of having a Copyright Act that is responsive to the realities of both today and tomorrow, a Copyright Act that will give creators, innovators and ordinary citizens the confidence they need to take advantage of the opportunities of the digital world.

The fact is the Copyright Act in its current form is not responsive to many of the realities our digital world has brought forward. Our government is committed to fixing this.

The last time the Copyright Act was substantially updated, VHS tapes, discmans and pagers were commonly used. For many, the flip phone was the trendy gadget of the day. Text messaging and mobile Internet were just beginning to be introduced on the market. In fact, dial-up modems were still quite common. That was only 15 years ago.

It would be a gross understatement to say that technology changed considerably since then. What was once considered cutting edge is now almost obsolete. In fact, it seems like something newer and better is popping up every day.

Just the other day I was reading about all the speculation around what consumers could expect from upcoming versions of Smart-phones. It is hard to predict what the high tech world will look like even 10 years from now. Digital technology has changed how Canadians access, use and share copyrighted content. Today, Canadians expect to be able to enjoy legitimately-acquired content where and when they want. Copyright laws need to respond to this reality.

Our government is committed to ensuring that Canada's copyright law is flexible and adaptable to change. We are also committed to ensuring that appropriate protections are provided for both creators and users. Bill C-11 would establish clear rules that would be flexible enough to allow the Copyright Act to evolve as technology continues to advance. It is balanced in that it provides new rights for creators, while providing new exceptions for users.

Let me tell members about some of the exceptions in Bill C-11. Bill C-11 would give Canadians the flexibility to record broadcast programming to enjoy at a more convenient time, often referred to as time shifting. It would also give individuals the freedom to copy music, films and other content onto any or all of the devices they owned, such as MP3 players and tablets, something that is often referred to as format shifting. Canadians would also be able to legally back up copyrighted material they purchased.

Government Orders

Our government believes it is important that all Canadians, including those with disabilities, have access to copyrighted materials in a format they can easily use. That is why Bill C-11 would allow Canadians with perceptual disabilities to adapt legally-acquired material to a format that would be more accessible. It would also clarify the law regarding the importation of adapted material into Canada and explicitly would allow the exportation of certain adapted materials, including Braille and audio books.

As I mentioned, digital technology has fundamentally transformed the way many Canadians work, play and learn. For example, in the digital world, consumers are no longer passive audiences. Large segments of the population are interacting with content in new and innovative ways. Bill C-11 recognizes this new reality by including new exceptions that respond to it.

Bill C-11 includes a user-generated content provision which would allow Canadians to incorporate existing copyrighted material in the creation of new non-commercial works. An example of this would be posting a home video on YouTube of a bride and groom dancing to their favourite wedding song.

This exception recognizes that these new uses of creative content contribute to Canada's cultural sector. For example, these uses can enhance interest in the original when videos of user-generated content go viral on the Internet. This innovative form of creation can also shed light on emerging talent from across our country and showcase it to the rest of the world. Of course the digital age does not just offer opportunities for creation; it also offers many unique opportunities for learning and education.

• (1205)

Bill C-11 recognizes the immense opportunities that new and emerging technologies present for education. Digital technologies can enhance the traditional classroom experience and encourage new models for education outside the physical classroom. This can increase access to education and communities big and small across our great country.

Bill C-11 includes exceptions that would allow teachers and students to make better use of digital technologies and of copyrighted materials. For example, Bill C-11 would amend existing educational exceptions so that they are technologically neutral. No longer would we see references to specific technologies like flip charts and overhead projectors.

Bill C-11 also introduces a number of new measures that would enrich the educational experience. For instance, teachers would now be allowed to digitally deliver course materials to students. Students would be allowed to use material that they find on the Internet.

There are a number of other educational exceptions in Bill C-11 that I could describe, but all of these recognize the potential that the digital environment holds for teaching and learning in Canada.

I have spoken about how Bill C-11 recognizes the opportunities that the digital environment offers for learning and creation in Canada. It is also important to note that Bill C-11 recognizes the potential this environment holds for creative and innovative businesses.

Bill C-11 includes a number of provisions that would strengthen the ability of copyright owners to control the online use of their works. This would help promote innovative and legitimate business models and prevent widespread illicit use.

For example, Bill C-11 includes new protections for copyright owners who choose to use digital locks to protect their works. For a number of copyright owners, the use of digital locks can allow for the monetization of creative content and the protection of potentially significant investments made during the development phase. By providing protections against the circumvention of these locks, our government is supporting the ability of creators to advance new digital business models and compete on the international stage.

Bill C-11 also includes a number of provisions that would allow creators and innovators to compete in the digital age with confidence. This includes legal protections for rights management information and a new category of civil liability that targets those who enable online piracy.

All of these measures would help attract new investments which would, in turn, promote economic growth and help protect and create jobs in Canada. In short, they would help position Canada as a leader in the digital economy of today and tomorrow.

It is clear that Canada's copyright laws need to be modernized to respond to the challenges and opportunities of the digital age. The bill we have before us would do just that. Bill C-11 takes a balanced approach to copyright modernization. It considers the needs and interests of all Canada. Furthermore, it would bring our copyright law in line with international standards. It is very much in keeping with our government's commitment to promote innovation, productivity and job creation.

Of course, we cannot enjoy any of these benefits until we pass the bill. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in giving these benefits to Canadians by passing Bill C-11.

• (1210)

Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the member opposite and I wonder if he recognizes that this is a very complicated area and a very complicated piece of legislation.

The proposed legislation has not received unanimous support from participants within the industry. The impact of the changes that are being proposed would be significant and difficult to change. It would bring forward some very onerous restrictions on users, artists and others and could, frankly, take away millions of dollars from the creators.

Would the member not agree that the matter being proposed is of such importance that it requires we take every opportunity to examine each and every piece and listen to any Canadian, especially those involved in the industry, to ensure we are doing this correctly the first time?

Government Orders

Mr. Andrew Saxton: Madam Speaker, yes, the government does recognize that this is a very complex and complicated matter. It is for that reason that we are continuing our review of the copyright modernization act, which actually began in the last Parliament.

Before being dissolved, the legislative committee studying the bill heard from more than 70 witnesses and received more than 150 written submissions. Over the course of the hearings there were two clear messages that emerged. First, that the bill balances the interests of the various stakeholders, and second, that Canada urgently needs to pass legislation to update the Copyright Act.

By re-introducing this bill without changes, the government is reiterating its support for a balanced approach to copyright reform and enabling parliamentarians to pick up where the last committee left off.

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to pick up where my colleague from Dartmouth—Cole Harbour left off. When I was listening to the parliamentary secretary's speech, I kept hearing this phrase over and over again, "creates new...". He said that the bill creates new rules about this and new rules about that. He said "creates new" quite a number of times, although I did not actually keep track.

My colleague from Dartmouth—Cole Harbour raised an excellent point when he said that there was a lot happening with this bill. It would create new powers, new rules and new regulations. It essentially would create a new way of doing business.

Therefore, I do not know how the parliamentary secretary can stand up and justify, with any credibility in the House, why it is that there has been time allocation moved on this and why it is we are not doing a proper and thorough study of this review. I would like him to comment on the fact that the very words in his speech contradict the position that his government is taking.

• (1215)

Mr. Andrew Saxton: Madam Speaker, as I mentioned just previously, we do recognize the complexity of the bill and that is the very reason we are continuing from where the review left off in the last Parliament. As I mentioned, there were more than 70 witnesses and 150 written submissions have gone to committee. Extensive work has already been done on this particular bill in the previous Parliament and we will continue that work in this Parliament.

I will outline what else the bill would implement. It would implement the rights and protections of the World Intellectual Property Organization. Internet treaties give Canadian creators and consumers the tools they need to remain competitive internationally.

Through this legislation, the government will modernize the Copyright Act to bring it in line with advances in technology and international standards; advance the interests of Canadians, from those who create content to the consumers who benefit from it; provide a framework that is forward-looking and flexible and that will help protect and create jobs, stimulate the Canadian economy and attract new investment to Canada; and establish rules that are technologically neutral so that they are flexible enough to evolve with the changing technologies and the digital economy, while ensuring appropriate protection for both creators as well as users.

Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak for a few moments to this important legislation. I will focus my intervention on a couple of points in the bill that I find quite troubling. I know my intervention must be focused on this bill and it will be.

I am particularly concerned with the way the government is prepared to move things through at a pace that is contrary to the rules of this House and that, frankly, fly in the face of the concerns that are brought to this House by members of Parliament on all sides as a result of discussions we have had with Canadians.

What we saw with Bill C-11 today was the government House leader introducing a time allocation motion, in other words, limiting debate once again. I believe it is the 23rd time that such closure motions or time allocation motions have been brought to this House in just a little more than a year.

There are not very many pieces of legislation that the government has been prepared to say to members of the House that they were elected by Canadian voters, just as the Conservative members were, and that it recognizes the role of Parliament and the rights of all members of the House, not just the government members, to represent their constituents and bring their concerns forward, and to use their own intellect, advice and experience to examine each piece of legislation within the confines of the general rules of practice and procedure.

Unfortunately, however, the government, and we are seeing it again with Bill C-11, does not believe in a parliamentary democracy but in something different. It believes in something that is almost leaning toward a dictatorship by the PMO. The PMO decides, and not the rules that govern procedure in the House, when there has been enough debate or discussion about a particular issue.

The Conservative member who spoke previously listed off the number of witnesses who have been heard and the number of people who have intervened. When the government House leader introduced limitation on debate on Bill C-11 this morning, he talked about how many hours we have already talked about this. He said that a similar piece of legislation had been here in a previous Parliament and therefore we have already been there and done that so we should get it over with and just run it through.

What that ignores, of course, for the 23rd time that the government has brought in some restriction, imposed with its majority, on my right and the rights of my colleagues who have contrary positions to fully debate each and every stage of a bill. The government has said that it will decide whether a bill is good.

I have heard many members opposite in committee and in this chamber say that they think this is the way things should be done and that although we think the other way and are going to listen to experts who do not agree with them, frankly, it does not matter because they have the majority and they will have their way.

Government Orders

● (1220)

The Conservatives very much begrudge our taking any time in this House to offer opinions which are in any way opposed to the government. We have seen how the government deals with opposition.

The National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy had the audacity to offer positions based on evidence, facts and science, which are contrary to the PMO's vision of the world. Therefore, the body that did all that good work, all the evidence and science, the body that spent time and energy discussing important issues about the environment and the economy with Canadians will no longer be there.

Yesterday, the member for Halifax said that the government, the Minister of the Environment and the Prime Minister's Office very much believe that they do not need expert panels, expert advice and scientists because they have the Internet and Google. They can get answers to their questions from Wikipedia. The beauty of that is if they do not agree with what is on Wikipedia, they will just change it. It does not have to be based on evidence or science; they will simply change it.

I find it extraordinarily distasteful. Frankly, it is creating bad policy.

I have some experience in dealing with legislation and I know that if we do not take the time, do not consider alternative opinions, do not pore over the various provisions within legislation with a fine-tooth comb, inevitably there will be mistakes. We have seen examples of that already. The government has had to withdraw legislation because it was so bad. The Conservatives passed legislation in this House without entertaining any amendments or changes. They would not listen to any of our arguments or arguments in the other place which suggested that piece of legislation needed correction. As a result, the Conservatives ended up having to make changes afterwards, because they did not want to make changes here. They did not want to show this place any respect. They did not want to admit that they may have been wrong on something, that they may not have considered all sides of a particular argument. They therefore rammed the legislation through and then had to make changes afterwards.

My concern is that it was a most obvious and egregious weakness in that particular piece of legislation. With something like Bill C-11, which is so technical and wide-reaching in terms of its implications, the government will ram it through without considering our amendments. We brought in 17 amendments at committee that were meant to establish a balance, but they were ignored.

The members opposite like to suggest there is no opposition out there and there is no other way. If I had the time, I would read into the record some testimony from a couple of experts, and there are many, but maybe in response to members' questions I will have the opportunity to mention some of the people who have problems with this legislation.

I call on all members to take their time, recognize this is important legislation and give it the kind of scrutiny it deserves.

● (1225)

Mr. Fin Donnelly (New Westminster—Coquitlam, NDP): Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's comments on this matter. It is a very technical matter that requires a good thorough discussion and a review by experts. In fact, I held a round table in my community with those concerned: artists, producers, creators, academics, locals, people who are very interested in this topic. I had great input, some of which fed back into the amendments which my colleague spoke about, which were put forward to the government to amend the legislation but were disregarded.

I wonder if my colleague could comment on what some of the experts had to say about this piece of legislation.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Madam Speaker, we should all take note of the work the member does. In his community he held a town hall meeting. He did not assume that he knew it all, but he went out into the community to get the advice of his constituents on how best to proceed. Should he not have the opportunity to stand in this House, at length and within the rules, to bring forward those concerns? Should not every member on this side and the other side have that same opportunity?

Michael Geist, a renowned technology commentator, is one person who has indicated some problems with this legislation. He said:

The foundational principle of the new bill remains that anytime a digital lock is used—whether on books, movies, music or electronic devices—the lock trumps virtually all other rights.... [This] means that the existing fair dealing rights...and [Bill C-11's] proposed new rights...all cease to function effectively so long as the rights holder places a digital lock on their content or device.

That is a very troubling comment by an expert.

● (1230)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. friend from Dartmouth—Cole Harbour for his presentation and for all the hard work of his colleagues in committee. I was not a member of the committee, but I know that the members of the official opposition on committee worked very hard to improve this bill. As he mentioned, they put forward amendments. They are not the same as the amendments that I have put forward on which we are now debating, but they were similar in some aspects. They were certainly similar in trying to reduce the draconian way in which digital lock provisions are included in Bill C-11.

We have heard a lot of members of the Conservative Party say that the music industry and other industry groups believe they will make more money or create more jobs based on passing this bill. I went through the evidence from the fall and found that two of the largest music industry collectives of copyright said that they did not see any evidence of this from the U.S., where there are WIPO rules regarding digital locks, and Canada where we do not. In Canada, we are able to sell legally online, where people are using the online availability of music and not downloading illegally but are paying for their music. Canada's digital industry of online music was growing faster than the U.S. industry. They simply reject the idea that they are going to make more money or create more jobs in the music industry based on digital locks. I wonder if my hon. friend has a comment.

Government Orders

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Madam Speaker, as the member rightly recognized, there is no doubt that the member for Timmins—James Bay has been doing remarkable work on this issue, not just in this Parliament, but in previous Parliaments. He has been doing an amazing job representing our party caucus and the millions of Canadian artists and others who are deeply concerned about this.

Clearly, there are serious concerns facing artists and creators, as well as those who want to access this entertainment material for their own personal use. It is a serious concern—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Westlock—St. Paul.

Mr. Brian Storseth (Westlock—St. Paul, CPC): Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak to Bill C-11.

To start, I would like to note my support for the bill. I encourage others to support it as well.

The bill is a result of consulting, listening, and listening until we got it right. In fact, this legislation has come to this point through one of the largest consultations in Canadian history. By now, there should be no mistaking the message that we have received. Canada needs to pass legislation to update its Copyright Act and we should do so quickly.

As we have heard during various speeches delivered during the course of the proceedings on Bill C-11 and former Bill C-32, this legislation purposely balances both the rights of creators and the interests of consumers. It does so in a way that allows artists and creators to position themselves as they wish, but principally protects and enhances their ability to succeed as entrepreneurs.

By strengthening the protection of their intellectual property rights, we know that if we give our artists and creators, digital or otherwise, the proper legal and economic framework in which to produce work, a large number of them will succeed, prosper and grow.

Canada is home to a great number of global success stories in the visual and performing arts, as well as artists and creators who use new media to tell their stories and create their work.

Every year, new artistic innovators emerge and build upon the successes of those before them. It is important that the laws which oversee the protection of their work are up to date and flexible, so that as art forms evolve and change, the law still applies in a way that makes sense, common sense.

On the other hand, without solid intellectual property protection, the kind of artistic activity that we celebrate every year at events like the Junos is discouraged, and success is more difficult to achieve.

For instance, we should look at Canada's very successful video game sector. We all know that Canada is home to world leaders like EA Sports, a great company that makes games like Madden football and NHL, but there are a host of other companies that thrive here in Canada as well.

For example, when the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the Minister of Industry visited BitHeads here in Ottawa, the owner of that company told the Toronto *Star* afterwards that he loses 90% of

his company's revenues to piracy activities. That is why he supports this new legislation. We need to ensure that this kind of piracy stops.

I can also speak about the positive effect the bill would have on photography in Canada. The bill ensures that photographers are the first owners of copyright on their photographs, and that copyright will be protected for 50 years after the photographer's death. Taken together, what the bill aims to do is protect the incentive to create.

Provisions in the bill strengthen the ability of copyright owners to control the uses of their online work, therefore preventing piracy and infringement and promoting new and legitimate online business models.

For example, there are provisions creating a new category of civil liability which directly targets the enablers of online piracy. In the same light, the bill ensures the protection of technological protection measures, such as digital locks, to prevent unauthorized access to copyrighted material.

Artists and rights holders will not only benefit from these protections against circumvention, but they will also benefit from the creation of rules that prevent the manufacture, importation and sale of devices that can break digital locks.

The opposition has been critical of digital locks. The important point here is that digital locks are a tool in the box for creators who wish to protect their hard work. Rights holders are free to market their work with or without a digital lock. Fundamentally, they will respond to the market in which they are active in the way that best suits their interests and values. That is how it should be in a free market.

It is because of the measures I have just mentioned and more that I am happy to see the bill move forward, beyond the delay tactics we saw at second reading and through a productive committee session in the winter, to this stage today. In many respects this debate has given parliamentarians a strong appreciation for the economic contribution of artists and creators to the Canadian economy as people who innovate, create jobs and strengthen their communities as well as the economy.

We are also more aware of the opportunities that exist for Canadian artists in our new digital economy. Because of this appreciation and the promise created by these opportunities, what we are saying to artists across the country is that we understand this piece of legislation is important for their ability to profit fully from their work.

● (1235)

We will bring the full force of the law against organized commercial piracy to protect the efforts of Canada's creative community. The commitment met with stakeholders' support again and again.

Government Orders

The Entertainment Software Association of Canada said that the government is delivering on a promise to modernize outdated law and support new and innovative business models. It considers that this legislation would provide a framework to allow creators and companies to distribute their works in the manner that best suits them. This is the association that supports video games and other entertainment software creators. It is saying clearly that this law should be passed now.

The Canadian Anti-Counterfeiting Network is just as clear. It said that it strongly supports the principles behind this legislation, and that piracy is a massive problem in Canada, which has an economic impact on government retailers and consumers. It said, "We are pleased the government is committed to getting tough on IP crimes."

The Canadian Publisher's Council said that "...we all benefit from strong and precise copyright legislation that provides incentives to protect rights holders" in this highly competitive economy.

It is clear that we have support to move ahead and that we are delivering with this legislation. With the kind of protection those stakeholders are seeking, it is clear that artists do not need things like an iPod tax, which the opposition supports again and again, and does so regardless of the market consequences and what it would mean for the ability of our creators to market their products in new and innovative ways.

The opposition should take a more positive and confident view of artists and creators. In essence, it should see them as the innovative entrepreneurs that they are and support copyright modernization in Canada as a way of enhancing their ability to succeed.

This is our third attempt at introducing copyright legislation. Thanks to the efforts of our government, as well as those who took part in the Bill C-11 committee, we will finally bring Canada's copyright laws in line with international standards. This legislation would strengthen our ability to compete in the global, digital economy. It would protect and create jobs, promote innovation and attract new investment to Canada. Moreover, this legislation would encourage new ideas and protect the rights of Canadians whose research, development and artistic creativity strengthen our economy each and every day.

For these reasons I am pleased to support the bill. I encourage all members of this great place to vote in favour of it.

• (1240)

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Madam Speaker, I understand that the member across feels passionately about ensuring that we have a modern copyright law, something that our party supports.

The bill in front of us has a lot of glaring gaps and problems. We are asking that we take this legislation back to the table and make it the kind of legislation that it could truly be. What is the problem in doing that? We know there are problems. Many stakeholders have indicated that clearly. Let us get down to work and do the best we can as legislators.

Mr. Brian Storseth: Madam Speaker, it is true that this is important legislation for artists, creators and consumers in our country.

This is not the first time this legislation has been brought before this great place. It is not even the second time. This is the third time that the bill has been brought before this place, two of those times in minority Parliaments in which the opposition had more than ample opportunity to stand up and make some of the changes that it looked to make. The opposition actually had a majority on committee.

When I was in Edmonton a month ago artists told me that it is time that we do this, that it needs to be done now. The longer we wait the more we put their work and their creations in jeopardy.

We have looked at this not once, not twice but three times in this country. We have done a great job, taking in the committee's proposals. The committee received over 150 submissions and heard from 70 witnesses. It is time to move forward and get some work done on behalf of Canadians and Canadian artists.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, this bill has been before the House numerous times. In fact, the first effort at amending copyright legislation goes back to 2005 under a previous Liberal government. Members on all sides of the House and all parties understand that Canada has signed on to international conventions relating to intellectual property and is amending domestic law to meet those terms. Steven Shrybman, counsel for the Council of Canadians, once said that if the governments of the world took climate change as seriously as they take intellectual property, we would have all our laws in place to reduce emissions.

Does the hon. member not think this law should differentiate people who accidentally break the digital lock at home or download material without any intention to resell or in any profit from it, in other words, the kinds of things people are used to doing today? Does he not think an individual violation of copyright law should be differentiated from a commercial violation of copyright law? At this point, individuals are subject to the same penalties of up to \$20,000 maximum as commercial attempts to circumvent copyright law.

Mr. Brian Storseth: Madam Speaker, I am glad that the hon. member recognizes how seriously our government takes copyright legislation and the modernization of it. She is a very thoughtful person, who puts forward very real amendments, unlike some of my colleagues opposite.

I am of the understanding through my reading of the legislation that this does differentiate people who are recording something at home, people who do not necessarily intend to break a digital lock. The minister has done an excellent job in balancing the needs of consumers while modernizing our copyright legislation so that artists, creators and photographers can have more modern standards in keeping with those of other countries.

Government Orders

•(1245)

[Translation]

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his speech, which was very interesting.

I would like to ask him a question about the rights of communities, including remote communities and communities in our regions. The bill we have before us does not seem to provide artists in remote areas with the necessary rights to promote their craft.

I would like to know whether this bill will benefit them. Will it promote cultural development in our remote areas?

[English]

Mr. Brian Storseth: Madam Speaker, I believe the question goes beyond just the copyright legislation and talks about the need for promoting culture and heritage throughout the regions of our country. I live in a rural region in Alberta that has strong Ukrainian and francophone communities. It is important that we address the cultural differences and promote culture in our country. That is why I am proud to stand behind the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages who does so much work on this file and continues to try to balance the needs of, in this case, the consumers and those creating the products.

Mr. John Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, we are going to see a diversity of people across Canada supporting this bill, from rural Alberta and urban British Columbia to the rural areas of the riding that I represent.

I am honoured to rise to speak to Bill C-11 and would like to begin by saying that I am proud that our government is getting closer to delivering on its commitment to modernize Canada's copyright law. I hope that all members will join me in ensuring the swift passage of this bill.

[Translation]

I would like to remind hon. members of all the work our government has done to bring this bill to where it is today.

[English]

The copyright modernization legislation was first introduced in June 2010 after extensive consultations that our government held across the country in 2009. During these consultations, we heard from thousands of Canadians. We listened and responded with a bill that would balance the interests of all Canadians. This includes Canadians who create and use copyrighted content.

The bill was then extensively debated in the House in the previous Parliament. It was then studied by a legislative committee that heard from more than 70 witnesses and received more than 150 written submissions before that Parliament was dissolved. On September 29, 2011, our government reintroduced it. By reintroducing this bill without changes, our government demonstrated its support for a balanced approach to copyright modernization.

[Translation]

We have since spent a great deal of time debating this bill in the House. Bill C-11 was referred to a parliamentary committee that picked up the study where the previous committee had left off. We heard from additional witnesses. We received additional submissions. A clause-by-clause study was completed and some amendments were passed.

[English]

This important piece of legislation is now before us, after this extensive review. We now need to deliver on our commitment to Canadians by passing Bill C-11 and modernizing the Copyright Act. Modernizing the Copyright Act would help protect and create jobs in Canada, which is the number one priority for this government. It would help promote innovation and it would help attract new investment to Canada, directly supporting economic growth.

One way that Bill C-11 would do all this is by helping to ensure that hard work and good ideas are valued and rewarded in today's digital economy. This would help fuel Canadian creativity, productivity and innovation. This is good news for all Canadians and for the Canadian economy.

[Translation]

Copyright is important for a several sectors of our economy, including the creative industries.

[English]

Let me relate the importance of some of these industries.

Copyright matters to the film and television industries. In 2010-11, these industries represented \$5.49 billion in economic activity and employed 128,000 Canadians. Where I reside, the North Shore of Vancouver, a tremendous number of people owe their livelihood to the TV and film industries.

Copyright also matters to the video game industry. In 2011, this sector employed some 16,000 Canadians, including the Vancouver-based company Electronic Arts. The same sector is estimated to contribute \$1.7 billion to the economy.

•(1250)

[Translation]

These industries are vital for our economy. I would also like to note that they contribute to the quality of life in communities across our great country.

[English]

Of course Canada's creative industries are not the only part of the economy that is affected by copyright. Copyright law affects a range of other sectors, one way or another. Some of these sectors include architecture, engineering, interior design, retail, telecommunications, information technology and educational institutions. Furthermore, copyright matters to Canadian citizens. This includes Canadians who make use of content, Canadians who purchase content and, of course, Canadians who create content.

Government Orders

It is clear that copyright law affects the lives of many Canadians and the work of many Canadian organizations. That is why we have taken a balanced approach to copyright modernization. Bill C-11 would balance the interests of all these parties. It would take a common sense approach by providing protections for the works of creators while, at the same time, recognizing the interests of users. This is good news for all Canadians, be they creators or users.

[Translation]

I would like to take the next few minutes to talk about the benefits of Bill C-11 for Canadian creators.

[English]

Bill C-11 promotes creativity and innovation by introducing new rights and protections for creators. It also provides creative businesses with a legal framework that will help them attract investment, engage in new business models and combat infringement in a digital environment.

Let me relate a few of these measures that will be of interest to Canadian creators. Bill C-11 would implement the rights established in the Internet treaties of the World Intellectual Property Organization. Let me relate a few of those rights.

First, there is the distribution right. This right will allow a copyright holder to control the first distribution of copyrighted material.

Then there is the making available right, which all copyright owners, including performers and producers of sound recordings, will enjoy. This right allows them to control the release of copyrighted material on the Internet.

Then there is the so-called moral rights for performers. These rights, similar to the moral rights already provided to authors, will give performers control over the integrity of their performance and its association.

By implementing all these rights, our government will bring Canada's copyright law in line with the widely recognized international standard of copyright protection for the digital age.

There are also a number of other measures of interest to Canadian creators in Bill C-11. For example, the bill would make photographers the first owner of copyright associated with their photographs. This copyright would be protected for the life of the photographer plus 50 years. This would harmonize the treatment of photographers under Canada's copyright law with that of other creators. This would allow photographers to take advantage of opportunities in the global marketplace.

By modernizing the Copyright Act, our government will help protect and create jobs. Bill C-11 would also help promote innovation and help attract new investment to Canada. It would give Canadian creators the tools they need to remain creative, innovative and to compete internationally. It would help all Canadians, be they creators or users, benefit from the opportunities of the digital age.

Let me stress that Canadians will not enjoy these benefits until Parliament passes the bill. Through consultations and committee hearings, we have heard the perspectives of thousands of Canadians.

Through hours of debate, we have discussed the perspective they have presented. It is now time for us to pass the legislation and deliver on our commitment to Canadians to modernize Canada's copyright law.

[Translation]

I urge all members of Parliament to join me in supporting this important bill.

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member from British Columbia. He definitely raised a lot of interesting points in his remarks. I would like to ask a question about digital locks to gain a better understanding.

He says that artists will benefit from the bill because their rights are going to be protected. But it seems to me that consumers will be at a real disadvantage. I would like him to go a little further and highlight the contrast between the two, so that I can have a better understanding of where he is drawing the line in terms of digital locks.

• (1255)

Mr. John Weston: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I will answer in English, because this topic requires a slightly technical vocabulary.

[English]

The digital locks are an important tool for creators and copyright owners to protect their work. Software producers, video game and movie distributors, for example, continue to use digital locks as part of their business model because they wish to protect the significant investment each makes in developing the products. Canadian jobs depend on their ability to make a return on this investment.

In other markets, however, in light of consumer demand, some businesses have chosen not to use those locks. Copyright owners may decide whether to use a digital lock and consumers can then decide whether to buy the product.

The bill would also provide a regulation-making power to allow the circumvention of digital locks in certain cases, for example, where the presence of a digital lock unduly restricted competition in an aftermarket sector.

[Translation]

I hope I have answered the question properly.

[English]

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend from West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country has underestimated the historic place of his riding in our hearts in the cultural industry, as it is the location of *The Beachcombers*.

Government Orders

I know he knows whereof he speaks in terms of the cultural industry. That is why I put to him the cultural industry groups, a very long list of them, which included the Canadian Actors' Equity Association, the Songwriters Association of Canada, the Screen Composers Guild of Canada, the Playwrights Guild of Canada. Over 80 of them recognize that the industry represents \$46 billion to the Canadian economy and employs over 600,000 people. This industry thinks the current bill is not properly balanced in relation to digital locks.

No one in the House, I do not believe, is suggesting that we do not want to protect the copyright of and the talent and creative energies of our cultural community, but the legislation goes too far in providing digital locks and making any effort to break those locks a violation of the law.

Does my hon. friend from West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country not think we could accept some amendments to the bill?

Mr. John Weston: Madam Speaker, my neighbour from Saanich—Gulf Islands helps me honour the tremendous creators who reside in the riding I represent, people like Joni Mitchell, Randy Bachman, Sarah McLachlan, some of Canada's top performers, who I have the honour to know.

I believe that after the tremendous amount of consultations, the 70 witnesses who came before committee and the 150 briefs, there is the balance to which the questioner has eluded. In fact, there are many exceptions in the bill. We have exceptions for educational institutions, libraries, archives and museums that can benefit from this bill.

There is a concerted effort to ensure that our creators, our entrepreneurs in the creative industry, are protected so that internationally our wonderful Canadians may be recognized and they can make a living from their art, while others can enjoy the art. There are protections, for example, for people who record TV shows so they will not be afraid of unfair, undue or disproportionate repercussions if they do so.

Mr. John Carmichael (Don Valley West, CPC): Madam Speaker, May 2 marked the first anniversary of the day that Canadians endorsed our government by giving it a majority mandate. With such a clear mandate, we understand that Canadians believe in government aimed directly at job creation, economic growth and long-term prosperity.

We have proof that the plan is working. Statistics Canada recently announced that 58,200 net new jobs were created in April, with large gains in the private sector, manufacturing and in full-time positions.

We campaigned on a commitment to provide a strong economy for Canadians, not with extravagant promises, but with the proposals and principles now contained in our economic action plan.

Part of our plan for economic prosperity is Bill C-11, the copyright modernization act. The message from Canadians is clear: Canada needs to pass this legislation. Because of this bill, we will finally bring Canada's copyright laws in line with international standards.

I am proud to support a bill that both recognizes how technologies change the lives of Canadians and supports the industry and consumers. The bill would help Canadians better address the challenges and opportunities presented by the digital age. It would work in concert with other measures to strengthen our digital economy, including \$80 million to accelerate digital adoption by small businesses, which was announced in budget 2011, and the significant funding toward innovation and venture capital in budget 2012.

We are also ensuring that Canadians have world-class digital infrastructure through actions like the auction of spectrum for next generation wireless networks and services. We are increasing direct support for business innovation, with \$95 million over three years and \$40 million per year in ongoing funding to make the Canadian innovation commercialization program permanent.

Copyright reform fits within these innovative measures.

The legislation reflects our understanding of the critical role new technology plays in creating new ways for consumers to purchase and enjoy copyrighted material. That is why we are creating a better framework in which copyright owners can create and protect their content. The legislation would strengthen our ability to compete in the global digital economy and it would protect and create jobs, promote innovation and attract new investment to Canada.

Multiple witnesses have come forward to express support for the bill. They acknowledge that the main goal is about protecting and creating jobs, while stimulating our digital economy and attracting new investment to our knowledge economy and creative industries.

As an example, the Entertainment Software Alliance of Canada said, "We strongly support the principles underlying this bill. This legislation will help provide a framework for the digital marketplace".

The Motion Picture Association of Canada has said:

A healthy film and television industry means more jobs, a stronger economy, and a greater array of entertainment choices for consumers...We support the Government's commitment to give copyright owners the tools they need to combat online content theft, and promote creativity, innovation and legitimate business models with the introduction of Bill C-11, the Copyright Modernization Act.

Right holders will finally have stronger legal tools to pursue online pirate sites that facilitate copyright infringement. The amendments would facilitate targeting those who would participate in violating rights of creators so the real criminals could be punished. Another amendment would eliminate the safe harbour for those who would enable the infringement of the rights of authors.

Government Orders

The legislation would also bring our country in line with the 1996 World Intellectual Property Organization Internet Treaties, including strong legal protections for digital locks, a new liability for those promoting infringement online and the making available right to ensure control of material over the Internet. We are ensuring that we protect copyright holders and are giving them the ability to defend themselves, while encouraging new ideas whose creativity strengthens our economy.

• (1300)

For example, a website run by an individual committed to wide-scale copyright infringement is truly damaging to rights holders. The person operating that site should face the full consequences of his or her activities. That is why one of the amendments adopted at the committee stage will facilitate targeting those who participate in violating rights of creators on a large scale: it is so that these types of violators can be punished. This bill will finally give more freedom to consumers while enforcing a hard line against organized piracy.

A strong digital economy also requires a connected education sector. As a result of this legislation, libraries, archives and museums will be permitted to make copies of copyrighted material in an alternative format if there is a concern that the original is in a format that is in danger of becoming obsolete.

As well, this bill includes a number of measures that will allow teachers and students to take advantage of digital technologies so that they can use copyrighted material on lessons conducted over the Internet. This will help the continued development of distance learning, which is opening up new educational opportunities for those in rural and remote communities.

These are just some of the measures in the bill that I fully support.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, this bill is an important step in strengthening our digital economy. As we showed in budget 2012, we are supporting the development of our digital economy through important measures, such as opening the telecom sectors to increase foreign investment and putting new funding toward the IRAP program.

This legislation is another step in the process that I strongly encourage members to support. Canadians have spoken, and we have answered. It is time to stop the delays and move forward with the real copyright reform.

• (1305)

Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened closely to the member's comments, as I did this morning to the comments of the Minister of Canadian Heritage when he was vigorously defending the need to close debate on this bill because, as he said, there are a number of validators on the record who have said that enough is enough and that this is the right bill. I want to put a couple of comments on the record as well, because I think both members have been very selective in their discussion of this bill.

First I will quote Michael Geist. Everybody here would know him as a renowned technology commentator. He puts it very succinctly when he states:

The foundational principle of the new bill remains that any time a digital lock is used—whether on books, movies, music, or electronic devices—the lock trumps virtually all other rights....[This] means that both the existing fair dealing rights and

[Bill C-11's] new rights...all cease to function effectively so long as the rights holder places a digital lock on their content or device.

There are others. I know I do not have time to quote them all, but in the cultural industries, the Writers Guild of Canada, SOCAN and the Samuelson-Glushko Canadian Internet Policy and Public Interest Clinic all have serious concerns about the bill.

I wonder whether the member would choose to address even one of them, since in his own comments he said there are only some parts of the bill that he supports.

Mr. John Carmichael: Mr. Speaker, clearly this bill has been a long time in coming. This is its third iteration and the third time we have debated it. There has been lots of discussion, debate and committee work around it, including 70 witnesses and 150 submissions.

Clearly, the information has been provided. The opportunity for thought, discussion and debate has come to an end, and today we have a bill that will clearly serve the purpose of this nation as we go forward.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member said that we have had a good lengthy debate. It is interesting that the longer this debate seems to go on, the more the government admits there is a need for more changes, because even the government is bringing in more amendments to the legislation.

My question is related to an earlier question I asked of one of the member's colleagues. It would be wonderful to get some clarification on this point.

I asked the member's colleague this: if one of his constituents goes to a local store, purchases a CD and takes it home, would he or she have the right to put that favourite song, or whatever it might be, onto one or two of his or her own MP3 players, strictly for personal use?

• (1310)

Mr. John Carmichael: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I heard him ask that question yesterday, as a matter of fact.

The bill calls for those who clearly intend to circumvent the law to be punished and challenged and dealt with in this situation. I believe the bill implies clearly that if there is no digital lock, there would not be a problem for those who take a CD home to put it on their MP3 or some other device. However, the question is relative to a digital lock, and if it is an intentional circumvention of the law for commercial purposes or for piracy, et cetera, then we have a situation that would definitely call for action by the authorities.

Mr. Mike Lake (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in terms of the opposition's comments about the amount of consultation and debate on this particular issue, I would just note that Bill C-32 in the last Parliament and Bill C-11 in this one have had very many hours of debate. We have seen about 180 individual witnesses come before committee and, between the two bills, dozens of hours of committee hearings. I wonder if the hon. member might comment on whether, in his experience in the House, he has seen this level of debate in any other bill.

Government Orders

Mr. John Carmichael: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague knows, I am a new member to the House as of a year ago. In my experience I have not seen this length of review, so I think it is time for the opposition parties to join the government and support this bill.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being allowed to rise for debate on Bill C-11, the copyright modernization act.

Since 2006, one of our government's goals has been to protect those who seek innovation by creating or evolving new ideas. We have answered the call sent by Canadians for responsible copyright legislation that would protect and help creators, performers and copyright owners or consumers. Our government recognizes how new technologies are changing the lives of many Canadians, and our creative industries deserve a modern understanding of the critical role copyright laws play in protecting and creating jobs in Canada's digital economy. In our fast-moving technological world, it is important that our legislation remain current and provide a better, more efficient way for copyright owners to create and protect their content.

After an attempt to modernize our copyright legislation in 2011, which we could not complete because of the demand from the opposition for an unnecessary election, I am proud to say that we continue to pursue this goal. We are glad that Canadians gave our government a strong majority so that the opposition can no longer disrupt our goal of providing creators with a modern copyright act that is in line with today's digital world.

By reintroducing this bill without change in the fall, our government reiterated its support for a balanced approach to copyright reform, and after hearing more than 70 witnesses at the Bill C-32 committee and almost as many at the Bill C-11 committee, we think that this bill will finally provide a new, modern and up-to-date vision for copyright that has always been shared by our government. Not only would this legislation bring our country on par with international standards; it would also make our country a world leader in terms of copyright reform. For example, I would cite the notice and notice provisions of this bill as truly innovative.

I am also glad to say that multiple witnesses have provided strong support for this bill, acknowledging that our government's main goal is protecting and creating jobs while stimulating our economy and attracting new investment to Canada. As an example, the Canadian Publishers Council said that our government "...demonstrates a clear understanding of the need to amend the current Copyright Act to bring it more in line with our times".

• (1315)

[*Translation*]

In this regard, let me say a few words about the proposed amendments to Bill C-11, amendments that speak to the concerns that have been raised and that will bring some clarity and precision to the bill.

For example, in response to the concerns from the CNIB, which provides support to blind and partially-sighted Canadians, we have introduced an amendment for non-profit organizations that limits the legal actions that can be taken against non-profits that mistakenly

export abroad an alternate format that is meant for people with visual impairments.

Some non-profit organizations had raised concerns with regard to the fact that they could be discouraged from making use of the exception regarding formats for people with a perceptual disability, because of the related legal liabilities. This clarification will enable these organizations to use the exception without fear of negative consequences.

At this point, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who contributed their briefs and suggestions to Bill C-11.

The intent of the bill is not to punish legitimate organizations that make an honest mistake in good faith, but to protect intellectual property as well as the rights of consumers. It should be noted that copyright holders can always ask for an injunction to bring an end to any violations. This amendment shows our good faith as well as our openness to proposed technical amendments. I would like to repeat that our intent is not to punish those who respect the law.

[*English*]

With this in mind, I would like to mention another amendment that would help to better target those persons who do not obey the law and who abuse the opportunities offered by the Internet. This amendment concerns safe harbour provisions. The amendment would clarify the scope of the legislation and eliminate safe harbours for persons who allow or enable copyright infringement.

Currently, service providers have four areas of exemption regarding enabling offences: caching services, hosting services, telecommunications services and information location tools, such as Google or Yahoo.

The amendment to the bill would eliminate safe harbours for caching and hosting in cases where copyright infringement would be enabled. Safe harbours are not created for criminals who seek to escape the law and abuse the legislation for their own profit. The amendment would clarify this issue.

The amendment would have a positive effect and give copyright holders other means of recourse to protect their works. They have the right to benefit from the results of their efforts.

We have also made an amendment concerning the scope of injunctions in order to clarify the legal issues surrounding search engines. This amendment would address concerns with search engines and possible catch-all injunctions that would be too broad to enforce, such as a court order requiring that a song be completely removed from the Internet.

It is a matter of demonstrating common sense and having realistic expectations of what can be done to fight Internet piracy. Under the provisions of our bill, search engines would not be liable as a result of performing their role as neutral conduits.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Once again, our goal is not to penalize legitimate intermediaries, such as search engines, that provide a valuable service to the users. That is highlighted by this amendment.

This amendment goes hand-in-hand with our desire to recognize the neutral role played by these intermediaries in online activities. This bill is intended to establish a balance between the parties, and this amendment will help establish a reasonable balance for everyone.

For the consumers, we have made another clarification with the amendment concerning access to copies in terms of alternative formats and later viewing. This amendment confirms that personal use refers to the entire household, not just a single individual. We feel this is a matter of common sense. We hope that the bill reflects this common sense, both in its implementation and in its spirit. We must ensure that consumers can take advantage of the content they have purchased at the time and in the format of their choice, while respecting the balance between creators' rights and consumers' rights.

In addition, the wording of the former provisions could suggest that they granted a right to mass-distribute copies, provided they were intended for the recipient's exclusive personal use. This amendment reinforces the language of the act without changing its spirit.

This amendment will also enhance intellectual property protection, while enabling consumers to enjoy their purchases in the comfort of their homes.

Earlier I mentioned that this bill would make Canada a world leader in copyright reform. It is also important to note that we will finally be meeting the standards of the international treaties to which Canada is a signatory.

We have also added an amendment respecting international treaties to clarify the remedies available to copyright holders and to make it clear that they may base a remedy on the treaty of their choice, but not two at the same time.

The purpose of our bill is to provide Canada with a modern intellectual property regime adapted to new technologies. Treaties overlap when copyright is asserted or belongs to countries that are signatories to both treaties. This clarification protects consumers and means they will not have to pay twice for the same service as a result of overlapping international laws.

Once again, we have to do things properly and ensure that the rights of consumers and creators are respected and that our intellectual property regime creates wealth for the future.

•(1320)

[English]

It is time to acknowledge that Canadians have spoken in favour of this legislation. It is time to pass the bill.

[Translation]

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

What comes to my mind when I think of Bill C-11 on copyright modernization is the contrast between creators, artists, musicians and so on and the companies that will certainly benefit from this bill more than the creators. I found it very interesting that, when we put questions on this matter to the Minister of Canadian Heritage in the House, he often responded with quotations. I would like to cite just one:

[English]

Our copyright legislation...was adopted by this Parliament....

In fact, the Canadian Recording Industry Association backs our bill. The Canadian Anti-Counterfeiting Network applauds our bill. The Canadian Film and Television Production Association said that it applauds the government's copyright reform....

[Translation]

That answer was given on March 13, 2012. I believe it really shows that this bill is unbalanced in that it grants all the protections demanded by the companies. However, creators, craftspeople and musicians have not been quoted in support of the bill.

I would like to hear the government member comment on the fact that the creators themselves do not support this bill and that only the companies support it. At least, that is what the government has shown.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Mr. Speaker, I must point out that this bill is indeed trying to find the essential balance between creators and consumers.

[English]

I do not know why the member is just focusing on big business. Many creators of intellectual property are not big business. In fact, they earn their living from the work they do and simply want their copyrighted materials protected.

Of course, we must also find the balance with the consumers, which is exactly what the bill would do.

[Translation]

This bill finds the necessary balance. We need to act, and I encourage the members on the other side to support this bill.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am working on a brochure and in order to get it right I would like the member to comment on whether what I am about to put out in my brochure is in fact wrong.

My brochure would read that the Prime Minister and the Conservative government believe that if people purchase a music CD at Walmart and it has a digital lock, that they had better not make a copy of any of the songs for personal use because if they do they will be breaking the law and committing a criminal offence.

If this legislation passes, that is what I will be telling my constituents. Am I right or am I wrong about personal use?

•(1325)

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Mr. Speaker, the member needs to wake up and realize the reality of today.

Government Orders

The producers of copyrighted material are not there to frustrate the consumer. They want to sell their products with minimum impact on the consumer. If the member has been in Walmart buying, for example, a movie, he knows that the movie with the digital lock is available in multiple format, a format, perhaps, on a DVD for a television, but also in a format that people can load right on to their iPad. There is no longer a need to break the digital lock.

When it comes to music, there are many CDs out there that do not have any digital lock at all. Of course, for personal use, the consumer is welcome to simply transcribe the format for his own personal device as long as there is not a digital lock.

I do not know why the member is trying to exaggerate the circumstances as they exist and why he does not recognize that the producers of content actually want consumers to buy their products. That is the reality of the new marketplace.

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member state his case and I heard the question from the gentleman on the other side earlier about the digital lock.

I have a niece who is a professional singer-songwriter. She depends on selling her music to make a living. There does not seem to be an understanding on the other side of the importance of protecting her intellectual property, the music and the songs that she writes and sings.

I would just ask the member whether this legislation would protect her and protect her property in a reasonable way.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Mr. Speaker, that was an excellent point and the point I made in my first response. We are not talking about big corporations here. We are talking about Canadians who create content and earn their living from that. That is how they feed their families. They should be protected, and that is what the bill would do. It finds that middle ground, that balance between the rights of the creators of content and the consumer.

The opposition members want to ramp this up but they are doing an injustice to the creator, Canadians who contribute to our industries. They are ramping it up unnecessarily when they know the consultation that has gone on with the bill, they know the support that it has and they should really be voting for the bill and standing on the side of Canadians and content creators.

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand in the House and speak to this important bill.

Many of us in the NDP know that our party has been at the forefront of pushing for innovative and effective legislation through the work of colleague from Timmins—James Bay and others who have painstakingly committed to extensive consultations, both in the confines of Parliament and out across the country. They and are our team have reached out to all stakeholders, artists, academics, students, producers and all people in the industry.

Our goal all along has been to produce the most innovative and effective copyright legislation we can. Unfortunately, the government seems to have issue with the concept of innovation, not just in this area but, frankly, all across the board. While it makes reference to wanting modern legislation, we know, and many stakeholders have indicated, that the legislation has gaping problems.

What we have suggested is that we sit down and go through these gaps, that we close the gaps, that we solve the problems and that we retract the problems created as a result of the legislation, problems that were not there before. That is something we have been very consistently saying. We want to work at this and are continuing to work at this.

We are very disappointed that the government pressed for closure of the debate, a habit that it has shown on many critical debates in this House. It is an action that limits not only the voices of Canadians in deciding their future on various issues, but makes for legislation that does not work, legislation that will cause greater problems, certainly in terms of copyright within the artistic community and the academic community. It might benefit some but most Canadians will face some real challenges as a result of the legislation.

We believe that copyright modernization is long overdue but this bill has too many glaring problems. In certain cases it even creates problems where none existed.

New Democrats believe that copyright laws in Canada can balance the right of creators to be compensated fairly for their work and the right of consumers to have reasonable access to copyright content. We have made it clear all along that the way we would consider possible amendments to the bill would be to create a fair royalty system for creators. However, as it stands, Bill C-11 wipes away millions of dollars in revenue for artists.

When we look closer at the issue, it appears that all Canadian attempts at copyright reform in recent years have had very little to do with creating a regime that would balance the rights of creators and the public, but rather have been an attempt to satisfy the demands of American large content owners, such as movie studios, music labels, video game developers and others.

What we are asking as New Democrats is: When will Canadians have copyright legislation that works for them? We believe that copyright laws in Canada can balance the right of creators to be compensated fairly for their work and the right of consumers to have reasonable access to content. The bill would grant a range of new access privileges but would not increase opportunities for artists' remuneration.

This new playing field will profoundly affect the ability of artists to survive. The copyright modernization act essentially gives with one hand while it takes away with the other. While the bill contains a few concessions for consumers, they are, unfortunately, undermined by the government's refusal to compromise on the single most controversial copyright issue in this country, that being the digital lock provisions.

In the case of long distance education, for example, people in a remote, isolated community would have to burn their school notes after 30 days. That is hardly an improvement or an appropriate use of copyright law.

Government Orders

•(1330)

People in remote communities across northern Manitoba depend on access to education and accessibility to materials. This is a clear necessity, as we New Democrats have said. The government claims to be on the side of training and education. However, the legislation would hinder that access, particularly for people who already face so many obstacles in accessing education and materials they need. The legislation would set them and our regions back.

We have proposed removing sections of the copyright modernization act that would make criminals out of everyday Canadians who would break digital locks for personal and non-commercial use.

We do support the lessening of penalties for those who are responsible for breaking copyright law. This would prevent the excessive use of problematic lawsuits against ordinary citizens, like what we have seen in the U.S.

The Conservatives unfortunately have ignored expert opinions raised in committee and the findings of their own copyright consultations in 2009. As a result, they have arrived at flawed legislation that may end up doing more harm than good.

New Democrats believe that copyright modernization is overdue, but this bill has too many glaring problems. We will be at the forefront of proposing positive changes and of being part of developing modernized copyright law that is in the best interests of Canadians.

I would also like to share the words of many respected people in their fields, people who know the legislation is flawed and that it will harm producers and users of so many materials that involve the copyright legislation.

Michael Geist, the renowned technology commentator, put it succinctly:

The foundational principle of the new bill remains that anytime a digital lock is used — whether on books, movies, music, or electronic devices — the lock trumps virtually all other rights...This...means that the existing fair dealing rights [and Bill C-11 rights]...all cease to function effectively so long as the rights holder places a digital lock on their content or device.

The cultural industry has made a statement. It represents over 80 arts and culture organizations across Quebec and nationwide. It argues that the bill may be toxic to Canada's digital economy. It warns that failure to amend the copyright modernization act to ensure fair compensation for Canadian content owners can only lead to a decline in the production of Canadian content and its dissemination domestically and abroad.

Instead of moving forward, instead of being at the cutting edge of innovation, instead of ensuring that our artists, researchers, academics and Canadian industries are able to be part of the future of the digital economy, the government's approach is setting us back.

Unfortunately this is an overall trend with the Conservative government, whether it is on the environment, economic development, education or in an area that I am involved with, women's rights. The government's approach is not to look forward, but rather to look at how we can pull away. In the case of Bill C-11, when so many hours and so much effort has been made to shape the best legislation, the government has unfortunately not produced that.

