



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 147 • NUMBER 120 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, October 1, 2014

—

Speaker: The Honourable Andrew Scheer