Finally, I would like to share the message of so many of my colleagues in the NDP. The legislation would set artists back. Artists are the backbone of our country. They are the people who shape our communities, who tell our stories, who bring us together from coast to coast in a country as broad and as wealthy in talent as ours. The reality is we need real legislation that will allow artists to do their work and that allows Canadians to move forward. Unfortunately Bill C-11 is not that legislation.

We hope the government will listen to New Democrats and allow us to do that work.

•(1335)

Hon. Laurie Hawn (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague talked about being concerned about creators. All of us are concerned about creators.

This is a quote from a group of creators, the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees. It says:

We congratulate the Government for protect[ing] the creative industries and men and women working in film and television production across Canada....The bill does not provide for the extension of the controversial private copying levy to devices such as ipods, which would have been extremely unpopular with consumers...

Given the fact that we have spent two and a half years debating this legislation, whether it was Bill C-32 or Bill C-11, given the fact that we have received thousands of input, given the fact there was a special legislative committee and given the fact that the bill attempts to balance the rights of consumers and creators, would the hon. member like to comment on the fact that no matter what provisions are in a bill there will always be somebody who will find the bill unsatisfactory? Would my colleague acknowledge that Bill C-11 is a good attempt at balancing that? I expect I know the answer. It is always a balancing act. Regardless, I wish we could just get on with it instead of playing politics with consumers and creators.

Ms. Niki Ashton: Mr. Speaker, for us, what is important is that we do the job right. What we have said consistently, and as indicated through the efforts of my colleague from Timmins—James Bay and others, is that we would like to do a thorough job. Absolutely, we would like to be time effective, but let us ensure that at the end of the day the legislation that comes out is to the benefit of all Canadians.

I would like to read the words of the Society for Reproduction Rights of Authors, Composers and Publishers in Canada that noted on the identical bill to C-11, Bill C-32:

If adopted without amendments, the bill tabled in the House of Commons will significantly affect creators' revenues. Moreover, the desired balance between the interests of creators and those of consumers and users is, in our opinion, completely absent.

This is not a balanced bill, and that is what we ask for.

Government Orders

• (1340)

Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat inspired to get up after hearing the hon. member for Edmonton. It almost seems like it is a black and white situation. We have a situation where he says that there will always be people against these sorts of measures. Of course there will be, but they have absolutely zero recourse.

Let us take a look at the education exemption as a fine example. We have a blanket exemption across the board. What if authors feel the education exemption is being exploited so their work is not being sold in the market? It would take away the ability of authors to sell their products. A multi-step test for the courts to decide whether an author has been infringed upon is the way to go. The government would not even entertain it. That person has been written off as far as any concerns the author may have. This is not a way of listening to the people opposed to this.

Ms. Niki Ashton: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the bill has tremendous gaps, as my colleagues and I have noted.

We are saying we should do the job right. Let us ensure that we close the gaps. We have said that we are willing to make the amendments, to be part of making that positive change, but once again, the government is resorting to closing the debate, ensuring that Canadians are once again silenced on something that is so important to our future.

The final result will be ineffective legislation that will take away revenues from artists and that will set Canadians back when it comes to our involvement in the digital economy. As New Democrats, we believe that is wrong.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sadia Groguhé (Saint-Lambert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech.

I would just like to say that Bill C-11 does not reflect the interests of Canadians, not in the way it will be adopted—since this is the nth time we have seen debate shut down—and not in its content—since it does not consider the consumers, for whom it is important to provide fair dealing.

Can my colleague comment on the use of locks in this context?

Ms. Niki Ashton: Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this bill poses a number of problems. For example, in the case of digital locks, we will have many more problems if this bill becomes a reality.

In addition, our party's caucus has a number of young people and other members who are concerned about young people's contribution to Canada. This type of bill makes us take a step back, not move forward. That is why the NDP does not support the Conservative bill.

[*English*]

Mr. Mike Lake (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in my place today to speak to Bill C-11, the copyright modernization act.

The bill is returned to the House after extensive review by a legislative committee and the adoption of some technical amendments that will improve it but not alter the important policy balance that has been achieved. However, for those technical amendments,

Bill C-11 is essentially the same as Bill C-32, which was being studied during the last Parliament.

Members of the House might remember that Bill C-32 went through 6 hours and 50 minutes of debate in the House, with a total of 17 speeches. In committee, 78 organizations and 122 different individuals appeared over the course of some 20 meetings, which lasted a total of 39 hours. That was a very comprehensive and wide-ranging debate on many of the same issues that have been reintroduced during the discussion around Bill C-11.

The debate on the bill before us now has been even longer and we have heard from even more speakers, with 86 speeches in total as well as numerous interventions. Clearly the House has many views on copyright reform.

The legislative committee also heard from a broad spectrum of interests that had a stake in the modernization of copyright. In February and March, the committee met on 11 occasions and heard from 62 individuals representing various creators, collectives, intermediaries, associations and businesses. They expressed varied and sometimes opposing views on a number of provisions in the bill.

To emphasize the range of views that were represented, we heard from librarians and archivists, broadcasters, directors and film producers, musicians, publishers and authors, educators, lawyers and persons with perceptual disabilities. We also heard from large and small businesses.

I would like to take this opportunity to respond to some of the concerns that we heard concerning copyright reform.

The first relates to concerns we heard about compensation for creators. Some have argued for the expansion of the private copying regime and oppose the new exceptions for consumers. Expanding the private copying regime would increase the cost of new technologies. The government cannot have a strategy of greater access to the Internet and promotion of our digital economy and at the same time support a policy that would increase cost and taxes on new technologies that drive innovation.

The digital economy provides creators with new ways to market their works and find new revenue streams. The bill would provide them with new rights, protections and specific measures to combat the enablers of copyright infringement.

Another concern expressed by some stakeholders is that the fair dealing exception for education may have a detrimental impact on the revenue streams of creators. They propose that fair dealing be constrained rather than rely on the six factors that have been established by the courts to determine what is fair.

I point out that fair dealing is not a blank cheque. It is a long-standing feature of our copyright law that permits individuals and businesses to make certain uses of copyrighted material in ways that do not unduly threaten the interests of copyright owners and which could have significant social benefits, but only if they are fair.

Government Orders

Finally, in summarizing what we heard during the second reading debate and at committee, I point out that the education provisions of the bill received considerable attention and some criticized some of the safeguards that had been put in place to ensure a balance of interest.

The bill introduces new measures aimed at enriching the educational experience. It greatly expands the ability of teachers and students to make use of new digital technologies and of copyrighted materials in the educational context.

For instance, teachers and students will be allowed to use copyrighted material in lessons conducted over the Internet and use legitimately posted material that they find on the Internet for educational purposes. The bill would also adjust existing educational provisions to make them more technology neutral. The limitations and safeguards in place in relation to these new measures are an essential part of the balance between supporting learning and respecting the legitimate interests of copyright owners.

These matters were discussed extensively at second reading and by the legislative committee, in which we enjoyed a very wide-ranging and thought provoking discussion. In addition to robust debate regarding the private copying regime, fair dealing and the specific education provisions, we heard about the need for technological neutrality and the benefits to consumers.

We are proud this bill would amend the Copyright Act to provide a technology neutral framework that would stand the test of time. We live in an ever-evolving media and technology landscape that requires such a framework moving forward, so we are getting rid of outdated references to flip charts and other technologies to ensure the legislation remains relevant.

• (1345)

Finally, as followers of the copyright debate know, the bill proposes key changes that would benefit consumers. Consumers would have more flexibility to enjoy and manage their legitimately acquired content. Consumers would be allowed to time-shift their programming recorded on television, radio and Internet broadcasts. Consumers would also be allowed to format-shift and make backup copies.

Furthermore, we would be adding parody and satire to fair dealing and the ability for Canadians to create user-generated content. These are important amendments that would increase innovation and consumer choice.

In committee, witnesses agreed with the central premise that has been made time and again in this House. Modernization of Canada's copyright laws is long overdue. Some argued that the balance we have established on the bill before us should be tilted one way; others argued we should go further in the other direction. That is the nature of a bill as complex as this one. Not everyone will get everything they were looking for in the modernized copyright regime. However, moving ahead with the bill will be much better than perpetuating laws that have not been updated in more than a decade.

The bill would deliver a common-sense balance between the rights of consumers and the creative community. Importantly, it would also bring our laws in line with the WIPO Internet treaties.

Bill C-11 would provide for a parliamentary review of the Copyright Act every five years. At that time, Parliament would have the opportunity to review the changes made by the bill, as well as study how well the Copyright Act, as a whole, is serving to balance the needs of creators and users.

However, let us move quickly on passing the bill now, so that consumers and creators can soon benefit from these provisions. I urge hon. members of all parties to join me in voting for third reading so the bill can proceed to the Senate.

• (1350)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Hélène LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member, whom I have the pleasure of working with as a member of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology.

My colleague spoke at length, but I would like him to talk a little more about the much-touted provision on education. We know very well that the market for educational books is fairly limited.

How would the market for educational books produced in Canada survive, given this provision? What does he see for the future of companies in the educational book business, the publishing companies? What would the future be like for these publishers, given this provision?

[*English*]

Mr. Mike Lake: Mr. Speaker, of course there are significant education provisions contained in the bill, provisions that would make it easier for teachers to enhance the educational experience for students through a variety of means, technological means, for example, using the Internet to kind of learn on the fly and creatively explore things as they come up, as they are discussed by the class. Of course, this would be covered by the rules around fair dealing. There are six factors that have to be considered when we are talking about fair dealing. Witnesses, during the course of the committee hearings, from time to time forgot about the fact that those six factors existed.

We are also taking measures to better enable the use of distance learning so, for example, a student somewhere in a northern community, in Nunavut, could take part in a classroom discussion that is happening in a classroom in Edmonton, for example, and not be hindered by the rules around the copyright law.

Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend knows, the bill would provide that persons with a perceptual disability could circumvent a digital lock. However, the problem is that they would also, then, have to put it back in its original condition, whether it is software, a DVD or whatever.

For persons with a disability, in many cases, it is hard to imagine how they could get access to the means whereby they could remove a digital lock, let alone put the software or DVD back in its original condition afterward.

Why does my hon. colleague feel the government is insisting on maintaining these provisions, which would not help people with disabilities?

Statements by Members

Mr. Mike Lake: Mr. Speaker, of course the hon. member had a chance to hear from individuals before the committee during the testimony. We have taken significant measures in the bill to enhance the ability of those dealing with perceptual disabilities to benefit from copyrighted works in ways that are balanced. Again the key word, as we have said in every discussion throughout the conversation around the bill, is “balance”.

Certainly, people came before the committee. Virtually everybody who came before the committee had something they would change about the legislation. However, the vast majority of the people who came before the committee also said that our copyright law would be better with the passing of the bill and urged us to pass the bill as soon as possible.

I hope we can count on the hon. member and his party to help us do that.

Hon. Laurie Hawn (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was impressed with my colleague's remarks about the level of consultations with Canadians, committees and so on. Aside from New Democrats, people have to be impressed with the two and a half years and all the processes that were gone through. I wonder if my colleague could compare the consultation process on this bill with that on other bills he may be familiar with from his time here.

Mr. Mike Lake: Mr. Speaker, there have been more consultations on this bill than almost any bill I have ever seen in my six years in the House. In fact, as I mentioned in my speech, I believe that between Bill C-32, which was introduced in the previous Parliament, and Bill C-11, which is the bill we are discussing now, committees heard from more than 180 different individuals. There were hours and hours of debate in the House of Commons, dozens and dozens of hours of discussion in committees and the opportunity to hear from and question witnesses. One thing that has to be said is that there has been no shortage of consultation on this bill.

•(1355)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): Before giving the floor to the member for Gatineau, I would like to say I will have to interrupt her at approximately 1:52 p.m., when it is time for statements by members.

The hon. member for Gatineau.

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Mr. Speaker, according to the hon. member opposite, this bill has been the focus of the most studies that this House has ever conducted.

One of my colleagues said it was the nth time, but it seems to me that this government is gagging us for the 21st time by limiting the time for debate. It is not just a question of the time available for study in committee, but also the time granted to the democratically elected representatives. They must be able to rise in this House and express their views on a bill without having a feeling that the gun is pointed at their heads and being told that they have to vote and pass this bill immediately. They must have a chance to sit down and pay particular attention to it, as new members must.

Every time it happens, we hear that this is the bill that has been studied the most often in committee, with the most days, the most hours and the most witnesses. I heard the same thing about Bill

C-10; I heard the same thing about Bill C-19; and I have heard the same thing about all the bills that are studied in committee. Now we are hearing the same thing about this very important bill.

This is how the government has decided to proceed. Because of the majority that it got with the support of 39% of the population, this is how we are forced to proceed. We have to bow to this state of affairs and express our views the way they have chosen.

In any event, I would like to congratulate my colleagues for Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, Timmins—James Bay, and Jeanne-Le Ber who, in one way or another, have spent endless hours working on the bill, and all those who sat on the committee for never-ending hours. In fact, they spent endless hours studying a bill that will have a major impact, an enormous impact, on the lives of creators and producers and on the lives of consumers, the people from all walks of life that we represent here, in this House. It is our duty to find the right balance to ensure that we respect everyone's rights, but it is not always easy.

Here again, there are numerous amendments to Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Copyright Act. There are tons of amendments. Some people will say that these are the amendments that society has been waiting a long time to see. Perhaps they are, but it is not because they are long-awaited that they have to be shoved down our throats.

I understand that my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I will continue after question period.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): The member for Gatineau will have seven minutes to end her speech and five minutes for questions and comments when the House resumes debate on this motion.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN BLOOD SERVICES

Mr. Bruce Hyer (Thunder Bay—Superior North, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, last month Canadian Blood Services closed Canada's only stand-alone plasma centre. We lost 30 skilled employees in Thunder Bay and hundreds of loyal donors. That facility provided vital transfusion products to patients across Canada.

Canadian Blood Services claims there is an excess supply of plasma while at the same time it has announced plans to import over 20,000 litres from suppliers in the United States collected from paid donors.

Now we hear that a private for-profit company in Toronto has applied to Health Canada to start paying donors for plasma to sell to Canadian Blood Services. This is insanity. Provinces will spend over \$300 million a year for imported blood products. The World Health Organization warns that paying for plasma increases the risk of blood-borne diseases. The Krever report said donations should never be paid for.

Statements by Members

Thunder Bay blood donors want an investigation. We need safe blood from Thunder Bay volunteer donors. We need to keep our Canadian health system public.

* * *

● (1400)

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Robert Goguen (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, economic action plan 2012 is bringing benefits to New Brunswick. Our government is investing in training, infrastructure and opportunities. A well-trained, highly educated workforce is one of our key advantages in competing and succeeding in the global economy. We are taking action to ensure barriers to workforce participation are reduced. We are positioning Canada to be better prepared to face labour market needs in the longer term.

The economic action plan proposes to extend the temporary hiring credit for small businesses for one year. A credit of up to \$1,000 against a small employer's increase in its 2012 EI benefits over those paid in 2011 would be provided. This temporary credit would be available to approximately 536 employers nationally, whose total EI benefits were at or below \$10,000 in 2011, reducing small businesses' 2012 payroll costs by approximately \$205 million.

Our government is focused on jobs, growth and long-term prosperity for Canadian families. We are getting it done.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTELLIGENT COMMUNITY OF THE YEAR

Mr. Denis Blanchette (Louis-Hébert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on June 8, 2012, in New York City, Quebec City will have the opportunity to follow in the footsteps of cities such as Seoul, New York, Calgary, Waterloo, Taipei and Stockholm by winning the title of Intelligent Community of the Year. Four hundred cities throughout the world were competing for the award, and today Quebec City was chosen as one of the seven finalists.

On April 17, I had the opportunity to meet with Louis Zacharilla, co-founder of the Intelligent Community Forum, to speak to him about why Quebec City should be chosen. A so-called intelligent community focuses on broadband connectivity, a knowledge workforce, innovation and digital inclusion in a spirit of leadership, collaboration and sustainability.

This title is important because it recognizes the efforts of a region that is in the process of becoming a true 21st century society, where the digital economy has such an important role to play.

I am convinced that Quebec City has what it takes to win the title of Intelligent Community of the Year for 2012.

* * *

[*English*]

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH

Hon. Laurie Hawn (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the issue of children's mental health.

Last weekend, I attended the annual CASA for Kids Spring Celebration in Edmonton. Since 1978, CASA Child, Adolescent and Family Mental Health has been advancing the cause of mental health of infants to 18-year-olds through family-oriented clinical services, education, research and advocacy in Alberta.

Every year, CASA helps 3,000 young people through a continuum ranging from consultation and community outreach settings to very intensive treatment programs.

We heard heart-rending stories about the challenges families face with mental illness. As always, Edmontonians opened their hearts and their wallets and raised hundreds of thousands of dollars for this excellent cause that affects so many Canadians.

CASA's delivery of critical services and its aggressive and goal-oriented research will help to open the door to a future of dignity, fairness and compassion for all young Canadians.

I salute CASA for its continued excellent work. I thank Edmontonians for once again showing that Canadians can work together to make life better for those who are not as lucky as the rest of us.

* * *

ROADSIDE CLEANUP

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Women's Institute of Prince Edward Island on what has come to be known as the annual roadside cleanup.

In 1973, the Women's Institute started this great island tradition whereby on a date in May, under its leadership, everyone is encouraged to clean up the litter from ditches and pack it in bags for pickup. This effort enhances the image to be island proud and keep it clean. Next year will mark the 40th anniversary of this event.

The Women's Institute has challenged all islanders to get outside and enjoy the fresh air while joining in the annual roadside cleanup to help keep Prince Edward Island beautiful.

Beyond all its other good work, the Women's Institute in this way provides inspiration to enhance our environment.

On behalf of myself and my island colleagues, I thank the Women's Institute for its hard work and dedication in promoting this wonderful island initiative that has proven to be such a success.

* * *

● (1405)

ULTIMATE CLASS FIELD TRIP

Ms. Eve Adams (Mississauga—Brampton South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Mississauga is still on top. St. Pio elementary school in my riding of Mississauga—Brampton South has won the Ultimate Class Field Trip contest for Canadian students.

To celebrate the 100th anniversary of Parks Canada, thousands of students competed in the nationwide contest. Hundreds of stories were submitted. St. Pio came out on top.

Statements by Members

The grade 8 history class at St. Pio researched and wrote the winning story, entitled “Ty's Cross-Country Adventure”. Ty travels from Yukon Territory to Newfoundland and through 23 of our wonderful country's national historic sites.

[*Translation*]

The winner receives a four-day, three-night trip to Ottawa, with a stop in Kingston, to visit national historic sites.

[*English*]

This afternoon I will be hosting the big winners here on Parliament Hill. I congratulate our outstanding students, their families and our great teachers. I congratulate St. Pio.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Alex Atamanenko (British Columbia Southern Interior, NDP): Mr. Speaker, municipal leaders across this country, including the mayors of Greenwood, Trail, Slocan and Grand Forks in my riding, strongly object to the provisions in CETA that will diminish their capacity to govern.

They are making it abundantly clear that a trade deal that limits their ability to give preference to local providers of goods and services or that results in their loss of control over water, waste, recycling and public transit is unacceptable.

According to the leaked draft of the agreement, any contracts above \$340,000 for goods and services and \$8.5 million for construction contracts would have to be opened to bids from European corporations. Municipalities that award contracts to local companies could very well be sued by these multinationals.

Who would even think of trading away the rights of the country's elected leaders to make decisions? Why has the government not clearly stated that these provisions are a non-starter?

Anything that strips municipalities of their democratic decision-making powers must not be included in CETA or any other trade agreement.

* * *

BENJAMIN ALAN RUSSELL

Ms. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay (Delta—Richmond East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Alan Russell, veteran, lawyer, valued mentor, constituent, passed away on March 30 at age 88.

Al was a modest and great Canadian who lived a life of service through the war, through his 32-year law practice and through volunteerism.

Always good at sports, he joined the war effort at age 18 as a physical training instructor. He lost his left leg below the knee in an on-duty accident in Canada.

After his discharge in 1945, he graduated in law from UBC, distinguishing himself as a lawyer and devoting himself to the War Amps.

Al lived the War Amps motto, Amputees Helping Amputees. His contributions regionally and nationally were immeasurable. He ultimately was elected chairman of the board for the last seven years.

As his firm's first woman student and associate, I always appreciated his warmth and kindness.

Al and his philanthropy will be missed by his family, his many friends at Cultus Lake, the Delta Golf Club, the Tunnel Town Master's Curling League and by me.

* * *

IRAN

Mr. Russ Hiebert (South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Iran is on the verge of developing nuclear weapons. As our Minister of Foreign Affairs recently said, those weapons could be a reality in a little less than a year if Iran decides to proceed.

A nuclear-armed Iran would be a destabilizing force in the Middle East and a serious threat to peace.

Given Iran's track record of persecuting minorities within and sponsoring terrorism abroad, Canadians are deeply concerned about Iran's objectives.

The Iranian regime claims it has no interest in nuclear weapons. Canadians would have more confidence in such claims if they could see evidence of peaceful intentions.

Instead of sentencing Iranian Christians, Baha'is and others to death for their faith, Iran should demonstrate religious tolerance. Instead of threatening Israel with destruction, Iran should stop funding Hezbollah. Instead of secrecy at atomic facilities, Iran should allow stringent international nuclear inspections.

* * *

SAGKEENG'S FINEST

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today I rise in the House to congratulate the first place winners of *Canada's Got Talent*, Sagkeeng's Finest.

As the MP for Sagkeeng First Nation, I would like to join the many people from across Manitoba and Canada in congratulating Vincent O'Laney, Brandon Courchene and Dallas Courchene. They have made so many people very proud.

Sagkeeng's Finest showcases the true spirit of our region. The name of their group honours the elders who have passed, who taught and influenced them and other young people to jig and fiddle. Like many aboriginal young people, Vincent, Brandon and Dallas combine the wealth of tradition with a modern twist.

Sagkeeng's Finest shows the power of community. Their first nation supported them and has helped shape them into role models. In fact, last night the community joined together to cheer on the next generation.

Statements by Members

Sagkeeng's Finest also shows us how we have to believe in young aboriginal people, their talents and their future. We must support the arts and education, and we must celebrate the successes of young Canadians.

We will be cheering on Sagkeeng's Finest on their journey forward.

Migwetch.

* * *

● (1410)

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr. Mark Adler (York Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I welcome members of the Automotive Industries Association of Canada, AIAC, to the House of Commons.

They are in Ottawa today to discuss how one of our most vital industries can continue to contribute to our economy, as well as help decrease Canada's environmental footprint.

As a member of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, I can say with confidence and experience that the AIAC is one of our great partners in working to ensure that the transport industry operates as best as possible for all Canadians.

This is most evident in the AIAC's new vehicle maintenance campaign, entitled "Be Car Care Aware". This program is aimed at educating drivers on the benefits of regular vehicle maintenance, something that is becoming increasingly important with 9.2 million vehicles on our roads that are between 6 and 12 years old.

I commend the members of the AIAC for their continued efforts in Canada's transport industry, helping it to be safer, more environmentally friendly and an even greater contributor to the Canadian economy.

I wish them all the best for their day on the Hill. I am looking forward to the reception tonight where everyone who comes will have the chance to see a NASCAR race car up close.

* * *

FOOD SHORTAGES

Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, along with others in the NDP shadow cabinet, I recently had the opportunity to brief the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food.

Although it is regrettable that Canada is the first developed country to be investigated for failing to protect the right to food, our meeting was a welcome opportunity to raise the profile of what is wrong with the Canadian food system.

Despite our country's relative wealth, more than two million Canadians regularly do not have enough to eat. People on government income support and those earning minimum wage are often forced to choose between food and rent.

At the same time, farmers and fishers are going out of business, a quarter of Canadians are considered obese, and the industrial food production system is one of the leading contributors to greenhouse gas emissions.

Food bank use has soared by 28% in the past three years. In a typical month more than 850,000 Canadians are using a food bank.

We desperately need a national food policy, and I am hopeful that the UN rapporteur's report will be the catalyst for government action.

In the meantime, I urge all Canadians who are able to donate to a food bank now. Donations drop off in the summer, but the right to food must be protected every day of the year.

* * *

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

Ms. Joyce Bateman (Winnipeg South Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the member for Newton—North Delta claimed that "recent cuts to CIDA's budget threaten Canada's commitment to maternal and child health in the world's poorest nations." Nothing could be further from the truth.

Thanks to this government, in Mozambique 141,000 women and children are receiving lifesaving HIV treatment. In Haiti new maternal clinics are providing a full range of neonatal services.

[*Translation*]

Canadian taxpayers are giving tangible help to women and children in developing countries. I am wondering if the hon. member thinks that such action is endangering the health of mothers and newborns.

Our record is clear. It shows that Canada is the world leader in the effort to reduce maternal and infant mortality. It is a record of which Canadians can be proud.

* * *

PALLIATIVE CARE

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week was National Hospice Palliative Care Week. Across the country, events focused on raising awareness about palliative care, an issue that deeply affects all Canadians. Palliative care is too often and wrongly considered incidental rather than an integral part of our health care system.

[*English*]

My riding of Lac-Saint-Louis is very fortunate to be home to the West Island Palliative Care Residence. This truly outstanding organization has been providing quality end-of-life care in a home-like setting since 2002, allowing patients from the western part of Quebec to live their last days in comfort and dignity.

Unfortunately, this type of care, which I consider to be a human right, is not universally available. Less than 30% of those who require palliative care currently have access to it.

Oral Questions

I therefore call upon the government to implement the recommendation contained in the report of the Parliamentary Committee on Palliative and Compassionate Care that the federal government re-establish a palliative care secretariat to bring together various levels of government and stakeholders to develop and implement a national palliative and end-of-life care strategy.

* * *

• (1415)

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION LEGISLATION

Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last night we were pleased to see Parliament pass the jobs, growth and long-term prosperity act at second reading.

Our government has a proven track record on the economy. That is why I was so pleased to see over 58,000 jobs created last month alone.

Canada's economic action plan 2012 is full of measures for job creation, and the sooner this legislation passes, the sooner these measures can help create more jobs and economic growth.

We consulted far and wide on what Canadians wanted to see in the budget. In fact, we held over 150 consultations with businesses, families, stakeholders and individuals right across the country. It was overwhelmingly received by Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

The NDP members should quit playing their silly games, put Canadians' best interests first and work with our government to pass this job-creating legislation.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT

Mrs. Anne-Marie Day (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, NDP): Mr. Speaker, less than a week after the unemployment rate goes up, the Minister of Finance has the gall to blame the unemployed. He is telling them to bite the bullet and accept any job.

This Conservative government is proving how out of touch with reality it is. There is a problem with the minister's twisted logic: for every job created in April, 23 Canadians were lining up for the dole. Is that what he calls a job creation strategy?

Even worse, the government wants to ram down Canadians' throats a 425-page budget that will restrict access to employment insurance.

The Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development cannot even define suitable work. In addition, she confirmed that she would not define it before the budget passes. She does not seem to realize the scope of the announced changes.

Canadians are tired of being treated with contempt by this government, which is reducing access to employment insurance, cutting government services and slashing old age security. Enough is enough.

In 2015, this government will be out of work.

[English]

NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF CANADA

Mrs. Tilly O'Neill Gordon (Miramichi, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the NDP leader recently announced his new shadow cabinet and there is certainly weakness among the ranks. He appointed the member for St. John's South—Mount Pearl as critic for ACOA and post-secondary education. This member has developed the reputation of an “unapologetic Newfoundland separatist” and is willing to take extreme positions on unity.

He certainly has not been prepared to stand up for one of Newfoundland and Labrador's oldest industries, the seal hunt. Instead of standing up to the radicals who oppose this traditional way of life, he suggested that it may be time for sealers to just give up. Our government is proud to stand up for Canadian sealers. It is shocking to hear the member for St. John's South—Mount Pearl speak so harshly against this important industry.

The NDP threatens dangerous economic experiments, job-killing taxes—

The Speaker: Order, please. Oral questions. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

PENSIONS

Mr. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, until now the Conservatives had refused to come clean on how much they plan to cut from old age security. Finally yesterday, when asked whether the Conservative cuts would take about \$10 billion out of the pockets of Canadian seniors, the Minister of Finance said, “I've heard that number. I've heard \$12 billion also. Something in that area.” I guess it is not just the Minister of Defence who has arithmetic problems.

Would the Prime Minister refresh the memory of his Minister of Finance and table the full cost of his old age security cuts in the House?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to refresh the memory of the leader of the NDP. Of course, in this budget there are no reductions to old age security. Seniors of Canada know that.

We are looking at adjustments to the age of eligibility that will not begin to take effect until the year 2023. In the meantime, seniors will have the option of delaying receiving these benefits and receiving them at a higher rate if they choose to do so.

Mr. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it will not take effect. They will have been thrown out of office before then.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

The Conservatives want to pick the pockets of our seniors and take \$12,000 from each one of them. That is what this means for our seniors. The Conservatives want to force them to work two extra years. That might cost \$10 billion or even \$12 billion.

What are the real figures? Why are the Conservatives refusing to disclose them? We know why. If the Conservatives disclose these figures, then everyone will know the simple truth: that the system is sustainable and there is no reason to add two years and take \$12,000 from every senior.

• (1420)

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, again, our seniors and our retirees know the truth. Their pensions are not being cut in this budget. On the contrary, the eligibility age will not change until 2023.

Next year, seniors will have the opportunity to delay receiving their OAS in order to increase the amount they receive. They have that option.

* * *

[English]

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance's remarks about OAS were not the only disturbing comments he made yesterday afternoon.

When asked whether unemployed teachers and nurses should be forced to take any job that comes along or be taken off EI, the minister said, "There is no bad job. The only bad job is not having a job."

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, please. I will ask hon. members to hold off on their applause until the Leader of the Opposition has finished his question.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thomas Mulcair: Mr. Speaker, the minister said, "There is no bad job. The only bad job is not having a job. So I drove a taxi—"

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, please.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Thomas Mulcair: "There is no bad job. The only bad job is not having a job."

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, please. We will have to make up the time somewhere else.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thomas Mulcair: Mr. Speaker, then he went on to say that he had driven a taxi and refereed hockey.

Does the Prime Minister actually agree that our teachers and our nurses should be taking jobs driving taxis rather than being given a chance to look for work in their own field?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I remind the leader of the NDP of the superior employment creation record of the country. When compared across the developed world, we have created 750,000 net new jobs since the recovery began. Those jobs are overwhelmingly private sector. They are overwhelmingly full-time and they are overwhelmingly well-paying.

We want to make sure going forward that people continue to have those opportunities. We anticipate that labour shortage is going to be a serious concern in the Canadian economy in the years to come. We want to make sure all Canadians have the opportunity to get the kind of work they need.

Mr. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance also went on to say that we are going to have significant labour shortages in this country. The solution? "That means we are going to have to encourage more persons with disabilities to work, more seniors to work.... We need to get rid of disincentives in the employment insurance system..."

Could the Prime Minister tell us how retirement is a disincentive, how living with a disability is a disincentive? The only disincentive here is the Conservatives hurling insults at seniors and people with disabilities. They should be ashamed of themselves.

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has changed very positively in the course of my lifetime has been our realization that people we call disabled are able to do a whole range of functions that every Canadian can do. An example of that is right before all of us, right here in the Minister of State for Transport, who is able to be Minister of State for Transport.

[Translation]

Mr. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, their attitude is reprehensible and nasty. What they are really doing is attacking people with disabilities. People with disabilities are not asking for anything more than to take their place in society. This government should be helping these people, rather than calling them lazy. That is what this government is doing.

Why attack our seniors? Seniors should not be a source of cheap labour because this government wants to force them to delay their retirement so it can steal \$12,000 from each of them.

Why are the Conservatives attacking seniors and people with a disability instead of helping them?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, it is the Leader of the Opposition who thinks that people with a disability should be unemployed. On the contrary, in the course of my lifetime, I have learned what people with a disability are capable of when they are given the right opportunities.

A perfect example of this is the Minister of State for Transport, a minister of the Crown. People with a disability are willing to do their part and participate fully in our society's labour force.

*Oral Questions**[English]***THE BUDGET**

Hon. Bob Rae (Toronto Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for most governments, George Orwell's *1984* is not exactly a guide to action. It is supposed to be a cautionary tale.

Yesterday the Minister of Foreign Affairs admitted that the reason the government had cut off the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy was because it was providing advice with which the government disagreed. The National Council of Welfare is also providing advice with which the government disagrees. Many charities are currently being attacked and pilloried by the government because they are doing things with which the government disagrees.

Does the Prime Minister not realize that he has to listen to people with whom he disagrees?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have to listen to the leader of the Liberal Party every day.

In reviewing the range of in-house research that is undertaken by various agencies and operations of the Government of Canada, we are making sure that we find administrative savings. Obviously, where expertise is already available within departments or outside departments, we do not need to duplicate that work. Those are the measures the government has taken in this particular economic action plan.

[Translation]

Hon. Bob Rae (Toronto Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have to say that neither I nor the members in this corner of the House have ever had the sense that either the government or the Prime Minister listen to us. They do not give me that impression.

His answer is completely different from the frank and candid answer we got from the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Yesterday, the minister revealed what is really going on with this Parliament and this government: they are smothering everything they hear from people they do not agree with.

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I can listen to the leader of the Liberal Party, but I still have to use common sense.

When deciding what changes to make in this budget, the government looked at research sources within departments and outside departments. Obviously, we do not want research duplication. That is what the government is doing in its economic action plan.

* * *

*[English]***NATIONAL DEFENCE**

Hon. Bob Rae (Toronto Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this morning the Auditor General, in speaking to the public accounts committee, reaffirmed every piece of information that is contained in his report with respect to the difference in his opinion between what information should have been given to Parliament and what information should have been given to the people of Canada, and

what information was not in fact given to Parliament and that information that was not correct was given to Parliament.

My question, once again, is for the Prime Minister. How can we possibly carry on with a situation when the Auditor General of Canada is telling us that Parliament has not been given accurate information?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we have said many times before, we have accepted the analysis of the Auditor General and we are acting on his recommendations.

Far from carrying on, the government has indicated that it is making a number of changes. It will undertake a multi-step process before proceeding with this particular purchase. We have not yet bought any aircraft or signed any contract.

We will ensure that we obtain all the information that is necessary and give that information to Parliament before deciding on how to proceed.

* * *

*[Translation]***PENSIONS**

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the government how much money it was planning to steal from seniors by increasing the age of eligibility for old age security benefits. The Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development once again dodged the question.

The Minister of Finance even told the media that he was unsure, that he had not planned that far ahead and that it might be \$10 billion or \$12 billion.

Is there a minister who can give us the actual amount that the Conservatives are going to cut from old age security?

• (1430)

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this budget does not make any cuts to old age security. We will be starting gradually in 2023 to change the age of eligibility from 65 to 67.

Starting next year, seniors will be able to collect more benefits if they so choose. If they want to, they can receive more benefits than they are receiving now.

[English]

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources knew her government was taking between \$10 billion and \$12 billion out of Canadians' pensions but simply refused to fess up. All along we have heard misleading talking points that have long since been refuted by independent economists. The Conservatives simply do not want Canadians to learn about the real impact of their Trojan Horse budget.

Are the Conservatives really taking \$10 billion away from Canadian seniors just to spend it on F-35s? Is that their plan?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the simple answer to that is no. The member has it wrong.

Oral Questions

We will be starting gradually in 2023 to raise the age of eligibility for OAS for seniors from 65 to 67. However, there are no cuts to seniors' pensions in the budget, none at all. Starting next year seniors will be able to delay their OAS and collect more if they choose.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives continue to contradict themselves.

At first, they said the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy had to be cut because other groups do the same work.

Yesterday, the Minister of Foreign Affairs said that it was abolished because the Conservatives did not agree with its research. For once, the Conservatives are being honest.

Why are the Conservatives so afraid of the objective advice given by independent organizations?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has already answered that question.

I would remind my colleague that I have thanked the national round table for a quarter century of service, service that, quite frankly, is no longer required.

At the same time, the Minister of Foreign Affairs was quite right in saying that this government does not support a carbon tax and this government, unlike all of the parties out there, will not impose a carbon tax on hard-working Canadians.

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has not straightened out the fact that last week, the Minister of the Environment claimed that the round table was cut because it was redundant and then yesterday we heard the Minister of Foreign Affairs say that it was cut because the Conservatives did not agree with its independent research.

It seems that disagreeing with the government makes for a very short career with the Conservative government.

Why did the Minister of the Environment mislead Canadians about why the national round table was cut?

Hon. Peter Kent (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, is entitled to his opinions. He was, after all, my predecessor but—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Minister of the Environment has the floor.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Speaker, I am sure my cabinet colleague would agree with me that when the national round table was created it was a relevant and rather unique organization in terms of relating to connections between the environment and the economy. It no longer is.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Matthew Kellway (Beaches—East York, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I think I see tire tracks across the back of the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

A few weeks ago, the Auditor General released a scathing report on how the Conservatives bungled the F-35. In response, the deputy minister of defence testified that the Auditor General got his numbers wrong, which is interesting, because today the Auditor General told committee that he actually got his numbers from the Department of National Defence.

Will the Minister of National Defence now direct his officials to stop attacking the Auditor General's report?

• (1435)

Hon. Julian Fantino (Associate Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is far from the truth.

We have, as was indicated, accepted the findings. We are acting on the recommendation of the Auditor General. There is a seven-step plan in place. We intend to honour that stepped plan. There is a secretariat in place that will put finite numbers to the issues that the Auditor General was concerned about.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier-Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the mismanagement of this file is truly worrisome. On the one hand, the Auditor General claims that the Department of National Defence knew the total cost of the F-35 jets. On the other hand, the Deputy Minister of National Defence is saying that he does not know where the estimated total cost came from.

Could the minister of self-defence help out his deputy minister, or will the minister continue to make excuses for keeping the information from Canadians?

[*English*]

Hon. Julian Fantino (Associate Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that premise is absolutely incorrect.

The Government of Canada is taking action to ensure that due diligence, oversight and transparency are firmly embedded in the process to replace Canada's aging fighter aircraft. We are following a seven-step action plan to fulfill and exceed the Auditor General's recommendation. We are going to stick to that and do the best we can for our men and women in the Canadian Forces, as well as Canadians.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AFGHANISTAN

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier-Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let us stick to defence and perhaps we will get some real answers.

The White House has asked the Conservatives to extend the mission in Afghanistan. Now it is the NATO secretary general's turn to say that he wants our troops to stay in Afghanistan beyond 2014. Parliament has already decided that this mission must end.

Oral Questions

Will the government give in to the pressure and agree to extend the mission or not?

[English]

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, no, this government never buckles to pressure. We always take principled stands.

Canada is committed until 2014 to participate in an international mission to train Afghan security forces to prevent that country from becoming a safe haven for terrorists. We will assess that as we will assess what is necessary to meet those objectives. We have not made any final decisions at this time.

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when we asked the government a month ago about a U.S. request to extend our military mission in Afghanistan, the Prime Minister said that he was not even aware of it. Now the Secretary-General of NATO is making his request publicly.

We know that the Conservatives want to extend this military mission, and they will not be able to avoid this question for much longer. Will they keep our soldiers in Afghanistan after 2014, yes or no?

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite seems to believe he already has an answer, which begs the question of why he is getting up in the House to ask it.

We sent a training mission to Afghanistan that arrived last year and will go until 2014 to help the Afghan forces develop the capacity so that they can provide for themselves and their country's own security. The men and women of the Canadian Forces are doing an absolutely splendid job representing Canada and assisting the people of Afghanistan in that security. We wish them very well in that important mission.

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the last time we asked this question, the Prime Minister thought it was a good time to talk about Hitler, so I suppose that is some kind of an improvement.

The Conservatives will not give us a straight answer but they have left the door wide open to extending the military mission past 2014. The United States has asked and NATO has asked.

The last time the Conservatives extended the military mission to Afghanistan, they acted without a vote and refused to put it to a motion in the House. Will they bring this latest military extension to this House for a vote, yes or no?

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, nothing to bring to the House for a vote because there is no decision.

The member opposite is factually incorrect. The House of Commons did vote on the combat mission, as the House is permitted to by any of the opposition parties from time to time.

The Prime Minister has made a commitment that before any combat troops or any military mission takes place off our shores that there will be a vote and that he will consult Parliament. The Prime Minister has shown more respect to Parliament in that regard than any prime minister in our history.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to look at the case of a single mother in Margaree Harbour in Cape Breton who contributes to the success of two seasonal industries. She works as a chambermaid during the tourism season and she makes Christmas wreaths at a small shop each fall. EI helps feed her family between seasons. Like many rural Canadians, she has no access to public transit or child care, and members should know this: her attitude is not defeatist.

As the Prime Minister now makes the rules for EI, in the case of this single mother, will she be packing or will she just be poor?

• (1440)

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us face it, Canada is facing unprecedented shortages of labour and skills. We need to help Canadians who are unemployed to get back to work quickly. The changes that we are proposing will help the unemployed find jobs in their local area and will, at the same time, address the skills shortages faced by Canadian employers.

Canadians will be expected to take jobs appropriate to their skill level in their area.

Ms. Judy Foote (Random—Burin—St. George's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, recent comments by the Minister of Finance reinforce the government's attitude toward those who are unemployed through no fault of their own.

Clearly, it is the government's intention to force anyone looking for work to pack their bags and take whatever job is available, regardless of his or her circumstances. This would mean having to leave families behind for low-paying jobs, which would make it impossible for people to make ends meet.

Why is the Prime Minister, whose prejudice against Atlantic Canadians is well known, forcing them to take jobs that would make them financially worse off?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, all those statements are completely wrong. We are facing skills shortages right across the country right now. We need to help employers find the workers they need. We will help connect people who are out of work through no fault of their own get access to those jobs in their local area in their range of skills.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will try a question for the regional minister for Prince Edward Island.

With respect to employment insurance, we have heard the immigration minister insult both the unemployed and foreign workers, the Minister of Finance's comments yesterday were clearly an attack on the seasonal industry with this "just move" attitude, and now the minister's answers clearly show that cabinet does not understand seasonal workers and their needs.

Oral Questions

How can the minister stand in her place and allow Parliament to be passed over, Islanders to be blindsided and all decisions on employment insurance being made by the Prime Minister?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are facing skills shortages and labour shortages right across the country. We want to ensure that we help Canadians who are out of work through no fault of their own to get access to those jobs, help the employers stay in business so they can produce for the country and to help the families.

We will help connect these people with jobs and, yes, they will be in their own area and within their appropriate skill level.

* * *

[Translation]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Sylvain Chicoine (Châteauguay—Saint-Constant, NDP): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservatives are slashing services to veterans, the chair of the Veterans Review and Appeal Board is dipping into veterans' coffers to pay for trips to London to see his wife give speeches. He has wasted over \$7,000 on his transatlantic trips. It is not surprising to see, when the example comes from the top.

Why are the Conservatives cutting services to veterans and yet allowing the chair to lavishly spend money that should be used to help those who served our country?

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would remind my hon. colleague that all services to veterans are being maintained and that the best way to support our veterans is to support budget 2012.

That being said, I expect the review board, which is an independent organization, and its members to rigorously enforce all public administration rules, since it is managing taxpayers' money.

[English]

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, arm's-length does not mean out of reach.

The Minister of Veterans Affairs signed off on this trip. The head of the Veterans Review and Appeal Board was just condemned by the Veterans ombudsman for denying so many people of the appeal board their rightful benefits by not applying the benefit of doubt. What does he do? He takes a junket over to England to visit with his wife, who just happens to be there, at a cost of over \$7,000. That kind of money would help a lot of disabled veterans.

How does the minister allow that kind of abuse of taxpayer money to carry on? Why does he not remove the member of the Veterans Review and Appeal Board or, in fact, remove the entire—

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Minister of Veterans Affairs.

• (1445)

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Veterans Ombudsman is going in exactly the opposite direction of the irresponsible way of the NDP. The NDP is

suggesting abolishing a tribunal that 4,000 veterans turn to every year. We will stand by the tribunal.

We expect all board members to be responsible and show respect for taxpayer dollars at all times. I am confident that this board will keep on providing good services for the veterans, who deserve the right to appeal the decision and to be well served by this government and this country.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, NDP): Mr. Speaker, things are going from the ridiculous to the absurd today.

As time goes by, the Conservatives are having a harder and harder time finding friends in the arts community. First, the Minister of Canadian Heritage made the chairman of the CBC pledge allegiance, and now he is asking the next board chairman of the National Gallery to maintain a relationship with him. Facebook friends are not necessarily the best people to run museums.

What is more important: a thorough understanding of our shared heritage or being buddies with the minister?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the selection process for candidates for this type of position is typical and standard. It has been in place for years and will not be changed.

[English]

Mr. Andrew Cash (Davenport, NDP): Mr. Speaker, our common heritage is too important, and those entrusted with it should not have to be required to be the minister's BFF.

It is not only the chair of the CBC who is required to be friends with the minister. If anyone want to apply to be chairman of the National Gallery or the National Battlefields commissioner, I guess they are going to have to "like" the minister's status too.

If the minister really wants more friends—and it is clear that he needs them—why does he not stop picking the pockets of Canadian artists?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the approach that is being used and the language come from an iPolitics story. That is really ridiculous. The process by which we choose people for these kinds of appointments is open and transparent. Yes, it does require that the minister and these organizations, crown corporations and agencies have an open dialogue and an ongoing conversation for the best interests of taxpayers. This process has been used for years, and we will continue to do so.

* * *

[Translation]

JUSTICE

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives continue to boast about their tough-on-crime agenda, but the more we look into it, the more we realize that it was written on the back of a napkin.

Oral Questions

Quebec's public safety department estimates that Bill C-10 will increase the prison population by 20%. That means an additional 1,000 people in the prison system, which is already 96% full.

If the government were serious, it would co-operate with the provinces to make sure they have the necessary resources.

For the time being, the only thing it does is send the bill to the provinces. Why?

[English]

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we work with the provinces, and the bill specifically targets drug dealers and those who molest children. I completely reject the math that says 1,000 people a day in the province of Quebec are going to get locked up for drug crimes or sex crimes. That is absolutely wrong, and I think most people would agree with me and this government.

[Translation]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we already know the minister's script, but what Canadians want is real answers to questions.

Quebec's public safety department has estimated construction costs for new detention facilities at \$750 million, and that was before the Conservatives announced their decision to close the Leclerc Institution in Laval.

Where will all those inmates be placed? Can the minister explain how it is possible to shut down penitentiaries, impose legislation that will increase the prison population by 20% and say that it will not cost a penny more?

[English]

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the NDP may find this offensive, but we are going after the individuals who traffic in drugs in this country, the people who are into child pornography and the people who molest children. We have had these conversations with the provinces. We are on the right track when we stand up for victims and law-abiding Canadians in this country. I wish the NDP would get on board with that just for once.

* * *

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Malcolm Allen (Welland, NDP): Mr. Speaker, proposed Conservative changes to federally regulated slaughterhouses would mean already-dead animals could be butchered and sold to Canadian consumers. These regulations exist as a direct result of the rotten meat scandal that plagued the industry in the 1970s. However, now Conservatives want to turn back the clock and allow animals previously unfit for human consumption to end up on the family dinner plate.

Will meat from dead stock be clearly marked in our grocery stores?

• (1450)

Hon. Gerry Ritz (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that will not be a problem because it will not be in the grocery store.

Let me quote the Canadian Cattlemen's Association:

The Canadian Cattlemen's Association strongly supports the proposed change...to allow for the rare circumstances where food meat animals can be euthanized on farms under veterinary supervision....

That is what this change is all about: making sure that farmers can receive what they need for those animals in a humane way and move them through the process.

We would never put food safety at risk, and these proposed changes would never do that.

Mr. Malcolm Allen (Welland, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that is not reassuring for Canadian families.

It gets worse. Hundreds of employees with the CFIA, including front-line food inspectors and indeed veterinarians, are on the chopping block. How does the government expect a smaller number of CFIA inspectors and veterinarians to do more with less resources?

CFIA is meeting with USFDA today to actually look at food regulations. Instead of consult first, regulate later, the government is putting the industry at risk with our largest trading partner.

Why is the government potentially putting Canadian industry and our health at risk with its risky new meat regulations?

Hon. Gerry Ritz (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as usual, the NDP has it completely upside down and backwards.

We are working with our major trading partner, the United States, to harmonize our regulations to make sure that we can do more with less. We will recognize their regulations, as they recognize ours, and we will end up with stronger system for both countries. That is the purpose behind this.

As we continue to reinforce CFIA and our border inspectors, the opposition completely votes against it. We put money in, and the opposition voted against it in the budget. When we add inspectors, they vote against those numbers.

Again, the NDP has it upside down and backwards.

* * *

[Translation]

HOUSING

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the most recent budget, almost 260,000 Quebec families have been abandoned. With the end of federal subsidies for affordable housing, at least 125,000 housing units in Quebec will be affected.

A number of organizations, some local and some throughout Quebec, including the Association des locataires de Villeray, FRAPRU and FADOQ, are mobilizing thousands of people and trying to find solutions to this crisis.

Oral Questions

We know that this government has written off Quebec and the poor, but would the minister at least have the decency to explain how he can outright abandon so many people?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is crazy.

It was our government that brought in five-year agreements with the provinces and territories, for five years of stable funding for affordable housing. In most cases, programs are delivered by the provinces and territories.

We are supporting renovations operating expenses for more than 600,000 affordable housing units.

* * *

[English]

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Ms. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, healthy fish stocks and fisheries are hugely important to British Columbians.

Critics of the government's failures in fisheries management and governance get louder every single day. The commercial and recreational fishers, former fisheries ministers, and now even diehard Conservatives like B.C. Conservative Party leader John Cummins and the Prime Minister's own best buddy from the oil and gas patch, Gwyn Morgan, all disagree with the government.

On top of all the cuts, the government is now gutting fish and habitat protection laws. Why is the Prime Minister condemning Pacific fisheries to the fate of the Atlantic cod?

Hon. Keith Ashfield (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is just the opposite. We are focusing our fish and fish habitat protection rules on Canada's fisheries, not in farmers' ditches.

As a matter of fact, there are major improvements to the act that the opposition likes to ignore. There will be several improvements and conservation tools. We will be identifying ecologically sensitive areas, making Fisheries Act regulations enforceable and allowing for higher maximum penalties for rule breakers.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a court case in Vancouver is shaking residential school survivors' trust in our judicial system.

While the facts of the case are before the courts, nearly 1,400 survivors' claims are sitting in limbo while the deadline for the independent assessment process fast approaches.

What is the minister going to do to make sure that these survivors are not victimized once again?

Hon. John Duncan (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this issue is before the courts. This process is one where we have advertised the upcoming expiry date, the final date for application. That message has reached over 95% of the potential claimants.

In terms of where we go from here, this is a multi-party activity that will have to occur. We will have to wait for the courts.

• (1455)

Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are coming up to the anniversary of the apology, and residential school survivors need more action from the government.

The situation is deteriorating so badly that the Assembly of First Nations is asking for an eminent survivor to be appointed to restore faith in the judicial process.

With the deadline fast approaching and many survivors' claims still waiting to be processed, what will the minister do to help residential school survivors before that deadline?

Hon. John Duncan (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, any claimant who puts in a claim before the expiry date this fall will be processed, no matter how long that processing goes beyond that date.

If somebody misses that date for extraordinary circumstances, we have provisions whereby we will certainly be cognizant of and sensitive to that. This worked for the comprehensive claims process, and I think it will work for the independent assessment process as well.

* * *

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Ms. Wai Young (Vancouver South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is focused on jobs, growth and future prosperity. Today we announced new measures to help part-time students access post-secondary education and training.

Would the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development please update this House on what she is doing to ensure that Canadian students and their families can access post-secondary education and training?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce that we have made changes to allow part-time students to have greater access to student loans and grants.

In fact, 8,000 part-time students will now qualify for student loans, and a further 1,500 part-time students will be able to access the Canada student grants program.

This is in addition to the previous changes we made that stopped the accumulation of interest on loans for part-time students while they were still studying. That is another great example of how we are helping students continue with their education in Canada—

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

FIREARMS REGISTRY

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, now that unrestricted long guns are no longer covered by the Criminal Code, it is a question of ownership and retailing, which is an area of provincial jurisdiction.

Why is the minister interfering in an area of provincial jurisdiction by trying to stop the provinces from requiring retailers to keep a list of their sales of unrestricted weapons? Why does the minister not just mind his own business?

[English]

Ms. Candice Hooppner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is wrong. The long gun registry has ended. The requirements for businesses and individuals to register their long guns has been abolished.

CFOs operate under federal jurisdiction. We expect that they will follow the directives of the RCMP commissioner, who is also the Commissioner of Firearms in this country.

The long gun registry has ended. We expect the letter and the spirit of the law to be adhered to.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. John Rafferty (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Biwaase'aa is the after-school program for aboriginal youth in Thunder Bay. It provides healthy food, recreational activities, first nations cultural teachings and emotional support to some 500 students in seven elementary schools. It does this for \$5 per day per student.

By all measurements, it is a program that should be replicated, not cut, yet the government has cut funding after a decade of success. It finds billions for limos, gazebos, jails and jets. That is no problem. Why is it cutting valuable programs like Biwaase'aa?

Hon. John Duncan (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is focused on ways to maintain the essential work we do to make Canada a better place for first nations, Inuit, Métis and northerners, but in better and more efficient ways. We are achieving reductions by reducing the costs of operations while protecting services in communities as much as we possibly can. We are working closely with all our employees to make sure this transition happens in the least disruptive, most effective and most transparent way possible.

* * *

●(1500)

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Royal Galipeau (Ottawa—Orléans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government knows that the natural resources sector is a cornerstone of Canada's economy, creating hundreds of thousands of jobs and economic growth for small rural communities in every corner of this great country.

[Translation]

These communities are found in British Columbia, in Ontario, in the Atlantic provinces and even in Quebec. I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. Can he tell this House about Quebec's latest natural resources plan?

Hon. Joe Oliver (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for that very astute question.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

The hon. Minister of Natural Resources.

Hon. Joe Oliver: Mr. Speaker, the northern plan explains the important role played by resource development in Quebec. While Quebec is proud of our resource heritage, the NDP leader calls it a disease. The NDP leader must apologize to the hundreds of thousands of Canadians throughout the country who work in the resource sector.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORTATION

Ms. Éline Michaud (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Transport met with Quebec's municipal affairs and intergovernmental affairs ministers about the Neuville airport. Finally.

As I have been doing in this House since November, they pointed out to him that the entire region is against the project and asked him to take action on this issue. The minister apparently said he was aware of the many problems that this airport is causing residents. It is about time, because planes have already started flying over the town.

Can the minister tell us if he now intends to meet with the mayor of Neuville and use the authority conferred on him by the Aeronautics Act to intervene in this matter?

Hon. Denis Lebel (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities and Minister of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member will get the same answer that she has had since November.

Yesterday, we did in fact have a meeting with Quebec government ministers about a number of issues, including the Neuville airport.

I would like to point out that the mandate of the Minister of Transport is to promote the economic development of the aviation industry in a manner that is stable and safe. There is no question of safety in this case. Even if there were a regulatory change—and none is foreseen—it would in no way concern Neuville, as it is a matter that we consider settled. If the mayor did not believe in the airport, he would not have signed an agreement after proposing seven possible locations.

*Government Orders***HOUSING**

Mrs. Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the fact that the federal government is withdrawing its funding for affordable housing is shameful. Despite desperate needs, the government is going to terminate operating agreements for these housing units. By 2016, thousands of Quebec families will lose the financial support that helps them afford appropriate housing. This morning, I presented part of a petition, with over 6,000 of a total of 27,000 signatures, condemning these cuts, which will affect the most vulnerable people in Quebec.

Does the government intend to renew this funding or is it going to again make the less fortunate pay for its deficits and absurd budget choices?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is completely absurd. It is our government that stabilized the housing market by allocating almost \$2 billion over five years for affordable housing. It is our government that helped these people in need. Unfortunately, the Bloc opposed every initiative that we took to help these people.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1505)

[*Translation*]

COPYRIGHT MODERNIZATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Copyright Act, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Gatineau has seven minutes to finish her speech.

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that so many members will hear my speech on Bill C-11.

Before question period, I congratulated my colleagues from Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, Timmins—James Bay and Jeanne-Le Ber, who are very passionate about this issue, and I congratulate them publicly again.

Why are they so passionate about it? I am going to give you a few facts that can sometimes be a little surprising. We often say that the government opposite does not like arts and culture because they are not big business, like oil and gas; arts and culture are not as important.

The Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists, or ACTRA, estimates that the arts and culture industries in Canada contribute \$85 billion a year to our economy. That represents 7.4% of Canada's gross national income and supports 1.1 million jobs, or about 6% of the Canadian labour force. These industries and the jobs that depend on them can survive only in an environment where intellectual property is protected.

Despite the important contribution of these industries, the average income in 2009-10 for an artist in Canada was only \$12,900 a year, which I find very sad. A 2008 report by the Conference Board of Canada indicated that the cultural sector generated approximately

\$25 billion. We are talking money and taxes. That is three times the \$7.9 billion investment in culture by all levels of government in 2007.

How much does the federal government invest in arts and culture? A meagre 1.6% of total government spending.

I was struck by another telling statistic in connection with this entire issue of copyright and the reform of copyright. In 2008, the Statistics Canada survey on household spending found that Canadians spent \$1.4 billion on attending live artistic performances, twice as much as on sports events. And we know how much the government opposite likes to talk about sports and how little it talks about arts and culture.

What does such a change mean? When we look at the bill, it seems rather complicated. That is why I strongly disagree with the government's move to once again force the adoption of a time allocation motion. That forces us to shorten the debates and limit my colleagues' speaking time and right to speak here in this House. Most of my colleagues are here for the first time. It is highly likely that this is the first time in their lives they have heard about the Copyright Act.

In the summary of the bill we see that some changes have been made to the Copyright Act to:

(a) update the rights and protections of copyright owners to better address the challenges and opportunities of the Internet, so as to be in line with international standards;

We know that the Internet is now a major player when it comes to copyright because a great deal of created material is on the Internet, including movies, music, books, you name it.

The summary also indicates that these changes to the Copyright Act will also:

(b) clarify Internet service providers' liability and make the enabling of online copyright infringement itself an infringement of copyright;

(c) permit businesses, educators and libraries to make greater use of copyright material in digital form;...

Thus, these amendments to the Copyright Act change many, many things.

The kinds of changes being made to this legislation can be categorized into three main groups: changes defined as sector-specific reforms, compromise provisions, and no-compromise rules regarding technological protection measures.

• (1510)

The NDP is looking to strike a balanced approach. Our party is seeking a balanced system between the rights of creators and those of the public. I hope that all the members of this House want to ensure that the public has access to as much information as possible while protecting copyright, which goes without saying.

With this bill, and with our friends opposite—with whom we are less and less friendly—we get the impression that any efforts have instead focused on meeting the demands of the big owners of American content. They are the big global players in this area. I am referring to film studios, record companies, developers of video games, and others.

Government Orders

Will Canadians one day have a law that meets their needs? That much is not clear, and this legislation will certainly not do the job.

I only have one minute left, which is very little time. I would have liked to discuss a great many things about this bill, which is riddled with shortcomings and defects. Amendments have been proposed, and it is my hope that they will be seriously considered so as to prevent foolish things from occurring. For example, students who are enrolled in distance education because they reside in remote areas would be forced to destroy their notes after a certain number of days.

There are things in the bill that make absolutely no sense. I want to commend those people who work in the area of arts and culture. I particularly salute those people who work very hard for the City of Gatineau and the Maison de la culture de Gatineau, whose board I had the pleasure to chair for a number of years. They do extraordinary work when it comes to disseminating arts and culture. They help new artists, along with well-known artists, to make a name for themselves.

Let us therefore protect artists and, at the same time, ensure that the public enjoys the best possible access to arts and culture.

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Cash (Davenport, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for her speech and for all the work she does in the House.

We on our side have said from the get-go that copyright legislation should balance the rights of artists and their need to be paid with the rights of consumers and their needs. We feel that, on a number of different levels, the government did not get that balance right.

I am wondering if my hon. colleague could speak to the issue of the importance of fostering a vibrant arts and culture sector in her community and what that means both to the economy and to the community as a whole.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from my colleague, who is also doing an absolutely phenomenal job in this area. He is an artist, a musician I very much like listening to.

The figures I cited earlier are absolutely incredible. It is often said that arts and culture are the poor cousins of the economy, but that is definitely not as a result of their impact in our communities. ACTRA estimated that the arts and culture industry in Canada injected \$85 billion a year into our economy, which represents 7.4% of Canada's gross national income. That is not peanuts. People attend more shows than hockey games or anything else.

And yet it seems that artists and people who work in the cultural field are forced to spend their lives fighting for money, whether from the Minister of Canadian Heritage or from Quebec's Minister of Culture. I see that in Gatineau. It is a constant struggle, and artists always get the impression of having to beg, of being poor cousins. And yet they ultimately inject an enormous amount of money into the economy.

There are activities and shows in the Outaouais, in Gatineau, among other places. Year after year, for example, L'Outaouais en fête fights for a minuscule grant from Canadian Heritage and is unable to

get it. It seems that it is asked for much bigger guarantees than what big businesses are asked for—oil companies, banks or other businesses—on the grounds that it is part of the cultural sector. And yet it is an extraordinary economic organization. It is excellent for us. It represents us in Canada, in Quebec, among other places, where culture and the arts are flourishing so well.

• (1515)

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, earlier my colleague mentioned the contribution that artists make to the economy. However, we know that most artists are not Céline Dion or Bryan Adams. They do not make millions of dollars. They earn only a few thousand dollars a year.

How will the bill, as it currently stands, affect the careers of most artists?

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Mr. Speaker, what a good question.

In my speech, I talked about the \$85 billion that is injected into Canada's economy. However, and this is shocking, by comparison, the average salary of Canadian artists is \$12,900. That is terrible. It is below the poverty line.

When you look at a bill like this one through the eyes of an artist, of a person who works in the cultural sector, you may well wonder whether you will see any part of those billions of dollars. The answer is "no" because, in our view, the Conservatives' bill is so unbalanced that we get the feeling its purpose, once again, is to protect the big fish, the major American studios, for example, the major American record companies and so on.

Has anyone looked at this bill through the eyes of a Canadian or Quebec artist? I very much doubt it. This is really not a balanced bill. That is why we have introduced a number of amendments. Unfortunately, as is the case with all other bills, everything has to come from this government, and what comes from other parties is fundamentally bad.

It is unfortunate that the Conservatives have this attitude, because we will be inheriting an act that cannot achieve the objectives for which it was drafted.

[*English*]

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak to this bill. I am pleased that our government is getting closer to delivering on its commitment to modernize the Copyright Act.

I would like to invite all of my colleagues to join me in ensuring the swift passage of Bill C-11, the copyright modernization act. By supporting the legislation, we will be delivering on our government's commitment to modernize the Copyright Act in a way that balances the needs of creators and users.

The road that has led us to where we are today has been a lengthy one. Once we pass the legislation, this will be the first time in more than 15 years that we have completed a comprehensive overhaul of the Copyright Act. During this time, we have heard from thousands of Canadians and have had ample time to debate copyright modernization.

Government Orders

As my colleagues may recall, the copyright modernization act was first introduced following the largest consultations of their kind in Canadian history. In the summer of 2009, we set out to hear the views and opinions of Canadians from across the country. We leveraged new technologies to provide as many people as possible with access to this important process. We hosted interactive and web-based discussions. We held live events from coast to coast in Halifax, Quebec City, Montreal, Gatineau, Peterborough, Toronto, Winnipeg, Edmonton, Calgary and Vancouver. Finally, we also accepted written submissions.

The response we received was impressive. Around 1,000 Canadians participated in the live events. More than 8,000 submissions were made, the website received 30,000 unique visits. We had more than 2,500 online forum posts and hundreds of followers on Twitter.

Based on this response, it was clear that Canadians from all walks of life understood the importance of modern copyright legislation, and this is still the case. During those consultations, Canadians told us about how copyright impacted their daily lives. Canadians told us about the importance of copyright to the digital economy and its effect on Canada's global competitiveness. Furthermore, Canadian creators and users told us that they needed clear, fair and predictable rules.

Our government listened to all of this and we responded with the introduction of the copyright modernization act in 2010 and its reintroduction last fall. We have responded with legislation that takes a common sense, balanced approach to copyright modernization. This approach considers the needs of both creators and users of copyright material. We have responded with legislation that reflects a uniquely Canadian approach to copyright modernization, an approach that takes into account the perspectives that Canadians have shared with us as creators, consumers and citizens during our consultations.

I would like to highlight four specific things we heard during the consultations and highlight how our government responded.

The first thing we heard was that Canadians thought that technological neutrality was an important guiding principle for copyright modernization. They emphasized that Canada's copyright regime must be able to accommodate technology that did not yet exist. They told us that any copyright reform must reflect the reality of an ever-evolving media and technological landscape. We responded. The copyright modernization act includes a number of exceptions that are technologically neutral. They reflect the reality of an ever-evolving media and technological landscape. They will stand the test of time.

The second thing we heard was that Canadians wanted to make reasonable use of content that they had legally acquired. We responded. The copyright modernization act includes a number of exceptions that facilitate commonplace private uses of copyright materials.

The third thing we heard was that Canadians did not think it was fair that one could risk facing huge penalties for minor copyright infringement. We responded to this, too. The copyright modernization act would create two categories of infringement to which

statutory damages could apply. The first category is commercial and the second category is non-commercial. For non-commercial infringement, the existing statutory damages in the Copyright Act will be significantly reduced. The copyright modernization act also introduces proportionality as a factor for the courts to consider when awarding damages.

The fourth thing we heard was that Canadian copyright owners wanted new rights and protections to sustain business models in a digital environment. We responded to this as well. The copyright modernization act would implement the rights and protections of the Internet treaties of the World Intellectual Property Organization. These include a making available right, a distribution right, moral rights for performers and protections for digital locks and digital watermarks.

● (1520)

These four things are just examples of what we heard during the 2009 consultations. There are numerous other things we heard and we responded to. Perhaps the easiest way to sum it all up is to say that the 2009 consultation demonstrated to us the importance of a balanced approach to copyright modernization, an approach that balances the interests of all Canadians, creators and users alike. This is the approach we will be delivering to Canadians by passing Bill C-11.

Large scale national consultations have been held, legislation has twice been introduced and debated, witnesses have testified and submissions have been received. Committees have studied the bill at length and a number of technical amendments have been made to improve the clarity of certain provisions.

The bill is back before us. We need to pass the legislation and deliver results to Canadians. The fact is that after 15 years, it is time to turn the page on this chapter of copyright modernization.

Our government recognizes that new challenges may emerge in the future for the Copyright Act. That is why we have included in the bill a mandatory review of the legislation every five years. This five year review will ensure that Canada's copyright regime does not fall back into the outdated state it is today. However, before we can think about all this, we need to first modernize the Copyright Act by passing the bill.

Canadians from all walks of life have an interest in modern copyright laws. The benefits of copyright modernization are many. However, Canadians will not enjoy them until we have passed the bill.

I urge all members to join me in supporting the swift passage of the copyright modernization act.

Government Orders

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the comments of my colleague. He would have us believe that this is a very balanced bill and that based on the consultation, the government has weighed in to protect both consumers and artists. However, when one examines the bill, this is not the case.

We could argue quite well that the real winners in Bill C-11 are the recording industry and major movie studios. In fact, this is one explanation why the technological protection measures, or TPMs, provided in the bill virtually trump all other rights to allow record companies and movie studios to strengthen their ability to generate enormous profits.

Would the member respond to that criticism? It is not just us saying this. People who have been very involved in the bill's process are very concerned that it favours these very large players.

• (1525)

Hon. Rob Moore: Mr. Speaker, she used a word that we heard over and over, and that was balance, that we had to strike a balance. That was the overarching objective of our government, and we did achieve that balance.

I will illustrate that. By having sat on the committee that studied the bill, we heard from a number of witnesses. It was very common to for witnesses to thank us for bringing in copyright legislation, but then they would say that there was one little thing we could change. We heard that from all sides of the spectrum.

At the end of day, the bill before us is one that is balanced, one that recognizes the needs of creators and also recognizes the needs of consumers. Some of the protections we have in place now for copyright holders, including distribution rights, moral rights, is the use of digital locks for those who choose to use them to better protect their copyrighted material.

It is a balance. We are in a new era. When this study first began, we knew that technologically we had advanced by leaps and bounds. We have to keep up with the times. Bringing in this copyright legislation now is the right thing. It is the right time. It is also the right balance. We heard this over and over at committee.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to ask a number of the hon. member's colleagues this question. Given his involvement in the committee stage, the concern that many of his constituents and my constituents would have is the whole idea of the digital lock.

If constituents purchase a favourite album, which has a digital lock, and they want to back it up or put it on one or two of their MP3 players for jogging purposes or whatever it might be, but strictly for personal use, should constituents not be allowed to do that?

Hon. Rob Moore: Mr. Speaker, this bill would legitimize the activities Canadians are doing everyday. I will give the member some examples. It would recognize that Canadians should not be liable for recording TV programs for later viewing, copying music from CDs to MP3 players or backing up data, if they were doing so for their private use and had not broken a digital lock.

The issue of a digital lock is up to the copyright holder. We heard from the testimony at committee that a digital lock is a way some

people would choose to protect their copyrighted material. We also heard in committee that other creators are moving well beyond that. They do not want to use a digital lock. They want their material to be shifted from one format to another, and they are embracing these new technologies and the ways consumers are using them.

However, we have to strike that right balance between the many creators we celebrate in Canada being able to continue to do the great work they do, making us proud and earning a living as a creator, with the issues consumers face with the technology available to us today, being able to use material in the way they see fit. This bill would strike that balance.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Mylène Freeman (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that I have to rise in the House once again to condemn this excessive and unbalanced Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Copyright Act. The people of Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, consumers and many creators alike, will not be happy to see that the Conservatives did not take advantage of the study in committee to make the necessary changes to this bill in order to take into account their rights and concerns.

As the New Democrats have been saying from the outset, Bill C-11 does not really protect creators' rights, since it will take millions of dollars in revenue away from them and erode their market.

We are not the only ones to say so. Over 80 arts and culture organizations have said that this bill is “toxic to Canada's digital economy”.

One of them, the Society for Reproduction Rights of Authors, Composers and Publishers in Canada, states that:

The desired balance between the interests of creators and those of consumers and users is, in our opinion, completely absent.

The people in my riding are concerned about this bill. I have received a hundred or so emails and phone calls from constituents who simply do not trust this bill or this government.

To these concerned citizens, I responded that, although changes to the act are necessary, those set out in Bill C-11 were harmful to artists, teachers and consumers. We need legislative changes that protect artist royalties, while making sure that distance education is not hampered and that young people are not exposed to unfair and costly fines.

That is what the people of my riding, what Quebeckers and what all Canadians want.

A person in my riding, from the municipality of Lac-Simon, wrote:

Thank you very much, Mylène.

Copyright is an issue that is close to my heart, and I fully agree with its renewal... but I do not have faith in the majority government in place...

Government Orders

In a few words, that sums up this government's problem. Its majority is going to its head and is preventing all intelligent discussion. We need a bill to modernize copyright, and the opposition wants to discuss and work constructively with the government. Unfortunately, the government's response is to muzzle debate. It is limiting the debate and, in the end, taking measures that will do nothing to improve the situation of artists and consumers.

This government's lack of subtlety and judgment is perfectly illustrated in one measure in this bill.

Bill C-11 proposes to block the use of content for which people have paid and which they are therefore entitled to use. For example, if you take a distance training course, you have an obligation to destroy the course notes 30 days after completing it. That is absurd and unfair. What happens if you take another course and are asked to use the concepts from the first course? What happens if you fail the course and have to take it again? This is really absurd and unfair.

Here is another example of improvisation: the only protection measure that can be taken by content owners—who are often not the creators themselves—is to lock their works, which will really hurt consumers. Rights owners do not like it either, because it often benefits only the big companies.

This bill is also not good for consumers because digital locks make criminals of Canadian users who are entitled to access those works. The bill criminalizes the act of circumventing digital locks, regardless of the reasons for doing so, even for legal purposes.

This bill ultimately gives consumers rights with one hand and, with the digital lock, takes them away with the other.

Another nonsensical aspect of this bill is more technical but illustrates the way this government makes things up as it goes along.

This bill creates an artificial and inconsistent legal distinction between "copying for private use" and "reproduction...for...private purposes". I just compared section 80 of part VIII of the Copyright Act and paragraph 29.22(2)(e) of the proposed Copyright Modernization Act.

● (1530)

The government is indiscriminately tackling complex legal provisions and imposing disproportionate penalties such as the possibility of a fine of more than \$1 million and five years in prison.

As in other matters, the Conservatives are self-styled experts, drawing inspiration from their retrograde ideology and, in this case, the controversial American legislation, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act.

This bill creates legal uncertainty that will result in many costly court cases. In short, artists and creators, as well as consumers, archivists, teachers and students are opposed to this unbalanced bill. That is why, with the support of many stakeholders, the New Democrats, at committee stage, proposed 17 amendments that would have made it possible to have a more balanced bill that was fairer to artists and consumers.

In a nutshell, here are a few of those amendments: eliminate the loophole that the Conservatives included in the bill and that takes \$21 million away from music creators; protect the moral rights of

artists for new forms of content produced by users, such as mashups and YouTube videos; link the ban on circumventing digital locks to acts of violating copyright, thus allowing the circumvention of digital locks for legal purposes, which also involves ensuring that people with visual or hearing impairments have the explicit right to circumvent digital locks to gain access to a work; remove the "book-burning" provisions that the Conservatives are imposing on students and educational institutions by requiring them to destroy their educational material once the course is over.

These proposed amendments, which would balance this bill, were rejected by the Conservatives, despite the broad consensus of creators of culture in Quebec and in Canada. Instead of protecting creators by protecting their rights and ensuring that they will be paid for their work, instead of protecting Canadians and Quebecers by giving them access to content, this bill aims to protect foreign interests. The Conservatives' priority is not to create a balanced system between the rights of creators and the rights of the public, but to respond to the demands of big U.S. content owners.

● (1535)

If the Conservatives had really wanted to create a balanced system, they would have listened to the witnesses in committee. The brief submitted by the Association of Canadian Community Colleges clearly condemned digital locks:

The digital-locks amendment will, in effect, severely limit how one can access and use digital information. In practice, this would mean that educational institutions, teachers, and students would lose their rights under fair dealing, educational and library exceptions, or other users' rights in copyright law to copy, perform, or share electronically a digital work that has been locked by a "technological measure".

The Canadian Library Association also strongly criticized this measure: "The prohibitions on the circumvention of digital locks in Bill C-11 exceed Canada's obligations under WIPO copyright treaties."

I am going to wrap things up now because I have just one minute left. Copyright modernization is long past due, but this bill has too many major problems. Canada has an opportunity to become a leader by implementing copyright regulations and taking a balanced approach between the right of creators to be compensated fairly for their work and the right of consumers to have reasonable access to content. It is clear that the NDP is the only party that truly stands up for the rights of artists and consumers.

Government Orders

• (1540)

[English]

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened to my colleague's speech with interest. It was concerning to me because the world is undergoing economic challenges and our government has been focused on job creation. In her province of Quebec the electronic gaming industry relies on digital locks in order for its business model to work. It is coming up with new models, guaranteed, but right now creators historically have been able to say that they own the intellectual property with their creations. Companies like EA in Montreal spend literally tens of thousands of hours creating a video game. That video game is locked. Companies sell the video game to consumers and the consumers know it is locked. That is their business model. They choose it. There is freedom for them to choose that model. What she and her party are proposing is that these locks should be able to be broken. Today with the new technology, that means one person could buy that game, upload it on the Internet and this great company that employs literally thousands of Canadians could lose that intellectual property. It would cause extreme job losses, not only in her province but across Canada.

What could the member say to people in the gaming creation industry about her party's policy and why would she propose those job losses?

Ms. Mylène Freeman: Madam Speaker, I think my colleague misunderstands our position. What we are saying is that this would go far beyond what is needed. Bill C-11, the copyright modernization act, essentially would give with one hand and take away with the other from the consumers. That is what we are saying. This bill contains a few concessions to consumers but they are then undermined by controversial issues like digital lock provisions. That is what is going to be undermining all sectors of the creation economy.

What my colleague does not seem to understand about our position is that we are talking about a more balanced approach. The digital lock provision is a sweeping legislation in favour of the companies and not there for the creators or for the consumers. This is really, in most cases, going to be in favour of the companies that are not usually based in Canada. So there needs to be a lot more battling.

[Translation]

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague from Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel on her speech.

I totally agree with what she said in the House about the importance of a balance between users and creators. I think she will agree with me that this balance cannot be found in this bill. This is why we are against it.

[English]

I am hoping that my colleague might be able to share with us her views as to whether she believes that this lack of balance in this copyright legislation is similar to what I think is a general disregard that the Conservatives and their government have had for supporting arts and culture in Canada. If the government were interested in supporting creativity and cultural industries, some of the cuts we

have seen, for example to Radio-Canada, to CBC, to the arts council and to Telefilm Canada, would not have taken place.

Does my colleague agree with me that it is part of a larger framework of a disinterest in the arts? I represent a region of the country where there is a vibrant artistic community and it is suffering under the current government.

Ms. Mylène Freeman: Madam Speaker, I am glad my colleague from the Liberal Party agrees with me. I am never sure, with the Liberal Party's record, what its members are going to say. However, I am very glad he does agree and that we are talking about moving forward and modernizing in a way that is more equitable.

I agree that the Conservatives do not really think about creators or the artists. There are numerous artists in my riding. One of the most famous is Gilles Vigneault. Obviously he has a very strong position on creator rights. This is his source of income and it needs to be protected and understood by everybody. However, that obviously needs to be balanced with consumer rights. That is what makes this legislation difficult. That is where we need to be putting the emphasis and that is not where the Conservatives are putting the emphasis.

• (1545)

Mr. Colin Carrie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is so wonderful to see such agreement on the other side of the House.

I am pleased to rise in my place to speak to Bill C-11, the copyright modernization bill. This legislation is a result of an extensive amount of consultation and debate. I believe that we have arrived at a good bill that is ready to be passed by this House. While the process to get here has been long, we have seen the support of representatives from across Canada's creative industries, like software producers, as well as consumer groups.

The name of this bill says it all. This is a bill to modernize Canada's copyright regime. Why do we need to modernize Canada's copyright law? Because it was last updated in the late '90s. Let us consider that for a moment.

In the era of SMART Boards and e-learning, the current Copyright Act is weighted down by provisions that apply to overhead projectors and dry erase boards. This says nothing about how consumers' lives have changed since the advent of smart phones and PVRs. This law is simply out of touch with our daily lives. We live in a global digital environment yet have copyright laws that were last updated in the 1990s, before the dot-com era, before social media, and before tablet computers and mobile devices allowed us to access thousands of songs, movies and gaming applications at the touch of a button or at the swipe of a finger.

We went from 8-bit video game consoles to motion sensing input devices that can use gestures and spoken commands instead of hand-held controllers. Video game consoles can be found now in households all over Canada and they have many times the processing power of computers from the '90s.

Government Orders

Our government's approach to copyright is clear. We want Canada to have a modern, forward-looking, technologically neutral copyright regime that balances the rights of creators and rights holders with the everyday activities of Canadians in the 21st century economy.

One of the motivating principles behind our government's approach to protecting intellectual property is to promote and spur innovation in Canada. Our government knows the important role that innovation plays in creating economic growth and jobs now and in the future. That is why, as part of our jobs, growth and long-term prosperity bill, we have proposed considerable investments in programs that support business-led innovation and research and development. All of this would be for nothing if those innovators, entrepreneurs and creators did not have the legal tools available to them to protect their works. A modern copyright regime is one of those tools.

Following the legislative committee's review of Bill C-11, the committee proposed a targeted set of technological amendments to the bill to ensure that the spirit of the legislation is implemented. It is for this reason that the committee adopted specific technical amendments to support innovative companies in the information technology sector. I commend the committee for its work and fully support the amendments it has proposed.

Allow me to explain. The amendments to the bill's exception for reverse engineering, interoperability and security testing will serve their purpose in encouraging these economic activities while not exposing other businesses to needless risks. When conducted in good faith, these kinds of activities are a necessary step in the process of developing new computer applications or computer security tools, thus driving innovation.

However, we cannot ignore the possibility that some individuals would pursue such activities for malicious reasons. To ensure that this does not happen, the bill has been amended to firmly establish that these exceptions should never apply to an activity that is otherwise in violation of the Criminal Code of Canada.

Furthermore, the committee proposed an amendment that seeks to clarify the section of the bill that brings many of those everyday activities that Canadians are already doing, namely time and format shifting, onto the right side of the law.

The amendments recognize that creators' and rights holders' interests could have been unduly compromised by an ambiguity in the original version of the clause, which did not specify that these exceptions are meant only for the private purposes of the person who made the copy, not for somebody else's private purposes. This change, while seemingly minor, made sure that the adequate protections remain in place for the legitimate interests of rights holders and creators. It also gives consumers the clarity they need to understand what is allowed and what is not allowed.

Finally, all of us in this House know the incredible growth potential that is still to be realized in the digital economy. Year over year, e-commerce continues to grow even despite broader uncertainty in the world economy.

Dematerialization of video games, for instance, is only one of the new phenomena produced by the progress of the digital economy.

This part of the Canadian economy is a hotbed for innovation and the creation of new technologies, like cloud computing. Our government is completely committed to supporting the digital economy and our record to date reflects this amazing commitment.

• (1550)

That is the big reason why we have included elements in the bill that strike directly at those who undermine legitimate online businesses by enabling the large scale infringement of copyright.

Illegitimate online services like these drag down the economic potential and opportunity of the mainstream digital economy. The piracy they enable makes creators and rights holders think twice about engaging in this new and emerging market. This is bad for creators and bad for consumers. Jason Kee, from the Entertainment Software Association of Canada, said in committee that we are talking about an industry that employs approximately 16,000 people in good quality jobs. He pointed out that it accounts for an estimated 11,000 more in terms of indirect employment, and contributes \$1.7 billion in direct economic activity.

That is one reason why we need this bill. It give creators and copyright owners the tools they need to specifically target these piracy enabling services. This is where the committee identified the need to tighten up this clause in order to ensure that the services that enable the violation of copyright are rightly identified and exposed to the appropriate level of liability.

I believe that the amendments that I have described today make it absolutely clear, the government does not tolerate piracy. This bill would make it much more difficult for commercial pirates to get away with infringement. Everyone in the House should welcome these technical amendments. They are the product of an extensive committee review process that stretched over two Parliaments and which met for 21 combined days of deliberation, hearing the testimony of 110 witnesses.

For creative industries, like software creators and video game publishers, the bill provides a clear, predictable, legal framework that allows them to combat online piracy and roll out new online business models. Businesses that decide to use technological protection measures to protect their products should have the protection of the law. We will provide legal protection for businesses that choose to use technological protection measures, or digital locks, to protect their work as part of their business models. At the same time, the bill also ensures that locks on wireless devices will not prevent Canadians from switching their wireless service providers, as long as existing contracts are respected. This will not affect any obligations under existing contracts.

This highlights our commitment to produce a bill that will be balanced. It is, above all, common sense. In closing, I think it is important to note the mandatory five year review that has been put right into the bill. This will mean that whatever issues may arise we will have the benefit of a review to see how the bill can be improved in the future. This step is important because we know that technology evolves, understanding of copyright evolves and new issues emerge. Parliament will have the ability to react in a thoughtful fashion to these issues.

Government Orders

I urge hon. members to join me in supporting this committee report and to work with the government to move the bill to the Senate.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague opposite for his speech. It sounds really nice when it comes out of his mouth. However, I wonder what he tells the various opponents of the bill who still see many shortcomings in it.

It makes me think that, even though the government tells us that enough time has been spent on this bill, not enough time really has been, when you consider the kind of opposition it has raised. For instance, the Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada, SOCAN, believes that amendments should be made to the bill to facilitate access to creative content on new media, and especially to ensure that creators are fairly compensated for their creative content on new media.

Once again, it is a question of balance. The creation of creative content will eventually drop off, because Canadian creators will no longer be able to make a living from their creations. There is a lot of talk about big digital enterprises and so on. However, we should not throw the baby out with the bathwater. There is the whole issue of the creators, the authors, that is at stake in this change, which is quite extensive, thank you, and which seems to create more problems than it solves.

Copyright lawyer Howard Knopf also objects, as do SODRAC, Jeremy F. de Beer and many others. I could continue in this vein for many more minutes.

[*English*]

Mr. Colin Carrie: Madam Speaker, I noticed one of the biggest opponents to copyright reform is actually the NDP. I do not know exactly what it is, if it is just that ideologically it is opposed to creating jobs.

As I said in my speech, the video game industry in Quebec is huge. It provides quality jobs for young people who enjoy not only the products, but enjoy creating new products for the future. The business model relies on these locks.

Perhaps I should read from some of the supporters. The Entertainment Software Association of Canada has said that the government is delivering on a promise to modernize outdated law and support new and innovative models. It considers that this legislation will provide a framework to allow creators and companies to distribute their work in a manner that best suits them. It said, "We strongly support the principles underlying this bill..."

It does because it supports freedom and choice, not only for businesses but for consumers and innovators. That is the side of the table we are going to be standing at.

• (1555)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I must confess that at times I can get really stuck on an issue and I am stuck on this issue in terms of what it is the government is actually doing.

If a constituent of his or mine goes to a store, acquires a digitally locked music disc, goes home and decides to make another copy of his or her favourite song, in essence, if this bill passes, the individual will have broken the law and will be a criminal. You are making criminals out of individuals who decide to copy something for personal use that has a digital lock on it, even though they purchased it and want to use it on a different format for personal use. Why are you criminalizing that sector of our constituents?

The Deputy Speaker: I would ask all members to direct their questions through the Speaker. I do not think I am criminalizing anyone.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Colin Carrie: Madam Speaker, I would agree with my colleague that he is stuck on this point because he has had the question answered numerous times. We are looking at a balance. Certain creators need protection for their work and, frankly, when they own the intellectual property of the copyright, it is their choice. It is not the choice of somebody buying the product what form he or she wants it in.

Let us say, for example, I am a creator and I choose to sell something that is locked. It is like if my colleague had a store of suits and decided that he would lock the store when there was nobody around. He could choose to lock it or unlock it but if he unlocked the store perhaps people would come into his store and take all of his suits. With that business model, unfortunately, he would go bankrupt.

There are creators who require that their products be sold with digital locks. The consumer can decide to buy it or not to buy it. That is what it is about. Unfortunately, we have tried to answer my colleague's questions over and over again but he still does not get it and I am sure he will ask it again.

Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to be joining the debate on Bill C-11, is a bill that I have worked on for some time. In fact, previous to this Parliament, I was parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, a position I quite enjoyed. I had the opportunity to work hand in hand with the minister and the Minister of Industry in the crafting of this bill.

This bill was undertaken with more consultation than any bill in history to the best of my knowledge. We had consultations in Canadian cities right across the country. In fact, there was even a consultation held in Peterborough, largely with members from outside of Peterborough, but folks from Peterborough were there as well. We had the opportunity to view some 8,000 online submissions for the bill as well. We undertook extensive consultations in consideration of this bill.

Government Orders

One of the comments by a witness who appeared before the committee that stands out for me was from the president and CEO of the Chamber of Commerce, the hon. Perrin Beatty. As members know, the Chamber of Commerce has been calling on governments for more than a decade to update Canada's copyright laws and his quote really stood out for me. Perrin Beatty said to the committee, "Why throw out the good in pursuit of the perfect?". That is what the opposition members would like. They would like a good bill thrown out because they know in their hearts there is no such thing as a perfect copyright bill. It does not exist.

Copyright law is about balance. It is about a balance between those who wish to purchase items and those who have created items. That is a relationship that will forever be changing and redefined. However, we establish the laws and boundaries that should dictate that relationship and we try to do so in a manner that is balanced and fair to all concerned.

However, that does not mean that all concerned will agree with every aspect of the bill but it does mean that we are striving to maintain a balance that respects everyone involved. That is what the government has worked to do. I am proud to say that the government is moving ahead with copyright modernization that addresses the challenges and opportunities of the Internet and other digital technologies and will bring Canada's copyright laws up to international standards.

We have a copyright law right now. We signed onto international treaties in 1997. The Liberal Party was in government then. I am sure members remember those dark days when the Liberal Party was in power and it would sign international treaties with no intention of actually fulfilling them. Well, it did that with the Copyright Act as well.

I hear a member of the NDP shouting across the aisle. I am going talk to the NDP House leader because he has spoken against that kind of action in this House and I commend him for his constant lobbying and efforts to bring a new level of decorum to this House. I will just make him aware that one of his members is not holding up to his own very high standards. I am sure we will get that looked after.

When it comes to our international obligations, we have taken them seriously. We want Canada to be inside the tent. We want to be with those nations that have stood up for copyright holders, creators and industries. We want to create those jobs. This bill is as much about economic stimulus as it is about anything else. It is as much about job creation as it is about protecting copyrighted materials.

With respect to the question from the member for Winnipeg North, I have been watching the debate on television and I have heard the question a number of times, not just from that member but from other members of his party and others. It has a very simple answer. When people purchase something, they purchase it for a specific purpose. The member keeps on talking about a CD and about format shifting something that is not permitted. Although one does not buy a legal right to format shift it, the member is making the argument that one should be allowed to format shift that piece of copyrighted material even though one did not pay for that right.

● (1600)

My colleague just used the example of a clothing store owner. It is like going to a clothing store, buying a pair socks and then going back and saying, "By the way, I have decided it was not socks that I needed. What I really wanted was shoes, so I am just going to take these, I am going to format shift from socks to shoes and I am not going to pay anything because it was all for my feet". That is the argument that we are hearing.

Time and time again, we heard from professional witnesses who came in and extolled the virtues of this bill. Did we hear from others who had other opinions? Yes, we did. The NDP members had lots of support for what we called an iPod tax and they called a levy. They had lots of support for placing additional charges on consumer electronic devices. Of course the debate was not honest at the outset. They were saying that it would just be for MP3 players and that it would be a nominal fee even though they applied to the Copyright Board to charge a fee of up to \$75 per device. At committee I told them that the technology had already passed them by with respect to those devices. I said that they were antiquated technologies.

On the new technologies, things like smart phones and car stereos, the NDP members initially scoffed and asked why they would want to put anything on car stereos. Well, I have a car outside that has 60 gigabytes of memory in it. It can actually store movies and music. However, I would never store music and movies while I am driving.

I oppose any kind of fee. The other problem with what the NDP members were proposing is that they were proposing a fee on devices like mine, a BlackBerry proudly made in Canada, great Canadian technology, but it would only go to one single medium, music. It would not go to photographers, or film creators or artists. It would only go to music.

This device that is capable of communication, emails, photos, movies, any kind of online activity as far as viewing and receiving information and may also be able to store music, but what the NDP members are proposing is a levy on that device just for music, that would only go to musicians, and consumers would have to pay even though they have already purchased the materials.

If I am buying a licence from, for example, iTunes and, with that, I receive a licence to make five additional copies, and this may also answer some of the questions that we have heard, I am buying an agreement that I can put that song on a device but also on up to four more devices. When people buy a licence from iTunes they are able to format shift that and store that on multiple devices.

The NDP and some of the other proponents made a proposal, which the Liberal Party was very strong on, as was former member, Pablo Rodriguez, and it was something that we voted against because we disagreed with it. Their proposal was to increase the price on devices and we disagreed on that. There were other areas where we did agree but this clearly was an area where we disagreed. That is why the hon. Perrin Beatty, who I referenced earlier, said that it would be silly to throw out a really good bill because we disagree with a certain aspect of it.

Government Orders

In the meantime, billions of dollars are being siphoned away from creators in this country, from the creative economy. Wealth destroyers, companies whose business it is to literally destroy the wealth of industries, are operating in this country illegally, pushing out pirated copies of music and movies and other things. This bill provides the tools needed to crack down on the wealth-destroying operations in this country. It is high time that we did it.

Graham Henderson of Music Canada came before our committee and gave a fantastic presentation. It was unfortunate that we had a procedural vote at the time but he spoke emphatically in support of this bill. The entertainment software industry emphatically supported this bill. The film industry said that a billion dollars a year were going missing that should be invested in jobs, movies, new creations and new products that Canada can be so proud of.

We need this bill, which is why I am proud to stand behind it and vote in favour of it tonight. It is time to end 15 years of debate on copyright legislation.

• (1605)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Blanchette (Louis-Hébert, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to my colleague's speech. I think we could have a long discussion on the basis of what he told us. What he told us is just fantastic.

When you go to a record store and you buy music, you buy it of course on some kind of medium, such as a CD. People do not go to a record store to buy a CD, but to buy music. So it is fair that people think they have the right to copy it onto some other medium for their personal use, so they can listen to it.

Does my colleague think that people go to a record store to buy a CD or to buy music that they want to listen to?

[*English*]

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: Madam Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with what the member just said. We are not buying that medium. We are buying what is stored on it. I agree completely. Legally we are also purchasing a licence to consume that media in the format we are purchasing it in.

I mentioned iTunes and how it allows people to make up to five copies of a piece. Today, Blu-ray provides opportunities for us to make what is called digital copies. We can take it off the Blu-ray and put it on our computer or on another storage device we have in the house. The industry is changing, and this is really a consumer-to-business relationship. It is evolving and it is working.

I have heard this argument many times. There is an amusement park just north of Toronto in the city of Vaughan, called Canada's Wonderland. Imagine making an investment in this wonderful amusement park and then have people say a fence cannot be built around it because people should be able to come and go as they please. Who would ever pay admission to go to this park?

That is what a technical protection measure is. People make the investment, they create something, they want to be able to protect it so they get paid for it. That is why a technical protection measure is needed.

• (1610)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am not too sure about the member's analogy. It may be a bit off base, a bit biased possibly.

What the member really caught me on was his pronouncement that Bill C-11 is the major economic job creation program of the Conservative government.

Does my colleague expect the number of jobs to be created over the next year to exceed the number of jobs the budget destroyed in terms of the 19,000-plus civil service jobs? Is this the only economic stimulus that would generate thousands of jobs in the future? Is that how he envisions Bill C-11?

Mr. Dean Del Mastro: Madam Speaker, that is just a remarkable question. I have some respect for the member. He may in fact camp under that desk, because he is here all the time. I would have thought that, for somebody who is here so much, he would actually know what all the government's plans are with respect to the economy.

Our plans are multi-faceted. We are working to create jobs in every sector. If the member went through budget 2012 or economic action plan 2012, he would see all forms of measures in there to create jobs.

If the member had the opportunity, he would have attended all the copyright meetings, because I can see he is keen on the file. The entertainment software industry said hundreds of millions of dollars are going missing. The film industry said more than \$1 billion a year is going missing, just in Canada. The music industry said more than \$900 million is going missing. That is \$900 million that was taken away from artists, from recording studios, from marketing, from all of the operations and from every store that sold these items.

That is where job creation comes in. The member cannot just say we are destroying jobs by the fact that Parliament cannot agree on a copyright act, so just put more people in the public service. Is that what the member is really suggesting?

We protect jobs. We make sure we outline the rules. This copyright bill does that. It would create jobs. It would be good for Canada.

The Deputy Speaker: Before resuming debate, 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 Scarborough—Rouge River, Citizenship and Immigration; the hon. member for Nickel Belt, Natural Resources; the hon. member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, Transport.

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Louis-Hébert.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Blanchette (Louis-Hébert, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today on Bill C-11. As we discuss this bill and listen to the different speakers, I get the sense that we are doing so strictly from the perspective of intellectual property as we knew it 20 or 25 years ago. In other words, there is a gap, and we have to find a legal way of plugging that gap. That is the sum of it. Having said that, this is a new age.

Government Orders

The digital age is in the process of completely redefining the way we see things, our relationship with others, and the way we buy and consume products. When we consider copyright, we must do so through this new lens. Otherwise, we will quite simply be left behind. It would be as if we were trying to apply old ways of doing things to a new world. And if we move in that direction, we are sure to fail.

Of course, on the other side of the House, the Conservatives will say that copying is wrong. Of course, copyright must be respected. However, the most important thing with this bill is to strike a real balance. We frequently talk about artists and consumers, but we often forget that there is somebody between the two called a distributor. This intermediary is often forgotten. In certain cases, it is even companies whose business it is to buy copyright and to market it.

We often talk about protecting artists and ensuring they have an income, which is very noble, I might add. We also talk about the rights of consumers, but we forget that the company that is trying to protect the products' distribution is the real beneficiary when it comes to this legislation. Very little is said about the distributor. Clearly these companies are losing a lot of money. Obviously, when copying is involved, money is lost. However, that does not necessarily mean that each copy would have meant a purchase in the real world.

Nevertheless, everybody needs to be compensated appropriately. And on that point, I come back to the artists, who, with this bill, will lose tens of millions of dollars in compensation. I am not thinking of the richest artists, but certainly of the artists who are the least well off.

It is important to look at this in a global context, especially from a legal point of view, because what we are doing right now is laying one of the first stones in the legislative framework of the digital world.

The compact disc industry is facing its demise. Why? Because, even though the medium was not very expensive, distributors tried to sell CDs for the same price, if not more, than a technology that was more expensive to produce. The upshot was that as soon as there was a less expensive alternative, copying became par for the course. Little by little, revenues dropped, and despite everything, new business models emerged. The success of iTunes attests to this very fact.

Companies that distributed the works were strongly opposed to the development of that kind of new model. It can definitely be hard to adapt to that kind of change, but adaptation is good. We cannot expect to do exactly the same thing with digital technology that we are doing now or have done in past decades.

Digital locks are one of the thorniest issues in this proposed legislation.

● (1615)

This is not about the rights of creators or consumers. It is about the rights of those who distribute works of all kinds. It seems to me that locks are a bit heavy-handed if the goal is to protect copyright. What this bill protects is distribution rights, not copyright. I would have liked to see a better balance between copyright, distribution rights

and consumer rights. That is why the NDP suggests greater flexibility with respect to locks in cases of material for personal use, and only then. We have to be specific about that.

As I pointed out in my question a few minutes ago, people do not go to a record store to buy a CD, just as they did not buy LPs or cassettes back in the day. What they are buying is music.

It is all well and fine to say that there is licence upon purchase, but what does the consumer understand by that? What are people saying about this licence? Go ask people on the street whether they are buying the right to take a CD and put it in the player. They would never say that. However, they will say that what they are buying is the right to listen to an excellent album wherever they want, whenever they want. They will tell you that every time, but they will never say they are buying just the CD.

That is why I think that in a way, the government is going a bit too far when it comes to these locks. What will more restrictive locks accomplish? I fear they will prevent creation. Indeed, people will be turned off and will not want to buy works that are expensive and difficult to access and that they have to pay for three, four or five times in order to be able to listen to them as they please, in other words, at home, at the cottage, in their car and so on. Where will this take us?

Some might say that I am exaggerating, but I am not too far off the mark. The important thing is to restore balance between access, use and distribution. That is the core message I want people to take away from my speech. I believe that we must respect international treaties, but are we respecting international treaties or the needs of certain international distribution companies?

In my opinion, we first need to restore the balance that should exist in an ecosystem. First of all, we do not live in a market, but rather in a society. People have aspirations. Students in particular come to mind. It is absurd to say that course notes should disappear a few days after the course ends. It makes no sense. Personally, I keep everything and I still have my course notes from when I was in university. Those notes would have disappeared a long time ago in the digital world under the bill currently before us. However, it can sometimes be useful to reuse these notes and have all this information close at hand, depending on the subject, of course.

There is something wrong here. The government says that many meetings were held and that the bill is the product of extensive consultation. The committee heard from many people in several parliaments. The government repeats this ad nauseam. Consultation is all well and good, but I have to wonder if the government listened.

● (1620)

Fundamentally, the question we need to ask is whether the government really listened. It can hear something, but if it does not listen and does not want to do what people say, it is destined to draft legislation that is more flawed than it should be. We will never create perfect legislation; we all know that. But we can always make it better. We had plenty of time, and many people gave their opinions on this. So why not adjust it for everyone's benefit, rather than for the benefit of just a few?

Government Orders

We currently have all the information needed to ensure that this cornerstone of the digital world is well made, well placed and stable. It is especially important to listen to what people have to say. That will result in better legislation.

• (1625)

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Madam Speaker, the parliamentary secretary said earlier that the NDP wanted to vote against the bill because, as usual, it votes against jobs. I would really have liked to respond, but since I cannot, I will direct my remarks to my colleague.

I would like him to elaborate on the good explanation he already gave about the need to strike a balance between the rights of the public, the rights of authors and the rights of distributors so that the member opposite will understand why we will not vote for this bill in its present form.

Mr. Denis Blanchette: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question.

The bottom line is that we want everyone to be satisfied with this legislation. We want creators to get their fair share. That means that they must be properly compensated for the work they do. We obviously want distributors to be compensated for their work, and we also want consumers to have access to works at a reasonable cost.

Naturally, if we cannot satisfy everyone, it will lead to an imbalance in the legislation. In my opinion, this imbalance will reduce creators' economic and commercial interest in producing. They will instead find a job as a taxi driver, for example, as was recently suggested.

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Madam Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member for Louis-Hébert for the different angle he brought to this debate.

During his speech, particularly at the end, he began talking about the government listening. Did the government listen to us? Did it listen to the people and the experts? I see that, in the House, the majority of the young people, who were born into technology, are on our side, both as members and as assistants. So we have a lot of experts with us and we recommend them. It is a different angle that I wanted to bring. The youth know a lot about this issue, and perhaps we should listen a little more to them.

I am quite sure my colleague can say more about technology, and about youth and this bill.

Mr. Denis Blanchette: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord.

Actually, this is an issue where the elder members—and I am one of them—do not dominate. The young people are the ones who use these technologies, who master them, drive changes in them and think them up. We are incredibly lucky to have a lot of young people in this Parliament. This is the youngest Parliament in history. As we build this digital society—because that is really what we are doing with technologies and the Internet—young people deserve not just their place, but a prominent place in the study of this type of issue, as my colleague said.

[English]

Mr. Ron Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege and honour to speak to Bill C-11, the copyright modernization bill. This bill was designed to address the interests of Canadians, from those who create content to the consumers who benefit from it.

I am also glad to see how the efforts of parliamentarians on all sides have moved the bill forward and have earned the support of Canada's creative community. Parliamentarians heard from many who contributed to the committee process through testimony and submissions. We heard a clear message that copyright laws play a critical role in protecting and creating jobs in Canada's digital economy.

We all know that a strong copyright regime is critical for the growth of our digital economy and our information and communications technology sector. Combined with other legislative initiatives, as well as innovative measures by the private sector, this bill will contribute to a well-functioning digital economy by instilling trust and confidence in consumers and creators. I cannot reinforce enough the fact that we need to instill trust and confidence in consumers and creators.

One of the key pieces to a strong digital economy is the safeguarding of intellectual property. This legislation will provide these safeguards.

A myriad of witnesses testified over the last couple of years through a few iterations of this legislation. I am glad to say that the following associations have shown support for aspects of the current bill: the Canadian Council of Chief Executives; the Canadian Chamber of Commerce; the Canadian Photographers Coalition; the Canadian Anti-Counterfeiting Network; the Canadian Council of Music Industry Associations; the Entertainment Software Association of Canada; the Canadian Independent Music Association; Association des producteurs de films et de télévision du Québec; and many more.

I would like to take some time now to discuss other important aspects of this bill.

The bill introduces a new remedy for copyright owners against those who knowingly enable infringement of copyright. This new remedy supplements existing criminal powers to deal with pirate sites by adding stronger tools for copyright owners and makes liability for enabling of infringement clear. I think it is important to bring clarity to this matter and that is what the legislation sets out to do.

We are making sure to protect copyright holders in order to give them the ability to defend themselves. Canada's creative industries will also benefit from an amendment made at the committee stage that clarifies statutory damages for copyright infringement. Copyright owners will finally have stronger legal tools to pursue online pirate sites that facilitate copyright infringement. The amendment will facilitate targeting those who participate in wide-scale violation of the rights of creators.

Government Orders

Another amendment will also eliminate the safe harbour for those who infringe author's rights. Canadian creators, performers and artists will benefit from the rights and protections that are part of the World Intellectual Property Organization, WIPO, Internet treaties, including the exclusive right to control how their copyrighted material is made available on the Internet.

Consumers will benefit from this bill as well. It legitimizes activities that Canadians do every day, such as downloading music and certain kinds of format shifting, such as when people use PVRs to record shows and watch them later. Canadians will finally be able to record television, radio and Internet programming in order to enjoy it at a later time with no restrictions as to the device or media they wish to use. Once again, the legislation is providing clarity and certainty.

The big issue is that this legislation speaks to the balance we have achieved. It is fair and it is balanced. Canadian consumers will also be able to copy legitimately acquired music, film or other works onto any device or medium, such as MP3 players, for their private use. They will also be able to make backup copies of these works.

Those are just a few examples of the common-sense changes within this bill. That is one reason I am so supportive of this legislation. Those examples show why this bill is so important.

Right away we can see that the bill is technologically neutral. We were told time and time again by stakeholders across the spectrum that we need legislation that is not rendered obsolete by new advancements in technology, as the current act is. There have been three different attempts over the last 15 years, since 1997, to bring the legislation into the 21st century. This is what we are about to do with this legislation moving forward. The fact is technology is advancing all the time. It will be something that we will be addressing as we move forward as well.

• (1630)

Canadians with perceptual disabilities will be permitted to adapt legally acquired material to a format they can easily use. We have heard time and time again about the difficulty perceptually impaired Canadians have accessing works in Braille or in a format they can enjoy more fully. I am proud that we have taken the step in this legislation to allow for some conversion.

Our government also understands the difference between a large-scale violator and an ordinary consumer. The legislation introduces the concept of proportionality in statutory damages. It revises current provisions for statutory damages to distinguish between commercial and non-commercial infringement. That is very important. This bill reduces an individual's potential liability in cases of non-commercial infringement to a one-time payment of between \$100 and \$5,000 for all infringements that took place prior to any lawsuit being launched.

It is through these types of measures that we will finally provide real protection for the intellectual property created by Canada's creative industries. It is through these and other steps we can see the meticulous balance that has emerged.

Even better, the bill also includes a statutory five-year review. As I mentioned, technology is advancing all the time, and it is important that we continue to review this legislation and have a proviso in the legislation so if that balance is upset at any time, or if an unforeseen

consequence of the legislation occurs, changes can be made to improve the act in the future. We know that perfection in copyright legislation is elusive, so having the opportunity to make changes just makes sense.

In closing, I want to take some time to connect this bill to other steps our government has taken to promote and create innovation in our economy. I represent the constituents of Kelowna—Lake Country, an innovative, technologically sound and vibrant community. We are encouraging the private sector to create and adopt new digital technologies. We are developing tomorrow's digital workforce. For example, in budget 2012, acting on the Jenkins report, we announced \$1.1 billion to directly support research and development; \$500 million for venture capital, something we have heard a lot about the need for; \$37 million annually for Canada's granting councils; \$10 million for the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research; \$500 million for the Canada Foundation for Innovation; and much more. Members can see this funding helps to provide the basis of a strong, connected digital economy.

I would encourage the opposition to join us in putting Canada's economy and Canadian jobs first. This bill is on the right track to do just that. It is time to get it passed.

• (1635)

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we can see what is in Bill C-11. People have a number of concerns, especially about the ability to purchase music and make a copy to have in their car or whatever.

The member for Kelowna—Lake Country is also a member of the trade committee. He and I were just at a meeting. It seems there is a possibility that Bill C-11 is just the first step. The Europeans seem to be claiming that Bill C-11 does not go as far as they want it to go. I wonder if the member could tell us how far the government is willing to concede to the Europeans, which would go well beyond Bill C-11 and might create some concerns for Canadians. As the member is on the trade committee, I wonder if he could give us some perspective on that.

Mr. Ron Cannan: Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague from Prince Edward Island and I do work together on the trade committee. Trade is very important. One in five jobs in Canada and 60% of our GDP are based on trade. We continue to expand our trading opportunities. One of the ways to do that is to ensure that Canadian creators have the certainty and protection that this balanced legislation provides. As my colleague just alluded to, we attended a workshop session on intellectual property and CETA, looking at the agreement with the European Union.

Government Orders

That is why it is so important, as I mentioned in my speech, to have the five-year review of the legislation. Situations could be brought forward. Technology is changing all the time. We want to ensure that we have the right legislation to meet the needs of Canadians from coast to coast to coast today. As I mentioned, this is the third attempt since 1997 to try to bring this legislation into the 21st century. I am very confident the legislation balances the rights of creators and the interests of consumers today and for the future.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1640)

[*Translation*]

ACT TO AUTHORIZE INDUSTRIAL ALLIANCE PACIFIC INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES INC. TO CONTINUE AS A BODY CORPORATE

(Bill S-1003. On the order: Private Members' Business:)

May 1, 2012—Second reading and reference to a legislative committee of Bill S-1003, An Act to authorize Industrial Alliance Pacific Insurance and Financial Services Inc. to apply to be continued as a body corporate under the laws of Quebec—Ms. Hélène LeBlanc.

Ms. Hélène LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard, NDP): Madam Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practices of the House, Bill S-1003, An Act to authorize Industrial Alliance Pacific Insurance and Financial Services Inc. to apply to be continued as a body corporate under the laws of Quebec, be deemed to have been reported favourably by the Examiner of Petitions pursuant to Standing Order 133(3); and that the bill be deemed to have been read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole, deemed considered in Committee of the Whole, deemed reported without amendment, deemed concurred in at report stage and deemed read a third time and passed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

COPYRIGHT MODERNIZATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-11, an act to amend the Copyright Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Deputy Speaker: There are two and half minutes left for questions and comments.

The hon. member for Halifax.

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Madam Speaker, my question for my colleague is about the rights of creators. In answer to the last question, he said that the bill balanced rights. I disagree with him.

I am from Halifax where we have a lot of creators. Creators are not necessarily the owners of copyright. Therefore, what is in the bill that stands up for creators? There is this long list of exceptions in the bill that do not adequately recognize the rights of creators. The Conservatives are creating new ways for people to access copyrighted works, which then leaves creators out in the cold.

What exactly is in the bill that works for creators, because I do not see anything?

Mr. Ron Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, that is an excellent question. We are concerned about finding the right balance.

I agree that the legislation encourages new ideas. It protects the rights of Canadians. Research, development and artistic creativity strengthen our economy. Artists from coast to coast to coast are a big part of our creative economy. We are providing that certainty for them to ensure they have the protection.

As I mentioned, we just looked at a section within our trade initiatives locally to ensure that each of our provincial and territorial parties worked together and to ensure that if someone writes a song or produces a piece of art, it has not only the protection but also the support of our government in marketing it.

I came from a background in music. I was a fledgling musician. I still have some albums available. If anyone would like to buy them, I could market them. I had a long history in the music industry in helping artists. I know this is important for young, aspiring artists and creators in the gaming industry.

Also, as I mentioned, I come from one of the best wine producing regions in Canada, but we also have some of the best technology. The silicone vineyard of the Okanagan Valley and Kelowna Lake country will want to ensure that this legislation has that balance.

For example one organization, the Balanced Copyright For Canada, says, “We welcome the reintroduction of copyright reform and encourage all Parliamentarians to work together for its quick passage”.

The Canadian Publisher's Council has said, “we all benefit from strong and precise copyright legislation that provides incentives to protect rates holders—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Unfortunately, the hon. member's time has lapsed.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Lapointe (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, NDP): Madam Speaker, for the past hour, I have been listening to the hon. members opposite talk about the industry's needs. If they were more transparent—honest might be a better word—they would clarify the fact that when they say industry, they mean the very large distributors. I have a great deal of respect for large distributors, which are a major part of the world economy, but they are talking about helping companies like Sony and Walt Disney. Those are the corporations that will benefit from this bill.

Let me go back to a rather striking example. How can they claim that they are thinking about the industry, when the cultural industry—which includes 80 arts and culture organizations across Quebec and the rest of the country, so from all across Canada—has stated that the bill will be toxic to Canada's digital economy? How can there be 80 major organizations across the country that have come to that conclusion and yet the government is still constantly claiming that it is thinking about the industry?

Certainly some sectors of the industry are perfectly comfortable with this bill, but let me reiterate that major sectors have reached that very harsh conclusion. That does not come from the New Democrats, but rather from a significant portion of the cultural industry, not just distributors. This bill will be toxic to Canada's digital economy.

Those organizations have warned us that if the government fails to amend the copyright modernization bill to ensure that content owners are properly compensated, this will lead to a decline in the production of Canadian content and its dissemination domestically and abroad. We are using the word “dissemination”. These are crisis words, blunt words that, I repeat, are not coming from the “big bad leftists”, as some of our neighbours opposite like to call us, but from people in the cultural industry.

With this kind of reaction from such important industry players, the government should first have the decency to not claim any great success. It should show great respect for the industry's response to the bill and go back to the drawing board until these people believe that the government's proposed legislation will not give rise to something as significant as disseminating Canadian content in Canada and abroad.

In Canada, the government has historically had a hard time fully understanding the cultural industry and its front-line players: creators.

I cannot cover every aspect of this 70-page bill, but I will take a few minutes to talk about one aspect I know well and to provide some historical overview.

We have been lagging behind for far too long with respect to the status of creators in Canada. We are one of the last countries to keep its Copyright Act under the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food. We are one of the last countries to realize that it has been a very long time since the days when artists were reduced to simply performing at agricultural fairs.

Then the government came up with a modernized copyright regime that was one of the worst in the western world.

Let us compare our copyright system with what was being done in Europe in the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Here, for example, a songwriter or composer—and this was true everywhere—shared up to 50% of total royalties with a publisher. Consequently, there remained 25% for the songwriter and 25% for the composer. That is generally how it worked. That was quite a common model. And then a few pennies were paid per song recorded on a widespread format, such as CDs, which are still in use. One of the differences between Canada and Europe was that, in Europe, the author had to be paid for the right to distribute CDs in stores.

• (1645)

If 100,000 copies of an artist's work were made, first it had to be proven that the composer of the musical work and the songwriter had received their few pennies per song, which could add up to a lot if it was a major success. We are not talking about \$100,000, but, even if it was a few pennies, that gave them a decent income.

In Canada, however, records could be distributed through merchants, in stores, without paying anything. Up to 20% could be considered “free goods”. That is what the merchants were given for promoting the product, and those “free goods” were exempt from copyright obligations. So 100,000 copies were distributed, but the first 20,000 copies did not generate a cent for the creator, and the other 80,000 copies had to be sold and had to be recorded as having been sold. Ultimately, the creator might receive his meagre 25% for a song recorded on a CD that eventually sold.

That was something like telling a bricklayer to lay bricks at a shopping centre, but that he would not be paid for his work unless the shopping centre was successful and had customers and its tenants were happy and paid their rent. He could do the brickwork at the shopping centre but never get paid. The deep roots of that attitude toward copyright in Canada are evident in the failures of this bill.

I will conclude on this basic attitude because the problem of a toothless copyright regime that has been around for decades underscores a fundamental perception that must absolutely change in Canada. The success of a cultural product stems from something magical that comes from the artist, not from the investor, the broadcaster or the person who—admittedly—may have invested thousands or even millions of dollars in the distribution of an album, a disk or a book. It is the artist who suddenly manages to grasp the most interesting thing that is happening at a particular time and who suddenly finds an audience. When an artist does that, he deserves his copyright.

If we understand that, we can immediately see that attempts in this legislation to protect major broadcasters do not honour the artist's medium- and long-term need to earn an adequate and decent income from new technologies. Often, people do not really understand that it is the creator's magic that makes the product.

If the major distributors had a magic potion and knew exactly how to produce an artistic product for one million dollars that would sell three million copies, they would do so every day. They attempt this regularly and, often, it does not work out. When it works, it is because there was something magical that came from the creators and had an effect on the public.

Government Orders

Things do not happen magically. Creators invest thousands of hours in practice and rehearsals, rewrite thousands of pages, and spend thousands of hours developing themselves culturally in order to become people who create magic. The fact that we are considering modernizing copyright—and that this is even in the title of the bill—and that the party in power has managed to conduct a smear campaign by conflating the notion of guaranteeing suitable copyright with a tax, represents a dangerous, slippery slope.

In sectors of the industry that require a lot of creativity, the downward spiral has already begun. In video game production, for example, creators are often paid on a per-game basis. Young men and women are approached and asked to put together a beautiful soundtrack in exchange for \$1,000. Regardless of its success, whether the video game in question is a hit and sells 75,000 copies, or is a total flop and only sells 200 copies, there is no copyright. That is what is called a buyout; the rights are purchased from the young creator.

• (1650)

That is the fate that awaits creators. Personally, I do not want to live in a world where creators can no longer live off copyright unless they produce a real hit. It means living in a less creative world. I do not need a *Rocky* 127. In future decades, I want to see creators who create interesting music and arthouse films.

• (1655)

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague just spoke of a downward spiral, and I get the impression that that has certainly been the case of late.

In my opinion, we need experts to tell us what the problems and solutions are, and what steps to take to avoid these slippery slopes.

Does my colleague think that that is what the Conservative Party is doing?

Mr. François Lapointe: Madam Speaker, there are many examples. We need only look so far as the example that was given earlier, namely, the very strong, very clear and very alarming position of 80 large cultural organizations.

Copyright experts are completely opposed to the decisions made in this bill. No, the government has not done its homework. The government must ensure that people who have a profound understanding of the problem are reassured and that they are included in the implementation of the bill, but it has not done so.

It is shameful that this bill, which is so important, has been under consideration for years and yet the results achieved are so mediocre.

[English]

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, I really appreciate my colleague's detailed knowledge of the issues involved in the bill. It is a very technical bill, and many of us do not have that level of expertise, but clearly my colleague has a lot of experience in terms of both the European situation and the situation as it relates to Canada.

One of the big issues in the bill is how the digital lock will affect students who are in distance learning or educational facilities. I just wonder what kind of response he has had in his own community to

that particular provision. We have heard about all the consultation that took place, but how would it actually impact people and what kind of response did the member get in his own riding?

[Translation]

Mr. François Lapointe: Madam Speaker, focusing exclusively on digital locks is not healthy, particularly when it comes to education, as my colleague pointed out.

We are all aware that this bill could lead to an obligation to completely destroy everything that has been built in a classroom within a very short period of time, perhaps even before the end of the semester. Is that feasible? We all know that it is not. How is it that this measure is still there and that it is going to be implemented? Is this situation really going to become a reality?

My colleague raised an important point. People have spoken about e-learning, for example, which can be an extremely important solution for people who live in remote areas. Right now, many of the current government's decisions are costing remote areas dearly. Ultimately, this is another decision that will ensure that remote areas pay a higher price, and it is a decision of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Denis Blanchette (Louis-Hébert, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for explaining how copyright works. In my view, this had to be done.

He also put his finger on something else. We often talk about copyright, culture and distribution as if they were specific to big cities. In rural areas, people living in this digital society also clearly consume arts and culture products through Internet access.

Could the hon. member tell me what solutions and improvements that would help authors the government has refused to consider so far?

Mr. François Lapointe: Madam Speaker, we will definitely have to take a sensible and balanced approach to address the issue of distribution networks and platforms. Is there a small percentage that can guarantee sustainability for creators?

We have to stop saying that this is a tax. CD copyright is not a tax, but rather a way of compensating musicians who write songs that we hear on the radio and who make our lives more enjoyable.

So why all of a sudden is any solution applied to new technologies a tax? If we accept this way of seeing things, how can we make sure that successful creators will be able to make a living from their works? We need to move away from this approach that is completely out of step—

• (1700)

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

The member for Winnipeg South Centre has the floor.

[English]

Ms. Joyce Bateman (Winnipeg South Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am grateful to have the opportunity to take part in today's debate on Bill C-11, the copyright modernization act.

Government Orders

In the 2011 Speech from the Throne, the Government of Canada committed to reintroduce and seek swift passage of legislation to modernize Canada's copyright law in a way that balances the needs of creators and users. This bill fulfills that promise.

[*Translation*]

This is the third time that we have tried to introduce this copyright legislation. Thanks to this government, we are finally going to update our act so it is consistent with international standards.

[*English*]

It is the culmination of one of the most extensive consultations that any bill has undergone, with more than 9,000 Canadian citizens and organizations having provided their thoughts regarding what a balanced copyright bill should look like.

It is from that listening exercise that our government arrived at the balance that we have today. It is a balance that not everyone is 100% content with, but everyone can agree that they have had some specific measure that was called for.

Canadians can also agree that what we have in this bill, especially with the amendments arrived at during committee stage, is in the right ballpark of what a balanced copyright act should look like.

[*Translation*]

This legislation will strengthen our competitiveness within the global digital economy and will protect and create jobs, promote innovation and draw new investments to Canada.

[*English*]

It is a hard-won balance, the result of principled compromise and one that the government is proud of.

Opposition parties have talked about this balance in several separate ways, almost disjointedly. On one hand they pit artists against consumers, and then they turn around and favour consumers over artists, all the while ignoring the need to ensure compromise.

[*Translation*]

Instead of advocating new costs for consumers, like an iPod tax, the opposition should finally side with us and support the modernization of Canada's Copyright Act.

[*English*]

Over here we realize that this compromise is necessary, because consumers and artists are in fact two sides of the very same coin. They are the same equation. If artists do not trust the rules that protect their rights and govern Canada's digital economy, they will be reluctant to produce their content here.

The government and members of Parliament have heard that time and time again in the consultations we have held. We have also heard that if consumers are unable to enjoy and use the content in legal ways that make sense to them, there will not be a market for the artists' work. That is why we have created a bill that strikes the right balance between the needs of consumers and users, while at the same time making strong exemptions for educational purposes or fair dealing.

The bill is an important stepping stone to the establishment of a strong framework in which Canada's digital economy can thrive. We know that the economy is changing significantly. What we do now with smart phones, tablets and computers has taken our economy in a new direction, where artists and rights holders are using the digital economy not only to bring new art to market but also to create hundreds of thousands of jobs for Canadians.

Those benefits are reflected in the raft of groups that are supportive of this legislation. To name only a few, they include the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Entertainment Software Association of Canada, the Business Coalition for Balanced Copyright, the Canadian Anti-Counterfeiting Network, the Canadian Intellectual Property Council and the Canadian Institute for the Blind.

I could go on, but I think the point is clear: the bill has wide-ranging support from those who see it as a key platform in the growth of the digital economy and the creation of knowledge economy employment.

● (1705)

I have listened with interest to today's debate, which is eerily reminiscent of the budget debate. In the budget, for example, we on the government side are putting forward a plan for how to sustain Canada's economic health in a time of global economic uncertainty.

[*Translation*]

Yes, unfortunately, the global economy is still fragile.

[*English*]

Here we have the opposition dreaming up new ways to stop our economic growth right in its tracks. We are providing for new, reasonable and economically viable ways to help grow our economy, whether it is an investment in our knowledge economy, sensible changes to the Investment Canada Act, or opening up our telecom sector to increased foreign investment, yet the opposition says "no" to those investments and "no" to changes that will create jobs and investment right here at home.

[*Translation*]

The new copyright regime will encourage new ideas and will protect the rights of Canadians whose research and development work and artistic creativity make our economy vibrant.

[*English*]

In the budget implementation act we have proposed practical changes to create a reasonable timeline for environmental reviews, while creating stronger environmental laws. We know that in the next 10 years more than 500 new projects representing over \$500 billion in new investments will be proposed for Canada. The potential for job growth is enormous.

Government Orders

Since 2006 our government has been looking to streamline the review process for major opportunities such as this. More needs to be done and more can be done, yet the opposition says “no” to jobs and “no” to economic strength. Federal and provincial revenues that would flow from that measure will not accrue to Canadians because of these decisions.

I understand that part of that is the role of an opposition. I appreciate that, but the opposition's parliamentary games are not reasonable. For example, the member for Burnaby—New Westminster took up over 13 hours of debate and 70 speaking spots simply reading from Twitter posts in the House of Commons. I guess none of his colleagues had anything substantive to add to that debate. When I look at those kinds of tactics, I am not surprised about the opposition's stance on this legislation.

The same kinds of games were played during second reading of Bill C-11. The opposition spoke for more than 19 hours, often repeating the very same words, and all the while, for every day it delayed, another day went by without a modern, flexible copyright regime to help spur on our digital economy.

[*Translation*]

The bill is the outcome of one of the broadest consultations of its kind in Canadian history. In addition, the government acknowledges the many testimonies and briefs from stakeholders and parliamentarians about the bill tabled in the last session of Parliament and thanks everyone who contributed. This process made it possible to send a very clear message: Canada urgently needs to modernize the Copyright Act.

• (1710)

[*English*]

When it comes down to it, that is what this legislation is about: how rights holders and consumers interact with the digital economy, the economy of the 21st century.

[*Translation*]

What we need is a bill for the 21st century.

[*English*]

We know, after listening to witnesses at the committee stage of both Bill C-11 and Bill C-32, that this bill would create jobs and support the growth of Canadian business in the digital and online environment. It would promote creativity and innovation.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, I note that the member used her time to go after the NDP for, apparently, speaking too long on Bill C-38. I am surprised by that because such a massive bill, which we have correctly named a Trojan horse because it has so many non-financial aspects in it, is something that absolutely has to be investigated and debated in the House of Commons. I was surprised to hear her say that 12 hours or 19 hours of debate is too long.

Having said that, I am curious about her position on this bill, and I wonder if she agrees with one of its main criticisms, which is that it cozies up to some of the big rights holders, like the big movie studios and largely U.S. cultural interests. The idea is that there is balance in the bill, but when we give it a close examination, we see that a lot of artists and small players are left behind.

I wonder how she would respond to the criticism that this is, basically, a sop to the big players who have been lobbying for these changes and that her government has now very nicely responded to them.

Ms. Joyce Bateman: Madam Speaker, we have different points of view. I quoted the exact numbers, but there were more than 9,000 consultations with the Canadian public, the business community and the artistic community. That is a lot of consultation. This is the longest consultation process in the history of Canada. It has been 15 years, and it is time we entered the 21st century.

This is in the interests of all the artists and creators who work in my community. A couple down the street from me owns a production company, just a little one, based in Winnipeg, Manitoba. It creates jobs and brings wealth to my community. It is very important that we make it possible for that couple to earn a living and create jobs in our economy. We are in the 21st century.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jonathan Tremblay (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, NDP): Madam Speaker, the member for Burnaby—New Westminster enabled Canadians to express their views in this House, which is something that the government has not done. This government lacks transparency, refuses to listen to anyone and conceals information. It only listens to big business.

This bill will hurt small and medium-sized businesses in the cultural sector.

Will the government agree to the NDP's amendments to protect small and medium-sized businesses?

[*English*]

Ms. Joyce Bateman: Madam Speaker, this government listens not just to big business; it listens to all business. Small businesses create a significant number of jobs, an incredible number of jobs, in this economy. We listen to big business, small business and the people down the street. In fact, I am proud to be a part of a government that engaged in extensive budget consultations during this year, and I learned a great deal from the people in my community.

We listened to more than 9,000 submissions. There were 150 witnesses. The committee has worked hard on this and, as I said to the member's honourable colleague, this is a 15-year process of consultation. It is important that we provide the tools to the businesses and creators who are making things happen for the 21st century economy.

• (1715)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, it is important to say that the member is absolutely right that there have been lots of consultations. However, it remains the case that the leading copyright experts in this country find this bill lacking. It is more restrictive than is required by the WIPO treaty. It is even more restrictive than the U.S. digital millennium copyright act.

Government Orders

I ask my hon. friend if Conservative members will relent at this point and accept the amendments to make this bill match at least U. S. standards.

Ms. Joyce Bateman: Madam Speaker, I am saddened that the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands thinks we should adopt an American standard here.

I am proud that we have adopted, through consultations with Canadian businesses, a Canadian standard. To me, a Canadian standard is our gold standard.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, here is another opportunity to speak on the bill. I know the bill has been recycled a number of times. I think its earliest life actually came when the Liberals were in power. In fact, they laid the groundwork for the copyright bill we are dealing with today. In fact, I think my hon. colleague across the way mentioned this. This is possibly about the third time the bill has come forward, which to me is a very good example of why sometimes we need to have a thorough examination of legislation; in this particular case, the copyright legislation.

This is a very technical bill. I would be the first to say that I am certainly not an expert on this issue. I know that some of my colleagues have been really drilling down into this legislation to examine what exactly is involved, who wins, who loses and whether or not there is a balance. We have heard time and again from the Conservative members who have quoted the numbers, the level of consultation. Consultation is very important, especially on a bill that is so wide in its scope and would affect so many different sectors, from very large corporations to individual artists to consumers. There is a very wide spectrum of people who would be affected. Those consultations are very important. I certainly would not deny that.

However, I think at the end of the day, we do have a fundamental question. Will Canadians have copyright legislation that would actually work for them? Is this the right balance that has been found?

I want to thank my colleagues on the committee who have worked so hard on the bill. In fact, not only did they work on the committee but they travelled across the country, as well, and heard from many individual Canadians and experts. We have had an enormous amount of feedback on the bill. In my own community of east Vancouver, which is home to many artists, I have had a lot of feedback on the bill.

Here we are, now, at the final stages of the bill and, unfortunately, that basic question is still before the House. Is this the right balance among consumers, creators and royalties, and would it unfairly kind of roll over to providing much greater support and a green light to some of the very large players?

As many of my colleagues before me have said today, on this side of the House we believe, having now gone through committee, having posed many amendments to try to mitigate some of the worst aspects of the bill, that here we are now at the final stages and the bill, unfortunately, does not strike the right balance.

In fact, I would say it appears that all the attempts that have been made at copyright reform in recent years have had very little to do, in reality, with creating a regime that would balance the rights of creators and the public. Rather, it has been more about satisfying the

demands of U.S. large content owners, and by that I mean the movie studios, the music labels, the video game developers et cetera. These are all things that are very pervasive in our culture, in our society. One only has to look at a younger generation to see how incredibly powerful these various cultural products are in our society. We could have a whole other debate about the ups and downs of that.

However, we are very concerned that the bill is tilted toward satisfying the demands of those very large players. In fact, I was very surprised to read that, as a result of WikiLeaks' cables, there was even information about how the former minister's staff used influence and tried to generate a whole scene of pressure in the U. S. to put pressure on Canada to bring in a bill and to get this moving along.

I think that is just the tip of the iceberg. It is a revelation that shows us that powerful interests are involved in this issue of copyright, and who wins and who loses is very significant. Therefore, the fact that the bill has taken a long time and that it is now back in the House, I think, is a reflection of the complexities of that debate. There were many witnesses at committee who came forward to express their concerns.

● (1720)

Our concern is that the bill essentially gives with one hand while it takes away with the other. While we certainly acknowledge that there are some concessions for consumers, the reality is when we weigh it up that they are undermined by the government's refusal to compromise on what is probably the single most controversial aspect of the bill, the digital lock provisions.

The example I gave in questions and comments, as have other colleagues, is long distance education. Under the provisions, people would have to get rid of their school notes after 30 days. To us, this seems to be a very heavy-handed approach.

In fact, at committee, NDP members proposed deleting sections of the bill that would criminalize Canadians who, in breaking digital locks for non-commercial use in the normal course of work or school, would be penalized under the provisions of the bill. That is a pretty unfair element of the bill, which has not been resolved even though there were many attempts to bring forward amendments to resolve it.

I want to segue a moment because, as I said, the bill has a very broad scope in terms of the number of people it impacts. The colleague from the Conservative Party earlier spoke about the budget implementation bill. I think she said that the Conservatives are growing the economy, and that made me think about what is really going on in this House. On the one hand we have this budget implementation bill that would fundamentally change many different regimes, whether it be environmental regulations and protections or health care. One of the changes involves EI. This is something that would have an impact on artists.

Government Orders

It is quite astounding to know that The Conference Board of Canada estimated that the cultural sector in Canada generates approximately \$25 billion in taxes for all levels of government. That was from 2007 and presumably it might be higher now. However, that is three times higher than what was actually spent on culture by all levels of government. What was spent was \$7.9 billion, but \$25 billion was collected.

The median income of an artist in Canada was just under \$12,900; not the average but median, which is a much more realistic comparison. I represent a community where we have an incredible diversity of artists, most of whom have other jobs to support themselves, in the service sector, restaurants or maybe at home, but they are creators. They are people who contribute enormously to our society, our local communities, our history, our culture and our understanding of the experiences we all have.

It was very interesting to hear the member across the way talk about the budget implementation bill as it relates to the copyright bill and say it is all about growing the economy. This is a bill that would actually penalize and limit the scope of artists in this country. When we look at what their income is and how much they struggle, it should very much concern us.

At the end of the day we took a hard shot at this bill. We really worked in good faith because there are some elements that are adequate, but mostly there are not. I know that our folks on the committee tried to find ways to bring forward amendments. However, if it was like our health committee, anything that we proposed automatically got shut down, which in and of itself is an affront to democratic practice. Unfortunately, that has become the practice in this place.

We are still opposed to this bill because the balance has not been found. It is still tilted in favour of the really big players.

•(1725)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. friend from Vancouver for her balanced and fair remarks.

We are on the verge of what is likely to be a very long night of votes but we still have the opportunity to pass the amendments that would deal with the critical failings of this bill, particularly in relation to digital locks. It is not the case that the U.S. law is tougher than ours. It is not a good thing, as my hon. colleague from the Conservative Party mentioned earlier, to strive to have a law that is tougher than that in the U.S. when we are talking about regressive and restrictive laws that would deny consumers access to property they have already bought, when there is an intrusive digital lock function that trumps all other rights within this piece of legislation.

I hope my friend from the Official Opposition will be voting for the amendments that are being put forward by opposition party members here tonight.

Ms. Libby Davies: Madam Speaker, the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands has been very involved in this debate and has spoken out. I certainly will be looking at those amendments. We have worked very hard to try to mitigate the worst aspects of this bill.

If this bill passes, as it likely will given the makeup of the House, one has to wonder about the impact it would have, not only on consumers but also on artists. We had better be prepared to evaluate this bill. There would be long-term consequences that would need to be redressed. That is very unfortunate because it could have been fixed now. I thank the member for bringing forward concrete, specific measures that would actually deal with some of the worst aspects of this bill. That is what we are here to do. I know the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands has done everything she can.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the government talks about the creators and how important it is that we have copyright laws. It is important to note that from an opposition point of view, whether the Green Party, the New Democratic Party or the Liberal Party, a series of amendments has been put on the table at the committee stage. Shortly we are going to have a series of votes in an attempt to provide more balance to this legislation.

By voting against this legislation, members are not voting against the creators or individuals who are trying to improve this system. We are trying to make the system better and more balanced, not only from creators' or artists' perspective, but from the perspective of the different stakeholders. In order to improve the bill, there needs to be more balance. That is why the government should reconsider its position when it comes time to vote on these important amendments.

•(1730)

Ms. Libby Davies: Madam Speaker, the member's comment is very interesting. I know what he is getting at. He knows the arguments that are going to be thrown back at those of us who voted against the bill. We are going to be told we are against artists or consumers, as we have seen time and time again with the crime bill and other legislation. Unfortunately, that has become the pattern in the House. He is trying to pre-empt that kind of attack.

Of course we support consumers. Of course we support the creators. The member is entirely correct. This debate is about trying to make a bill the best it can be. There is a very strong feeling in the House and among the experts that this bill is not at that point. We would have a lot of difficulty with this legislation; there would be some long-term consequences that we would have to address.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I wish to advise the House that Friday, May 18 shall be the fourth allotted day.

* * *

COPYRIGHT MODERNIZATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-11, an act to amend the Copyright Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Government Orders

Mr. Peter Braid (Kitchener—Waterloo, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about the importance of Bill C-11, the copyright modernization act, and its important role in creating a modern, dynamic, 21st century intellectual property framework.

Intellectual property affects all sectors of our economy. It comprises, among other rights, patents, trademarks, industrial design, and today's subject, of course, copyright. The logo on our baseball hat, a new and innovative drug, a work of art, a video game for our PlayStation, a song for our iPod or BlackBerry, all of these are rooted in intellectual property. That is why protecting IP is so important for consumers who demand better products, for businesses that create them and for our economy that grows as a result.

Let me take a few moments to expand on some of the main forms of IP and what they mean. Copyright protects the expression of ideas and applies to all original literary, dramatic, musical and artistic works and computer programs. Our copyright regime ensures that only the copyright owner is allowed to produce or reproduce the works, or allow someone else to do so. Through Bill C-11, our government would modernize this regime to ensure that it is relevant and responsive in today's digital world.

Patent rights enable inventors to create a market space in which to make, use or sell their invention in Canada.

Trademarks enable businesses to identify themselves using words, designs and other means. Trademarks ensure that products are what they say they are, which is essential for informed consumer choice.

As we move forward with the modernization of our copyright framework, it is useful to reflect on the important role that IP has played, and continues to play, in our economy. Certainly, as member of Parliament for Kitchener—Waterloo, the centre of innovation in Canada, I understand and appreciate the important role of IP.

Why do we have rights protecting IP? Protecting IP ensures that a person's idea, a company's product or an artist's creation has an economic value, and it allows its owners to earn from their creations. By providing temporary exclusive rights, IP protection creates incentives to innovate and inspires creativity. At the same time, by providing limitations to these exclusive rights, Canada's IP regime provides for access and supports the dissemination of knowledge. In short, IP protection prevents competitors from copying or closely imitating products or services, and allows businesses to bank on potential returns on investment. This creates economic growth, jobs and prosperity across the country.

IP preserves the competitive edge that a business or a person acquires through research and development and marketing, inventiveness or creativity. It allows dynamic entrepreneurs to answer unsatisfied market domain or open up new market frontiers. It allows businesses to develop goodwill through branding strategies that help them retain customers by ensuring that a brand is consistently associated with a level of quality of products or services.

In addition to protecting ingenuity and creativity, IP helps instill trust, confidence and loyalty in consumers. All of us in the House no doubt know and trust many Canadian products. IP protection ensures that these brands are protected against piracy and counterfeit.

In the digital age where data and information can travel around the world in the blink of an eye, the role of IP has never been greater. That is why now, more than ever, Canadian companies are concerned not only about the nature of the rights that are granted, but also about the effectiveness of their enforcement, both here in Canada and abroad.

● (1735)

That is why Canada signed the anti-counterfeiting trade agreements in October 2011, demonstrating our commitment to combating the trade in counterfeit and pirated goods.

I am proud of our government's introduction of the copyright modernization legislation, which is before us today. This bill would strengthen copyright protections and modernize our copyright regime to bring it in line with international standards and with the realities of the digital age. Specifically, it would provide a clear framework for businesses to be able to protect their creative content, reach new markets, reinvest in further innovation through the development of new business models, and combat infringement in a digital environment, particularly online piracy.

This bill would implement the rights and protections that are set out in the World Intellectual Property Organization Internet treaties which were signed in 1997 and never ratified here in Canada. For too long we have been outside the consensus on modern protections for IP. With this bill, that would no longer be the case.

The bill would provide legal protection for businesses that choose, choose being the operative word, to use digital locks to protect their intellectual property as part of their business models. It would also give copyright owners the tools to pursue those who wilfully and knowingly enable copyright infringement online, such as operators of websites that enable illegal file sharing.

Rights holders would also benefit from legal protection for rights management information. For example, these provisions would prevent the removal of a digital watermark for the purposes of facilitating infringement. The bill would give innovative companies the certainty they need to develop new products and services that involve legitimate uses of copyright material.

Software companies would be allowed explicitly to engage in encryption research, security testing, compatibility testing and reverse engineering. This would support the growth of a competitive third party software market in Canada, spurring follow-on innovation. It would make clear that temporary reproductions made during a technological process are not a violation of copyright.

Government Orders

Finally, the bill would clarify the roles and responsibilities of intermediaries, such as ISPs and search engines. Copyright modernization is a major element of the intellectual property regime in Canada. In this digital age, it is vital that we act now to pass Bill C-11.

Modern copyright is a springboard for a growing digital economy and the foundation for any future digital economy strategy. In passing this bill, we would enhance Canada's innovative capacity, create the necessary environment for growth in our dynamic innovation-driven industries and foster Canadian creativity. All of this would mean jobs, growth and long-term prosperity, something that all members of this House should welcome.

I urge all hon. members to join me in supporting this bill and ensuring that the copyright modernization legislation can proceed to the Senate.

• (1740)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Blanchette (Louis-Hébert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his speech. He is a member of the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates.

I really liked what he said in his speech because he talked about the government's true intention, which is to make the focus of this legislation intellectual property and commercialization. In the context of this debate, it just so happens that the English term and the French term do not mean exactly the same thing. In English, "copyright" is the right to copy, while in French, "droit d'auteur" is the creator's right to compensation. There are certainly differences between the two.

My point is that I agree we should respect copyright holders. However, there may be a problem in terms of compensation for creators, but he did not have much to say about that.

I would like him to tell us what he thinks of this bill, knowing that creators will earn less as a result.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Braid: Mr. Speaker, the member's final comment is simply not the case. There are mechanisms in Bill C-11 that would ensure all creators, authors, musicians, artists, software designers, computer programmers, are all properly compensated for their work.

In Canada, we want to ensure that the range of industries that would be impacted by the bill continue to thrive and flourish and, with Bill C-11, that would certainly be the case. We have heard that at numerous committee meetings and from a range of witnesses who appeared before us. It is time to get the bill passed.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Party recognize how important it is to ensure that there is fair compensation. We understand and we appreciate the degree to which creators and artists from coast to coast to coast contribute to our economic well-being. They play an important part in terms of economic activity in many different ways.

However, I am sure can the member appreciate that, through the committee process, a great number of amendments were proposed that would have improved the legislation and would have ensured that there was more balance in the legislation. Why, time and time

again, did the government refuse to look at amendments that would have improved this legislation? Why did it ignore the amendments? Many of the stakeholders who made presentations supported those amendments.

• (1745)

Mr. Peter Braid: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that balance has been achieved with this legislation. There have been extensive consultations across the country before two special legislative committees. It was critically important that the bill achieved balance between consumers and creators and that balance has been achieved.

Speaking of the Liberal Party, John Manley said, "...overall the Copyright Modernization Act reflects an appropriate balance among the needs of creators, distributors, consumers and society as a whole...".

For that reason, I encourage members of Parliament to move forward with this as expeditiously as possible. I could not agree more.

[*Translation*]

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

The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The division on Motion No. 1 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The 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.

Government Orders

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The division on Motion No. 2 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 3. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 3 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 6. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 6 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 7. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 7 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 22. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The division on Motion No. 22 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 23. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The division on Motion No. 23 stands deferred.

● (1750)

[*English*]

I shall now propose Motions Nos. 4, 5 and 9 to 21 in Group No. 2 to the House.

Government Orders

● (1755)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP), seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North, moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-11, in Clause 22, be amended by deleting lines 33 to 37 on page 19.

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-11, in Clause 22, be amended by deleting lines 30 to 34 on page 20.

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by replacing line 25 on page 45 with the following:

“measure for the purpose of an act that is an infringement of the copyright in the protected work.”

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by deleting lines 21 to 40 on page 46.

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by adding after line 26 on page 47 the following:

“41.101 (1) Paragraph 41.1(1)(a) does not apply to a person who has lawful authority to care for or supervise a minor and who circumvents a technological protection measure for the purpose of protecting the minor if

- (a) the copy of the work or other subject-matter with regard to which the technological protection measure is applied is not an infringing copy; and
- (b) the person has lawfully obtained the work, the performer’s performance fixed in a sound recording or the sound recording that is protected by the technological protection measure.

(2) Paragraphs 41.1(1)(b) and (c) do not apply to a person who provides a service to a person referred to in subsection (1) or who manufactures, imports or provides a technology, device or component, for the purposes of enabling anyone to circumvent a technological protection measure in accordance with subsection (1).

(3) A person acting in the circumstances referred to in subsection (1) is not entitled to benefit from the exception under that subsection if the person does an act that constitutes an infringement of copyright or contravenes any Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province.”

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by adding after line 26 on page 47 the following:

“41.101 (1) No one shall apply, or cause to be applied, a technological protection measure to a work or other subject-matter that is intended to be offered for use by members of the public by sale, rental or otherwise unless the work or other subject-matter is accompanied by a clearly visible notice indicating

- (a) that a technological protection measure has been applied to the work; and
- (b) the capabilities, compatibilities and limitations imposed by the technological protection measure, including, where applicable, but without limitation
 - (i) any requirement that particular software must be installed, either automatically or with the user’s consent, in order to access or use the work or other subject-matter,
 - (ii) any requirement for authentication or authorization via a network service in order to access or use the work or other subject-matter,
 - (iii) any known incompatibility with ordinary consumer devices that would reasonably be expected to operate with the work or other subject-matter, and
 - (iv) any limits imposed by the technological protection measure on the ability to make use of the rights granted under section 29, 29.1, 29.2, 29.21, 29.22, 29.23 or 29.24; and
- (c) contact information for technical support or consumer inquiries in relation to the technological protection measure.

(2) The Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the form and content of the notice referred to in subsection (1).”

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by adding after line 26 on page 47 the following:

“(5) Paragraph (1)(a) does not apply to a qualified person who circumvents a technological protection measure on behalf of another person who is lawfully entitled to circumvent that technological protection measure.

(6) Paragraphs (1)(b) and (c) do not apply to a person who provides a service to a qualified person or who manufactures, imports or provides a technology, device or component, for the purposes of enabling a qualified person to circumvent a technological protection measure in accordance with this Act.

(7) A qualified person may only circumvent a technological protection measure under subsection (5) if

- (a) the work or other subject-matter to which the technological protection measure is applied is not an infringing copy; and
- (b) the qualified person informs the person on whose behalf the technological protection measure is circumvented that the work or other subject-matter is to be used solely for non-infringing purposes.

(8) The Governor in Council may, for the purposes of this section, make regulations

- (a) defining “qualified person”;
- (b) prescribing the information to be recorded about any action taken under subsection (5) or (6) and the manner and form in which the information is to be kept; and
- (c) prescribing the manner and form in which the conditions set out in subsection (7) are to be met.”

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by deleting lines 38 to 44 on page 47.

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by deleting lines 17 to 29 on page 48.

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by deleting line 37 on page 49 to line 3 on page 50.

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by deleting lines 24 to 33 on page 50.

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 7 on page 51.

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by replacing line 25 on page 51 with the following:

“(2) Paragraph 41.1(1)(b) does not”

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by replacing line 11 on page 52 with the following:

“(2) Paragraph 41.1(1)(b) does not”

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-11, in Clause 47, be amended by adding after line 15 on page 54 the following:

“(3) The Board may, on application, make an order

- (a) excluding from the application of section 41.1 a technological protection measure that protects a work, a performer’s performance fixed in a sound recording or a sound recording, or classes of them, or any class of such technological protection measures, having regard to the factors set out in paragraph (2)(a); or
 - (b) requiring the owner of the copyright in a work, a performer’s performance fixed in a sound recording or a sound recording that is protected by a technological protection measure to provide access to the work, performer’s performance fixed in a sound recording or sound recording to persons who are entitled to the benefit of any limitation on the application of paragraph 41.1(1)(a).
- (4) Any order made under subsection (3) shall remain in effect for a period of five years unless

- (a) the Governor in Council makes regulations varying the term of the order; or
- (b) the Board, on application, orders the renewal of the order for an additional five years.”

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The question is on Motion No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 4 stands deferred.

• (1800)

The next question is on Motion No. 5. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 5 stands deferred.

The next question is Motion No. 9. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 9 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 10. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 10 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 11. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 11 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 12. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 12 stands deferred.

•(1805)

The next question is on Motion No. 13. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 13 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 14. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 14 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 15. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 15 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 16. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 16 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 17. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 17 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 18. 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.

Government Orders

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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 18 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 19. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 19 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 20. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 20 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 21. 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The recorded division on Motion No. 21 stands deferred.

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

Call in the members.

● (1845)

And the bells having rung:

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1.

● (1850)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 197*)

YEAS

Members

Andrews	Bélanger
Bellavance	Bennett
Brisson	Byrne
Casey	Coderre
Cotler	Cuzner
Dion	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter	Eyking
Foote	Fortin
Gameau	Hsu
Hyer	Karygiannis
Lamoureux	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
MacAulay	May
McCallum	McGuinity
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Mourani
Murray	Pacetti
Plamondon	Rae
Regan	Scarpaleggia
Sgro	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
St-Denis	
Valeriote— 39	Trudeau

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Angus
Armstrong	Ashfield
Ashton	Aspin
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Baird
Bateman	Benoit

Government Orders

Benskin	Bevington	Reid	Rempel
Bezan	Blanchette	Richards	Richardson
Blanchette-Lamothe	Blaney	Rickford	Ritz
Block	Boivin	Rousseau	Saganash
Borg	Boughen	Sandhu	Savoie
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi	Saxton	Schellenberger
Braid	Breitkreuz	Scott	Sellah
Brosseau	Brown (Barrie)	Shea	Shipley
Butt	Calandra	Shory	Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Calkins	Cannan	Sitsabaesan	Smith
Carmichael	Caron	Sopuck	Sorenson
Carrie	Cash	Stanton	Stewart
Charlton	Chicoine	Stoffer	Storseth
Chisholm	Chisu	Strahl	Sullivan
Chong	Chow	Sweet	Thibeault
Christopherson	Clarke	Tilson	Toews
Cleary	Clement	Toone	Tremblay
Comartin	Côté	Trost	Truppe
Crowder	Cullen	Turmel	Tweed
Daniel	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Uppal	Valcourt
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day	Van Loan	Vellacott
Del Mastro	Devolin	Wallace	Warkentin
Dewar	Dionne Labelle	Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre	Sky Country)	Wilks
Dreeshen	Dubé	Weston (Saint John)	Wong
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dusseault	Williamson	Yelich
Dykstra	Fantino	Woodworth	Young (Vancouver South)
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Young (Oakville)	
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Flaherty	Zimmer — 245	
Fletcher	Freeman		
Galipeau	Gallant		
Garrison	Genest	Nil	
Genest-Jourdain	Giguère		
Gill	Glover		
Godin	Goguen		
Goldring	Goodyear		
Gosal	Gourde		
Gravelle	Grogue		
Harper	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)		
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)		
Hassainia	Hawn		
Hayes	Hiebert		
Hillyer	Hoback		
Hoepfner	Holder		
Hughes	Jacob		
James	Jean		
Julian	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)		
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kellway		
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerr		
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)		
Lake	Lapointe	Bellavance	
Larose	Lauzon	Hyer	
Laverdière	Lebel	Mourani	
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leef		
Leitch	Lemieux		
Leslie	Leung		
Liu	Lizon		
Lobb	Lukiwski		
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie	Ablonczy	
Mai	Marston	Adler	
Martin	Masse	Albas	
Mathysen	Mayes	Alexander	
McColeman	McLeod	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	
Menegakis	Menzies	Ambrose	
Merrifield	Michaud	Anderson	
Miller	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Angus	
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)		Ashfield	
Moore (Fundy Royal)		Aspin	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Aubin	
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Baird	
Mulcair	Nantel	Bélangier	
Nash	Nicholls	Benoit	
Nicholson	Norlock	Bevington	
Nunez-Melo	O'Connor	Blanchette	
O'Neill Gordon	Obhrai	Blaney	
Oda	Oliver	Boivin	
Opitz	Papillon	Boughen	
Paradis	Patry	Brahmi	
Payne	Péclet	Breitkreuz	
Penashue	Perreault	Brosseau	
Poillievre	Preston	Butt	
Quach	Rafferty	Calandra	
Rajotte	Rathgeber	Cannan	
Ravignat	Raynault	Caron	

PAIRED

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

● (1900)

(The House divided on the Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 198*)

YEAS

Members

Fortin
May
Plamondon — 6

NAYS

Members

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Welland)
Ambler
Anders
Andrews
Armstrong
Ashton
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bateman
Bennett
Benskin
Bezan
Blanchette-Lamothe
Block
Borg
Boutin-Sweet
Braid
Brisson
Brown (Barrie)
Byrne
Calkins
Carmichael
Carrie

Government Orders

Casey
Charlton
Chisholm
Chong
Christopherson
Cleary
Coderre
Côté
Crowder
Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Devolin
Dion
Donnelly
Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dusseau
Easter
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Flaherty
Foote
Galipeau
Garneau
Genest
Giguère
Glover
Goguen
Goodyear
Gourde
Grogue
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
Holder
Hughes
James
Julian
Karygiannis
Kellway
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lamoureux
Larose
Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leef
Lemieux
Leung
Lizon
Lukowski
MacKay (Central Nova)
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McGuinty
McLeod
Menzies
Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Murray
Nash
Nicholson
Nunez-Melo
O'Neill Gordon
Oda
Opitz
Papillon
Patry
Péclet
Perreault
Preston
Rae
Rajotte
Ravignat
Regan
Rempel

Cash
Chicoine
Chisu
Chow
Clarke
Clement
Comartin
Cotler
Cullen
Daniel
Davies (Vancouver East)
Del Mastro
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Dubé
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dykstra
Eyking
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher
Freeman
Gallant
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Gill
Godin
Goldring
Gosal
Gravelle
Harper
Harris (St. John's East)
Hassainia
Hayes
Hillyer
Hoepfner
Hsu
Jacob
Jean
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Lake
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebel
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leitch
Leslie
Liu
Lobb
MacAulay
MacKenzie
Marston
Masse
Mayes
McColeman
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Menegakis
Merrifield
Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Norlock
O'Connor
Obhrai
Oliver
Pacetti
Paradis
Payne
Penashue
Poilievre
Quach
Rafferty
Rathgeber
Raynault
Reid
Richards

Richardson
Ritz
Saganash
Savoie
Scarpaleggia
Scott
Sgro
Shiple
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaesan
Sopuck
St-Denis
Stewart
Storseth
Sullivan
Thibeault
Toews
Tremblay
Trudeau
Turmel
Uppal
Valeriotte
Vellacott
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)

Rickford
Rousseau
Sandhu
Saxton
Schellenberger
Sellah
Shea
Shory
Smith
Sorenson
Stanton
Stoffer
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Toone
Trost
Truppe
Tweed
Valcourt
Van Loan
Wallace
Watson
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Zimmer — 278

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the Motion No. 2 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

● (1910)

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 199)

YEAS

Members

Bellavance
Hyer
MouraniFortin
May
Plamondon — 6

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambrose
Anderson
Angus
Ashfield
Aspin
Aubin
Baird
Bélanger
Benoit
Bevington
Blanchette
Blaney
Boivin
Boughen
Brahmi
Breitkreuz
Brosseau
Butt
Calandra
Cannan
Caron

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Welland)
Ambler
Anders
Andrews
Armstrong
Ashton
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bateman
Bennett
Benskin
Bezan
Blanchette-Lamothe
Block
Borg
Boutin-Sweet
Braid
Brison
Brown (Barrie)
Byrne
Calkins
Carmichael
Carrie

Government Orders

Casey
Charlton
Chisholm
Chong
Christopherson
Cleary
Coderre
Côté
Crowder
Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Devolin
Dion
Donnelly
Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dusseault
Easter
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Flaherty
Foote
Galipeau
Garneau
Genest
Giguère
Glover
Goguen
Goodyear
Gourde
Grogulé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
Holder
Hughes
James
Julian
Karygiannis
Kellway
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lamoureux
Larose
Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leef
Lemieux
Leung
Lizon
Lukiwski
MacKay (Central Nova)
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McGuinty
McLeod
Menzies
Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Murray
Nash
Nicholson
Nunez-Melo
O'Neill Gordon
Oda
Opitz
Papillon
Patry
Péclet
Perreault
Preston
Rae
Rajotte
Ravignat
Regan
Rempel

Cash
Chicoine
Chisu
Chow
Clarke
Clement
Comartin
Cotler
Cullen
Daniel
Davies (Vancouver East)
Del Mastro
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Dubé
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dykstra
Eyking
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher
Freeman
Gallant
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Gill
Godin
Goldring
Gosal
Gravelle
Harper
Harris (St. John's East)
Hassainia
Hayes
Hillyer
Hoepfner
Hsu
Jacob
Jean
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Lake
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebel
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leitch
Leslie
Liu
Lobb
MacAulay
MacKenzie
Marston
Masse
Mayes
McColeman
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Menegakis
Merrifield
Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Norlock
O'Connor
Obhrai
Oliver
Pacetti
Paradis
Payne
Penashue
Poilievre
Quach
Rafferty
Rathgeber
Raynault
Reid
Richards

Richardson
Ritz
Saganash
Savoie
Scarpaleggia
Scott
Sgro
Shiple
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan
Sopuck
St-Denis
Stewart
Storseth
Sullivan
Thibeault
Toews
Tremblay
Trudeau
Turmel
Uppal
Valériote
Vellacott
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)

Rickford
Rousseau
Sandhu
Saxton
Schellenberger
Sellah
Shea
Shory
Smith
Sorenson
Stanton
Stoffer
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Toone
Trost
Truppe
Tweed
Valcourt
Van Loan
Wallace
Watson
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Zimmer — 278

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 6.

● (1915)

(The House divided on Motion No. 6, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 200)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)
Angus
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bellavance
Benskin
Blanchette
Boivin
Boutin-Sweet
Brisson
Byrne
Casey
Charlton
Chisholm
Christopherson
Coderre
Côté
Crowder
Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Foote
Freeman
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Godin
Grogulé
Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu
Andrews
Ashton
Aubin
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevington
Blanchette-Lamothe
Borg
Brahmi
Brosseau
Caron
Cash
Chicoine
Chow
Cleary
Comartin
Cotler
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Dion
Donnelly
Dubé
Dusseault
Eyking
Fortin
Garneau
Genest
Giguère
Gravelle
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hassainia
Hughes

Government Orders

Hyer	Jacob	McColeman	McLeod
Julian	Karygiannis	Menegakis	Menzies
Kellway	Lamoureux	Merrifield	Miller
Lapointe	Larose	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	Moore (Fundy Royal)	
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie	Nicholson	Norlock
Liu	MacAulay	O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Mai	Marston	Obhrai	Oda
Martin	Masse	Oliver	Opitz
Mathysen	May	Paradis	Payne
McCallum	McGuinty	Penashue	Poilievre
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud	Preston	Rajotte
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Rathgeber	Reid
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Rempel	Richards
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani	Richardson	Rickford
Mulcair	Murray	Ritz	Saxton
Nantel	Nash	Schellenberger	Shea
Nicholls	Nunez-Melo	Shiely	Shory
Pacetti	Papillon	Smith	Sopuck
Patry	Péclet	Sorenson	Stanton
Perreault	Plamondon	Storseth	Strahl
Quach	Rae	Sweet	Tilson
Rafferty	Ravignat	Toews	Trost
Raynault	Regan	Trottier	Truppe
Rousseau	Saganash	Tweed	Uppal
Sandhu	Savoie	Valcourt	Van Loan
Scarpaleggia	Scott	Vellacott	Wallace
Sellah	Sgro	Warkentin	Watson
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)		Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)		Weston (Saint John)	
Sitsabaiesan	St-Denis	Wilks	Williamson
Stewart	Stoffer	Wong	Woodworth
Sullivan	Thibeault	Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Toone	Tremblay	Young (Vancouver South)	Zimmer — 150
Trudeau	Turmel		
Valeriotte — 135			

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler	Ambrose
Anders	Anderson
Armstrong	Ashfield
Aspin	Baird
Bateman	Benoit
Bezan	Blaney
Block	Boughen
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brown (Barrie)	Butt
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Chisu
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Daniel
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Flaherty
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer
Hoback	Hoepfner
Holder	James
Jean	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerr	Komarnicki
Krampr (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Lebel
Leef	Leitch
Lemieux	Leung
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Mayes

Nil

PAIRED**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 6 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 7.

● (1925)

[*Translation*]

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

*(Division No. 201)***YEAS**

Members

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
Angus	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélanger
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Boivin	Borg
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Brison	Brosseau
Byrne	Caron
Casey	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Chow
Christopherson	Cleary
Coderre	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dusseault
Eyking	Foote
Fortin	Freeman
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain

Government Orders

Giguère
Gravelle
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hassainia
Hughes
Julian
Kellway
Lapointe
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Pacetti
Patry
Perreault
Quach
Rafferty
Raynault
Rousseau
Sandhu
Scarpaleggia
Sellah
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan
Stewart
Sullivan
Toone
Trudeau
Valeriotte — 133

Godin
Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu
Jacob
Karygiannis
Lamoureux
Larose
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leslie
MacAulay
Marston
Masse
May
McGuinty
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Murray
Nash
Nunez-Melo
Papillon
Pécllet
Plamondon
Rae
Ravignat
Regan
Saganash
Savoie
Scott
Sgro
St-Denis
Stoffer
Thibeault
Tremblay
Turnel

Leitch
Leung
Lobb
MacKay (Central Nova)
Mayes
McLeod
Menzies
Miller
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Norlock
O'Neill Gordon
Oda
Opitz
Payne
Poilievre
Rajotte
Reid
Richards
Rickford
Saxton
Shea
Shory
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Tilson
Trost
Truppe
Uppal
Van Loan
Wallace
Watson
Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Zimmer — 151

Lemieux
Lizon
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
McColeman
Menegakis
Merrifield
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Nicholson
O'Connor
Obhrai
Oliver
Paradis
Penashue
Preston
Rathgeber
Rempel
Richardson
Ritz
Schellenberger
Shipley
Smith
Sorenson
Storseth
Sweet
Toews
Trotter
Tweed
Valcourt
Vellacott
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Ambler
Anders
Armstrong
Aspin
Bateman
Bezan
Block
Braid
Brown (Barrie)
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Chong
Clement
Del Mastro
Dreeshen
Dykstra
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Gosal
Harper
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
Holder
James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Lake
Lebel

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambrose
Anderson
Ashfield
Baird
Benoit
Blaney
Boughen
Breitkreuz
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Chisu
Clarke
Daniel
Devolin
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Flaherty
Galipeau
Gill
Goguen
Goodyear
Gourde
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes
Hillyer
Hoepfner
Hyer
Jean
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lauzon
Leef

Nil

PAIRED

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 22.

● (1935)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 202*)

YEAS

Members

Bellavance
Hyer
Mourani

Fortin
May
Plamondon — 6

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambrose
Anderson
Angus
Ashfield
Aspin
Aubin
Baird
Bélanger
Benoit
Bevington

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Welland)
Ambler
Anders
Andrews
Armstrong
Ashton
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bateman
Bennett
Benskin
Bezan

Government Orders

Sgro
sor)
St-Denis
Valeriotte — 39

Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
Trudeau

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambrose
Anderson
Armstrong
Ashton
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bateman
Benskin
Bezan
Blanchette-Lamothe
Block
Borg
Boutin-Sweet
Braid
Brosseau
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Carrie
Charlton
Chisholm
Chong
Christopherson
Cleary
Comartin
Crowder
Daniel
Davies (Vancouver East)
Del Mastro
Dewar
Donnelly
Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher
Galipeau
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Gill
Godin
Goldring
Gosal
Gravelle
Harper
Harris (St. John's East)
Hassainia
Hayes
Hillyer
Hoepfner
Hughes
James
Julian
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Lake
Larose
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leitch
Leslie
Liu
Lobb
MacKay (Central Nova)
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McColeman

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Welland)
Ambler
Anders
Angus
Ashfield
Aspin
Aubin
Baird
Benoit
Bevington
Blanchette
Blaney
Boivin
Boughen
Brahmi
Breitkreuz
Brown (Barrie)
Calandra
Cannan
Caron
Cash
Chicoine
Chisu
Chow
Clarke
Clement
Côté
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Devolin
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Dubé
Dusseault
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Flaherty
Freeman
Gallant
Genest
Giguère
Glover
Goguen
Goodyear
Gourde
Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
Holder
Jacob
Jean
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kellway
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebel
Leef
Lemieux
Leung
Lizon
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Marston
Masse
Mayes
McLeod

Menegakis
Merrifield
Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mulcair
Nash
Nicholson
Nunez-Melo
O'Neill Gordon
Oda
Opitz
Paradis
Payne
Penashue
Poilievre
Quach
Rajotte
Ravignat
Reid
Richards
Rickford
Rousseau
Sandhu
Saxton
Scott
Shea
Shory
Sitsabaiesan
Sopuck
Stanton
Stoffer
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Toone
Trost
Truppe
Tweed
Valcourt
Vellacott
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)

Menzies
Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Nantel
Nicholls
Norlock
O'Connor
Obhrai
Oliver
Papillon
Patry
Péclet
Perreault
Preston
Rafferty
Rathgeber
Raynault
Rempel
Richardson
Ritz
Saganash
Savoie
Schellenberger
Sellah
Shipley
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Smith
Sorenson
Stewart
Storseth
Sullivan
Thibeault
Toews
Tremblay
Trottier
Turmel
Uppal
Van Loan
Wallace
Watson
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Zimmer — 246

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 5.

● (2000)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 205*)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)
Angus
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bellavance
Benskin
Blanchette
Boivin
Boutin-Sweet
Brisson
Byrne

Andrews
Ashton
Aubin
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevington
Blanchette-Lamothe
Borg
Brahmi
Brosseau
Caron

Government Orders

Casey
Charlton
Chisholm
Christopherson
Coderre
Côté
Crowder
Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Foote
Freeman
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Godin
Groguché
Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu
Hyer
Julian
Kellway
Lapointe
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Pacetti
Patry
Perreault
Quach
Rafferty
Raynault
Rousseau
Sandhu
Scarpaleggia
Sellah
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan
Stewart
Sullivan
Toone
Trudeau
Valeriote — 135

Cash
Chicoine
Chow
Cleary
Comartin
Cotler
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Dion
Donnelly
Dubé
Dusseault
Eyking
Fortin
Garneau
Genest
Giguère
Gravelle
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hassainia
Hughes
Jacob
Karygiannis
Lamoureux
Larose
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leslie
MacAulay
Marston
Masse
May
McGuinty
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Murray
Nash
Nunez-Melo
Papillon
Péclet
Plamondon
Rae
Ravignat
Regan
Saganash
Savoie
Scott
Sgro
St-Denis
Stoffer
Thibeault
Tremblay
Turnel

Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Gosal
Harper
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
Holder
Jean
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lauzon
Leaf
Lemieux
Lizon
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
McColeman
Menegakis
Merrifield
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Nicholson
O'Connor
Obhrai
Oliver
Paradis
Penashue
Preston
Rathgeber
Rempel
Richardson
Ritz
Schellenberger
ShIPLEY
Smith
Sorenson
Storseth
Sweet
Toews
Trottier
Tweed
Valcourt
Vellacott
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)

Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Flaherty
Galipeau
Gill
Goguen
Goodyear
Gourde
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes
Hillyer
Hoepfner
James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Lake
Lebel
Leitch
Leung
Lobb
MacKay (Central Nova)
Mayes
McLeod
Menzies
Miller
Norlock
O'Neill Gordon
Oda
Opitz
Payne
Polievre
Rajotte
Reid
Richards
Rickford
Saxton
Shea
Shory
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Tilson
Trost
Truppe
Uppal
Van Loan
Wallace
Watson
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Zimmer — 150

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Ambler
Anders
Armstrong
Aspin
Bateman
Bezan
Block
Braid
Brown (Barrie)
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Chong
Clement
Del Mastro
Dreeshen
Dykstra

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambrose
Anderson
Ashfield
Baird
Benoit
Blaney
Boughen
Breitkreuz
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Chisu
Clarke
Daniel
Devolin
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Fantino

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 9.

● (2005)

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 206*)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)
Angus
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bellavance
Benskin

Andrews
Ashton
Aubin
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevington

Government Orders

Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe	Chong	Clarke
Boivin	Borg	Clement	Daniel
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi	Del Mastro	Devolin
Brisson	Brosseau	Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Byrne	Caron	Dykstra	Fantino
Casey	Cash	Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Charlton	Chicoine	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Flaherty
Chisholm	Chow	Fletcher	Galipeau
Christopherson	Cleary	Gallant	Gill
Coderre	Comartin	Glover	Goguen
Côté	Cotler	Goldring	Goodyear
Crowder	Cullen	Gosal	Gourde
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day	Hawn	Hayes
Dewar	Dion	Hiebert	Hillyer
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly	Hoback	Hoepfner
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé	Holder	James
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dusseau	Jean	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Easter	Eyking	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Footé	Fortin	Kerr	Komarnicki
Freeman	Garneau	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Garrison	Genest	Lauzon	Lebel
Genest-Jourdain	Giguère	Leaf	Leitch
Godin	Gravelle	Lemieux	Leung
Grogulé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Lizon	Lobb
Harris (St. John's East)	Hassainia	Lukiwski	MacKay (Central Nova)
Hsu	Hughes	MacKenzie	Mayes
Hyer	Jacob	McColeman	McLeod
Julian	Karygiannis	Menegakis	Menzies
Kellway	Lamoureux	Merrifield	Miller
Lapointe	Larose	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	Moore (Fundy Royal)	
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie	Nicholson	Norlock
Liu	MacAulay	O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Mai	Marston	Obhrai	Oda
Martin	Masse	Oliver	Opitz
Mathysen	May	Paradis	Payne
McCallum	McGuinty	Penashue	Poilievre
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud	Preston	Rajotte
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Rathgeber	Reid
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Rempel	Richards
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani	Richardson	Rickford
Mulcair	Murray	Ritz	Saxton
Nantel	Nash	Schellenberger	Shea
Nicholls	Nunez-Melo	Shiple	Shory
Pacetti	Papillon	Smith	Sopuck
Patry	Péclet	Sorenson	Stanton
Perreault	Plamondon	Storseth	Strahl
Quach	Rae	Sweet	Tilson
Rafferty	Ravignat	Toews	Trost
Raynault	Regan	Trottier	Truppe
Rousseau	Saganash	Tweed	Uppal
Sandhu	Savoie	Valcourt	Van Loan
Scarpaleggia	Scott	Vellacott	Wallace
Sellah	Sgro	Warkentin	Watson
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)		Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)		Weston (Saint John)	
Sitsabaiesan	St-Denis	Wilks	Williamson
Stewart	Stoffer	Wong	Woodworth
Sullivan	Thibeault	Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Toone	Tremblay	Young (Vancouver South)	Zimmer — 150
Trudeau	Turmel		
Valeriote — 135			

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Ashfield	Aspin
Baird	Bateman
Benoit	Bezan
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinooge	Butt
Calandra	Calkins
Canman	Carmichael
Carrie	Chisu

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 9 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 10.

● (2015)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 207)***YEAS**

Members

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
-----------------	---------

PAIRED

Government Orders

Angus
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bellavance
Benskin
Blanchette
Boivin
Boutin-Sweet
Brisson
Byrne
Casey
Charlton
Chisholm
Christopherson
Coderre
Côté
Crowder
Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Foote
Freeman
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Godin
Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu
Hyer
Julian
Kellway
Lapointe
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Pacetti
Patry
Perreault
Quach
Rafferty
Raynault
Rousseau
Sandhu
Scarpaleggia
Sellah
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan
Stewart
Sullivan
Toone
Trudeau
Valeriote — 135

Ashton
Aubin
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevington
Blanchette-Lamothe
Borg
Brahmi
Brosseau
Caron
Cash
Chicoine
Chow
Cleary
Comartin
Cotler
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Dion
Donnelly
Dubé
Dusseauit
Eyking
Fortin
Garneau
Genest
Giguère
Gravelle
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hassainia
Hughes
Jacob
Karygiannis
Lamoureux
Larose
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leslie
MacAulay
Marston
Masse
May
McGuinty
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Murray
Nash
Nunez-Melo
Papillon
Pécelet
Plamondon
Rae
Ravignat
Regan
Saganash
Savoie
Scott
Sgro
St-Denis
Stoffer
Thibeault
Tremblay
Turmel

Braid
Brown (Barrie)
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Chong
Clement
Del Mastro
Dreeshen
Dykstra
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Gosal
Harper
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
Holder
Jean
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lauzon
Leaf
Lemieux
Lizon
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
McColeman
Menegakis
Merrifield
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Nicholson
O'Connor
Obhrai
Oliver
Paradis
Penashue
Preston
Rathgeber
Rempel
Richardson
Ritz
Schellenberger
Shipley
Smith
Sorenson
Storseth
Sweet
Toews
Trottier
Tweed
Valcourt
Vellacott
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)

Breitkreuz
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Chisu
Clarke
Daniel
Devolin
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Flaherty
Galipeau
Gill
Goguen
Goodyear
Gourde
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes
Hillyer
Hoepfner
James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Lake
Lebel
Leitch
Leung
Lobb
MacKay (Central Nova)
Mayes
McLeod
Menzies
Miller
Norlock
O'Neill Gordon
Oda
Opitz
Payne
Poilievre
Rajotte
Reid
Richards
Rickford
Saxton
Shea
Shory
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Tilson
Trost
Truppe
Uppal
Van Loan
Wallace
Watson
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Zimmer — 150

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Ambler
Anders
Armstrong
Aspin
Bateman
Bezan
Block

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambrose
Anderson
Ashfield
Baird
Benoit
Blaney
Boughen

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 11.

● (2020)

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negated on the following division:)

*Government Orders**(Division No. 208)***YEAS**

Members

Andrews	Bélanger
Bennett	Brisson
Byrne	Casey
Coderre	Cotler
Cuzner	Dion
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Easter
Eyking	Foote
Garneau	Hsu
Hyer	Karygiannis
Lamoureux	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
MacAulay	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Murray
Pacetti	Rae
Regan	Scarpaleggia
Sgro	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
St-Denis	sor)
Valeriotte — 35	Trudeau

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Angus
Armstrong	Ashfield
Ashton	Aspin
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Baird
Bateman	Bellavance
Benoit	Benskin
Bevington	Bezan
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Blaney	Block
Boivin	Borg
Boughen	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brosseau
Brown (Barrie)	Butt
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Caron	Carrie
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Chisu	Chong
Chow	Christopherson
Clarke	Cleary
Clement	Comartin
Côté	Crowder
Cullen	Daniel
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dewar	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dreeshen	Dubé
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Dusseault
Dykstra	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Flaherty
Fletcher	Fortin
Freeman	Galipeau
Gallant	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Gill
Glover	Godin
Goguen	Goldring
Goodyear	Gosal
Gourde	Gravelle
Grogulé	Harper
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hassainia
Hawn	Hayes

Hiebert	Hillyer
Hoback	Hoepfner
Holder	Hughes
Hyer	Jacob
James	Jean
Julian	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kellway
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lapointe
Larose	Lauzon
Laverdière	Lebel
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leslie	Leung
Liu	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	Mayes
McColeman	McLeod
Menegakis	Menzies
Merrifield	Michaud
Miller	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mourani	Mulcair
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nicholson
Norlock	Nunez-Melo
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Obhrai	Oda
Oliver	Opitz
Papillon	Paradis
Patry	Payne
Péclet	Penashue
Perreault	Plamondon
Poilievre	Preston
Quach	Rafferty
Rajotte	Rathgeber
Ravignat	Raynault
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Richardson
Rickford	Ritz
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Savoie
Saxton	Schellenberger
Scott	Sellah
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaiesan	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Stewart
Stoffer	Storseth
Strahl	Sullivan
Sweet	Thibeault
Tilson	Toews
Toone	Tremblay
Trost	Trottier
Truppe	Turmel
Tweed	Uppal
Valcourt	Van Loan
Vellacott	Wallace
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 — 250

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 12.

● (2030)

(The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 209)

YEAS

Members

Andrews	Bélanger
Bellavance	Bennett
Brison	Byrne
Casey	Coderre
Cotler	Cuzner
Dion	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter	Eyking
Foote	Fortin
Garneau	Hsu
Hyer	Karygiannis
Lamoureux	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
MacAulay	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Mourani
Murray	Pacetti
Plamondon	Rae
Regan	Scarpaleggia
Sgro	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
St-Denis	
Valériote — 39	Trudeau

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Angus
Armstrong	Ashfield
Ashton	Aspin
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Baird
Bateman	Benoit
Benskin	Bevington
Bezan	Blanchette
Blanchette-Lamothe	Blaney
Block	Boivin
Borg	Boughen
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brosseau	Brown (Barrie)
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Caron	Carrie
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Chisu	Chong
Chow	Christopherson
Clarke	Cleary
Clement	Comartin
Côté	Crowder
Cullen	Daniel
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Del Mastro
Devolin	Dewar
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dreeshen
Dubé	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dusseault	Dykstra
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Flaherty	Fletcher
Freeman	Galipeau
Gallant	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Gill
Glover	Godin

Government Orders

Goguen	Goldring
Goodyear	Gosal
Gourde	Gravelle
Groguhé	Harper
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hassainia
Hawn	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer
Hoback	Hoepfner
Holder	Hughes
Jacob	James
Jean	Julian
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kellway	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerr	Komarnicki
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lapointe	Larose
Lauzon	Laverdière
Lebel	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leaf	Leitch
Lemieux	Leslie
Leung	Liu
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
Mayes	McColeman
McLeod	Menegakis
Menzies	Merrifield
Michaud	Miller
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mulcair
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nicholson
Norlock	Nunez-Melo
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Obhrai	Oda
Oliver	Opitz
Papillon	Paradis
Patry	Payne
Péclet	Penashue
Perreault	Poilievre
Preston	Quach
Rafferty	Rajotte
Rathgeber	Ravignat
Raynault	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Richardson	Rickford
Ritz	Rousseau
Saganash	Sandhu
Savoie	Saxton
Schellenberger	Scott
Sellah	Shea
Shiple	Shory
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Stewart	Stoffer
Storseth	Strahl
Sullivan	Sweet
Thibeault	Tilson
Toews	Toone
Tremblay	Trost
Trottier	Truppe
Turmel	Tweed
Uppal	Valcourt
Van Loan	Vellacott
Wallace	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 — 245	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

Government Orders

The next question is on Motion No. 13.

• (2035)

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

(Division No. 210)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
Angus	Ashton
Atamanenko	Aubin
Ayala	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Boivin	Borg
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Brison	Brosseau
Byrne	Caron
Casey	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Chow
Christopherson	Cleary
Coderre	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dion
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dusseault
Easter	Eyking
Foote	Fortin
Freeman	Garneau
Garrison	Genest
Genest-Jourdain	Giguère
Godin	Gravelle
Groguhé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Hassainia
Hsu	Hughes
Hyer	Jacob
Julian	Karygiannis
Kellway	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larose
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	MacAulay
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
McCallum	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mourani
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nunez-Melo
Pacetti	Papillon
Patry	Pécllet
Perreault	Plamondon
Quach	Rae
Rafferty	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Savoie
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaiesan	St-Denis
Stewart	Stoffer
Sullivan	Thibeault
Toone	Tremblay
Trudeau	Turmel
Valériote — 135	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler	Ambrose
Anders	Anderson
Armstrong	Ashfield
Aspin	Baird
Bateman	Benoit
Bezan	Blaney
Block	Boughen
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brown (Barrie)	Butt
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Chisu
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Daniel
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Flaherty
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goodyear	Gosal
Gourde	Harper
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Hoepfner	Holder
James	Jean
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lauzon
Lebel	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Mayes	McColeman
McLeod	Menegakis
Menzies	Merrifield
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Nicholson
Norlock	O'Connor
O'Neill Gordon	Obhrai
Oda	Oliver
Opitz	Paradis
Payne	Penashue
Poilievre	Preston
Rajotte	Rathgeber
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Richardson
Rickford	Ritz
Saxton	Schellenberger
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Storseth
Strahl	Sweet
Tilson	Toews
Trost	Trotter
Truppe	Tweed
Uppal	Valcourt
Van Loan	Vellacott
Wallace	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 — 149	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 defeated.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 14.

● (2045)

(The House divided on Motion No. 14, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 211)

YEAS

Members

Bellavance	Fortin
Hyer	May
Mourani	Plamondon— 6

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Angus	Armstrong
Ashfield	Ashton
Aspin	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Baird	Bateman
Bélangier	Bennett
Benoit	Benskin
Bevington	Bezan
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Blaney	Block
Boivin	Borg
Boughen	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brison
Brosseau	Brown (Barrie)
Butt	Byrne
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Caron	Carrie
Casey	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Chisu
Chong	Chow
Christopherson	Clarke
Cleary	Clement
Coderre	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Daniel
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Del Mastro
Devolin	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dreeshen	Dubé
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Flaherty	Fletcher
Foote	Freeman
Galipeau	Gallant
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Gill
Glover	Godin
Goguen	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Gravelle	Groguhé
Harper	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)

Government Orders

Hassainia	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Hoepfner	Holder
Hsu	Hughes
Jacob	James
Jean	Julian
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kellway
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larose
Lauzon	Laverdière
Lebel	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leslie	Leung
Liu	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	McLeod
Menegakis	Menzies
Merrifield	Michaud
Miller	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nicholson
Norlock	Nunez-Melo
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Obhrai	Oda
Oliver	Opitz
Pacetti	Papillon
Paradis	Patry
Payne	Pécllet
Penashue	Perreault
Poillievre	Preston
Quach	Rae
Rafferty	Rajotte
Rathgeber	Ravnat
Raynault	Regan
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Richardson
Rickford	Ritz
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Savoie
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
sor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	St-Denis
Stanton	Stewart
Stoffer	Storseth
Strahl	Sullivan
Sweet	Thibeault
Tilson	Toews
Toone	Tremblay
Trost	Trotter
Trudeau	Truppe
Turmel	Tweed
Uppal	Valcourt
Valeriote	Van Loan
Vellacott	Wallace
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— 278

Government Orders

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 14 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 15

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If you seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the vote from the previous motion to Motions Nos. 15 to 21.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 212)

YEAS

Members

Bellavance	Fortin
Hyer	May
Mourani	Plamondon— 6

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Angus	Armstrong
Ashfield	Ashton
Aspin	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Baird	Bateman
Bélanger	Bennett
Benoit	Benskin
Bevington	Bezan
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Blaney	Bloch
Boivin	Borg
Boughen	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brison
Brosseau	Brown (Barrie)
Butt	Byrne
Calandra	Calkins
Canman	Carmichael
Caron	Carrie
Casey	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Chisu
Chong	Chow
Christopherson	Clarke
Cleary	Clement
Coderre	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Daniel
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Del Mastro
Devolin	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dreeshen	Dubé
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Flaherty	Fletcher
Footé	Freeman

Galipeau	Gallant
Gameau	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Gill
Glover	Godin
Goguen	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Gravelle	Groguhé
Harper	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hassainia	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Hoepfner	Holder
Hsu	Hughes
Jacob	James
Jean	Julian
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kellway
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larose
Lauzon	Laverdière
Lebel	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leslie	Leung
Liu	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
Mayer	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinity
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	McLeod
Menegakis	Menzies
Merrifield	Michaud
Miller	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nicholson
Norlock	Nunez-Melo
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Obhrai	Oda
Oliver	Opitz
Pacetti	Papillon
Paradis	Patry
Payne	Pécelet
Penashue	Perreault
Poilievre	Preston
Quach	Rae
Rafferty	Rajotte
Rathgeber	Ravnat
Raynault	Regan
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Richardson
Rickford	Ritz
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Savoie
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Shea	ShIPLEY
Shory	Sims (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
sim	sor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	St-Denis
Stanton	Stewart
Stoffer	Storseth
Strahl	Sullivan
Sweet	Thibeault
Tilson	Toews
Toone	Tremblay
Trost	Trottier
Trudeau	Truppe
Turnel	Twedd
Uppal	Valcourt

Government Orders

Valeriote
Vellacott
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)

Van Loan
Wallace
Watson
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Zimmer— 278

PAIRED

Nil

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 213)***YEAS**

Members

Bellavance
Hyer
Mourani

Fortin
May
Plamondon— 6

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Adler
Albas
Alexander
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambrose
Anderson
Angus
Ashfield
Aspin
Aubin
Baird
Bélanger
Benoit
Bevington
Blanchette
Blaney
Boivin
Boughen
Brahmi
Breitkreuz
Brosseau
Butt
Calandra
Cannan
Caron
Casey
Charlton
Chisholm
Chong
Christopherson
Cleary
Coderre
Côté
Crowder
Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Devolin
Dion
Donnelly
Dreeshen
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dusseau
Easter
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Flaherty
Foote
Galipeau
Garneau
Genest
Giguère

Adams
Aglukkaq
Albrecht
Allen (Welland)
Ambler
Anders
Andrews
Armstrong
Ashton
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bateman
Bennett
Benskin
Bezan
Blanchette-Lamothe
Block
Borg
Boutin-Sweet
Braid
Brisson
Brown (Barrie)
Byrne
Calkins
Carmichael
Carrie
Cash
Chicoine
Chisu
Chow
Clarke
Clement
Comartin
Cotler
Cullen
Daniel
Davies (Vancouver East)
Del Mastro
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Dubé
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dykstra
Eyking
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher
Freeman
Gallant
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Gill

Glover
Goguen
Gosal
Gravelle
Harper
Harris (St. John's East)
Hassainia
Hayes
Hillyer
Hoepfner
Hsu
Jacob
Jean
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Lake
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebel
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leitch
Leslie
Liu
Lobb
MacAulay
MacKenzie
Marston
Masse
Mayes
McColeman
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Menegakis
Merrifield
Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Norlock
O'Connor
Obhrai
Oliver
Pacetti
Paradis
Payne
Penashue
Poilievre
Quach
Rafferty
Rathgeber
Raynault
Reid
Richards
Rickford
Rousseau
Sandhu
Saxton
Schellenberger
Sellah
Shea
Shory
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Smith
Sorenson
Stanton
Stoffer
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Toone
Trost
Trudeau
Turnel
Uppal
Valeriote
Vellacott
Warkentin

Godin
Goodyear
Gourde
Grogulé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
Holder
Hughes
James
Julian
Karygiannis
Kellway
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lamoureux
Larose
Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leef
Lemieux
Leung
Lizon
Lukiwski
MacKay (Central Nova)
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McGuinty
McLeod
Menzies
Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Murray
Nash
Nicholson
Nunez-Melo
O'Neill Gordon
Oda
Opitz
Papillon
Patry
Péclet
Perreault
Preston
Rae
Rajotte
Ravignat
Regan
Rempel
Richardson
Ritz
Saganash
Savoie
Scarpaleggia
Scott
Sgro
Shiple
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
Sitsabaiesan
Sopuck
St-Denis
Stewart
Storseth
Sullivan
Thibeault
Toews
Tremblay
Trotter
Truppe
Tweed
Valcourt
Van Loan
Wallace
Watson

Government Orders

Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
 Weston (Saint John)
 Wilks
 Wong
 Yelich
 Young (Vancouver South)

Williamson
 Woodworth
 Young (Oakville)
 Zimmer — 278

PAIRED

Nil

(The House divided on Motion No. 17, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 214)

YEAS

Members

Bellavance
 Hyer
 Mourani

Fortin
 May
 Plamondon — 6

NAYS

Members

Abлонczy
 Adler
 Albas
 Alexander
 Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Ambrose
 Anderson
 Angus
 Ashfield
 Aspin
 Aubin
 Baird
 Bélanger
 Benoit
 Bevington
 Blanchette
 Blaney
 Boivin
 Boughen
 Brahma
 Breikreuz
 Brosseau
 Butt
 Calandra
 Cannan
 Caron
 Casey
 Charlton
 Chisholm
 Chong
 Christopherson
 Cleary
 Coderre
 Côté
 Crowder
 Cuzner
 Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
 Day
 Devolin
 Dion
 Donnelly
 Dreeschen
 Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
 Dusseault
 Easter
 Fantino
 Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
 Flaherty
 Foote
 Galipeau
 Garneau
 Genest
 Giguère
 Glover
 Goguen
 Gosal

Adams
 Aglukkaq
 Albrecht
 Allen (Welland)
 Ambler
 Anders
 Andrews
 Armstrong
 Ashton
 Atamanenko
 Ayala
 Bateman
 Bennett
 Benskin
 Bezan
 Blanchette-Lamothe
 Block
 Borg
 Boutin-Sweet
 Braid
 Brison
 Brown (Barrie)
 Byrne
 Calkins
 Carmichael
 Carrie
 Cash
 Chicoine
 Chisu
 Chow
 Clarke
 Clement
 Comartin
 Cotler
 Cullen
 Daniel
 Davies (Vancouver East)
 Del Mastro
 Dewar
 Dionne Labelle
 Doré Lefebvre
 Dubé
 Duncan (Etobicoke North)
 Dykstra
 Eyking
 Fast
 Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Fletcher
 Freeman
 Gallant
 Garrison
 Genest-Jourdain
 Gill
 Godin
 Godyear
 Gourde

Gravelle
 Harper
 Harris (St. John's East)
 Hassainia
 Hayes
 Hillyer
 Hoepfner
 Hsu
 Jacob
 Jean
 Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
 Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Komarnicki
 Lake
 Lapointe
 Lauzon
 Lebel
 LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
 Leitch
 Leslie
 Liu
 Lobb
 MacAulay
 MacKenzie
 Marston
 Masse
 Mayes
 McColeman
 McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
 Menegakis
 Merrifield
 Miller
 Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
 Moore (Fundy Royal)
 Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
 Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
 Mulcair
 Nantel
 Nicholls
 Norlock
 O'Connor
 Obhrai
 Oliver
 Pacetti
 Paradis
 Payne
 Penashue
 Poilievre
 Quach
 Rafferty
 Rathgeber
 Raynault
 Reid
 Richards
 Rickford
 Rousseau
 Sandhu
 Saxton
 Schellenberger
 Sellah
 Shea
 Shory
 Sor
 Sims (Newton—North Delta)
 Smith
 Sorenson
 Stanton
 Stoffler
 Strahl
 Sweet
 Tilson
 Toone
 Trost
 Trudeau
 Turmel
 Uppal
 Valeriote
 Vellacott
 Warkentin
 Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
 Weston (Saint John)
 Wilks
 Wong

Groguhé
 Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
 Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
 Hawn
 Hiebert
 Hoback
 Holder
 Hughes
 James
 Julian
 Karygiannis
 Kellway
 Kerr
 Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
 Lamoureux
 Larose
 Laverdière
 LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
 Leef
 Lemieux
 Leung
 Lizon
 Lukiwski
 MacKay (Central Nova)
 Mai
 Martin
 Mathysen
 McCallum
 McGuinty
 McLeod
 Menzies
 Michaud
 Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
 Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
 Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
 Murray
 Nash
 Nicholson
 Nunez-Melo
 O'Neill Gordon
 Oda
 Opitz
 Papillon
 Patry
 Pécelet
 Perreault
 Preston
 Rae
 Rajotte
 Ravignat
 Regan
 Rempel
 Richardson
 Ritz
 Saganash
 Savoie
 Scarpaleggia
 Scott
 Sgro
 Shipley
 Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
 Sitsabaiesan
 Sopuck
 St-Denis
 Stewart
 Storseth
 Sullivan
 Thibeault
 Toews
 Tremblay
 Trottier
 Truppe
 Tweed
 Valcourt
 Van Loan
 Wallace
 Watson

Williamson
 Woodworth

Government Orders

Yelich
Young (Vancouver South) Young (Oakville)
Zimmer— 278

PAIRED

Nil

(The House divided on Motion No. 18, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 215)

YEAS

Members

Bellavance Fortin
Hyer May
Mourani Plamondon— 6

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy Adams
Adler Aglukkaq
Albas Albrecht
Alexander Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac) Ambler
Ambrose Anders
Anderson Andrews
Angus Armstrong
Ashfield Ashton
Aspin Atamanenko
Aubin Ayala
Baird Bateman
Bélangier Bennett
Benoit Benskin
Bevington Bezan
Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe
Blaney Block
Boivin Borg
Boughen Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi Braid
Breitkreuz Brison
Brosseau Brown (Barrie)
Butt Byrne
Calandra Calkins
Cannan Carmichael
Caron Carrie
Casey Cash
Charlton Chicoine
Chisholm Chisu
Chong Chow
Christopherson Clarke
Cleary Clement
Coderre Comartin
Côté Cotler
Crowder Cullen
Cuzner Daniel
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway) Davies (Vancouver East)
Day Del Mastro
Devolin Dewar
Dion Dionne Labelle
Donnelly Doré Lefebvre
Dreeshen Dubé
Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseauit Dykstra
Easter Eyking
Fantino Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East) Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Flaherty Fletcher
Foote Freeman
Galipeau Gallant
Garneau Garrison
Genest Genest-Jourdain
Giguère Gill
Glover Godin
Goguen Goodyear
Gosal Gourde
Gravelle Grouhé
Harper Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East) Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hassainia Hawn

Hayes
Hillyer
Hoepfner
Hsu
Jacob
Jean
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Komarnicki
Lake
Lapointe
Lauson
Lebel
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leitch
Leslie
Liu
Lobb
MacAulay
MacKenzie
Marston
Masse
Mayes
McColeman
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Menegakis
Merrifield
Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Norlock
O'Connor
Obhrai
Oliver
Pacetti
Paradis
Payne
Penashue
Poilievre
Quach
Rafferty
Rathgeber
Raynault
Reid
Richards
Rickford
Rousseau
Sandhu
Saxton
Schellenberger
Sellah
Shea
Shory
sor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Smith
Sorenson
Stanton
Stoffer
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Toone
Trost
Trudeau
Turmel
Uppal
Valeriotte
Vellacott
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)

Hiebert
Hoback
Holder
Hughes
James
Julian
Karygiannis
Kellway
Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lamoureux
Larose
Laverdière
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leef
Lemieux
Leung
Lizon
Lukiwski
MacKay (Central Nova)
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McGuinty
McLeod
Menzies
Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Murray
Nash
Nicholson
Nunez-Melo
O'Neill Gordon
Oda
Opitz
Papillon
Patry
Péclet
Perreault
Preston
Rac
Rajotte
Ravignat
Regan
Rempel
Richardson
Ritz
Saganash
Savoie
Scarpaleggia
Scott
Sgro
Shipley
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
Sitsabaiesan
Sopuck
St-Denis
Stewart
Storseth
Sullivan
Thibeault
Toews
Tremblay
Trottier
Truppe
Tweed
Valcourt
Van Loan
Wallace
Watson
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Zimmer— 278

Government Orders

PAIRED

Nil

(The House divided on Motion No. 19, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 216)

YEAS

Members

Bellavance	Fortin
Hyer	May
Mourani	Plamondon— 6

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Angus	Armstrong
Ashfield	Ashton
Aspin	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Baird	Bateman
Bélanger	Bennett
Benoit	Benskin
Bevington	Bezan
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Blaney	Block
Boivin	Borg
Boughen	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brisson
Brosseau	Brown (Barrie)
Butt	Byrne
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Caron	Carrie
Casey	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Chisu
Chong	Chow
Christopherson	Clarke
Cleary	Clement
Coderre	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Cullen
Cuzner	Daniel
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Del Mastro
Devolin	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dreeshen	Dubé
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseau	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Flaherty	Fletcher
Footé	Freeman
Galipeau	Gallant
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Gill
Glover	Godin
Goguen	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Gravelle	Grogulé
Harper	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hassainia	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Hoepfner	Holder

Hsu	Hughes
Jacob	James
Jean	Julian
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kellway
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larose
Lauzon	Laverdière
Lebel	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leslie	Leung
Liu	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinity
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	McLeod
Menegakis	Menzies
Merrifield	Michaud
Miller	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nicholson
Norlock	Nunez-Melo
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Obhrai	Oda
Oliver	Opitz
Pacetti	Papillon
Paradis	Paty
Payne	Péclet
Penashue	Perreault
Poilievre	Preston
Quach	Rae
Rafferty	Rajotte
Rathgeber	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Richardson
Rickford	Ritz
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Savoie
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Shea	Shipley
Shory	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind- sor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	St-Denis
Stanton	Stewart
Stoffer	Storseth
Strahl	Sullivan
Sweet	Thibeault
Tilson	Toews
Toone	Tremblay
Trost	Trottier
Trudeau	Truppe
Turmel	Tweed
Uppal	Valcourt
Valerioté	Van Loan
Vellacott	Wallace
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— 278

PAIRED

Nil

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 20, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 217)***YEAS**

Members

Bellavance	Fortin
Hyer	May
Mourani	Plamondon— 6

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Ambler
Ambrose	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Angus	Armstrong
Ashfield	Ashton
Aspin	Atamanenko
Aubin	Ayala
Baird	Bateman
Bélanger	Bennett
Benoit	Benskin
Bevington	Bezan
Blanchette	Blanchette-Lamothe
Blaney	Block
Boivin	Borg
Boughen	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Braid
Breitkreuz	Brisson
Brosseau	Brown (Barrie)
Butt	Byrne
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Caron	Carrie
Casey	Cash
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Chisu
Chong	Chow
Christopherson	Clarke
Cleary	Clement
Coderre	Comartin
Côté	Cotler
Crowder	Culler
Cuzner	Daniel
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Del Mastro
Devolin	Dewar
Dion	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dreeshen	Dubé
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Flaherty	Fletcher
Foote	Freeman
Galipeau	Gallant
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Genest-Jourdain
Giguère	Gill
Glover	Godin
Goguen	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Gravelle	Grouhé
Harper	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hassainia	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Hoepfner	Holder
Hsu	Hughes
Jacob	James
Jean	Julian
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Karygiannis

Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kellway
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larose
Lauzon	Laverdière
Lebel	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leslie	Leung
Liu	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
Mayes	McCallum
McColeman	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	McLeod
Menegakis	Menzies
Merrifield	Michaud
Miller	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Moore (Fundy Royal)	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nicholson
Norlock	Nunez-Melo
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Obhrai	Oda
Oliver	Opitz
Pacetti	Papillon
Paradis	Patry
Payne	Péclet
Penashue	Perreault
Poilievre	Preston
Quach	Rae
Rafferty	Rajotte
Rathgeber	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Richardson
Rickford	Ritz
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Savoie
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Shea	Shipley
Shory (sor)	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	St-Denis
Stanton	Stewart
Stoffer	Storseth
Strahl	Sullivan
Sweet	Thibeault
Tilson	Toews
Toone	Tremblay
Trost	Trottier
Trudeau	Truppe
Turnel	Tweed
Uppal	Valcourt
Valeriotte	Van Loan
Vellacott	Wallace
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— 278

PAIRED

Nil

(The House divided on Motion No. 21, which was negated on the following division:)

*Government Orders**(Division No. 218)***YEAS**

Members

Bellavance Fortin
 Hyer May
 Mourani Plamondon— 6

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy Adams
 Adler Aglukkaq
 Albas Albrecht
 Alexander Allen (Welland)
 Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac) Ambler
 Ambrose Anders
 Anderson Andrews
 Angus Armstrong
 Ashfield Ashton
 Aspin Atamanenko
 Aubin Ayala
 Baird Bateman
 Bélanger Bennett
 Benoit Benskin
 Bevington Bezan
 Blanchette Blanchette-Lamothe
 Blaney Block
 Boivin Borg
 Boughen Boutin-Sweet
 Brahmī Braid
 Breitreuz Brison
 Brosseau Brown (Barrie)
 Butt Byrne
 Calandra Calkins
 Cannan Carmichael
 Caron Carrie
 Casey Cash
 Charlton Chicoine
 Chisholm Chisu
 Chong Chow
 Christopherson Clarke
 Cleary Clement
 Coderre Comartin
 Côté Cotler
 Crowder Cullen
 Cuzner Daniel
 Davies (Vancouver Kingsway) Davies (Vancouver East)
 Day Del Mastro
 Devolin Dewar
 Dion Dionne Labelle
 Donnelly Doré Lefebvre
 Dreeshen Dubé
 Duncan (Vancouver Island North) Duncan (Etobicoke North)
 Dusseault Dykstra
 Easter Eyking
 Fantino Fast
 Findlay (Delta—Richmond East) Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Flaherty Fletcher
 Foote Freeman
 Galipeau Gallant
 Garneau Garrison
 Genest Genest-Jourdain
 Giguère Gill
 Glover Godin
 Goguen Goodyear
 Gosal Gourde
 Gravelle Grogulé
 Harper Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
 Harris (St. John's East) Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
 Hassainia Hawn
 Hayes Hiebert
 Hillyer Hoback
 Hoepfner Holder
 Hsu Hughes
 Jacob James
 Jean Julian
 Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission) Karygiannis
 Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's) Kellway
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast) Kerr
 Komarnicki Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)

Lake
 Lapointe
 Lauzon
 Lebel
 LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
 Leitch
 Leslie
 Liu
 Lobb
 MacAulay
 MacKenzie
 Marston
 Masse
 Mayes
 McColeman
 McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
 Menegakis
 Merrifield
 Miller
 Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
 Moore (Fundy Royal)
 Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
 Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
 Mulcair
 Nantel
 Nicholls
 Norlock
 O'Connor
 Obhrai
 Oliver
 Pacetti
 Paradis
 Payne
 Penashue
 Poilievre
 Quach
 Rafferty
 Rathgeber
 Raynault
 Reid
 Richards
 Rickford
 Rousseau
 Sandhu
 Saxton
 Schellenberger
 Sellah
 Shea
 Shory
 Sims (Newton—North Delta)
 Smith
 Sorenson
 Stanton
 Stoffer
 Strahl
 Sweet
 Tilson
 Toone
 Trost
 Trudeau
 Turmel
 Uppal
 Valeriote
 Vellacott
 Warkentin
 Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
 Weston (Saint John)
 Wilks
 Wong
 Yelich
 Young (Vancouver South)

Lamoureux
 Larose
 Laverdière
 LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
 Leef
 Lemieux
 Leung
 Lizon
 Lukiwski
 MacKay (Central Nova)
 Mai
 Martin
 Mathysen
 McCallum
 McGuinty
 McLeod
 Menzies
 Michaud
 Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)

Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
 Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
 Murray
 Nash
 Nicholson
 Nunez-Melo
 O'Neill Gordon
 Oda
 Opitz
 Papillon
 Patry
 Pécelet
 Perreault
 Preston
 Rae
 Rajotte
 Ravignat
 Regan
 Rempel
 Richardson
 Ritz
 Saganash
 Savoie
 Scarpaleggia
 Scott
 Sgro
 Shipley
 Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)

Sitsabaiesan
 Sopuck
 St-Denis
 Stewart
 Storch
 Sullivan
 Thibeault
 Toews
 Tremblay
 Trotter
 Truppe
 Tweed
 Valcourt
 Van Loan
 Wallace
 Watson

Williamson
 Woodworth
 Young (Oakville)
 Zimmer— 278

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 15 to 21 defeated.

Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Industry and Minister of State (Agriculture), CPC) moved that the bill, as amended, 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:

● (2055)

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

(Division No. 219)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler	Ambrose
Anders	Anderson
Armstrong	Ashfield
Aspin	Baird
Bateman	Benoit
Bezan	Blaney
Block	Boughen
Braid	Breitkreuz
Brown (Barrie)	Butt
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Chisu
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Daniel
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Flaherty
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goodyear	Gosal
Gourde	Harper
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Hoeppner	Holder
James	Jean
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerr
Komarnicki	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lauzon
Lebel	Leef
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Mayes	McColeman
McLeod	Menegakis
Menzies	Merrifield
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Moore (Fundy Royal)	Nicholson
Norlock	O'Connor
O'Neill Gordon	Obhrai
Oda	Oliver
Opitz	Paradis

Payne
Poilievre
Rajotte
Reid
Richards
Rickford
Saxton
Shea
Shory
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Tilson
Trost
Truppe
Uppal
Van Loan
Wallace
Watson
Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Zimmer — 149

Government Orders

Penashue
Preston
Rathgeber
Rempel
Richardson
Ritz
Schellenberger
Shipley
Smith
Sorenson
Storseth
Sweet
Toews
Trotter
Tweed
Valcourt
Vellacott
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to

Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)

NAYS

Members

Andrews
Ashton
Aubin
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevington
Blanchette-Lamothe
Borg
Brahmi
Brosseau
Caron
Cash
Chicoine
Chow
Cleary
Comartin
Cotler
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Dion
Donnelly
Dubé
Dusseault
Eyking
Fortin
Garneau
Genest
Giguère
Gravelle
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hassainia
Hughes
Jacob
Karygiannis
Lamoureux
Larose
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leslie
MacAulay
Marston
Masse
May
McGuinty
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mourani
Murray
Nash
Nunez-Melo
Papillon
Péclét
Plamondon

Allen (Welland)
Angus
Atamanenko
Ayala
Bellavance
Benskin
Blanchette
Boivin
Boutin-Sweet
Brisson
Byrne
Casey
Charlton
Chisholm
Christopherson
Coderre
Côté
Crowder
Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dewar
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Foote
Freeman
Garrison
Genest-Jourdain
Godin
Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu
Hyer
Julian
Kellway
Lapointe
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McCallum
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Pacetti
Patry
Perreault

Adjournment Proceedings

Quach	Rae
Rafferty	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Savoie
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaiesan	St-Denis
Stewart	Stoffer
Sullivan	Thibeault
Toone	Tremblay
Trudeau	Turmel
Valeriotte — 135	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

I wish to inform the House that because of the delay, there will be no private members' business this evening. 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*]

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan (Scarborough—Rouge River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last fall the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism announced, effective immediately, a moratorium on new applications to sponsor parents and grandparents to immigrate to Canada. This unfair punishment for new Canadians and Canadian permanent residents is compounded by new measures recently introduced in the punishing refugees act, also known as Bill C-31, which will place a mandatory five-year wait time for refugees to become permanent residents and apply to reunite with their families.

The last time I asked the minister about this issue, he blamed the problem of the backlog of applications on the Liberals. We continue to hear the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism claim that his department is increasing and speeding up the reunification for family members, but with this moratorium on family reunification and a five-year bar for refugees, the Conservative government is making it harder for families to stay together. The Conservative government has to take responsibility for that.

Parents and grandparents wait an average of seven years to come to Canada. One family in my riding has waited over 16 years. Now, people will have to wait an additional five years on top of an already lengthy separation. But wait, this excruciatingly long countdown for parents to see their children, and grandparents to see their grandchildren will not begin until 2014. The government will not be accepting new applications to sponsor parents and grandparents until 2014, if at all. While we know there is a substantial backlog for family class applicants, refusing to reunify families is not the way to deal with the backlog.

Working as the member of Parliament for Scarborough—Rouge River, I have spoken with many families who have been waiting

years and years to have their parents and grandparents join them here in Canada. We all know the benefits of having our parents and grandparents here with us. We understand the value of reuniting families. I am lucky enough to have had my grandparents join me here in Canada from Sri Lanka. They have added so much value to my life.

We need to address the existing inequities in the system and develop a balanced and equitable approach to dealing with the backlog. This includes raising the overall level of immigration and the number of immigrants that we accept each year to approach approximately 1% of the population.

When will the Conservative government start putting families first and help those who have waited so long to be reunited with their loved ones?

● (2100)

Mr. Rick Dykstra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC): Mr. Speaker, certainly with the response the minister gave to the member's question and the position that our government has taken on this issue, the member either has not been listening very closely or she does not respect the fact that we have taken huge strides when it comes to family reunification and, in fact, when it comes to the immigration system overall.

The member shows a lack of respect for the 30-plus hours of witness testimony which brought the issues to our attention. Bill C-31 is going to change the way the refugee system in this country works for the positive in the sense that it will do more for those who are true refugees. It will also ensure that those who are not true refugees will not clog up our system, which hurts those who truly need assistance, and has a huge impact on the Immigration and Refugee Board and the immigration system as a whole.

Specifically, the one thing the member did not respond to, and which her party said it supported, as did the third party, is how we have dealt with the issue of the family class with respect to parents and grandparents.

We implemented the super visa program late in the fall of 2011 and it can only be described as a tremendous success. In fact, the super visa does something no other visa did before. It allows parents and grandparents who would like to visit their children and grandchildren to apply for a 10-year visa to come to this country. The super visa allows parents and grandparents to come to Canada for up to two years to stay and visit with their family and assist with the upbringing of children if that is their wish.

The fact is, that program had to be implemented because there was a backlog of over 165,000 applications which started way before we formed government. In fact, it was never dealt with by the previous administration and it put us in a position of having to act.

In 2011, to work through that backlog, we increased by 60% the number of parents and grandparents who are allowed to come into this country. We implemented the super visa which has put families and parents in a position to come here faster and to stay for a period of up to two years. The only requirement is that they get their own health insurance so that when they are here, they do not put a burden on Canada's health care system.

Adjournment Proceedings

• (2105)

Ms. Rathika Sitsabaiesan: Mr. Speaker, it is sad that the parliamentary secretary thinks that refugees clog up our system when these are people who are fleeing situations of persecution or oppression from wherever they are coming. They are asylum seekers.

The parliamentary secretary needs to stop blaming the backlog on the previous Liberal government. I agree that the Liberals handled it poorly, but for the last six years, the government has not done much to make the situation any better. It has actually made it worse.

Family reunification and family support are extremely important factors for healthy and effective integration of our newer immigrants in Canada. People who have faced war, who have faced traumatic experiences beyond our imagination will no longer have access to this vital support system, and thanks to the amendments to our immigration laws, including Bill C-31, they will now be revictimized.

When will the government understand the importance of family reunification and immediately reverse the moratorium on parent and grandparent class applications within the family class?

Mr. Rick Dykstra: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat in response to the point being made by the member that we actually have a refugee system that is broken. Over 60% of the applicants are actually denied their applications to become permanent residents or to achieve asylum here.

We have a system in which more than 60% of those who apply are actually not deemed to be true refugees. Those are the people I am speaking about in terms of clogging up our system and putting us in a position of not being able to help those who are truly in need.

With respect to the family class, I have said we have a system that is broken. Having to wait eight, nine, or ten years to come to this country with the program that was in place is not acceptable. We have put in place a moratorium that will allow us to work through the backlog. The super visa program allows parents to get here to see their children and grandchildren much, much quicker.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Claude Gravelle (Nickel Belt, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I asked a question of the Minister of Natural Resources on the development of our natural resources. I said that the Conservatives are not listening to the public. I would like to expand on that.

We figure that the Conservatives' approach to natural resources management is unbalanced. We have to change that approach to natural resources to make it more profitable for Canadians. How would we do this? First, we need a made for Canada national energy strategy that prioritizes the Canadian interest. What the Conservatives are trying to do right now is export all of our oil to other countries. If we had a strategy that looked after the interests of all Canadians from coast to coast to coast, it would be profitable not only for Canadians, but also for the oil industry.

When we are exporting our oil overseas, we are also exporting jobs. For some reason, the Conservatives are more interested in creating jobs in the U.S. and China.

During some meetings of the natural resources committee, we heard expert testimony from CEP that for every 400,000 barrels of oil exported, we exported at the same time 18,000 jobs. That is a lot of jobs to export to other countries. If we want to save these jobs, we should upgrade our refineries in Canada and refine our oil right here in Canada.

At committee we often hear the Conservatives say that we have no market for Canadian oil. If we transfer the oil to China, Japan or the U.S.A., they will find a market for the oil that they refine. Saying that we do not have a market is no excuse.

If we were to have an energy strategy, we would have security throughout the country. What the Conservatives are doing right now is exporting our oil, yet on the east coast we are importing oil from unstable countries like Saudi Arabia. What is wrong with shipping oil from western Canada to eastern Canada where it could heat Canadian homes?

• (2110)

Mr. David Anderson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am actually very encouraged to hear the member opposite say that he supports the reversal of the line to eastern Canada because I am not sure that is his party's position.

The NDP's Canada energy strategy, as near as I can tell, would mean sitting in the dark eating veggies and we are not prepared to do that just yet.

I will begin by talking about the refining sector, which he mentioned. We are proud of Canada's refining sector. Through responsible and market-based policies, which are foreign to the NDP, we refine more oil than can be used in Canada. He did not mention that. We refine more crude oil than we can consume, with exports of refined petroleum products to the United States of over 400,000 barrels per day. That makes us a major player in the United States.

It is disappointing that my colleague opposite, from what is rapidly becoming known as the no development party, did not learn anything from our committee's study of refining capacity in Canada. Perhaps he should go back and read the report. In the meantime, I will take a couple of minutes to remind him of some of the testimony.

We heard that Canadian refineries face some economic challenges. They are operating at an 80% to 84% utilization rate when, to be fully profitable, they need to be at over 90%. Building more refineries when the current refineries are not even operating at full capacity is just the type of economics the NDP is famous for.

North America's demand for gasoline is actually declining. He did not mention that either. He also did not mention that refining is a capital-intensive business. The cost of building a new refinery is \$5 billion to \$10 billion, with a 40 year return on investment.

We believe the decisions about increasing refining capacity is a private-sector decision.

Adjournment Proceedings

What I would like the member opposite to explain is the NDP's contradiction on subsidies to oil companies. It says on one hand that it is opposed to all subsidies but on the other hand it wants more refineries built.

The private sector has told us that it is not building more refineries. So I guess, as the member opposite knows, the only other way to do that is through massive subsidization. It may come as a shock to him but the refineries to this point have been owned by the oil companies. Is he suggesting that the government and the taxpayers should be building and owning new refineries in Canada?

Does the member want to subsidize refineries or not? He says, yes. That is interesting. I think Canadians would be interested in hearing that he wants them to buy into an industry that is already overcapacity in this country. As I have seen in my home province of Saskatchewan, that is how NDP economics work and, in the end, they do not work well for the people.

We have heard at committee that pipelines are the safest and most efficient means of transporting large quantities of crude oil and natural gas over land. I would not be surprised if my colleague opposite is ignoring that testimony as well because he was one of the NDP members who travelled to Washington, to our largest trading partner, to try to get it to reject Canadian oil and the Canadian pipeline.

The NDP takes the puzzling position of supporting job creation by opposing all job creating projects in our natural resources sector. Our government is taking a different approach.

I have tried to find a job creating project that the NDP actually supports but I have not been able to do so.

Every time the member opposite and members in his party stand in the House, it is to rant against the economic opportunities that are creating hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions in economic growth across this country. They criticize everything. They praise nothing.

Mr. Claude Gravelle: Mr. Speaker, I think the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources has been here too long because he certainly did not understand what I said.

I said that we wanted to develop natural resources in Canada. What would that do? It would upgrade our refineries. We never said anything about building new refineries. We said that we wanted to upgrade refineries. What happens when we upgrade refineries? We create jobs.

Why are the Conservatives killing jobs by exporting our crude oil?

We need to upgrade our refineries. In his province of Alberta, we could upgrade the refineries and create thousands of jobs, instead of building pipelines where the jobs for building a pipeline last two years. If we were to build refineries, we could create long-lasting, good paying Alberta jobs.

• (2115)

Mr. David Anderson: It is a tragedy, Mr. Speaker, but I am actually from Saskatchewan where the refineries have just been upgraded, which is good news for the member opposite.

First, the NDP wants to build refineries when the current refineries are not even fully utilized due to lack of demand. That is the type of make-work voodoo economics that the NDP is famous for.

Second, it wants to massively subsidize more refineries owned by oil companies, or perhaps the government, when it opposes all subsidies, supposedly, to oil companies.

Third, it wants to build refineries but it opposes all pipelines. Pipelines are required to transport the oil. I guess that means that we will refine the oil and then what? Let it sit at the refinery?

Fourth, while the resource sector employs hundreds of thousands of Canadians, the NDP seems to also believe that these jobs are a disease. While the NDP has said that it supports some energy projects, we cannot find one that it actually supports.

It is time for the no development party to stop its baseless criticism of Canada's resource sector.

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT

Ms. Éline Michaud (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in this House once again to address the problematic Neuville airport file, because the Minister of Transport continues to ignore it and has tried to sweep it under the carpet from the outset.

Since the very beginning of the project, the constituents have been opposed to the airport being built. They are deeply worried about losing their quality of life and about the deterioration of their health and that of their children.

I am now going to explain the file more clearly to the hon. members opposite, who do not seem concerned in the slightest. The runway in Neuville is approximately 200 feet from houses where people live. So planes would fly over the houses of people who have lived there for years. Those people were there long before the promoters came. There are also other residences in the area.

Even though he has never set foot there, the Minister says that Canadians' safety is not at stake, that everything is fine and dandy, that everything is safe. This shows that he clearly does not know what he is talking about.

Speaking of ignorance, I would also like to remind the Minister of Transport that the municipal council and the constituents have been against the airport project right from the outset.

The minister constantly hides behind the memorandum of understanding to justify his failure to take action on this issue. The memorandum was signed between the city and the developers to protect the citizens, and that is what the Minister of Transport is refusing to do right now.

Adjournment Proceedings

The sole purpose of the memorandum of understanding that we have been hearing so much about is to regulate operations that will take place at the airport in order to minimize the negative consequences of increased air traffic over the town. The parties came up with this solution because the government had nothing to offer.

If the Minister of Transport had taken the time to sit down and talk to Bernard Gaudreau, the mayor of Neuville, as it happens—I wanted to mention that to give the minister some context—he would know that the memorandum does not mean the city has agreed to the project. It is a last resort in response to the government's lack of support.

The root of the problem is the fact that, under the current Aeronautics Act, private developers who want to build an airport can do so wherever in Canada they want to, as long as they obey basic safety rules established by Transport Canada. Developers do not even have to notify anyone of the existence of their runway on the land. They do not have to register their airport if they do not want to. Verifications will not necessarily be done. This poses a problem, because municipalities have no way of becoming involved in the process in order to have their say and be consulted.

The provinces and municipalities have their own areas of jurisdiction that are guaranteed by the Constitution, including, for instance, land use, municipal planning and the protection of agricultural land. These jurisdictions are not being respected in the context of the Aeronautics Act.

On the one hand, the federal government refuses to take full responsibility in its exclusive jurisdiction and, on the other hand, it also refuses to allow the provinces and municipalities to legislate in their own areas of jurisdiction.

The airport problem is a direct result of the legislative gap that exists in the Aeronautics Act. This situation needs to be rectified because it could affect every Canadian municipality.

Moreover, I think that the minister was wrong to claim today that the Neuville file is settled. Section 4.9 of the Aeronautics Act stipulates, among other things, that the minister has the authority to legislate concerning the location and operation of airports.

With all this information, how can the minister still justify his inaction? How can he categorically refuse to meet with the mayor of Neuville?

When the Minister of Transport was a reeve and a mayor, I strongly doubt that he tolerated the same degree of intransigence and contempt on the part of the sitting Minister of Transport. So why is the minister refusing to act to preserve the quality of life of the residents of Neuville?

• (2120)

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities and for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by stating that the role of Transport Canada is to promote the establishment of a safe, secure, effective and environmentally friendly transportation network in Canada. I am aware that a request for an injunction to halt activities

at the airport was filed in the Superior Court of Quebec, and the minister's officials are keeping a close eye on the situation.

Although the placement of airports is exclusively a federal area of jurisdiction, Transport Canada is encouraging stakeholders in the aeronautics community to respect relevant and applicable provincial and municipal regulations, and to listen to the public in order to promote aeronautical activities that are respectful of the community.

In this particular case, the site chosen by the developer is outside a residential area. The minister's policy in this regard is therefore to encourage the management and resolution of potential conflicts at the local level by the parties concerned—that is, issues that are likely to affect the whole municipality when an airport project is on the drawing board.

The minister is in favour of solutions that strike a balance between the development of the aviation sector and disturbances that may be caused by aeronautical activities. Transport Canada is going to great lengths within the scope of its mandate, and in collaboration with community and industry partners, to mitigate impacts on the public.

Moreover, the memorandum of understanding signed by the City of Neuville and the developer of the Neuville airport, formally demonstrates the intention of the parties concerned to collaborate harmoniously. The restrictions on airport operating hours contained in the memorandum are concrete evidence that there is a willingness on both sides to work together in a harmonious fashion, and we hope that there will be an effort made, in this spirit, to look for solutions.

A liaison committee will also be struck in order to promote and maintain this spirit of collaboration between the airport and the residents of the community. This is a further indication of the willingness of the parties concerned to work together to find a common and appropriate solution, and I salute this initiative.

Ms. Éloïse Michaud: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member did not hear anything I said or did not listen; we will need to see what choice he has made. I repeat: the airport is built in an inhabited area. There are houses and the flight path passes directly above those houses. The people were there long before the airport was built. It is not because it is a rural area that is not inhabited. The houses are simply farther apart.

The parliamentary secretary tells me that they want to find a solution that respects the community, but what is going on in Neuville right now does not respect the community or what it wants. The municipal council was against the airport, and the citizens have spoken out against it many times. So, how can we provide a balance in this entire situation if the minister refuses to even talk to the mayor? He is refusing to speak to the people who are experiencing the negative consequences of the airport directly. I live in Neuville and I hear the airplanes flying over the city.

Of course, a memorandum of understanding exists, and its clauses specify that air traffic should be reduced to a minimum over the city. But when I was there last week, I heard at least 30 airplanes. So how is the memorandum of understanding satisfactory? Why is the department not getting involved in this situation, which is not regulated by the existing legislation?

Adjournment Proceedings

• (2125)

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, the hon. member mentioned wanting to change the law to give the municipalities the power to refuse to permit an airport. That might be popular in an isolated case.

It is also true that all Canadians want airports to be in another municipality. If we allow every municipality to refuse to permit an airport or an airfield, there would not be any in the country. What the hon. member is proposing will never happen, regardless of the government or its political stripes.

I suggest that she work with the municipalities, the other partners and the government in order to find a solution that suits the local

population and our national aviation system, a system that is necessary and essential.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 81(4) the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been withdrawn. The House will now resolve itself into committee of the whole for the purpose of considering all votes under Environment in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2013.

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

[For continuation of proceedings see part B]

Benjamin Alan Russell	
Ms. Findlay.....	8103
Iran	
Mr. Hiebert.....	8103
Sagkeeng's Finest	
Ms. Ashton.....	8103
Automotive Industry	
Mr. Adler.....	8104
Food Shortages	
Ms. Charlton.....	8104
Maternal and Child Health	
Ms. Bateman.....	8104
Palliative Care	
Mr. Scarpaleggia.....	8104
Budget Implementation Legislation	
Mr. Payne.....	8105
Employment	
Mrs. Day.....	8105
New Democratic Party of Canada	
Mrs. O'Neill Gordon.....	8105

ORAL QUESTIONS

Pensions	
Mr. Mulcair.....	8105
Mr. Harper.....	8105
Mr. Mulcair.....	8105
Mr. Harper.....	8106
Employment	
Mr. Mulcair.....	8106
Mr. Harper.....	8106
Mr. Mulcair.....	8106
Mr. Harper.....	8106
Mr. Mulcair.....	8106
Mr. Harper.....	8106
The Budget	
Mr. Rae.....	8107
Mr. Harper.....	8107
Mr. Rae.....	8107
Mr. Harper.....	8107
National Defence	
Mr. Rae.....	8107
Mr. Harper.....	8107
Pensions	
Ms. Nash.....	8107
Ms. Finley.....	8107
Ms. Nash.....	8107
Ms. Finley.....	8107
The Environment	
Ms. Leslie.....	8108
Mr. Kent.....	8108
Ms. Leslie.....	8108
Mr. Kent.....	8108

National Defence	
Mr. Kellway.....	8108
Mr. Fantino.....	8108
Ms. Laverdière.....	8108
Mr. Fantino.....	8108
Afghanistan	
Ms. Laverdière.....	8108
Mr. Baird.....	8109
Mr. Harris (St. John's East).....	8109
Mr. Baird.....	8109
Mr. Harris (St. John's East).....	8109
Mr. Baird.....	8109
Employment Insurance	
Mr. Cuzner.....	8109
Ms. Finley.....	8109
Ms. Foote.....	8109
Ms. Finley.....	8109
Mr. Easter.....	8109
Ms. Finley.....	8110
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Chicoine.....	8110
Mr. Blaney.....	8110
Mr. Stoffer.....	8110
Mr. Blaney.....	8110
Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Nantel.....	8110
Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam).....	8110
Mr. Cash.....	8110
Mr. Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam).....	8110
Justice	
Ms. Doré Lefebvre.....	8110
Mr. Nicholson.....	8111
Ms. Doré Lefebvre.....	8111
Mr. Nicholson.....	8111
Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. Allen (Welland).....	8111
Mr. Ritz.....	8111
Mr. Allen (Welland).....	8111
Mr. Ritz.....	8111
Housing	
Mr. Trudeau.....	8111
Ms. Finley.....	8112
Fisheries and Oceans	
Ms. Murray.....	8112
Mr. Ashfield.....	8112
Aboriginal Affairs	
Ms. Crowder.....	8112
Mr. Duncan (Vancouver Island North).....	8112
Ms. Crowder.....	8112
Mr. Duncan (Vancouver Island North).....	8112
Post-Secondary Education	
Ms. Young (Vancouver South).....	8112
Ms. Finley.....	8112

Firearms Registry	
Mr. Scarpaleggia	8113
Ms. Hoepfner	8113
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Rafferty	8113
Mr. Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	8113
Natural Resources	
Mr. Galipeau	8113
Mr. Oliver	8113
Air Transportation	
Ms. Michaud	8113
Mr. Lebel	8113
Housing	
Mrs. Mourani	8114
Ms. Finley	8114

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Copyright Modernization Act	
Bill C-11. Report stage	8114
Ms. Boivin	8114
Mr. Cash	8115
Ms. Boutin-Sweet	8115
Mr. Moore (Fundy Royal)	8115
Ms. Davies (Vancouver East)	8117
Mr. Lamoureux	8117
Ms. Freeman	8117
Mr. Carrie	8119
Mr. LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	8119
Mr. Carrie	8119
Ms. Boivin	8121
Mr. Lamoureux	8121
Mr. Del Mastro	8121
Mr. Blanchette	8123
Mr. Lamoureux	8123
Mr. Blanchette	8123
Ms. Boutin-Sweet	8125
Mr. Tremblay	8125
Mr. Cannan	8125
Mr. Easter	8126

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Act to Authorize Industrial Alliance Pacific Insurance and Financial Services Inc. to Continue as a Body Corporate	
(Bill S-1003. On the order: Private Members' Business:)	8127
Ms. LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	8127
Motion	8127
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee of the whole, reported without amendment, concurred in, read the third time and passed)	8127

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Copyright Modernization Act	
Bill C-11. Report stage	8127
Ms. Leslie	8127

Mr. Cannan	8127
Mr. Lapointe	8128
Mr. Tremblay	8129
Ms. Davies (Vancouver East)	8129
Mr. Blanchette	8129
Ms. Bateman	8129
Ms. Davies (Vancouver East)	8131
Mr. Tremblay	8131
Ms. May	8131
Ms. Davies (Vancouver East)	8132
Ms. May	8133
Mr. Lamoureux	8133
Business of Supply	
Mr. Van Loan	8133
Copyright Modernization Act	
Bill C-11. Report stage	8133
Mr. Braid	8134
Mr. Blanchette	8135
Mr. Lamoureux	8135
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	8135
Division on Motion No. 2 deferred	8136
Division on Motion No. 3 deferred	8136
Division on Motion No. 6 deferred	8136
Division on Motion No. 7 deferred	8136
Division on Motion No. 22 deferred	8136
Division on Motion No. 23 deferred	8136
Ms. May	8137
Motions Nos. 4, 5 and 9 to 21	8137
Division on Motion No. 4 deferred	8138
Division on Motion No. 5 deferred	8138
Division on Motion No. 9 deferred	8138
Division on Motion No. 10 deferred	8138
Division on Motion No. 11 deferred	8138
Division on Motion No. 12 deferred	8139
Division on Motion No. 13 deferred	8139
Division on Motion No. 14 deferred	8139
Division on Motion No. 15 deferred	8139
Division on Motion No. 16 deferred	8139
Division on Motion No. 17 deferred	8139
Division on Motion No. 18 deferred	8140
Division on Motion No. 19 deferred	8140
Division on Motion No. 20 deferred	8140
Division on Motion No. 21 deferred	8140
Motion No. 1 negatived	8141
Motion No. 2 negatived	8142
Motion No. 3 negatived	8143
Motion No. 6 negatived	8144
Motion No. 7 negatived	8145
Motion No. 22 negatived	8146
Motion No. 23 negatived	8147
Motion No. 4 negatived	8148
Motion No. 5 negatived	8149
Motion No. 9 negatived	8150
Motion No. 10 negatived	8151
Motion No. 11 negatived	8152
Motion No. 12 negatived	8153
Motion No. 13 negatived	8155

Motion No. 14 negatived	8156
Motions Nos. 15 to 21 negatived.....	8162
Mr. Paradis	8162
Motion for concurrence.....	8162
Motion agreed to	8164

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Citizenship and Immigration

Ms. Sitsabaiesan.....	8164
-----------------------	------

Mr. Dykstra.....	8164
------------------	------

Natural Resources

Mr. Gravelle.....	8165
Mr. Anderson.....	8165

Transport

Ms. Michaud	8166
Mr. Poilievre.....	8167

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and
Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

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.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les
Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

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



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 146 • NUMBER 124 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, May 15, 2012
(Part B)

—

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, May 15, 2012

[Continuation of proceedings from part A]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ENVIRONMENT—MAIN ESTIMATES, 2012-13

(Consideration in committee of the whole of all votes under Environment in the main estimates, Ms. Denise Savoie in the chair)

The Chair: I will put out a few rules around tonight's debate.

[Translation]

Tonight's debate is a general one on all of the votes under Environment. The first round will begin with the usual rotation, with the official opposition followed by the government and the Liberal Party. After that, we will follow the usual proportional rotation

[English]

Each member will be allocated 15 minutes at a time, which may be used both for a debate and for posing questions. Should members wish to use this time to make a speech, it can last a maximum of 10 minutes, leaving at least 5 minutes for questions to the minister.

When a member is recognized, he or she should indicate to the Chair how the 15 minute period will be used. Members should also note that they will need the unanimous consent of the committee if they wish to split their time with another member. Members need not be in their own seats to be recognized.

• (2130)

[Translation]

When the time is to be used for questions and answers, the Chair will expect that the minister's response will reflect approximately the time taken by the question, since this time will be counted in the time originally allotted to the member.

[English]

I also wish to indicate that in committee of the whole, all remarks should be addressed through the Chair, and I ask for everyone's co-operation in upholding the standards of parliamentary language and behaviour.

[Translation]

At the conclusion of tonight's debate, the committee will rise, the estimates under Environment will be deemed reported and the House will adjourn immediately until tomorrow.

[English]

We will now begin tonight's session of the House in committee of the whole pursuant to Standing Order 81(4)(a), the second appointed day, consideration in committee of the whole of all votes under Environment in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2013.

The hon. member for Halifax.

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Madam Chair, I will use my allotted time right now to jump right into things and start with questions. I have a number of questions for the minister concerning Rio Plus 20. They will be short questions and I look for some straightforward answers.

As we know Rio Plus 20 is coming up in June, will the minister attend?

Hon. Peter Kent (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Madam Chair, yes. I will attend with a delegation of representatives from the federal government, with representatives of business and industry and with representatives of the provinces and territories.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, will the minister include the opposition in his official delegation?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, the answer is simple and it is short, no.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, will the minister extend government accreditation for members of Parliament from the opposition?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, as I did at the United Nations framework convention on climate change in Durban, we will assist in the accreditation of opposition members, but they will not be an official part of the Canadian delegation.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, what is the budget for the delegation?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, it is premature to set a precise figure on the budget as we are still deciding on the numbers involved and the eventual size of the federal delegation.

The provinces and territories and industry will pay their own expenses. In the fullness of time, I will be glad to share that number with my colleague.

Business of Supply

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, the minister has alluded to my next question. How many representatives will we be sending? Also, what departments will be represented in the Canadian delegation?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I can tell my hon. colleague that those numbers and that representation is still under consideration.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, does the minister have the answer now to what the budget is for the delegation?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I thought I was quite clear about that. That will be determined as we determine the shape of the delegation and the timing of the attendance in Rio. I will be glad to share those figures with my colleague and with the official opposition in the fullness of time.

● (2135)

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, could the minister give us a rough ballpark of what the budget will be for the delegation? Surely he has a lot of resources at his fingertips, and I am sure that there must at least be an estimate.

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I have abundant resources at my fingertips, but many attending delegations are still in the same situation that we in Canada face.

There are last minute determinations of exactly what panels will be necessary to attend. The size of our delegation could vary by as much as 50%.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, would the minister clarify about accreditation to opposition members of Parliament? When it came to Durban, that courtesy was not extended to the opposition.

Would he clarify that he will assist members of Parliament from opposition parties who wish to attend.

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, to clarify for my colleague, while members of the opposition were not the members of the Canadian delegation, we did assist two members of the opposition, who decided to attend, to get their accreditation. One of them, in fact, my colleague's counterpart who attended on her behalf, made her application very late in the game. Our delegation enabled her last minute accreditation.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, I will take that as a yes.

Has the government consulted Canadians as to its official position at Rio Plus 20 and if it has, could the minister please tell us who it has consulted with?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, we have consulted widely with our provincial and territorial counterparts. We have consulted with industry and a variety of public policy boards. I have consulted with first nations.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, I would like to switch gears and ask a few questions about the Kyoto protocol.

When the government made its decision to withdraw from the protocol, the government and the minister stated that it was designed to save Canada \$14 billion in penalties. Was an economic analysis done to come up with this number?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, my colleague should know that because of the extremely volatile nature of the international carbon market, that price is not fixed in time. It is a price which relates to a particular moment when the market was at that value.

I can assure the member that this government, by not embracing the Kyoto protocol, probably the biggest mistake the third party made during its term in government, did save Canadian taxpayers billions of dollars in funds sent offshore.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, billions of dollars is different from what the minister quoted. He quoted \$14 billion. Did the minister do an analysis to come up with this number?

Hon. Peter Kent: Yes, Madam Chair. That figure was the result of an analysis which represented a certain value at a point in time. However, that market is exceptionally volatile and rises and falls on the whims of the market.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, if it was the result of an analysis, then precisely what would the \$14 billion would be spent on?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, that \$14 billion of hard-earned Canadian tax dollars would be spent out of the country to buy hot air credits from depressed eastern European economies. It would do nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Canada.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, if this is the result of an analysis, then I would ask the minister to table that analysis in the House. Is he able to table that analysis?

● (2140)

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I will take that request and I will provide that backup. That is not part of budget 2012, or our jobs, growth and prosperity act or the responsible resource development legislation that I assume we are here to talk about tonight.

I can provide that information to my colleague in the fullness of time.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, by how much did the government calculate that it would miss its Kyoto target?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, from the moment our government assumed power in 2006, we made it quite clear that we would not embrace Kyoto, that we would abide by the reporting requirements of Kyoto. We embarked on a mission to achieve a global climate change initiative, which would include all major emitters. We are doing that through our compliance with Copenhagen.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, the Commissioner on Environment and Sustainable Development said last week that he believed Canada would miss its target of 17% below 2005 levels and furthermore that the government had no plan to reach it.

Has the government done an economic analysis on the cost of reaching this weak target?

Business of Supply

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, as I have informed the House a number of times in the weeks since the environment commissioner tabled his report, his points of reference were almost a year out of date and did not take into account our latest report just a month ago with regard to the 2009-10 greenhouse gas inventory reports that showed a significant decrease.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, that was not my question. My question was, has the government done a costing of reaching its target?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, as I explained in answer to the comment from the environment commissioner, it is premature to offer total costing of our sector-by-sector regulation process, simply because we are only partway through that process. We are engaged in consultations that will determine what many of those costs will eventually be.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, will the minister then confirm that the government has not done a costing of what it will cost to reach its target?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, as I have explained, we are in a sector-by-sector regulatory process. We addressed transportation, which accounts for almost one-quarter of our annual greenhouse gas emissions, with regulation of cars and light trucks, and now most recently, heavy trucks. I am about to bring final regulations down for the coal-fired electricity sector. We are in consultations with oil and gas and we will continue around that sector wheel.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, on that, when the Canadian Electricity Association first suggested a capital stock turnover approach to tackling coal, it suggested a 40-year end of life. Environment Canada has given it 45 years in the *Gazette*, yet we have seen reported in several news outlets that some coal producers are seeking a further weakening to 50 years. Does the minister deny the reports of the 50-year end of life?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, it would be completely improper for me to comment on this. We are about to publish *Canada Gazette* part II final regulations. The regulations will be market-moving data, and I would ask my hon. colleague to be patient for just a few more weeks.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, the government has said 45 years. Does this mean that the minister cannot deny that a 50-year goal is being considered?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, again I would correct my hon. colleague. What she is quoting are the draft regulations in *Canada Gazette* part I from almost a year ago. Since then, we have engaged in energetic consultation with industry and the provinces—

The Chair: Order, please. The hon. member for Halifax.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, let us go back to Kyoto. Has the government done an economic analysis of the impacts of climate change on the Canadian economy?

• (2145)

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, yes, and there are any number of papers that have been done over the years by government bodies, by scientists within Environment Canada and by other public policy organizations. Those results are estimates, but they have been addressed by our policies, both with regard to mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and other emissions, as well as adaptation.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, will the minister please give us the latest figures for the latest economic analysis that his government has done on the impacts of climate change on the economy?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, there are not any short dollar figures that one can pull out of the air. We know that eventually we are looking at billions of dollars of impact as a result of climate change. The permafrost melt in the north alone is undermining highways, railroads, ports, commercial and governmental structures and all of these things. We know that there are some very real costs, some very significant costs, and we are addressing them.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Madam Chair, would the minister agree that he is unable to table with us a budget for Rio, an economic analysis on the \$14 billion for Kyoto, or the economic impacts of climate change in Canada? He cannot table any of these?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, my answer to those three simplistic questions would be “no”.

The Chair: Resuming debate, the hon. Minister of the Environment.

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I am pleased to be here this evening to discuss with the committee of the whole this important budget and our commitment to environmental excellence in Canada.

[*Translation*]

I am accompanied this evening by my deputy minister, Paul Boothe, the chief executive officer of Parks Canada, Alan Latourelle, and the president of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Elaine Feldman.

[*English*]

Recently I marked my one-year anniversary as Canada's environment minister. I must say that the past year and a half has been challenging, but it has been very rewarding.

As we look forward to the next year, our government is keenly focused on ensuring that our natural resources are developed in an environmental and sustainable manner while maximizing economic growth, competitiveness and the creation of good long-term jobs for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

As we all know, one of the main duties of Environment Canada is to develop, implement, monitor and enforce science-based environmental standards and regulations across Canada.

Business of Supply

This year, we are focusing on simplifying and increasing the efficiency and transparency of our regulatory processes to make them more effective. The department is strongly committed to growing as a world-class regulatory organization, and it will continue to improve its track record of regulatory excellence.

[English]

My department has made steady progress in a number of key areas. Working in partnership with Alberta, I announced on February 3 an historic plan for implementing a world-class, comprehensive and transparent environmental monitoring plan in the oil sands. This plan will deliver rigorous scientific data to ensure that the oil sands are developed in an environmentally sustainable manner. My department will monitor water, air and biodiversity, and it will be among the most transparent and most accountable systems of its kind in the world.

Monitoring will be carried out in more places, more frequently, for more substances. For example, by 2015 we will add up to 22 new water sites, 11 new air sites, and over 37 new biodiversity sites. The dedicated scientists in my department have already begun collecting crucial measurements during the spring melt and the ice breakup. Throughout this process, we have been engaging industry, independent scientists, aboriginal peoples and other stakeholders.

Canada is making significant progress in reducing Canada's total greenhouse gas emissions by 17% below 2005 levels by 2020 through a sector-by-sector plan. In fact, federal measures, combined with actions taken by provinces, brought us one-quarter of the way toward our 2020 target a year ago, and we have made significant progress since then. Emissions have declined in almost all sectors, including oil and gas and electricity generation, since 2005. Between 2009 and 2010, our emissions remained virtually steady, despite economic growth of 3.2%.

More progress on reducing our greenhouse gas emissions is forthcoming, following on publication of our final cold-fired electricity regulations in coming weeks and the proposed heavy duty vehicle regulations I recently announced.

All of these proposed regulations will help enhance Canada's position as a world leader in clean energy, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality for all Canadians.

We are now moving forward to develop regulated performance standards for other major emitting industrial sectors. We have already initiated an engagement process with the oil and gas sector and the provinces to enable ongoing consultation on regulatory development. We plan a similar engagement as we move forward to develop regulations for other emissions in intensive industrial sectors.

My department will also continue its efforts to improve air quality by working with provinces, industry and non-governmental organizations to implement the air quality management system. This system is a comprehensive consensus-based approach to reducing air pollutant emissions and improving air quality across Canada, eventually in partnership with the U.S. along the lines of the acid rain treaty.

• (2150)

Furthermore, under the next phase of Canada's chemicals management plan, our department is working with partners to assess and regulate a multitude of chemicals used in thousands of industrial and consumer products.

As part of the action plan for clean water, in 2011 the Government of Canada invested almost \$3 million for the cleanup of Lake Simcoe and almost \$400,000 for nine new community projects to clean up Lake Winnipeg. Negotiations with the United States to modernize the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement have been successful. The process to amend the agreement is nearing completion.

Significant resources were invested in the Great Lakes for the cleanup of contaminated sites, reduction of harmful algae blooms, waste water infrastructure and science and research.

We are also taking action to protect and conserve Canada's rich and abundant biodiversity. Under our new Plan Saint-Laurent, we are working with Quebec to ensure water quality, to protect ecologically sensitive areas and to conserve the incredible biodiversity of that mighty river. In that regard, the Canada-Quebec agreement on the St. Lawrence was signed and announced in Montreal last November. This new agreement sets out the St. Lawrence action plan up to 2026.

Under budget 2012, \$50 million over two years is being provided to support updated application of the Species at Risk Act. This money will support improvements to the program that respond to submissions made during and after the parliamentary review of the act in 2009 and 2010. These changes will deliver greater conservation benefits, reduce the need for direct federal intervention and provide greater certainty for partners.

On the international stage, Canada has played a significant role in advancing work toward a new international climate agreement for the future. The Durban platform for enhanced action took an important step forward by setting out a negotiating mandate for all countries to develop a single new international treaty to include all major emitters to be implemented by 2020. This has been a long-standing objective of our government.

We have invested and continue to invest \$1.2 billion in fast-start financing to help developing countries address global climate change. Canada is also working with international partners to reduce short-lived climate pollutants such as black carbon and methane.

There has been much talk—and great exaggeration, misrepresentation and few factual references—about the changes to environmental assessments under the responsible resource development initiative. My colleagues will speak to this matter in detail later in the debate, but let me just say that our government takes environmental protection very seriously. We are amending outdated and inefficient elements of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act in order to modernize the environmental assessment processes and strengthen enforcement provisions.

For the first time, for example, federal inspectors will have authority to examine whether conditions in an environmental assessment decision statement are actually met. When passed, Bill C-38 would allow for monetary penalties that range from \$100,000 to \$400,000 for non-compliance. These are real penalties meant to ensure compliance and to safeguard Canadians. They complement the much greater stiffening of regulations under CEPA a year ago.

Environment Canada has also focused its resources to address areas of highest concern to Canadians, such as severe weather. I announced investments to strengthen weather monitoring infrastructure, ensuring Canadians continued access to world-class weather, water and climate monitoring data, and we will continue to provide Canadians with a comprehensive national weather, water and climate monitoring system.

I must say that I am very proud of the accomplishments and dedication of this government vis-à-vis the environment. We are serving Canadians every day and protecting Canada for years to come. Our government's economic action plan is creating jobs and growth for Canadians now and in the future.

In conclusion, I take this opportunity to thank members present on both sides of the House for their interest in the work of my department and I welcome their questions throughout the evening.

● (2155)

Hon. Julian Fantino (Associate Minister of National Defence, CPC): Madam Chair, as you will know, the war of 1812-1814 was a defining moment in Canadian history and contributed a sense of pride and identity to the growing national consciousness. The memory of the struggle and the heroic sacrifices made in defence of the country would help lay the foundation for Confederation in 1867 and for the development of Canada as we know it today.

Through the collective efforts of a diverse population of anglophone, francophone and aboriginal peoples of Canada, together with military forces from Great Britain, successive American invasions of Canada were turned back.

As proud as I am of today's men and women who serve in the Canadian Forces, I am equally proud of those who have gone before us.

Could the minister please outline for the House and for all Canadians some of the special events that Parks Canada is involved in that will mark this historic anniversary?

Hon. Peter Kent: It is an excellent question, Madam Chair, and I thank my colleague from the neighbouring riding of Vaughan.

Let me assure the House and all Canadians that knowledgeable Parks Canada staff will captivate all ages and interests with

Business of Supply

fascinating stories, an authentic sense of place and interactive and experimental programs that I believe will ignite the imagination and engage the senses.

In many cases, partnerships with local aboriginal peoples will bring representatives of these groups into events and programs to tell their own stories first-hand.

Through Canada's economic action plan, Parks Canada has invested more than \$16 million at many of our War of 1812 national historic sites. As a result, we have made improvements to visitor infrastructure, updated our exhibits and rehabilitated our historic resources.

Now, thanks to a \$9.4 million share of the government's 1812 commemoration fund, Parks Canada is rolling out programming under all three pillars of the commemoration. There will be a television docudrama series. There will be a graphic novel and web based initiatives, including social media and other news media, all appealing to young Canadians.

The 200th anniversary will also be widely commemorated in the United States. This activity will include binational awareness through the celebration period.

Hon. Julian Fantino: Madam Chair, as a former police officer, I am especially interested in questions of enforcement.

Could the minister please inform the House about the importance of the role played by Canada's officers who enforce our environmental legislation?

● (2200)

Hon. Peter Kent: Again, this is a particularly relevant question from my colleague, Madam Chair, and I am proud to say that this government has a strong record of investing in environmental enforcement and achieving results. Our government has made significant investments in enforcement. The government permanently increased resources to enforcement by \$21 million annually to ensure we have the officers, the equipment, the forensic science and the tools to do the job.

Today there are 50% more enforcement officers than there were just five years ago. They are stationed in offices across the country. They are working in the field to detect and take action against those who violate our environmental legislation.

Every day, these dedicated men and women gather intelligence, they conduct inspections and they build investigations against polluters, poachers and smugglers. The goal of officers is to stop environmental crime and, where possible, to bring offenders back into compliance. They have a range of tools to help them do so.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Madam Chair, the repeal of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act would affect regulatory decision-making and the risk of project-specific and cumulative environmental impacts.

Business of Supply

Could the minister tell us what analysis has been undertaken to assess the costs of liabilities that would arise under the new assessment process, how they compare to the costs of liabilities under the old assessment process and whether he will table said analysis?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I will correct my hon. colleague. What we are doing is strengthening and contemporizing the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. It is an act that our government has been reviewing for some time now. Legislative changes with regard to CEAA were brought into effect in June 2010. They have worked.

What we have in the legislation before the House now, in Bill C-38, is to improve on those original fixes to strengthen environmental protection while at the same time eliminating duplication and providing firm and efficient timelines.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Madam Chair, we get no answer on liabilities. I have asked very specifically about the liabilities, how they compare and whether he will be tabling that.

Last week Environment Canada released its report on plans and priorities, signed by the minister. I will quote from the report:

Skills: Due to transition alignment challenges, the Department risks being unable to stay current with advances in science and technology. ...knowledge required to support programs and internal services could pose difficulties.

Environment Canada is a science-based department. The above passage suggests the government is doing Environment Canada serious damage.

The minister has previously misled Canadians by saying there would be no compromise of programs. Given the recognition that there is a problem at Environment Canada, what new funds has the environment minister specifically allocated to bring his department up to date with advances in science and technology in order to protect the environment, the health and safety of Canadians and evidence-based decision-making?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, again I will correct my hon. colleague. Part of the objective of the report on plans and priorities is to outline potential risks in the year ahead. She did quote one paragraph rather accurately, but like the original news story, which she is using as the basis for her question, she does not quote the subsequent paragraphs where we outline in great detail exactly the measures we will take to mitigate those risks and strengthen and encourage the scientific vitality of my department.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Madam Chair, given that there is recognition that there is a problem at Environment Canada, I asked what new funds the minister would give to correct this.

The monitoring of atmospherically transported chemicals is required under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement between the United States and Canada. In response to the agreement, Canada and the United States formed the Integrated Atmospheric Deposition Network, or IADN.

Could the minister tell us what the cuts are to IADN in terms of personnel and money and, most important, whether the Canadian contribution to IADN will continue and if Canada will be able to maintain its commitment to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement?

• (2205)

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I would again quibble with the preamble in my colleague's question. However, with regard to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, the good news is that in the very near future we will be announcing renewal of that treaty and an updating with regard to all the areas of mutual concern between our two countries. That involves water, air and biodiversity on both sides of our shared boundary.

Again, I urge patience on my colleague for just a few short weeks until the final details of that renewed treaty will be made public.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Madam Chair, the minister is not answering my questions. I asked whether the Canadian contribution to IADN will continue and if Canada will be able to maintain its commitment to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

This past week the Environment Commissioner reported what we have known for a very long time; namely, that the government is not on track to make its 2020 emissions targets. The government has no comprehensive climate change plan. It has weakened its own greenhouse gas emissions targets by an astonishing 90%. It could only get a third of the way to reaching its very weak target, and the government has spent over \$9 billion to achieve very little for Canadian taxpayers.

When will the minister deliver the plans and regulations for the six remaining sectors and particularly for one of the most important sectors, the oil and gas industry, as the oil sands are the fastest growing source of emissions in Canada?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, again to my colleague's preamble, Canada will fulfill all its obligations under the existing Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement and I urge her to wait patiently for details on the updated agreement.

With regard to our sectoral regulatory approach to greenhouse gases, again my colleague makes no reference to the latest greenhouse gas inventory report, which we brought out a month ago. It shows that emissions are down in virtually every sector, including oil and gas, for a variety of reasons.

My colleagues on the other side often like to compare Canada to Australia. Our per capita greenhouse gas emissions today are at the lowest level since 1990 and below Australia's equivalent.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Madam Chair, the reason the greenhouse gas emissions are down is that courageous provincial leaders have taken action.

Environment Canada's measurement stations and analysis for ozone trends are a gold standard in the northern latitudes, which are highly vulnerable to stratospheric ozone depletion. Canadian observations were essential to the discovery of last year's Arctic two million square kilometre ozone hole.

Business of Supply

Will the minister specify how many of the 10 ozonesonde stations will be supported under the new budget? How many scientists will be supported for management and analysis relating to each of the networks?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, as my colleague should know through repeated answers to her questions in the House these recent months, our government has no intention of reducing ozone monitoring at our three principle Arctic ozone stations in Alert, Resolute and Eureka.

My colleague should know since she questioned our lead scientist, Dr. Karen Dodds, on this matter that there are considerations of some streamlining at the southern ozone monitoring stations, which will not compromise in any way the quality of the excellent work our scientists are doing.

• (2210)

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Madam Chair, the southern stations are Kelowna, Stony Plain, Bratt's Lake, Churchill, Egbert, Goose Bay and Yarmouth. I would like to ask the minister which ones will be streamlined.

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I put that question to Dr. Dodds recently, and those decisions have not yet been taken.

This is a continuing process. We will ensure, as I have reassured this House any number of times, that ozone monitoring in all its dimensions will continue. Canada will continue to host the World Ozone and Ultraviolet Radiation Data Centre in Montreal and provide world-class service.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Madam Chair, will the minister specify how many of the Brewer stations will be supported under the new budget?

For the record, they are Alert, Eureka, Resolute, Saturna Island, Stony Plain, Bratt's Lake, Winnipeg, Downsview, Montreal, Goose Bay and Halifax.

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, as I said, with regard to our three Arctic stations, we will continue operating there as we have. With regard to the southern stations, again it is our scientists who make those decisions, not the minister.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Madam Chair, there is still no answer since September.

What is budgeted for CORALNet lidar operations, whether at their existing locations or in support of the oil sands monitoring plan?

Several scientists are required to fully operate and analyze data from CORALNet network. How many scientists will be supported for working with CORALNet under the new plan?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, again, as I have informed my colleague a number of times in the House, LIDAR is not used in Environment Canada's ongoing air quality monitoring, but we will maintain our capacity for possible future applications. It is an important technology, but at the moment, there are no clients in Canada who wish to avail themselves of the technology. However, as I have said, we will maintain our capacity in this area.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: I will try again, Madam Chair.

How many scientists will be supported for working with CORALNet under the new plan?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, my colleague seems to have more information about a new plan which is not in the firmament.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: No answer on the number of scientists, Madam Chair.

Last week's report by the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development reinforced what we already knew. The Conservative government lacks a plan on federal contaminated sites with clear measurable expectations. In fact, the report said there was no lead agency on the file, there was a lack of standard site closure reporting system, and there was a risk that contaminated sites would not be addressed.

Parliament does not even know if it got value for its money because a performance measurement and reporting system does not exist.

With the bulk of funds going to four large project sites and the total estimated financial liability for federal contaminated sites \$500 million higher than the amount of dedicated funding that remains, how does the government plan to protect the health and safety of Canadians with the other 10,000 sites that need to be cleaned up when it does not have the money to do it?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, my hon. colleague's question is, if anything, more under-informed than the comments offered by the environment commissioner a week ago.

As I have explained, our government has invested \$3.5 billion in a federal contaminated sites program. However, the program is aimed only at the largest, the most seriously contaminated, locations.

Overall in Canada, there is a list of perhaps 22,000 contaminated sites, most of them relatively small. However, the lead agency in each of those cases is either the federal department or the agency which has the responsibility. There are 16 bodies which have the lead in this case. The federal government's lead is on only the most seriously contaminated sites. The environment commissioner did compliment us on our work to date. We have closed 42% of the major contaminated sites that we have targeted. We are halfway through a 15 year program, and we will proceed.

• (2215)

The Chair: That ends that round.

I will now go to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries.

Business of Supply

Mr. Randy Kamp (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and for the Asia-Pacific Gateway, CPC): Madam Chair, I would like to focus my comments on environmental assessment and the work of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. This, of course, is a key part of the environment portfolio and a very important part of what the federal government does. The funding being considered as part of the main estimates is necessary for the continued application of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, and preparation for the implementation of the proposals in Bill C-38 should that legislation receive royal assent.

Environmental assessment sits at a crucial intersection between the environment and the economy. Environmental assessment is a way to ensure responsible resource development. It allows the Government of Canada to assess and mitigate the environmental impacts of projects that represent billions of dollars of potential investment for Canada.

While founded upon the best of intentions, the current federal process is overly complex and dated. Accountability is spread across government, and there have been inconsistent application and delays as a result. This situation actually harms the economy. Project proponents face unnecessary costs. Investment decisions are put off. Jobs for Canadians are put on hold. The argument can be made that this actually harms the environment, too.

Limited government resources are consumed by unnecessary process steps and the need to assess small projects that pose minimal risk to the environment. There are also few enforcement provisions. The current law is based on concepts and approaches from the late 1980s. It is time to build on our record and move forward. It is time to modernize federal environmental assessment.

A responsible resource development plan sets out a path to modernization that relies on four pillars: one, making reviews more predictable and timely; two, reducing duplication; three, strengthening environmental protection; and four, enhancing consultation with aboriginal peoples. The new Canadian environmental assessment act supports all four pillars through responsible and certain timelines, better integration of federal and provincial responsibilities to avoid duplication, fair and consistent enforcement measures to ensure the environment is protected, and an explicit requirement to ensure that changes to the environment that affect aboriginal peoples are assessed and mitigated.

Environmental assessment is receiving much attention, inside and outside the House, as part of the debate on Bill C-38, the jobs, growth and long-term prosperity act. Let me take this opportunity to set the record straight on some of the myths that have unfortunately dominated this debate.

The first myth is that the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency budget has been cut by over 40%. Perhaps members have heard that. The opposite is true. At a time of fiscal restraint, the agency's capacity has been protected. Its budget is in fact increasing by 5% as a result of budget 2012. Additional funds are being provided for consultations with aboriginal peoples. Fundamentally, the provision of funding to the agency will ensure that it continues to provide Canadians with high quality environmental assessments.

The second myth permeating this debate is that environmental assessment is somehow being gutted by Bill C-38. A brief comparison between the current law and the bill is in order to explain this point. As I just noted, the government is providing additional funding to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency because we expect it to do more, not less.

For an environmental assessment to be required under the current act, there has to be a federal decision associated with the project. No decision means no environmental assessment, even though there might be serious effects on matters within federal jurisdiction. The bill proposes to address this gap. An environmental assessment may be required when there are adverse effects within federal jurisdiction and the project is on the project list or specifically designated by the minister. A federal decision about the project is not a prerequisite.

When there is a federal decision associated with the project undergoing an environmental assessment, the environmental effects of that decision will be assessed. This is a requirement today. This is a requirement in the updated act.

The current law requires follow-up programs for major projects. These follow-up programs verify if mitigation measures are protecting the environment. Unfortunately, application of this requirement has been fragmented across government. Follow-up information is not being put to the best use possible.

• (2220)

The bill proposes to fix this problem. Follow-up programs would be mandatory after all environmental assessments. The results would flow to one of three responsible authorities: the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and the National Energy Board. These bodies would use this information to help manage unanticipated environmental effects and improve the practice of environmental assessment.

A final area of comparison relates to enforcement. The current law has no enforcement provisions. This is a very significant shortcoming. As parliamentarians we expect bills to be enforced when they become law. Bill C-38 proposes to make this the case for environmental assessment through several measures.

The act would prohibit a proponent from proceeding with a project identified in regulations unless it underwent an environmental assessment or the agency decided that one is not required. At the end of an environmental assessment, proponents would have to comply with the conditions set out in a decision statement. Federal inspectors for the first time would have the authority to examine whether conditions in an environmental assessment decision statement were met. Finally, there are proposed penalties for violations that range from \$100,000 to \$400,000.

Business of Supply

Bill C-38 proposes to close gaps in what projects can be subjected to a federal environmental assessment. It would strengthen how follow-up information is managed and used. New enforcement powers would be provided. All of this adds up to a strengthening of environmental assessment in a significant way.

Now I would like to turn to the third myth. Some are saying that the government has not consulted nor heard from Canadians on how to improve environmental assessment. There has been a wealth of input from various sources under both this government and the previous government. Let me run through some of the highlights.

In 2003, the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development issued a report entitled "Beyond Bill C-9". Among other things, the standing committee recommended creating a system of environmental assessment permits. Bill C-38 proposes to do so through the enforceable environmental assessment decision statement.

The standing committee also recommended that the agency look into the use of regional environmental assessments as a means to deal with cumulative effects of multiple projects and activities. This examination of the potential of regional studies was done in cooperation with provinces and territories through a task group of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment in 2008-09. The result can be seen in proposed provisions for regional studies.

In 2004, the government appointed the external advisory committee on smart regulation. Environmental assessment was the issue that generated the most complaints from stakeholders during this study of the broader federal regulatory system.

The smart regulation committee recommended the creation of a single federal agency for environmental assessment, better integration of federal-provincial assessments, timelines and more emphasis on follow-up programs. Proposals consistent with the spirit of these recommendations are all found in Bill C-38.

In 2009, the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment also issued a discussion paper and held consultations on the issue of one project, one review. The outcome is reflected in the bill's proposal for substitution and equivalency.

These new tools allow provincial environmental assessments to substitute for, or be recognized as equivalent to, a federal review as long as the substance of requirements of the act are met.

The Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development members, many of whom are in the House tonight, reviewed the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act this past year. The majority of the committee's recommendations have found their way into the bill, including the use of a project list to avoid requiring assessments of small projects, such as a blueberry washing facility.

This project list approach includes a safety net authority for the Minister of the Environment to require the environmental assessment of a project not identified in the regulations. This power could be used in unique circumstances where a relatively routine type of project is of concern because of its proposed location, for example, in a sensitive environmental setting.

Two standing committee reports, a public consultation by federal and provincial governments and a blue ribbon committee have all contributed to the development of this important bill.

We have listened to what is being said about environmental assessment over the past decade. We are moving forward to protect the environment while promoting jobs, growth and long-term prosperity for all Canadians.

• (2225)

Madam Chair, I know the Minister of the Environment is also interested in matters relating to fisheries. In fact, we co-operate on a number of different areas and his department enforces section 36 of the Fisheries Act.

It is somewhat sad that, even with the best of intentions, we can have the best regulations but if there is no way to enforce those regulations we will not get anywhere. One of those anomalous situations is when, for example, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans issues an authorization for some work to be done and attaches conditions to that authorization and then someone does not abide by those conditions of the authorization, there is no ability in the current Fisheries Act for that to be addressed. So there have been many calls, maybe because of that and other things, to improve the current habitat enforcement provisions. The responsible resource development plan announced a number of measures to enhance compliance and enforcement and I wonder if the minister could outline some of those for us.

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission for shining some very clear light on the constructive improvements to the Fisheries Act.

The responsible resource development act seeks to modernize and strengthen environmental protection for natural resource developments in Canada. Our government made the first round of reforms to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act in budget 2010, when we started the process of providing predictable timelines for project assessments. We are continuing this process in a government-wide approach now, including assessments conducted by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, the National Energy Board and the Department of Fisheries.

At the end of these assessments, proponents will be unable to proceed unless they comply with conditions set out clearly in the assessment. As I told the House a few moments ago, failure to comply with mitigation measures can result in significant monetary penalties from \$100,000 to \$400,000. These penalties help give teeth to our already effective environmental protection regime.

Mr. Randy Kamp: Madam Chair, as I mentioned, we have worked collaboratively on responsible resource developments and the focus of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is on the protection of commercial and recreational aboriginal fisheries. I wonder if the Minister of the Environment could comment on that focus and tell us whether he agrees.

Business of Supply

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, as my colleague knows, but I think I should share with this House, there are a number of provisions that provide and enable enhanced protection. These include establishing ecologically sensitive areas, such as a critical spawning habitat for salmon or other species, and if any activities are proposed within these areas, proponents would be required to submit plans for review. As my colleague said, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans may then require higher levels of protection for such areas.

Other measures include increased fines and penalties for offences, the creation of enforceable conditions for ministerial authorizations and a duty to notify requirement that states that proponents shall report an occurrence that results in serious harm to these important fisheries.

Our government made these reforms, in 2010 with regard to improvements in the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act and we have built on those with regard to the responsible resource development legislation that is now before this House.

• (2230)

The Chair: This completes this round of questions and comments.

The hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry has the floor.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Beauharnois—Salaberry, NDP): Madam Chair, my questions will concern the cuts.

The cuts to the environment portfolio announced in budget 2012 total \$88 million in ongoing funding.

What programs will be eliminated?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I would like my hon. colleague to amplify a bit further her interest in the programs of the department.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, in fact, it would be the minister himself who could enlighten us on this matter. What we want to know has to do with the full environment portfolio: what programs are affected and how many jobs will be cut in total, given these cuts of \$88 million in ongoing funding.

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, we are focusing on the essential services of the department, which we have looked at very carefully. We have made some very tough choices with regard to programs that do not relate to the core obligations and services provided by Environment Canada. Those programs will be trimmed and the affected staff will be treated in a considerate and respectful way.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, it seems to me that my question was very clear. It is the minister who is responsible for his department. A total of \$88 million will be cut, and we want to know which programs will be affected by these cuts. Could he please list the programs?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, it is a very large and multi-agency department. However, now that I get the gist of my colleague's question, the answer is that our budget is remaining relatively flat from the 2010-11 budget year to 2011-12. There are some very slight changes. I do not know where she got the figure that she is referring to.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, it is a little absurd that the minister himself is not capable of assessing programs that will be slashed by his own department, under his authority. Eighty-eight million dollars seems like a lot of money.

His team is incapable of putting their fingers on the figures, despite the fact that there are three people with him who are supposed to come up with the answers. So I will switch topics and give the minister some time to come back to that a little later.

I will now talk about Environment Canada's Report on Plans and Priorities, which was recently published and details personnel requirements on a program activity basis for the next three years.

In fact, 94% of the job cuts fall under one single program, which deals with climate change and air quality. The staff working for this program will be cut back by 14% over a mere three-year period.

The programs' objectives concern the health of Canadians and the economy. If these objectives are important, why get rid of so many jobs?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I am not sure from where my colleague is drawing these numbers.

Climate change remains one of the principal focuses of my department, as does clean air in its various air sheds across the country and through the different programs we operate.

My colleague needs to understand that the central objectives of Environment Canada have not changed at all. We remain focused on providing Canadians with an environment that is clean, safe and sustainable.

• (2235)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, if the minister is incapable of telling us which jobs are going to be cut by his department, could he at least tell us what are the duties of those people responsible for the environment and air quality? Can he say whether this program, in light of all these job losses, will fulfill its mandate despite the approximately 100 jobs being cut?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I am beginning to understand where my colleague may have gone off track.

Business of Supply

The main estimates do not include all of the funding initiatives that are continued through a fiscal or calendar year. The central core obligations and services of Environment Canada will be maintained. We are, as are all other departments and agencies, doing our part to contribute to addressing a deficit reduction.

However, the central services and obligations of Environment Canada will continue to be met and funded.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, we are eager to see how services of the same quality can be provided with far fewer employees working on the program.

Let us now turn to environmental stewardship. The Canadian Association of Professional Employees, CAPE, indicated that half of its affected members work for one single branch: environmental stewardship.

Can the minister describe the type of work performed by CAPE members?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, there has been a great deal of exaggeration from some quarters as to the number of jobs that will eventually be declared surplus and those individuals who have an affected status.

I would like to go back and show my colleague how wrong the opposition was a year ago when we issued 776 affected letters. It portrayed this as 776 jobs lost, individuals on the street. In fact, no permanent employees last year lost their jobs. There are still 193 staff being replaced as attrition takes our numbers down. However, again, where it was exaggerating and fear-mongering about—

The Chair: The hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, the minister has not answered my question at all. I asked him to describe the type of work performed by CAPE members.

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, my colleague asked about jobs that will be lost and I provided her with a good example of how some of her assumptions are based on misrepresentations and inaccuracies.

With regard to this budget year, 2012-13, we have reported that 340 individuals in total are affected. This will, in the fullness of time we assume, result in 200 positions being declared surplus according to workforce adjustment provisions under the Treasury Board. These employees will have 12 months severance with assistance to find a new job.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, once again, they are talking about job cuts, but the minister is incapable of describing the duties performed in these jobs.

Can the minister at least tell us how many full-time jobs there were?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I just gave my colleague that number. There are 340 affected permanent positions, we believe, and again this is not a precise number. As we go forward, the department and the assistant deputy ministers, in their wisdom, will move these numbers around to ensure that our core services are not compromised. However, we believe that there will be 200 surplus permanent positions by the end of the process.

• (2240)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, in terms of scientific research, the department's latest report on plans and priorities indicates that the department is running the risk of not being able to keep abreast of breakthroughs in the science and technology sector, because of challenges with the transition.

So, how many research jobs have been or will be cut at Environment Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent: Again, Madam Chair, my NDP colleague is using the same selective piece of news media copy that her Liberal colleague used a little earlier. The report on planning and priority is a perfect opportunity for department officials to examine potential risks in the year ahead, and they did. Unfortunately, the paragraph that has been taken out of context was followed by several paragraphs that outline very clearly how we would address that potential risk and how we would maintain the department.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, we keep asking the same questions because we need answers and we are getting none.

Termination notices have been sent to employees in the environmental emergencies program of Environment Canada. That is the unit that responds to oil spills and environmental emergencies.

How many people in total worked in the programs before they were restructured?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, in response to my colleague, I would first suggest that perhaps the NDP members do a little more original research rather than rely on flawed news media reports as the basis for their questions.

With regard to the environmental emergencies offices, we are consolidating six offices—Madam Chair, do you want me to answer the question?

The Chair: The hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, we actually rely on scientific facts. I have no idea what the minister is relying on.

Could you tell us how many people in total worked in that office and how many people will be working in the two consolidated offices in Canada's national capital region and in the Montreal area?

Business of Supply

[English]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I want to answer my colleague's question about environmental emergencies, potential pollutant spills, oil spills and the like. The fact is we are consolidating six offices to two, but Environment Canada is not a first responder. I am assured by my deputy and officials that we will continue to provide equally sterling services from those two consolidated offices as we have in the past with six. There are new technologies and applications that we expect to use, but that service will be maintained.

[Translation]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, the minister has still not told me how many people are going to work in the integrated offices.

I will change the topic since the minister is unable to give me a clear answer.

With respect to shale gas, a number of Canadians have expressed concerns about shale gas extraction because of its environmental impact. In September 2011, the minister announced that he had asked the Council of Canadian Academies to bring together a panel of experts to conduct an independent study on the state of scientific knowledge on the possible environmental impact of developing Canadian shale gas resources.

When will that study be finished and will it be made public?

[English]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, let me remind my colleague that shale gas falls within provincial jurisdiction, except when it occurs on federal lands.

She is quite correct in saying that we are accumulating scientific evidence from a variety of sources. We would expect to have that information probably later this year or early 2013.

● (2245)

[Translation]

The Chair: The hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry has the floor. There are 50 seconds remaining, which means 25 seconds for the question.

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Madam Chair, to respond to that statement, following an access to information request, the minister indicated that shale gas is affected by the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the Canada Water Act and the Species at Risk Act.

Are the regulations on shale gas, which were started in 2010, still being drafted?

[English]

Hon. Peter Kent: The short answer to my colleague's question, Madam Chair, is no. However, I have now found the \$88 million to which she originally referred. That is a cumulative savings number over a period of three years.

With regard to total job shrinkage at Environment Canada, those 200 eventual surplus positions represent about 3% of Environment Canada's total staff.

The Chair: That completes this round.

The hon. Minister of Veterans Affairs.

[Translation]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise this evening to salute the remarkable work carried out by my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, who has the opportunity this evening to explain in greater detail his action plan and its measures, not only for the stewardship of our ecosystems throughout the country, but also his strategies for the management of drinking water and sewage, for air quality and, of course, for the reduction of greenhouse gases. As the minister explained, the results in this regard are compelling.

We are already a third of the way to meeting our objective, established in the Copenhagen accord, of reducing our greenhouse gas emissions by 17% by 2020. Already, there has been a reduction of approximately 48 megatonnes as compared to 2005. We are, therefore, well on track to meeting our objectives—thanks to the regulatory framework established by the minister—particularly in the transport sector, which covers a quarter of our country's greenhouse gas emissions. We are also making progress in the areas of electricity, coal, and the oil and gas sectors.

This action plan provides convincing results, and what is more, we still have a few years left to achieve these outcomes, as our objective was set for 2020.

I am also pleased to rise this evening as a Quebecker, since my remarks have to do with the St. Lawrence River, which is the backbone of Quebec, and in some ways, of the entire country.

The St. Lawrence plan includes measures we have put in place to ensure the sustainability and conservation of the St. Lawrence River. The St. Lawrence is one of the highest priority ecosystems in Canada. It is an environment inhabited by numerous species and is a major source of drinking water and resources for the population. It is a pillar of economic development; it generates billions of dollars in economic activity. That is why the health of this ecosystem is crucial to a prosperous Quebec and Canadian economy.

It is also why the governments of Canada and Quebec wish to pursue measures undertaken initially by the Conservative government of Brian Mulroney in 1988, by creating the first ever St. Lawrence action plan in order to protect and restore the St. Lawrence River. Since 1988, this plan has produced results. Indeed, the Canadian government invested heavily and obtained tangible results.

The toxic liquid waste of 50 of the most polluting plants along the St. Lawrence was reduced by 96%. We have also protected 100,000 hectares of natural habitats by creating and expanding parks, ecological reserves and wildlife sanctuaries, and by establishing conservation agreements. We have also published a list of species likely to be designated as threatened or vulnerable, which may be given protected status under Quebec's *Loi sur les espèces menacées ou vulnérables*.

We have also created the Saguenay—Saint-Laurent Marine Park, the foremost marine park in Canada. We have redeveloped and reopened Montreal's Lachine Canal, 20 years after it was closed. Furthermore, 10,000 inspections of agricultural companies from six targeted regions have been carried out in order to identify the nonpoint-source pollution that may be affecting the quality of water in the St. Lawrence River.

Business of Supply

Just a few months ago, in November 2011, the government pursued this course of action with the St. Lawrence action plan 2011-2026. I was honoured to join Quebec's sustainable development, environment and parks minister, Mr. Arcand, and our own Minister of the Environment to announce the plan at the Old Port of Montreal.

The agreement involves some 18 federal and Quebec departments, which are working together and taking meaningful action on behalf of the people by improving and maintaining the quality of the St. Lawrence ecosystem.

• (2250)

By 2016, the Government of Canada will have invested \$49 million and the Government of Quebec \$20.6 million to initiate dozens of projects in key areas, such as maintaining biodiversity and improving water quality.

We plan to focus on sources of agricultural pollution and the effects of emerging substances, such as pharmaceutical products. We want to improve contaminated sediment management tools and learn more about nonpoint-source pollution.

[English]

The work on evasive alien species must continue. We will protect environmentally sensitive areas through programs aimed at identifying protected areas and conserving biodiversity.

Furthermore, we will promote responsible fishery management and designate public access sites. We will support sustainable navigation activities and consolidate hydrometric data on water levels and supplies.

[Translation]

This new agreement between the Canadian government and the Quebec government is another example of partnership in the spirit of open federalism and of the excellent co-operation that is taking place with the Quebec government in many areas. This agreement breaks new ground with a numerical environmental prediction program that will also serve as an important decision-making tool.

Environment Canada has been supporting ZIP—priority intervention zones—committees and Stratégies Saint-Laurent since 1993 through an annual funding envelope of \$1.1 million.

Lastly, in addition to engaging various federal and provincial departments, this plan makes room for community projects through the community interaction program. The \$12.4 million allocated through this program since 1993 has made it possible to complete 375 projects worth \$22.6 million, thanks to the commitment of individuals, community organizations and many partners whose actions have contributed to the development and protection of the St. Lawrence River.

This plan will allow us to pursue the excellent partnership we have created with the Quebec government and with our other partners in order to provide sound information based on the expertise of our scientists. It will allow us to get decision-makers and people who use the St. Lawrence involved in order to ensure the health of the St. Lawrence River.

The St. Lawrence River is vital to our development and has played an important part in our history and our daily lives. I live in

Lévis, where we have the Quebec City-Lévis ferry, the St. Lawrence cruises, port activity and sailing activities. This summer and in the next few years, Quebec City will be hosting important events such as the Rendez-vous naval de Québec—there will be a number of vessels—and competitions will take place in Quebec City and the St. Lawrence corridor, with the tall ships.

Therefore it is our duty to leave a healthy St. Lawrence River to future generations so they can have the best possible economy and environment.

Before concluding, I would simply like to remind members that the work carried out by our Minister of the Environment has been noticed internationally. In fact, the International Institute for Sustainable Development has recognized that Canada is well on its way to reaching its greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

The Minister of the Environment has made massive investments in Parks Canada, including through the economic action plan. We have a Minister of the Environment who has actively committed to increasing protected areas throughout the country in order to protect our ecosystems. Our minister keeps in direct contact with major greenhouse gas emitters in order to ensure that Canada, in co-operation with the provinces, can meet its targets.

• (2255)

The Chair: We will now proceed with questions for the minister.

Hon. Steven Blaney: Madam Chair, I have a few questions for the Minister of the Environment.

In my speech, I spoke a lot about the St. Lawrence action plan. The river starts in the Great Lakes. Could the minister explain about the Great Lakes? I spoke a lot about the measures he has taken in the St. Lawrence action plan, but I would like to know more about the Great Lakes.

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I would like to thank the hon. member for Lévis—Bellechasse.

The whole Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system is considered part of the agreement activities and projects when feasible. For example, the numerical environmental prediction program will develop a water management model for the St. Lawrence and, in order to do so, will necessarily take into account the entire Great Lakes-St. Lawrence basin.

Hon. Steven Blaney: Madam Chair, I see that there is an integrated plan for the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes.

When I look at the data, I am a bit surprised. We have an effective plan with which we have achieved a third of our targets. However, I see that, in the past decade, under the Liberals, carbon dioxide emissions in Canada increased by 28.4%.

I would like to know how the minister did it. Under the Liberals, our country had completely lost control of our carbon dioxide emissions. We see that when we, the Conservatives, came to power, we managed to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions and finally reduce them.

Business of Supply

Could the minister talk about the measures that cover the transportation industry, the source of a quarter of Canada's greenhouse gas emissions? How did he manage to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation industry? Did our government implement a regulatory regime and, if so, did the government do this alone or in partnership with other countries?

[*English*]

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I thank my colleague for refreshing the collective memory of the House about those who went before us.

Under the Copenhagen accord, this government made a commitment to reduce Canada's greenhouse gas emissions by, as I have said today, 17% below 2005 levels by 2020. We are firmly committed to achieving this target. We were about a quarter of the way to achieving that target about a year ago. We have progressed significantly since then. I should have some new numbers in the weeks ahead.

What is important is with our sector by sector strategy we are systematically addressing all major sources of emissions. As I have reminded the House this evening, we have already addressed transportation, which contributes about a quarter of our annual greenhouse gas emissions. New regulations are about to be presented with regard to the coal-fired electricity sector. We are consulting with oil and gas, including the oil sands. We will move on to talk to other major emitters: cement, steel, buildings, both commercial and residential, as we work our way around the pie chart and closer to achieving our target of a 17% reduction by 2020.

• (2300)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: The hon. Minister of Veterans Affairs has one minute left to ask a very brief question.

Hon. Steven Blaney: Madam Chair, I believe that the minister answered everything quite well.

My last question concerns contaminated sites. Could the minister tell us what has been done in this regard over the past two years? We know that there are contaminated sites in this country. Have investments been made to deal with these sites? Some of them were very badly contaminated.

[*English*]

What has been done in regard to those contaminated sites that we have here?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I have reminded my critics on the other side of the House this evening that the environment commissioner complimented us on our progress to date with regard to the major contaminated sites program in which our government has invested \$3.5 billion. We have closed 42% of those sites. We are working for the next seven years to close the rest of those targeted sites.

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Madam Chair, I will get right to the questions.

Why is the government dismantling the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, this is a well-visited question, and I will offer my hon. colleague the stock response.

When the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy was created a full quarter century ago, there were no other similar public policy bodies which examined the relationship between the economy and the environment. Today there are any number of public policy bodies across academia and private foundations and any number of boards and chambers which now provide that information.

The \$5 million that had been spent on the national round table enables us to avoid making cuts in more significant parts of my department.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, why did the Minister of Foreign Affairs tell this House on Monday that the round table was being eliminated because of its climate change research?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, my answer as I have given it is the decision was mine. The decision was taken for the reasons that I have just explained. Where the national round table was at one time unique and relevant, it is no longer so.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, when was the decision to eliminate the national round table taken, and with which groups did the government consult in making the decision to eliminate the round table?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, the decision is mine.

I think we would more profitably spend our time here this evening talking about exactly what our department is doing to fulfill its mandate, and—

The Chair: I am not purposely cutting off the minister, but I am trying to allocate the same amount of time, approximately, as the hon. member. I will go back to the hon. member.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, I think it would be valuable if the minister actually responded to the questions that we are asking him.

We have an issue. The national round table released a report on climate change adaptation and impacts on businesses, a 136-page advisory report, a 42-page guide for businesses, and 99 pages of case studies. Can the minister name a national organization that produces similar research?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I am not going to run through the list for my hon. colleague, but there are any number of organizations. I must say that I was quite impressed when his counterpart, my critic, earlier this evening said that she was not going to set her hair on fire about this.

• (2305)

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, the record shows that the minister was not able to name one organization.

In 2011, the government made two research requests to the round table asking for help analyzing provincial climate change plans and life cycle approaches to environmental management. How many references or research requests has the government given to the round table since 2006?

Business of Supply

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I will come back to the fact that we are here to talk about my department and my department's mandate.

I will just remind my colleague of the fact that I am here to manage a clean environment, to manage substances and ways to reduce pollution, to provide for a safer environment, and to provide for a sustainable environment.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, again, there is no answer. I will give the minister one more chance.

How many research requests has the government given to the round table? How many requests are still pending?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, the short answer to that, and I can only speak for myself in the recent 18 months, is a request was made to the round table to investigate a number of issues with regard to water. We are awaiting two final reports.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, in that spirit, how many times has the round table's report on climate prosperity been downloaded? The minister surely must know that.

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, we are getting into the ridiculous here. The reports of the round table can be downloaded and they can be acquired by hard copy.

As I have said, we thanked the round table for its service for over a quarter century and with respect and consideration we bid them good fortune in the future.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, the minister should have been able to answer that question.

The minister said earlier that there is an expanded community of environmental stakeholders. Would the minister consider the Canadian Environmental Network to be one of these stakeholders?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, no.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, could the minister then list examples of this community of environmental stakeholders since the government seems intent on crushing and closing the doors on many of the reputable environmental organizations that exist in this country?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, no, but I will explain why the Canadian Environmental Network is not considered to be one of those sources.

Times change, relevant contributions to the body of science change, and modalities change. In that sense, the CEM, like the national round table, NRT, represents quality services, but services of the past.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, again, the minister could not answer the question and list examples of this community of environmental stakeholders. I will give him one more chance.

I would ask him how these stakeholders are going to continue to provide analysis and policy advice when changes in the budget bill exclude them from environmental and pipeline reviews. Will environmental NGOs be considered directly affected or as having relevant information or expertise for the purposes of environmental review processes?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, my colleague obviously needs to pay some attention to the detail of Bill C-38.

The responsible resource development legislation has four very simple, very clear and environmentally logical provisions and principles. They are: to strengthen environmental protection first and foremost from my perspective as the Minister of the Environment; to make reviews of resource projects more predictable and timely; to reduce duplication and regulatory burden; and to enhance consultations with aboriginal Canadians. That is what Bill C-38 would do.

● (2310)

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, we have read the bill and we know that it would exclude environmental organizations that have much to offer and much to teach the government about environmental assessments.

I am going to move on to environmental emergencies and give the minister the opportunity to respond to the question that he did not respond to from the member for Beauharnois—Salaberry.

Since the environmental emergency offices are being closed in places like British Columbia, how many people in total worked in this program before the restructuring? How many people will work at the two consolidated offices? How many jobs in total will be lost from this program? What jobs specifically are being cut?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I would be glad to answer my hon. colleague, but I would remind him again that the environmental emergency offices are not first responders. Environment Canada personnel very rarely attend the sites of pollutant spills, oil spills or gaseous emissions. They support the lead agencies in any of these cleanup situations, be they municipal organizations, fire departments, police departments, provincial organizations, or in the case of federal departments, where a seaborne spill is involved, the Coast Guard under Transport Canada, and for rail accidents, Transport Canada, or the appropriate federal lead agency.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, the former head of environmental emergencies said that the staff were regularly sent out to the scene.

In the 2010 oil spill at the Chevron refinery in Burrard Inlet, did Environment Canada respond on the ground?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, of the roughly between 1,500 and 2,000 spills that occur across Canada every year, Environment Canada personnel very rarely attend the scene. They do, and there have been instances in recent months, where they have been requested by a lead agency, be it a province or a federal ministry, such as the Department of Transport, for example, with two recent rail accidents. However, for the most part, they support telephonically with advice and scientific data to assist whatever lead agency is in charge with the cleanup.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, I appreciate the minister correcting himself. Indeed, they are present on the ground.

Business of Supply

Could the minister tell us how many incidents the environmental emergencies program has been involved in responding to for each of the last three years?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, again, I do not have those numbers at hand but I can certainly find them for my colleague. However, as I said in my earlier response, very seldom do Environment Canada personnel attend spill sites. They provide support and essential data but on very few occasions would they attend the site.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, it would be helpful if the minister could actually respond with the number of times that has happened, and we can make the judgment as to whether that is often or not.

We asked this earlier and we ask it again. How many positions have been cut in British Columbia and what is the total jobs that will be present and will continue at the two consolidated offices?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, I can tell my colleague that in the consolidation of the six offices to two, which will not in any way compromise the efficiency or the services provided by the environmental emergencies office, the reduction is from 59 jobs to 36, which leaves a net job loss of 23.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, I hear the Conservatives clapping for the loss of jobs in British Columbia.

I would like to come back to asking the minister another question. What is the estimated time for environmental emergencies program staff to arrive on the scene of an incident, for example, in Vancouver from offices back east now that the regional offices have been closed?

• (2315)

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, again my colleague cannot seem to grasp this.

Environment Canada personnel or not first responders. The responsibility lies with the municipal, provincial or the federal department or agency that is in charge of the cleanup and actually accomplishes the containment and the cleanup with advice generally from a distance and scientific data provided through a variety of technologies.

However, Environment Canada personnel are not emergency first responders in any instance.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Chair, we have had the former head of environmental emergencies say that staff were sent out to the scene. The minister said no and then admitted later that it does happen but he cannot provide us with the numbers.

I have a last question. Given that the minister was unable to respond to the member for Halifax and unable to respond to many of the questions from the member for Beauharnois—Salaberry, why does the minister have difficulty responding to basic questions about his ministry with respect to information that Canadians want to know?

Hon. Peter Kent: Madam Chair, my colleague trivializes this entire process. However, I am here tonight to say that with regard to the environmental emergencies office or any of the other offices, departments and agencies within Environment Canada, we are

dedicated to making Canada a cleaner, safer and more environmentally sustainable country now and for generations into the future.

The Chair: That completes this round. I will turn to the hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette.

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette, CPC): Madam Chair, it is an honour to address my remarks regarding Bill C-38 to Canada's magnificent endowment of freshwater resources that are so important to our country.

I think Canadians treasure our freshwater endowment almost above all other resources. Our freshwater resources are vital sources of safe drinking water, key transportation routes and are the basis of our freshwater fisheries, as well as important for tourism recreation. Our lakes and rivers simply are what makes Canada Canada.

Our government has recognized that we have a tremendous responsibility to ensure our freshwater resources are protected. We understand that there are significant pressures affecting the health of some of our freshwater. We are addressing those challenges by taking concrete and measurable actions to restore and protect nationally significant bodies of freshwater, such as the Great Lakes, Lake Simcoe and, in my own backyard, Lake Winnipeg.

Environment Canada is carrying out this work by conducting leading edge science, research and monitoring to better understand issues, identify threats and inform decision-making to protect our precious water resources.

Our government is building partnerships with other levels of government, stakeholders and the public to plan and deliver on water-related priorities. We are cleaning up problem areas and addressing specific issues, such as eutrophication and to improve overall water quality.

In my own riding of Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette, we have many beautiful freshwater lakes, rivers and wetlands that are used for both recreational and commercial fisheries and are very important to local communities, the local environment, the ecosystem processes, our economy and our rural way of life.

I would like to take a moment and focus on three nationally significant bodies of freshwater, their importance, what we have accomplished and where we are headed.

The Great Lakes and the major rivers that connect them constitute the world's largest freshwater system and they are fundamental to the well-being of millions of Canadians. This region supports Canada's highest concentration of industry, nearly 25% of total Canadian agricultural production, a commercial and recreational fishery that has been estimated to be worth about \$7 billion and a transportation corridor with shipping from all over the world. The Great Lakes provide the foundations for billions of dollars in economic activity, sustain a rich a variety of plants and animals and are a direct source of high quality drinking water for one-fourth of Canadians.

Business of Supply

The Government of Canada has made significant investments in the Great Lakes, resulting in important gains for both the environment and human health. Our investments include over \$538 million since 2007 to enhance municipal waste water treatment infrastructure, which directly improves water quality within the Great Lakes. We provided \$48.9 million from 2008 to 2016 to accelerate the remediation of contaminated sediment in the Great Lakes and the renewal of the Great Lakes action plan in budget 2010. We are committing \$8 million per year on an ongoing basis to support the remediation of Great Lakes areas of concern, locations that have been identified as experiencing environmental degradation.

Budget 2011 provided new funding of \$5 million over two years to improve nearshore water and ecosystem health and better address the phosphorous issues in the Great Lakes.

These significant investments in the Great Lakes are resulting in important environmental gains but more work needs to be done.

To that end, the Governments of Canada and the United States are in the process of finalizing amendments to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. Since 1972, this agreement has guided the efforts of both countries by aligning objectives and coordinating action across multiple jurisdictions.

The agreement has been an international example of effective management of shared water resources and was instrumental in reversing eutrophication issues in the late 1970s and 1980s, significantly reducing persistent toxic substances in the ecosystem and cleaning up contaminated areas within the Great Lakes.

The agreement and the leading edge work it produced has also served as a powerful driver for developing and reforming environmental laws and policies within the United States and Canada, including our own Canadian Environmental Protection Act, a key tool in delivering the highest level of environmental quality for all Canadians.

● (2320)

An amended Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement would allow our government to comprehensively address current problems in the Great Lakes, including cumulative stresses acting on the nearshore environment, aquatic invasive species, habitats and species loss and climate change impacts, and move quickly to prevent future problems.

For over 40 years, the Government of Canada has worked in cooperation with the Province of Ontario on Great Lakes aquatic ecosystem health through a series of Canada-Ontario agreements respecting the Great Lakes basin ecosystem. The Canada-Ontario agreement establishes a domestic plan of concrete actions that the federal and provincial governments will undertake to implement the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement to restore, protect and conserve the Great Lakes. We anticipate a new Canada-Ontario agreement later this year that will align with the newly amended Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

The Government of Canada is also working to restore, protect and conserve water quality and ecosystem health in other bodies of water, such as Lake Simcoe in Ontario. Located north of Toronto, the lake is a major recreation area generating millions of dollars a year in tourism revenue. It lies in a major agricultural area and supplies

drinking water to eight municipalities. The lake has been suffering some stress due to phosphorous inputs and eutrophication.

The health of Lake Simcoe has been declining for many years. Since 2008, the Government of Canada's \$30 million Lake Simcoe cleanup fund has supported initiatives to preserve and protect the environment of Lake Simcoe and has allowed Canadians to live, work and play near Lake Simcoe to enjoy the benefits of a cleaner lake. I am proud to say that our government has supported, which I find unbelievable, approximately 160 local projects so far, including over 90 habitat and non-point source pollution improvement projects to restore and preserve the health of Lake Simcoe. That is what I call delivering real environmental results.

Recognizing the success of this program, budget 2012 continues to provide new investments to ensure we are able to work together with local partners toward improving the water quality and ecosystem health of Lake Simcoe and deliver on our commitment to clean water.

The Government of Canada is also taking action on Lake Winnipeg to restore its ecological integrity, reduce blue-green algae blooms, ensure fewer beach closings and ensure continuation of a vibrant and sustainable fishery. Lake Winnipeg is the sixth largest freshwater lake in North America and supports a \$50 million per year freshwater fishery and a \$110 million per year tourism industry. The lake is situated in and receives inputs from a drainage basin of almost one million square kilometres that encompasses four provinces and four U.S. states.

Beginning in 2008, the Government of Canada committed \$17.7 million over four years to work with our provincial partners to clean up Lake Winnipeg through the Lake Winnipeg basin initiative, again delivering real environmental results. This initiative has contributed to cleaning up the lake and supporting science.

Despite the work done to date, Lake Winnipeg continues to experience poor water quality due to excess nutrient loading from multiple local and transboundary sources. The excess nutrient load causes increasingly large, frequent and potentially toxic algal blooms. Without a reduction in nutrient inputs, primarily phosphorous, deterioration in the lake's water quality will continue.

Budget 2012 also provides renewed funding for Lake Winnipeg to continue the important work begun in 2007, which will enable us to work with partners to take action to resolve problems that threaten this great resource. Through our work on Lake Winnipeg, Lake Simcoe and the Great Lakes, the Government of Canada is ensuring clean freshwater for all Canadians.

Business of Supply

We will continue to deliver on that commitment through our government's investments in research, monitoring, leading edge science, partnerships with other jurisdictions and targeted actions to clean up problems of the past. We hope to prevent future problems because Canada's freshwater resources are not only a source of immense pride for our country but are vital to supporting our environment, our economy and our society.

I cannot emphasize enough that this government provides resources to deliver real and tangible environmental results.

I have questions for the minister. I was wondering if the minister could please explain and elaborate on what our government is doing to protect the Great Lakes.

● (2325)

Ms. Michelle Rempel (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette who really cares about Canada's environment. He does a great job on the environment committee. He is a great superstar for our team.

With regard to Canada's Great Lakes, we have invested millions of dollars to protecting Canada's water over the last years including, for example: \$48 million to accelerate the remediation of contaminated sediments in Great Lakes areas of concern under the clean water action plan, and I am not sure my colleagues opposite voted for that; \$8 million per year on an ongoing basis to support the remediation of the area of concerns under the Great Lake action plan in budget 2010, and I am not sure if my colleagues across the way voted for that either; \$16 million to address the recurrence of toxic nuisance algae in the Great Lakes with a particular focus on Lake Erie in budget 2011, and they did not vote for that either; and over \$330 million between 2005 and 2010 to enhance municipal waste water treatment infrastructure within the basin.

These are important measures that result in tangible environmental outcomes, as my colleague has so succinctly said.

Mr. Robert Sopuck: Mr. Chair, could the minister or parliamentary secretary further elaborate on what the Government of Canada is doing to protect Lake Simcoe and Lake Winnipeg?

Ms. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Chair, I had the opportunity of being at Lake Simcoe this year to announce further funding for the protection of this great region. Lake Simcoe has an enormous impact on the regional economy. We have several members of our government who are keenly interested in ensuring that this water basin maintains its health. To support that, the Government of Canada's \$30 million Lake Simcoe cleanup fund has supported initiatives designed to preserve and protect the environment of Lake Simcoe, supporting 160 local projects since 2008 and leveraging another 600 restoration projects with third party agreements. This means that local community groups are working with government to partner and ensure the health of this ecosystem. However, the NDP voted against this funding as well.

Through the Lake Winnipeg basin initiative, Canada committed \$17.7 million over four years, from 2008 to 2012, to clean up Lake Winnipeg, aiming to reduce blue-green algae blooms, ensure fewer beach closings, keep in place a sustainable fishery, provide a clean lake for recreation and restore the ecological integrity of the lake.

Again, we are recognizing a problem that is happening in one of our water basins, investing to support it, working with community groups to come up with real action, but the NDP voted against that.

Mr. Robert Sopuck: Mr. Chair, the members opposite make a great show of being supporters of environmental groups, but one of the most significant environmental communities in our country that they never talk about or support is Canada's millions of hunters and anglers who are the true conservationists in the country. They deliver on the ground programs and projects through local clubs and deliver real environmental results. In fact, this is one conservation group that actually asks to pay tax.

In the minister's department there is a section called Wildlife Habitat Canada, which is funded by the hunting licences that we migratory bird hunters have to buy. I am a very strong supporter of this agency.

Could the minister or the parliamentary secretary make a few comments on the great work that the dollars from hunters and anglers do to support conservation in their department?

● (2330)

Ms. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Chair, my colleague's excellent question shows how government can work with local organizations whose members understand the community and help support initiatives on the ground that make impactful, significant support for our environment changes on an ongoing basis.

My colleague talked about organizations which we partner with, including Ducks Unlimited. We have heard from Ducks Unlimited in committee several times over the last few weeks, with regard to the development of a national conservation plan. There is the NCC. These are all groups, including our fisher and angler communities, that work to preserve the landscape in a working landscape concept. This means they understand the principle of using land for productivity, while ensuring conservation.

Some of the things we have done to support meaningful environmental protection in our country since 2006, which my colleagues have voted against, include: nearly \$200 million to help address the health and environmental risks posed by dangerous chemicals through the chemical management plan; \$100 million to support clean energy generation in Canada's forest sector through the next generation renewable power initiative; \$97 million to develop and promote clean energy technologies; and \$86 million to support clean energy actions, this year. I hope they will support those in the future.

Business of Supply

[Translation]

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing, NDP): Mr. Chair, I would like to ask some questions about the impact of environmental assessments on first nations.

There was \$13.6 million in the budget for consultations.

Can the minister tell us what portion of that \$13.6 million will be specifically allocated to aboriginal communities for consultations?

[English]

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, the bulk of the money, and I will see if I can put my hands on the specific dollar amount, will go to aboriginal consultation with a very small amount will go to administration costs.

Through Bill C-38, through the responsible resource development legislation, we have ensured that we not only do what has been done so well in the past with regard to aboriginal consultation, but that we engage earlier and that we fulfill our statutory obligations to support and assist their interventions.

[Translation]

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, I still have not heard an answer. The minister says he will try to get the total. I hope I will get an answer before the end of the evening.

Given that the budget announced essentially the same amount that was allocated to consultations before budget 2012, and that this is not really new funding since the aboriginal funding envelope program was ending, can the minister tell us how much of this funding is new money?

[English]

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, again, I will correct the hon. member's perception. There is a significant increase to the amount of funding provided for aboriginal consultation, an increase of \$1.5 million. As I said earlier, the bulk of that will go to the consultation. A very small amount will be used for administrative purposes.

[Translation]

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, I did not get the figure I was asking for, namely what part of the \$13.6 million announced will be specifically allocated to the first nations communities for consultation purposes. I would appreciate an answer.

As far as the \$1.5 million is concerned, again, by all accounts it seems to be old money in a new announcement.

• (2335)

[English]

Is the minister considering increasing the allocation for environmental consultations with aboriginal communities, and if so, by how much?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I would be delighted to enlighten my colleague. There has been no re-announcement. This is new money. The department will spend \$6.8 million annually, \$2.2 million plus the \$1.5 million in new money will go to first nations.

The agency will provide and use the rest of that money for the consultation process.

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, is the minister telling me that the full amount that was announced previous to this budget was fully spent?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, the amount is still to be determined. Again, I emphasize that this \$1.5 million is new money. It is not re-announced.

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, it appears in the new legislation that reports undertaken for proponents will stop the clock on the timelines that will be undertaken by environmental reviews, but it is not as clear if first nations will ever interact with decision makers under the act. This is because many decisions made under the budget implementation act will be made by cabinet.

The Minister of Finance could not answer this question at committee today, even though it is his bill. Hopefully the minister will be able to answer the question.

Could the minister please advise if reports under section 23(2), which are suitable for stopping the clock under section 27(6), include studies undertaken for the purpose of consultation?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, again, I would remind my colleague that the significant changes under this legislation are on the National Energy Board and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission side of the process. The minister and the Governor-in-Council have always had the authority to accept or to deny decisions from panels or comprehensive studies at any level.

We are now merely harmonizing the process on both sides of the assessment process.

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, maybe the minister could elaborate as to why it is the primary responsibility for engagement. Why is the primary responsibility for engagement given to proponents?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, the entire concept of environmental assessment is, on one hand, for a proponent to bring a project forward to be assessed to see whether it will cause a significant negative environmental impact. The other side of the process is for the agency, through its panels or through studies at the provincial level, to determine how to mitigate those negative impacts.

That process is in place. It will be more effectively in place under the new legislation.

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, could the minister advise whether first nations will ever actually meet any Crown decision makers during the consultation/accommodation process?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I am glad to assure my colleague that we recognize this. In my talks with Grand Chief Atleo, we have made a commitment that consultations will begin much earlier in the process, at the beginning of the process in fact, and that these consultations will continue through the assessment process.

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, would the minister tell me how many first nations the government plans to consult?

Business of Supply

• (2340)

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, that number is a very large number. It has any number of permutations and combinations, depending upon the project which may be proposed. We have a statutory obligation. Under CEAA and under the new regulation, we will again consult as specified in the legislation.

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, I take it that not all first nations will be consulted, and that is a shame. This is exactly what we have seen over and over again from the government.

[Translation]

For many years, first nations communities have had a hard time with the application of the CEAA in traditional territories. If the law does not address the issue of aboriginal title, it will create a regulatory vacuum wherein neither the federal government nor the province will have the clear ability to assess environmental impacts. The same reasoning applies to the Keewatin lands in Ontario.

What is the government's position on the issue of federal lands, given that it is extremely likely that aboriginal title will be recognized by a court in the next few years?

[English]

Hon. Peter Kent: Again, Mr. Chair, I must correct the inaccuracies and the fear-mongering of my colleague.

It depends upon the projects. However, any first nations, whether treaty bands, or Métis, or Inuit, that are in close proximity and will be affected by a proposed project will be engaged and involved fully in the consultations.

[Translation]

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, I do not believe he answered my question, and I think he is having difficulty this evening, perhaps because it is rather late.

[English]

What is the government's position on the recent Keewatin decision, which states that various takings up of lands by Ontario were illegal because they constituted a violation of Treaty 3?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I would suggest that my colleague raise that question at Queen's Park. It is just down the highway.

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, I think the minister has a role to play here, and obviously he is shirking that responsibility.

CEAA 2012 contains a great deal about public participation and the use of an Internet site. The duty to consult and accommodate at the low end of the scale requires government to provide notice and opportunity to comment to first nations. To a reasonable person, "notice" means first nations would actually be contacted and provided with information. Where there is a digital divide in the country, which the government has failed to address, even the broad interpretation of notice does not hold water.

How will the government fulfill its constitutional obligation to provide notice to first nations potentially affected by development?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I am delighted to enlighten my colleague.

The consultation process has many dimensions. There is initial contact made when a project comes before the agency. The agency will visit in any number of situations with first nations, either individually or in groups. We will assist financially in their ability to appear before federal panels, in the case of federal panels, to make sure that they convey as fully as possible their interests and concerns.

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, I hope that the notice is not going to be on a government website and the government is going to say it has been there for months. As the minister knows, in some of our ridings the access to Internet ranges from very limited to none.

We all know that cabinet decisions are subject to cabinet confidence. As experience has shown us, this government has been remarkably expansive in its interpretation of cabinet confidence. What is discussed in cabinet meetings and even the documents provided to cabinet are cloaked in secrecy. If first nations want to know whether their rights and interests have been accommodated or even acknowledged, it appears the only vehicle for finding out is using a costly and lengthy discovery process through litigation.

Exactly what information will be available to the public on the many cabinet decisions that will be made under this legislation?

• (2345)

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, the principle of cabinet confidence is a long and historic one. Through the consultation process a dialogue is maintained, and when decisions are made, those decisions are shared effectively with all affected parties, first nations included.

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, certain provisions of CEAA 2012 contain expansive powers for a responsible authority to compel information relevant to an assessment. There appear to be no exceptions for matters of privacy and privilege.

How will disclosure provisions in CEAA 2012 interact with access to information privacy, solicitor-client privilege, and first nation ownership, control, access and possession of information? Will the government release strength of claim analyses to first nations?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, when the CEAA 2012 comes into effect, the procedures and processes will be transitioned, and they will develop according to the specific legislation.

Mrs. Carol Hughes: Mr. Chair, why did the government remove paragraph 59 (1), which allowed first nations to make their own environmental assessment regulations, and instead insert section 67, which appears to require cabinet approval for government-funded projects occurring on reserve?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I can only say that Environment Canada has ultimate responsibility for environmental considerations across the country, including the provinces, the territories, federal lands and first nations lands. We exercise that authority in very close and considerate consultation with the first nations and we will continue to do so in the future.

The Assistant Deputy Chair: That will finish this round. We will move on.

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Wellington—Halton Hills.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Chair, I want to thank you for allowing me the time to talk about the main estimates. I am actually quite excited about one aspect of the government's plans and priorities for the next year in Environment Canada.

The issue I want to bring to the attention of members in the House is a project that I have been working on, along with a number of other people, which is the establishment of a new national urban park in the Rouge Valley in Toronto. This is a very exciting project.

This project is really an example of citizens coming together to spur the government to action. This is something that was started by the Honourable Pauline Browes, who was a minister in the government of Brian Mulroney in the late 1980s and represented Scarborough in this Parliament. She and people like Glenn De Baeremaeker, a City of Toronto councillor, and other interested stakeholders who served in the City of Toronto, in the town of Markham and in the greater Toronto region have worked for the better part of 20 years to fight to preserve a very important watershed in southern Ontario.

I was asked to sit as the federal government's representative on the Rouge Park Alliance some five years or so ago. Minister Flaherty asked me if I would sit on that group, representing the government. I did so without really knowing a lot about this particular project. When I started to get involved with the alliance, I realized what a gem we had there in the eastern part of the GTA.

What also struck me was that literally thousands of ordinary Canadians had given up their time, effort and money to push the governments, both federally and provincially, to work towards the establishment of this park.

Many people had spent the better part of two decades working on this project. When I joined it, I sought to educate myself about it under the leadership of Alan Wells, who was then and is now the chair of the alliance. He was appointed by the Government of Ontario.

We decided that after 20 years of a very ad hoc governance arrangement, we really needed to come forward with a new governance structure for the park, a new budget, a new vision, so we engaged in a year and a half of consultations with various stakeholders, both governmental and non-governmental, including the federal, provincial and municipal governments and environmental NGOs.

What we ended up with was a report that we came forward with in the early part of 2010. The report called for the creation of a national

Business of Supply

park in the Rouge Valley. The report was unanimously adopted by all of the various stakeholders—municipal and provincial, environmental and non-environmental—involved with this initiative.

We presented the findings to the federal government in early 2010, and we started to lobby the government and the then Minister of the Environment, Minister Prentice, to seek action, to see if the government would take the report's recommendations and work toward the establishment of this park.

I remember very vividly the day Minister Kent was appointed to the federal cabinet as Minister of the Environment. I was in a hotel room when I managed to get hold of him. We had an hour-long chat over the telephone about this initiative. I think it was in late January or early February of 2011. We had a long and sincere chat about this initiative.

I said to him at the time that this was really the make or break moment for the park. I really felt that if the government did not move forward with this initiative, it was going to fall apart, and all the work that we had done would have been for naught.

I was delighted that Minister Kent took it upon himself to really push this initiative. We had an election about five months later, and it was in the party's election commitment to work towards the establishment of this park. Then, after the election, in the Speech from the Throne in 2011, the government reaffirmed its commitment to establish this park.

● (2350)

Last fall, a mere several months later, Parks Canada, with Alan Latourelle, initiated the consultations that began on the Scarborough campus of the University of Toronto, where we invited a wide range of stakeholders, including, I might add, a member of the New Democratic caucus from Scarborough who joined us for this consultation. She participated for the whole day in those consultations, and that marked the start of the process that we are now in.

I am very excited about this because it is important for two reasons.

The first reason is that it is ecologically important. We have protected large swaths of Canada's north and the boreal forest zone of the High Arctic. I was in Auyuittuq National Park on my own time and my own dime. A couple of years ago I hiked up the Weasel River some 19 kilometres. Never did I think that these moraines would be so difficult to climb. I thought I could do five kilometres an hour, but I think it took me an hour a kilometre to scramble up these moraines. It was a memorable trip.

We have protected the High Arctic. We have protected the rain forest in the Pacific Rim National Park. We have protected marine areas, whether off the Bruce Peninsula in Ontario or off the Pacific or Atlantic coasts. We have protected Gros Morne National Park. We have protected large swaths of Canada's biodiversity, but the most intense biodiversity in Canada that we have not protected on a large scale is the Carolinian forest zone, found only in southern Ontario.

Business of Supply

This zone lies to the west of Toronto. If one were to draw a line between Toronto and Stratford, everything south of that is the Carolinian forest zone, and we have not protected a big chunk of it. It is the most dense biosphere in the country. This park would expand the federal protection of that very important biosphere, the eastern deciduous forest zone known as the Carolinian forest zone. That is the first reason this is such an important issue.

The second reason is that many of us will never go to Canada's national parks. The fact of the matter is that most of Canada's national parks are in very remote areas, especially for people who are living in the St. Lawrence lowlands. They are far away and cost thousands and thousands of dollars to get to. To do a canoe trip in Nahanni would cost \$5,000 or \$6,000 just for a week or two up there. The same goes for many of Canada's national parks, yet in southern Ontario, in the GTA, we have some 8 million Canadians, and in the next 20 years we are going to have a 50% increase in that population, to some 12 million Canadians who would live in what is now called the Golden Horseshoe. Many of these Canadians are new Canadians and have never accessed the great outdoors. Many have never had access to our national park system.

We all know the challenge in these last three years with the decline in the global economy and the challenge of making our national park system accessible. That is why this is such an important initiative. It would give access, a gateway, to our national park system to some eight million Canadians, many of whom are new Canadians living in the greater Toronto area. We will make this national park system accessible right on their back doorstep with a quick hop on the rapid transit system.

I want to thank Parks Canada, the minister, Catherine Grenier and Andy Campbell for their continued work on this initiative. I also want to recognize members of the Rouge Park Alliance for their tireless diligence. People have contributed over 20 years of volunteerism and hard work to this project.

I am very excited about the department and agency's plans and priorities for this initiative. I am going out on a limb here, but I think this could become the most visited national park in our national park system once it is created and up and running. This is a tremendous initiative that will create a new opportunity for Canadians to access the great outdoors.

I will finish on this final note of informing members of this committee why this is an interesting project.

We have never created a park in an urban setting. This park will be 10 to 15 times the size of Central Park. It will far outstrip Stanley Park in Vancouver in terms of size, and it is right in the heart of the city of Toronto, in the town of Markham. Because of that, we are going to create a new type of national park with this initiative called a near-urban national park, or an urban national park.

• (2355)

This will allow Parks Canada to develop expertise in this kind of set-up for parks that are near urban areas. This will be a precedent-setting park that may expand its initiatives in the Gatineau, across the river from Ottawa here, and in other large metropolitan regions, whether they be Montreal or Vancouver.

I want to thank the minister for this initiative. I will just ask a quick question.

A lot of services have been reduced in existing areas at Parks Canada. My question for the minister is: Why is Parks Canada working on creating new national parks and national marine conservation areas, while at the same time it is reducing the budget in other areas of Parks Canada?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Wellington—Halton Hills for carrying the torch in the House with regard to the dream of an urban park, the dream of the Rouge Park Alliance to have this magnificent park within the limits of the greater Toronto area.

I would just like to remind the House that when Parliament passed the Parks Canada Agency Act, it directed Parks Canada to include representative examples of Canada's land and marine natural regions and systems of national parks and national marine conservation areas.

In 2006, Parks Canada's protected areas network was approximately 277,000 square kilometres. Since 2006, this government has taken actions that will protect an additional 150,000 square kilometres. This brings Parks Canada's protected areas network to 427,000 square kilometres, which represents a 54% increase. I would advise the House that we are not stopping here.

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, when we did the report for the Rouge Park Alliance that recommended the creation of the national urban park for the Rouge Valley, the alliance's estimate of the costs associated with this park, which some members have been wondering about, was that it would require \$40 million to \$50 million in capital costs over a 10-year period and about \$4 million to \$5 million in ongoing annual operating costs. I just put that on the record.

It is not in these main estimates, but the government did reaffirm its commitment to the establishment of this park. Obviously we cannot come up with numbers for the fiscal framework in the main estimates until we have gone through the consultation process, determined the boundaries for the new park, developed an MC to bring to cabinet, got the approvals for the fiscal framework and so on. I just put that out as a point of information.

Perhaps the minister would comment on the Rouge Park Alliance's estimates for both the \$40 million to \$50 million in capital costs for a 10-year period and the \$4 million to \$5 million in ongoing operating annual costs.

• (2400)

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, my colleague accurately described the current process. At the moment we are in the midst of consolidating land from the various title holders, be they municipal, provincial or federal, and the next process we are about to begin is public consultations. We will work to finalize the eventual boundaries of the Rouge Park.

With regard to capital and operating costs, I can assure my colleague that we will be presenting our initial estimates for the House's consideration in the very near future.

Business of Supply

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, I want to commend the minister for this important initiative. This is really a hidden gem in the city of Toronto and in the town of Markham. Most people do not realize there are working farms in the city of Toronto today. There are conservation areas within the city of Toronto that will be in this park, which people can walk into and think they are in the middle of wilderness.

This is an important initiative that would preserve an important part of Canada's biodiversity.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I can assure my colleague that I share his dream of making the Rouge near urban national park yet another jewel in the string of parks, many of them quite different from our first parks in Banff and Jasper or our newest designated park, Sable Island off Nova Scotia.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, I would like to begin by correcting the record. Gutting environmental protections is not strengthening, as the minister claims. Repealing the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act and the Kyoto Protocol Implementation Act and weakening the Fisheries Act, the Species at Risk Act and water legislation is gutting.

In reading the *Hansard* from the first Liberal round, one can only conclude that the minister believes that the Environment Commissioner is wrong.

Does the minister refuse to accept the recent report of the commissioner?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, with regard to my colleague's preamble, she was wrong on each and every count.

With regard to the report by the Environment Commissioner, we endeavoured to assist him in updating his figures with respect to climate change. His report makes it quite clear that his terms and points of reference were a full year out of date.

While we do accept the compliments that were scattered through the Environment Commissioner's report, although they seem to have been overlooked by colleagues on the other side of the House, with regard to the federal contaminated sites program, I understand the commissioner has since agreed that he did not understand or did not have a full grasp of the parameters of the federal program.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, what the minister does not say is that I used to consult to his department and I served on the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and was asked by my government to do so.

I would like to know what is in the budget to address the concerns of the commissioner.

• (2405)

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I have here something with which my colleague should be familiar.

The Environment Commissioner was asked, "Did I hear correctly that inventory data was not reflected in your report that dealt with 2010 emissions?" The Environment Commissioner answered, "Correct. Just to be clear, there is a lag between when the year and when Environment Canada takes to compile all the data and then release it."

So the Environment Commissioner has been very gracious in his acknowledgement that his report is based on significantly dated data.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, the question was actually: What is in the budget to address the concerns of the commissioner?

In his answer to consultations on Rio, I noticed that the minister said he consulted with first nations. Can the minister provide me with a list of the first nations consulted?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I can. I do not have that list at hand, but I have had any number of meetings in recent months with various first nations, both at the gathering on Sussex Drive, which was held so successfully just a couple of months ago, and with the grand chief most recently. I have met with representatives of various first nations bands in Ottawa, Gatineau and various locations across the country.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, I would ask that the minister table the first nations, Inuit and Métis with whom he consulted.

The government signed onto the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which calls for free, prior and informed consent on anything to do with their lands. How is this commitment incorporated into the department and the budget?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, as I have explained to colleagues opposite any number of times this evening, under CEAA 2012, the responsible resource development legislation, we are committed to improve, expand and increase assistance funding to ensure that our constitutional obligations to consult with first nations are fully and properly met.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, how many of Environment Canada's climate and impacts adaptation group, many of them Nobel prize winning scientists, will be supported to undertake adaptation work for Canada as the costs of adaptation will be \$21 billion to \$43 billion by 2050?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I would like my colleague to ask the last part of that question again, just so I can respond precisely to it.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, I asked very clearly how many of Environment Canada's climate and impacts adaptation research group, many of them Nobel prize winning scientists, will be supported to undertake adaptation work for Canada as the costs of climate adaptation will be \$21 billion to \$43 billion annually by 2050.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, there are a variety of funding instruments in place to address both climate change mitigation and climate change adaptation. Some months ago \$150 million was committed, and I can tell my colleague that \$252 million is committed to support regulatory activities to address climate change and air quality.

Business of Supply

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, yet again the minister did not answer my question. How many of the scientists, many of them Nobel prize winning scientists, are going to be funded? Has the adaptation impacts research group closed?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, the adaptation research group is, like climate change, an evolving organization. As we address the challenges of climate change, both in terms of mitigation and also with regard to adaptation, we respond and direct our resources to where they are best applied.

● (2410)

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, that is still no answer. We do not know if the impacts group is gone, and climate change is getting worse. The 2°C window associated with dangerous climate change is fast closing.

Ozonesonde measurements in Canada's most populous province, Ontario, have stopped. There are still no ozonesonde measurements in Canada's second most populated province, Quebec. Is this what the minister had in mind when he set to streamlining the ozone program, to stop measuring ozone pollution where people are most affected by it? What other ozone stations have been cut? Can he please answer this time?

Hon. Peter Kent: First, Mr. Chair, I would correct my colleague. In the Canadian Arctic, the 2°C increase has already been quite clearly surpassed.

With regard to ozone monitoring, my colleague seems to think I make the decisions and I assign the locations from where the ozonesonde balloons are launched. That is not the case, and she knows full well that Dr. Dodds is the responsible official for that very essential and important service. She has assured the environment committee that the ozone monitoring program will continue effectively, scientifically acceptable, and the service will continue to be provided to clients around the world.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, the minister does not understand. We are concerned about a 2°C average global temperature. That is associated with dangerous climate change.

We believe in evidence and science on this side of the House. It turns out that ozonesonde measurements have not only ceased at the Centre for Atmospheric Research Experiments in Egbert, Ontario; they have also stopped at Environment Canada's research station at Bratt's Lake near Regina, Saskatchewan. This is downwind from the oil sands and, presumably, would have been part of the minister's plan for oil sands monitoring. Where else will ozonesonde launches that monitor ozone pollution be cut?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I have reached a point where I cannot resist the temptation to remind my hon. colleague that the previous Liberal government paid mere lip service to environmental considerations, while it signed Kyoto without any thoughtful consideration or costing of the commitment it made. It did nothing about it, and emissions rose 30% under its watch.

Our government has moved forward. We have made a very clear and firm commitment to Copenhagen. We are moving sector by sector to regulate, and I can assure the House that we will meet those 2020 targets.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, the Liberals did have a plan. It was called the green plan. This plan would have reduced greenhouse gases. It would have got us 80% of the way to meeting our Kyoto targets. The government killed that plan. It reduced the targets by 90% and it can get us only one-third of the way there.

Last fall the Minister of the Environment repeatedly claimed that the World Ozone and Ultraviolet Radiation Data Centre's world-class services would continue. Could the minister tell us if the move of the data centre to the Meteorological Service of Canada went smoothly and if there were any disruptions in service?

Hon. Peter Kent: Yes, Mr. Chair, I can again assure my colleague that ozone monitoring will continue and so will the world-class service. I would remind my colleague that the Liberal plan was to impose a carbon tax on all Canadians which would impact on virtually everything and the cost of living of all Canadians. Our government will not go there. The carbon market itself is one of the most volatile and insecure in the world. Many of those who have invested in that market are wondering now whether they will ever see a return on that questionable investment.

● (2415)

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, I would remind the minister that his own Prime Minister has promised a price on carbon by 2016-2018, \$65 per tonne.

The question I asked was, were there any disruptions in service at the World Ozone and UV Data Centre, yes or no.

Hon. Peter Kent: Let me clear the air once again, Mr. Chair. This government will not now nor in the future impose a carbon tax on Canadians.

An hon. member: That is what the Liberals want. The Liberals lost two—

Hon. Peter Kent: And they may well again.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: He keeps going back to climate change. The actual question was on ozone.

Will the Minister of the Environment appear before the finance subcommittee on Bill C-38, and before the Senate committee to explain his outrageous accusations against reputable Canadian charities and finally list the organizations he accused of money laundering?

Hon. Peter Kent: I can inform my colleague I will be appearing before the Senate committee later this week, Mr. Chair, and I will appear with great enthusiasm before the finance subcommittee.

With regard to the member's confusion about our government's intention with regard to carbon pricing or carbon taxation, again I assure her that will not happen.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: There is no confusion, Mr. Chair. The Prime Minister made a promise to put a price on carbon by 2016 to 2018, \$65 per tonne.

Business of Supply

Would the minister now list the charities that he has accused of money laundering?

Ms. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Chair, again, our government wants to make sure that charities operate within the tax parameters that are set out in the tax code. Canadians support this.

I should remind my colleague opposite that her government proposed the carbon tax, a tax on everything that would hurt jobs in this country, and our government will not do that.

Ms. Kirsty Duncan: Mr. Chair, I will try again. Will the minister list the organizations he has accused of money laundering?

Hon. Peter Kent: No, I will not, Mr. Chair. Our government's interest is that any organization which has the benefit of charitable status, does nothing to compromise that status.

I would remind my colleague that Canada Revenue Agency rules for a charitable agency explicitly prohibit any communication or call to political action, encouraging the public to contact or oppose any government policy or law.

The Assistant Deputy Chair: That will conclude that particular round.

Order, please.

Now we are going to the hon. member for Mississauga South.

Mrs. Stella Ambler (Mississauga South, CPC): Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this committee of the whole this evening.

Clean air is important to all Canadians. When our air is compromised by pollution, our health pays the price. When our government came into office in 2006, clean air was and remains a top priority. Air pollution is linked to a wide variety of health concerns, including asthma and cardiovascular disease. Air pollution can lead to premature death, increased hospital admissions, more emergency room visits and higher rates of worker absenteeism.

Budget 2011 alone provided almost \$870 million in renewed funding for the clean air regulatory agenda to ensure that we can deliver on our commitments and priorities on air quality. Because of Canada's diverse geography and types of industrial development, pollution levels and the sources of air pollution vary across the country. Environment Canada is taking steps that will make an impact on air pollution across the country. These include regulations to reduce emissions from vehicles and engines, the gradual phase-out of coal-fired electricity generation and regulations to reduce emissions from certain consumer and commercial products that contain harmful elements in large quantities. The government is also working hard with the provinces and industrial stakeholders on a new, comprehensive, nationwide air quality management system to improve air quality across Canada.

The air quality management system has been developed over the past three years with the unprecedented collaboration of the federal, provincial and territorial governments; industry; and a broad range of other stakeholders. As part of the air quality management system, Canadian ambient air quality standards for particulate matter and ground-level ozone more stringent than the existing Canada-wide standards have been developed. The objective of these national standards is to achieve a level of air quality that provides a

measurable improvement in the health of Canadians. These standards will also be used by provinces and territories to manage air quality at the regional and local levels.

In addition to national efforts to improve air quality within Canada, the Government of Canada is taking steps internationally to reduce the cross-border flow of air pollution and its impacts. Developing a clearer national framework on air pollution through the air quality management system will provide a strong basis for further engagement with the United States on transboundary airflow issues, including the Canada–U.S. air quality agreement. Cooperation between Canada and the United States on air quality is ongoing under the air quality agreement, and also under the mandate of the Canada–U.S. Regulatory Cooperation Council. Over 20 years ago, scientists concluded that transboundary movement of air pollution from industrial activities between Canada and the United States resulted in acid rain causing smog and serious damage to our environment. Action was taken to establish a joint agreement to address the issue. Following 20 years of cooperation between Canada and the U.S., emissions causing acid rain have been cut in half and emissions causing smog have been cut by one-third in the region covered under the agreement.

In Canada as a whole, emissions of the key pollutants that contribute to smog, acid rain and poor air quality have seen significant declines since 1990. For example, emissions of sulphur oxides declined by about 54%, mainly due to reductions from base-metal smelters which were down 72% and fossil-fuel fired electricity-generating utilities which decreased by 45%. Since the addition of the ozone annex to the Canada–U.S. air quality agreement in 2000, Canada has also reduced emissions to nitrogen oxide by one-third in southern and central Ontario and southern Quebec. Environment Canada's initiatives have also resulted in a 34% reduction in emissions of particulate matter which is linked to respiratory illness such as chronic bronchitis and asthma as well as cardiac illness and premature death.

● (2420)

However, more effort on particulate matter is required, and this government is acting. Environment Canada is working with the U.S. on the expansion of the Canada–U.S. air quality agreement to address transboundary particulate matter.

Environment Canada is also working with international partners under the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe to address transboundary air pollution.

Business of Supply

In just the past few weeks, Canada played a constructive role in finalizing historic amendments to the 1999 Gothenburg protocol adopted in Geneva on May 4. This protocol will result in further global reductions of air pollution by 2020. The revised Gothenburg protocol is also noteworthy on air pollution policy because it is the first international treaty to include a short-lived climate pollutant, black carbon, as a component of particulate matter. Black carbon is both an air pollutant and a major contributor to global warming. By taking action to reduce black carbon emissions, we fight air pollution and climate change at the same time.

This government is proud of its achievements in reducing air pollution emissions. We are committing significant funding resources to continue the work. Again, progress has been achieved domestically, with close collaboration among this government and the provinces and territories and also bilaterally, by way of our ongoing work with the U.S. to reduce cross-border air pollution.

This government has also worked constructively with our partners in Europe and the U.S. to finalize and see adopted the revised Gothenburg protocol.

This issue is of the utmost importance to the people of Mississauga South, and to all Canadians. This government will continue to address Canada's air quality issues today and in the future, to ensure that future generations can breathe easier.

I do have a few questions for the minister. My first question, through you, Mr. Chair, for the Minister of the Environment is with regard to the current state of air quality compared with other countries.

What is the current state of our air quality in Canada?

• (2425)

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Mississauga South for reminding us about the importance of the acid rain treaty signed by a previous Conservative government 21 years ago, which has led to a significant reduction in illnesses like chronic bronchitis and asthma. Due in part to the acid rain treaty, but also to other measures, Canada has relatively clean air, compared with many countries in the world.

Despite the progress, though, as my colleague has reminded us, a significant portion of the Canadian population still lives in areas where they are affected by a variety of pollutants. This does have an implication for the health of Canadians. However, this government plans to address that challenge.

Mrs. Stella Ambler: Mr. Chair, would the minister explain why we need new ambient air quality standards and regulations?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, ambient air quality standards set a bar, so to speak, for the level of air quality that can be achieved in all parts of the country, whether the airsheds are east to west, north to south, or, in eastern Canada, where our concern is of course, south to north.

With new science and research regarding the effects of air pollution on our health and the environment, it has become apparent that the current Canada-wide standards need to be updated and more stringent ambient air quality standards need to be created. We will do that under the air quality management system.

Mrs. Stella Ambler: Mr. Chair, what does the Minister of the Environment believe the economic impacts of the air quality management system would be on Canada's economy?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, impacts on industrial competitiveness and implications for the Canadian economy, as in all sectors across the economy, whether with regard to our regulatory actions in the transportation sector or in the coal-fired sector, will be carefully considered as we move forward, as will the benefits of cleaner air. There will be economic benefits from cleaner air with regard to reduced health care costs and infrastructure.

Mrs. Stella Ambler: Mr. Chair, could the minister please tell us if it is important to work with other stakeholders, provinces and industry when setting the new standards? When improving the air quality management system, is it important to include other stakeholders, and if so, which ones and why?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, yes, indeed, in answer to my colleague, the development of the air quality management system has been done over recent years in very close collaboration with the provinces and the territories. In recent talks that I have had with my American counterpart at the environmental protection organization, we have talked about a possible future treaty along the lines of the acid rain treaty which would take ambient air quality standards to a new and better continental high.

• (2430)

Mrs. Stella Ambler: Mr. Chair, could the minister tell us, would the government ever impose a carbon tax on Canadians?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I will have to think about that for just a moment.

We have made it very clear. Despite the misperceptions of some of our colleagues opposite, our government has made it very clear in successive elections and in any number of policy discussions with our colleagues in the provinces, territories and municipalities, and at public policy conferences, that this government will never impose a carbon tax in any form on hard-working Canadian taxpayers.

The record to date of the carbon market is one of high volatility and great risk. If one were to look at the European market, the carbon price is less than half of the original investment made by most of the investors.

The Assistant Deputy Chair: Does the hon. member have any more questions? If not, we will move on.

Mrs. Stella Ambler: Mr. Chair, I am happy to give my time to the parliamentary secretary for the environment.

The Assistant Deputy Chair: Is there unanimous consent of the House for the hon. member to split her time?

Some hon. members: No.

Mrs. Stella Ambler: Mr. Chair, I would like to ask the minister about the Gothenburg protocol. In particular, why was that a watershed agreement for Canada to be a part of? Why is it important for Canadians and the health of Canadians?

Business of Supply

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I know we have limited time, but the protocol is important, as are all international treaties and agreements with which we comply to better serve the interests of Canadians in the protection of the environment.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, as I know the minister will want to give the fullest and most complete answers possible, I thought I would let him know that I will be asking questions about the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act and schedule II of the act.

First, I would like to ask a question. In calculating the impact of this budget in the context of long-term prosperity, as in the title of the budget, has the department estimated what it will cost to meet the government's Copenhagen target, yes or no?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, as I answered earlier this evening, the objective of the responsible resource development legislation, as all of the other integral parts of the jobs, growth and prosperity budget that is before Parliament, is aimed at improving the climate for job creation in Canada while at the same time ensuring the protection of the environment.

The economic benefits will be abundant, multi-dimensional in any number of areas, as will the benefits, for example, with regard to our climate change sectoral regulatory process, which is already reducing costs to Canadian taxpayers.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, does the minister have an estimate of the cost of climate change to the Canadian economy, yes or no?

Hon. Peter Kent: No, Mr. Chair. That is an unrealistic expectation. The cost of climate change, as I have explained, comes in many forms and situations. It will be billions of dollars in the years ahead, both in terms of the impact on our Canadian Arctic and in terms of measures which will be required to be taken in mitigation in the south.

• (2435)

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, regarding greenhouse gas limits for oil and gas, the minister has repeated that he is consulting with industry in advance of introducing regulations for the oil and gas sector, and before him, minister Prentice said the same thing. We still have no regulations.

When will the minister announce regulations for this sector?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, we are now in calendar year 2012. Our Copenhagen commitments are for calendar year 2020. As I have explained in the House any number of times, our sector by sector regulatory approach started with transportation, which contributes fully one-quarter of Canada's annual greenhouse gas emissions. We are about to finalize the coal-fired electricity sector regulations in the next few weeks. We are in the consultation process with oil and gas, both conventional and the oil sands. We will continue to work our way around that pie chart.

I believe my colleague is somewhat impatient in her expectation of short-term and immediate answers.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, consultations have been going on since 2007. Could the minister just answer the question, when will we actually see these regulations?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I must again correct my colleague. The consultations with the oil and gas industry with regard to eventual regulation began less than a year ago in material terms and

in real terms. They are continuing. We would expect in not too many months from now to have draft regulations which will be published in *Canada Gazette Part I*.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, I would like to know from the minister how much the department has spent on industry consultations in the past five years.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I do not have that number at hand. That is not an impossible number to quantify, but it would mean breaking down all sorts of day to day operational costs.

There are some who believe I may have spoken—

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, I asked a simple question and it was very short. I would expect that the minister would follow the timelines as were set out at the beginning of committee of the whole.

The Assistant Deputy Chair: I appreciate members' patience on this issue. It is correct that members should do their very best to try to make the responses equally timed to the length of the question. I appreciate that some of these questions can compel a more fulsome response, and I would seek the minister's and other respondents' cooperation in doing their best in terms of keeping the responses short.

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, a reasonable response to a reasonable question is certainly in order. The question my friend asked is somewhat off in the weeds and I do not have that number at hand. We can endeavour to find that number.

I would like to continue on a point of clarification. Earlier I said I was willing to appear before the finance committee this week. I believe I still am. There is some concern that there may be an agenda issue, but I am enthusiastically available to appear before both the finance subcommittee as well as the standing committee.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, my next question is, how much did the ministry spend on consultations in the last fiscal year? The minister has several binders of information in front of him. I am sure he can find the answer.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, that figure is not a budget item. It is not a line item. It is a dollar figure which would be found in any number of operations of any number of sub areas of Environment Canada. That is not a reasonable request.

• (2440)

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, well, the budget does have dollar numbers in it, so how much is budgeted for industry consultations for the coming fiscal year?

Business of Supply

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, industry consultations are not a line item. They are part of an ongoing process which involves consultations across the spectrum of stakeholders, of provinces and territories. It is not in itself an identifiable line item.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, on all of these questions about the estimates, so far we have had zero answers on dollars.

I am going to switch to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. The environment commissioner is seriously concerned about provisions that restrict public participation and decision making. He said that public consultation has always been a bedrock of environmental policy in Canada and that there will be a significant narrowing of public participation in the budget bill. I would like to know how much of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's budget for 2012-13 is dedicated to public consultation.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, it varies from project to project.

I would ask my friend what is the cost of her leader's divisive tactics in trying to turn provinces against provinces over the legitimate and well-regulated resource development of many of our God-given resources?

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, surely the Minister of the Environment could tell us how much of the budget is dedicated to public consultation. It is a very straightforward question.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, the consultation dollars that are a line item, which are specifically allocated, are within the area of aboriginal consultation. In terms of industry consultation and stakeholder consultation, that is a broad spectrum of work that is done by folks within the agency, but it is not identified and need not be identified by any reasonable measure as a line item.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, can the minister even confirm that there will be money spent on public consultation this coming year?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, the short answer is yes.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, it is great that the minister was able to answer my question. I applaud him for that.

Moving on, the changes in part 3, division 1 of the budget implementation bill hand over the decision on who is an interested party to the National Energy Board, or whoever is carrying out the assessment. It says in new paragraph 2, "a person is an interested party if, in its opinion, the person is directly affected by the carrying out of the designated project," et cetera. How does the minister define "directly affected"?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, as with panels and comprehensive studies under CEAA in the past, it will be up to the individual panel to determine those who are appropriately in the affected category, whether they are people living in the immediate vicinity of a proposed project, whether they are first nations, or whether they have significant scientific expertise to share with the panel.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, I appreciate actually getting some information from that answer.

Has the government developed guidelines to determine who will be considered directly affected or is this simply a panel decision?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, this is normally decided by the panels in compliance with the circumstances, the location and the scale of the proposed project.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, it is normally decided by panel, but I am wondering if the government has actually developed guidelines to determine who is directly affected.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, the guidelines, as they are set out in general terms in the new legislation on the National Energy Board and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission side of the assessment regime will be effectively harmonized, brought into line with processes, procedures and considerations already in place under CEAA.

•(2445)

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, would people who live two kilometres from a proposed facility be considered directly affected or would it be a 5, 10 or 20 kilometre zone, such as with Fukushima? What is his opinion on how far one would actually need to be?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, as I have already explained, that is to be determined by the panel on the basis of what the proposed project is, where the proposed project is and which of the three groups I earlier outlined for my colleague is involved.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, what does the minister think our sustainable practice is in the oil sands?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, in short, they are practices that will, in the very least measure, have significant negative environmental impacts and those actions and measures which would be taken to mitigate that possible impact.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, I will move on to schedule 2 that I spoke about. Subparagraph 5(1)(a)(iv) of the budget implementation act and clause 5(3) refer to the fact that environment effects are caused by, and there is a list of criteria there, but it says that items including "any other component of the environment that is set out in Schedule 2".

Could the minister describe what is in schedule 2?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, yes I could.

My colleague is quite right, schedule 2 does allow the government to add to the environmental effects which are listed in section 5. Only effects within federal jurisdiction are relevant. The law could evolve and at some point in the future we might have other areas that would constitute federal jurisdiction.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Chair, does the minister have a list or a draft list in the works of what would be in schedule 2?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, by the time this legislation comes into effect there will be additional information with regard to the regulatory side that complements the legislation itself.

Business of Supply

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake, CPC): Mr. Chair, it is a pleasure to rise this evening. Actually, this is my third time in the past week that I am here at this late hour speaking to Canadians about issues that are important to them. Indeed, as the former chair of the Standing Committee on the Environment, it is great to be able to speak to the House about the important work being undertaken by the government, work that has a real impact on the health of all Canadians and the environment in which we live.

As everyone knows, Environment Canada is a regulatory department. As one of the federal government's most active regulators, Environment Canada has wide-ranging regulatory powers. In fact, the department is responsible for more than a dozen statutes and 80 regulations in a number of areas, including controlling the level of toxic substances in commercial products and protecting migratory birds and species at risk.

Although Environment Canada's strong regulatory performance goes uncontested given these realities, it is necessary for the department to aim for progressively higher levels of regulatory excellence. Changes to the regulatory processes will be a key component in enabling the department to achieve its goals for all Canadians. To this end, the department's next steps in improving regulatory measures involves streamlining and increasing the efficiency and transparency of its regulatory processes so they can be more efficient and effective.

While these are significant aims, there are broader, practical considerations as well, especially given the impact that environmental rules and standards have on our economy. We have to uphold these high standards at the same time as we ensure Canadian businesses hold their own in an intensely competitive global marketplace.

Given the key role that first-class environmental regulations play in a well-functioning economy, it is easy to understand why striving for regulatory excellence is so important. The commitment to regulatory excellence is perhaps best demonstrated through the internationally recognized chemicals management plan. Launched in 2006 as a combined effort of Environment Canada and Health Canada, the chemicals management plan has elevated Canada to the position of world leader in addressing threats to the safety and security of Canadians for new and existing chemical substances.

Many of the chemicals reviewed under the chemicals management plan are pervasive in the everyday lives of Canadians. They range from chemicals used in various industrial sectors, including fuels, energy, pulp and paper, household products, children's toys and in food. Bisphenol A is a well-known example. Here is a case where a comprehensive series of measures have been put in place starting with banning its use in baby bottles. This was followed by controls to limit the release of industrial effluents to water and the implementation to research and monitoring programs to determine if further action is required. In addition, the chemicals management plan is a predictable science-based regime that provides regulatory certainty for business.

Canada is also using its research and monitoring data together with our regulatory experience to provide international leadership in chemicals management. For example, last summer, Canada hosted the International Conference on Mercury as a Global Pollutant in

Halifax. That brought together several hundred researchers from around the world and showcased the results of Canada's work in this field. In particular, this science has identified that over 95% of mercury, a potent neurotoxin that is particularly harmful to pregnant women and children, is coming from other countries and accumulating in Canada's north.

Canada's science is informing UN negotiations for a mercury treaty aimed toward limiting atmospheric emissions from these countries and, thus, protecting Canadians and our environment. It is also informing the international community on the progress that has been made in managing persistent organic pollutants, such as PCBs.

Together, over the past five years, Environment Canada and Health Canada have made great strides in a wide range of chemical risk assessments, regulatory activities, monitoring and research. That work must and will proceed.

In 2011, the government announced \$500 million over five years to ensure the significant work on chemicals, which we began back in 2006, continues at full speed. We have made solid progress under the chemicals management plan in addressing a significant portion of the chemicals that are believed to be in commerce and that have been identified as having potential risks to human health or the environment. We have now worked through the assessment of about 1,100 chemicals on that list and will tackle close to 1,500 over the next five years. We will also ensure that new harmful chemicals do not enter the Canadian market.

● (2450)

The chemicals management plan exemplifies many of the hallmarks of a world-class regulatory system. It is a transparent regulatory program that provides for stakeholder participation and is responsive to the growing body of new science in this field. Last year, for example, stakeholders asked for reconsideration of one of our regulatory decisions on the basis of new science. A board of review was established composed of a panel of experts in this area and they examined new information, including studies carried out by Environment Canada. The board found that the substance did not pose a danger to the environment and, as such, the department was able to conclude that the substance was not toxic and regulatory control measures were not required.

Another strength of the chemicals management plan is the government's ongoing commitment to consult and share information with stakeholders and the public at key stages throughout the regulatory process.

Business of Supply

Since 2006, about \$400 million have been spent by Environment Canada and Health Canada to ensure that the health of Canadians and their environment is protected, which is a key priority. We are determined to ensure that existing chemicals used in our homes, businesses and public spaces are properly managed and that the risks to Canadians are minimized. We are equally determined to keep close tabs on any and all new chemicals that enter the market.

There is no question that protecting the health of Canadians and their environment is a key priority. This priority is clearly reflected through the funding of the next phases of the chemical management plan.

Moving forward, I am confident that Environment Canada and the entire department will continue to regulate in a manner that is evidence-based, efficient, effective, transparent and adaptable, firmly establishing itself as a world-class regulator.

I have a couple of questions for the parliamentary secretary.

First, how can the government say that it is a world leader in chemicals management when Canadians and the environment are still exposed to harmful chemicals?

• (2455)

Ms. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Chair, I want to personally thank the member for Selkirk—Interlake for his hard work on the Lake Winnipeg file. He has been a tireless advocate for the health of that lake. I know he supports our government's continued funding for the important environmental protection work that we are doing in that area.

With regard to his question, Canada's chemical management plan is leading the world on many fronts. We are the first country in the world to conduct a systematic assessment of all chemicals in commerce. This has put us in a position where we are pioneering the management of certain chemicals. For example, Canada was the first country in the world to take action to prohibit the importation, sale and advertising of baby bottles that contain BPA.

The CMP will continue to protect the health of Canadians and the environment. We will continue to work with industry to support stewardship and innovation, to partner and engage with all stakeholders for effectiveness and efficiency, to invest in research and monitoring, to work with our international partners and to make information on chemicals publicly available so that Canadians can participate in consultations with us and make informed decisions.

Mr. James Bezan: Mr. Chair, the parliamentary secretary mentioned Lake Winnipeg and its south basin is in my riding of Selkirk—Interlake. This has been one initiative that I have been so pleased was undertaken by our government.

Over the past four years, Environment Canada has invested \$18 million in research to look at things like nutrient loads and ways to control agricultural run-off and to monitor and improve municipal waste water treatment right through the entire basin. The basin consists of four provinces and four U.S. states. It has been incredible to have the participation of stakeholders throughout the Lake Winnipeg basin. They have contributed to the knowledge and the reduction of nutrient loads going into Lake Winnipeg.

I, my kids and my family love to swim in Lake Winnipeg. We have some beautiful beaches in the south basin and the last thing we want to see is algae blooms. The last thing we want to see is having high E. coli counts and beach closures because of these nutrient loads that occur from time to time. We need to work closely with stakeholders to reduce those nutrients.

The \$18 million through Environment Canada and targeted through research within the department and also working along with academics throughout the basin have provided a significant benefit long term. Part of the Lake Winnipeg basin initiative also consisted of the Lake Winnipeg stewardship fund and that component was almost \$4 million in funding provided to community stakeholder groups that did different types of projects. One that was particularly successful, and is still running to this day, was the one that was undertaken by the Lake Winnipeg south basin mayors and reeves. They introduced a lake-friendly program to label products that were lake friendly, essentially that they were low in phosphates and nitrates and that they were safe to use if they ever ended up in the lake through the watershed.

In watching the debate earlier today, I understand there were a number of members who already spoke to the benefits of protecting Lake Winnipeg since it acted as the reservoir for the entire southern Prairies and the northern great plains of the United States.

The parliamentary secretary is extremely familiar with Lake Winnipeg. Could she speak of her experience and her ideas and suggestions on how this program has worked and how it may continue into the future?

Ms. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Chair, my colleague's question is well-informed. He is quite correct. I have a great fondness in my heart for Lake Winnipeg, having grown up spending countless summer nights on that lake. It is dear to many people in the prairie provinces. However, it is important to note as well that the Lake Winnipeg basin's watershed exceeds over one million square kilometres. As my colleague mentioned, it also incorporates part of the northern U.S. states.

Therefore, it is particularly important that we continue the work we do as a government to monitor water quality in the major rivers that contribute nutrients to Lake Winnipeg, including the Red, Pembina and Saskatchewan Rivers. As has been mentioned already tonight, we are also monitoring for biological effects and changes along the southern shoreline of the lake and following nutrient transport from distributed sources.

The one thing I want to highlight in my colleague's comments is the ongoing partnership that our government has with local conservation groups, local research teams and industry groups to get to a point where we have policy in place that balances that need to use the landscape to produce agriculture with that environmental protection component. Our investments into this area are so important and vital. As a former Manitoban, this is really important to the people of that province and the watershed basin. We hope we will continue with those measures well into the future.

Business of Supply

• (2500)

Mr. James Bezan: Mr. Chair, in the last Parliament, when I was the chair of the Standing Committee on Environment, I was proud of the work that we undertook in studying the oil sands. We looked at the amount of work that was taking place in monitoring the oil sands and the possible contamination of the Athabasca River and surrounding area and the impact on downstream communities. I am quite concerned about some of the comments that have been made by the leader of the NDP over the last week or so.

What is the parliamentary secretary's take on the comments made by the leader of the NDP, calling the oil sands a disease that was going to hurt Ontario and eastern Canada.

Ms. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for this very important question, because to put these comments into perspective, we have been talking tonight a lot about funding programs that support the environment.

The oil sands make a very important contribution to the Canadian economy. If developed sustainably, the oil sands are projected to contribute over \$2.1 trillion over the next 25 years to our economy. To have the Leader of the Opposition engaging in tactics that would see workers in one region pitted against workers in another is not really productive. It is not productive to help grow the economy; furthermore, it is not productive towards ensuring that we continue to have industrial growth so that these important programs we are talking about tonight—programs we need to fund, such as the Great Lakes Basin protection programs—will continue to have sustainable funding available.

I certainly hope that my colleagues opposite, over the coming weeks, will repudiate their leader's comments and support workers across this country in a unified way.

The Assistant Deputy Chair: That will bring that round to a close.

Now we will go to the hon. member for Burnaby—New Westminster.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, we have been disappointed with the lack of responses to our questions this evening.

However, I am going to come back now to a question that I asked three times earlier tonight. I am sure the minister has now had time to consult his department officials. It is a very simple question around the environmental emergencies program.

How many incidents has the environmental emergencies program been involved in responding to for each of the last three years?

I ask this question for a third time now.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I can give my colleague an approximate number. The total number of events, spills or releases of pollutants was approximately 1,500.

Here is the exact number. In 2010-11, there were 1,050 pollution incidents to which Environment Canada provided technical support. Of these events, though, Environment Canada personnel attended only approximately 10%.

I remind my colleague that Environment Canada staffers are not first responders. They very seldom attend unless there is a

compelling reason, either in the magnitude of the event or in the scientific complexity, that requires their on-location presence.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, what that shows is that on average, every 72 hours the environmental emergencies program was responding to an environmental emergency. So much for it being a rare occurrence. I think it is very good to have that exposed.

I would like to come to the issue of the probable increase in environmental incidents that would require a response from the emergency environmental program if the northern gateway pipeline project is approved.

Has the department calculated the probable increase in environmental incidents that the EEP would be called to?

• (2505)

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, first, to correct my colleague, of those 1,050 instances, the vast majority were very small and were contained by local or provincial agencies.

With regard to the legislation before us and the possible development of major projects, in budget 2012 we provided \$35.7 million, for example, over two years to further strengthen Canada's tanker regime, again depending upon projects and tanker routes as they would be approved.

With regard to major pipeline projects, there has been provision for far greater inspection and oversight of any new completed project.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, he did not answer my question, which asked if they have calculated the probable increase in environmental incidents.

I will not give the minister another chance to obfuscate. However, if he does have the response, I hope that he will give it.

As we know, the B.C. environment minister was very surprised about the closure of the environmental emergencies program in British Columbia and the B.C. spill response centre. Were any consultations at all done with the Government of British Columbia before the B.C. spill response centre was closed?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, first, my colleague is asking a hypothetical question. In a perfect world, there would be no additional, or possibly fewer, spill incidents to respond to.

With regard to the contents of the legislative material before us, the responsible resource development and the jobs, growth and prosperity legislation, we can not breach cabinet confidence to consult. I did consult immediately after the tabling of the legislation and immediately after the details were released.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, that explains why British Columbians and the B.C. government were so surprised by what many considered to be irresponsible actions taken by the government.

I will move on to the issue of the media protocol for scientists. There have been a number of concerns about Environment Canada scientists being limited in how they can speak to the media about their work.

What is the department's overall media protocol for scientists?

Business of Supply

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, again I go back to my colleague's preamble. In consultation with my counterpart in the British Columbia government, there has been recognition that the decision to consolidate offices from six to two and the provisions to continue our environmental service to lead agencies with regard to spill has been accepted as a sound and logical decision.

With regard to the second part of the question, our government believes that taxpayer-funded scientists should focus their efforts on taxpayer-funded research. We do enable thousands of interviews across government every year with our scientists, with reasonable media requests.

However, we believe that a demand to meet a 60 minute deadline by an individual reporter is simply not acceptable. We will continue to work with the media on reasonable requests. Again, I would expect many thousand more interviews in the year ahead.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, will the minister make the media protocol public? Specifically, what was the media protocol for Environment Canada scientists attending this year's international polar year conference?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I would remind my colleague that any large organization that does not have a communications policy is out of touch with modern realities.

With regard to the polar conference, it was a very successful conference at which we enabled any number of interviews on location, with a number to come in the future. We ensured that our scientists spoke to the science of their projects and that ministers spoke to policy.

● (2510)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, again, will the protocol be made public? That is the question.

Let us look at two issues. Scientist David Tarasick and his ozone layer research published in the journal, *Nature*, and the scientific team publishing in the *Journal of Geophysical Research*, were not allowed to do the interviews that were requested by the media. Was the minister's office involved in that decision? Again, will the media protocol be made public?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, again, and I will try to be very clear for my colleague's benefit, the media protocol is public.

Journalists of one sort or another, whether scientific journalists or general news journalists, contact the department when they see an item, a paper or a statement that they would like to address. The communications department of Environment Canada, as in other government departments and in most private sector companies, processes the request. In 99% of the cases it enables the interview to take place.

With regard to the two incidents referenced by my friend, the circumstances simply did not work out to enable those interviews at that specific time.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, does the media office keep statistics to track how often it meets or misses deadlines for comments? How many complaints has the media office received in the last year from journalists about delayed access or restricted access to Environment Canada scientists?

Hon. Peter Kent: Again, Mr. Chair, my colleague is speaking as though this is a regulatory process. Journalists do not file complaints with non-compliance. Some of them are understandably upset if they do not get immediate satisfaction to their request, but, as I said, we enable many thousands of interviews across government with no complaints.

I would assure my colleague that the complaints are relatively few and far between.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, the question was how many complaints, and as we saw with the environmental emergency program, according to the minister, what was rare turned out to be not so rare when we asked about the statistics. That is why we were asking for hard facts. That is what we are looking for.

I will move on now to the accusations made about Canadian environmental charities. The minister made a claim around criminal activities because that is what money laundering is. He made the claim on April 28, repeated it on May 1 and again on May 3 in this House. Tonight he has responded that he simply does not have any proof of criminal activity.

Would the minister retract the term and retract the claims that he made on three occasions in the House of Commons?

Hon. Peter Kent: The short answer, Mr. Chair, is no. Our government appreciates the great service that charities across the spectrum provide in adding and supplementing in areas where government cannot necessarily provide services. Charities provide great support in areas of culture, the arts and, indeed, in health care and academia.

My points were referenced and included the environmental non-governmental organizations. My remarks reflected our government's concern about a small number of agencies in Canada with charitable status which, as evidence accumulates almost by the day, were putting their charitable status at risk by behaviour and by actions that were in violation of CRA regulation.

● (2515)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, we simply need to ask the minister even understands the definition of money laundering. That, of course, is a criminal activity. What he has said tonight is that he has no proof of any criminal activity from these environmental charities.

I would like to move on to the issue of the minister's statement on January 12 in Calgary when he described the decision to withdraw from Kyoto as "an early Christmas present" to himself. Could he please explain what he meant by that?

Hon. Peter Kent: First, Mr. Chair, the term that I used was a figure of speech. I could have used greenwashing. I could have used whitewashing and, as I have said in this House, I could have used shell game or three card monte, which is also an offence under the Canadian Criminal Code. However, these are only offences if criminal proceeds are involved.

Business of Supply

It is a figure of speech. I am delighted that it caught the attention of those charities that may have been compromising their status. I am glad if it has caught the attention of the opposition and I am glad it has caught the attention of the Canadian public. I would hope that those charitable organizations, which do have the benefit of charitable status, will conform with CRA regulation.

With regard to my early Christmas present, our government, since coming to power in 2006, had stated quite clearly that the Kyoto protocol was one of the largest single mistakes made by the previous Liberal government with any thought or consideration or due diligence. It was my honour to represent Canada, both at the Durban conference in December and upon the—

The Assistant Deputy Chair: I have to stop the minister there. We just have one minute left.

The hon. member for Burnaby—New Westminster.

Mr. Peter Julian: I have two questions to conclude, Mr. Chair.

First, we had a recent media story that highlighted the amount of overtime charged by ministerial drivers. Environment Canada refused to release those overtime records. I would like to ask the minister why he refused to release those overtime records.

Second, I would like to point out to the minister, in the Accountable Government Guide it says that he must answer all questions pertaining to his areas of responsibility, correcting any inadvertent errors at the earliest opportunity. He has made an error tonight and in previous declarations in the House accusing environmental charitable organizations of criminal activity. He has the opportunity to withdraw and retract. We certainly hope that he will take that opportunity tonight.

Finally, will the minister commit to respond to the many questions we have asked him over the course of this evening that he was unable to respond to directly? He does have the responsibility to respond. Will he do so in the coming days?

Ms. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Chair, with regard to the driver policy, I am certainly glad our Minister of the Environment is working hard. Anything to do with the policy is also subject to confidentiality terms, privacy terms as per Parliament.

With regard to the charitable status of political activities in this country, Canadians want to see charities work within the tax code. Surveys have been done that show that more than 80% of Canadians agree with what we put in budget 2010, which is ensuring compliance with the tax code. Charities do great work in our communities. We just want to make sure that, when people are giving their hard-earned dollars to charities, they are complying with the tax rules. That is all.

This is something the opposition should support. We want to make sure that scope is respected.

The Assistant Deputy Chair: That will conclude the round. We have just one more round to go. It will be the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment. However, I should point out to hon. members that there is about eight minutes remaining in the time allocated for this evening's debate.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment.

Ms. Michelle Rempel (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Chair, I want to thank all my colleagues here on the government side for being with us tonight and doing such a great job. We have a great team here. It is 1:20 Wednesday morning, and it gives me great pride to work with my colleagues.

I want to speak about our plan for oil sands monitoring.

Over the last year, Canada has weathered economic storms, and few other countries in the world have succeeded in the same way we have. Oil sands and oil sands development have had an important part to play in this. They are an extremely important resource for Canada and a key driver of our economic development.

Our country's oil reserves, 97% of which are found in the oil sands, are third only to major producing nations such as Saudi Arabia and Venezuela in proven national oil supplies. The oil sands sector accounts for 2% of our GDP and accounted for more than \$17 billion in capital investment in 2010.

Equally important to this government is that the oil sands are developed in an environmentally responsible way. While the leader of the opposition will travel across this country and try to tell Canadians it is okay to slander people in one region, who work in one sector, against people in another, Canadians know different. They know we are united under one banner.

We are united under an economy that provides jobs and opportunity for Canadians in an equal way. This equality, this unity, is something our government stands for, and as a government member, I am certainly proud to stand here tonight and talk about responsible resource development that will ensure jobs and economic growth for years to come for this country.

The sustainable development of Canada's oil sands will require discipline, focus and co-operation to protect the environment while realizing the full positive potential for all Canadians. That is exactly what our government is committed to doing.

Last July, we released our integrated environment monitoring plan for the oil sands, a plan that was developed in partnership with leading environmental scientists from across Canada. It outlined the elements needed for a world-class monitoring program with a comprehensive approach that covers water, air and biodiversity. Then in February, we released a joint implementation plan describing how we would work with the Government of Alberta and industry, in consultation with other key stakeholders, to put a world-class monitoring program in place.

Rather than slander the sector, we worked with the stakeholders, we worked with industry and we worked with the communities to put together a plan that would ensure this monitoring system was put in place in a sustainable way.

Business of Supply

This plan will make Canada's oil sands monitoring among the best in the world. It optimizes existing provincial and federal environmental monitoring for water, air and biodiversity and is being carried out in an efficient manner as we utilize infrastructure that is in currently place. Monitoring will be comprehensive and integrated. We will seek advice from all stakeholders as we deliver on this plan. Implementation will be tracked through annual progress reports.

This new program will be subject to external scientific peer review at the end of the three-year implementation, and periodically thereafter. Therefore, in spite of what the opposition will say, there will be external peer review as part of this process.

This will ensure that we build and maintain one of the best environmental monitoring systems anywhere in the world. This is a democratic free country where we have oil reserves that are under a democratic government with a world-class oil sands monitoring program.

This collaboration and informed discussion are the cornerstones to success for an undertaking as complex and as important as the oil sands monitoring development project. We will make the system highly transparent. We will ensure that scientific data that is collected from our monitoring and analysis is publicly available with common quality assurance practices in place. As we move forward with the implementation of this program, we will continue to engage stakeholders, so they are informed each step of the way.

The governments of both Canada and Alberta have already committed significant resources to environmental monitoring. Industry has indicated it is willing to provide the additional funding required to implement the new monitoring activities and is working with the two governments to establish sustainable funding arrangements for the program.

Our plan for the oil sands monitoring is a direct result of the fact that this government listened and acted. We listened to environmental monitoring experts when they raised concerns about possible environmental impacts of the oil sands. We acted. We listened to an environmental advisory panel that recommended we develop a world-class, scientifically credible and trusted monitoring reporting system, which the Environment Commissioner noted as such in committee testimony.

• (2520)

We listened to Canadians who support the environmentally responsible development of this economic resource. We look forward to the next 12 months as our government is keenly interested in striking the right balance between economic renewal and environmental protection.

As we close off this hearing tonight, I think it is really important to note that our government is not interested in rhetoric or inflaming different regions against each other.

We want to ensure that our country is prosperous. We have seen the creation of hundreds of thousands of jobs since 2009. We have a plan to ensure that economic growth is created, and the energy sector is part of that. We are balancing that with a firm environmental stewardship plan that is funded in this budget. We have all sorts of excellent metrics in place through the oil sands monitoring program. We need to ensure that the rhetoric that is put in place by the NDP is not something that Canadians take to heart. This is about the sustainable development of our energy sector.

As an Albertan and as a Canadian, I certainly hope that my constituents' voices and the voices of all Canadians who are impacted by this important sector are listened to by the NDP and that the NDP will not continue this harmful, disuniting practice of pitting workers in one region against the other.

When we look at the government's track record, millions of dollars have been invested into programs that have created positive environmental impacts. My colleagues tonight have talked about the Lake Winnipeg Basin and the local conservation groups that we are supporting. Right now we are travelling across the country in the environment committee, but the NDP is not talking about that, listening to Canadians and talking about how we can engage local conservation groups in creating a national conservation plan framework, something that we committed to in our throne speech.

Instead of the Liberal Party that puts forward plans, grand international accords and sees greenhouse gas emissions rising, we are actually taking action. The most recent greenhouse gas emission trend report came forward. It showed that for the first time we are seeing economic growth in this country, and the stabilization of our greenhouse gas emissions.

Listening to Canadians and industry and coming up with a plan that balances economic growth with environmental stewardship is something that is prudent, it is something that Canadians want and it is something that I am certainly proud to support.

I am proud of our environment minister and proud of our team here.

• (2525)

The Assistant Deputy Chair: It being 1:27 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 81(4) all votes are deemed reported. The committee will rise and I will now leave the chair.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bruce Stanton): This House stands adjourned until later today at 2:00 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 1:28 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 15, 2012

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Environment—Main Estimates, 2012-13

(Consideration in committee of the whole of all votes
under Environment in the main estimates, Ms. Denise
Savoie in the chair)

Ms. Leslie	8169
Mr. Kent	8169
Mr. Fantino	8173
Ms. Duncan (Etobicoke North)	8173
Mr. Kamp	8176

Ms. Quach	8178
Mr. Blaney	8180
Mr. Julian	8182
Mr. Sopuck	8184
Ms. Rempel	8186
Mrs. Hughes	8187
Mr. Chong	8189
Mrs. Ambler	8193
Mr. Bezan	8197
Ms. Rempel	8201
All Environment votes reported	8202

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>

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.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>

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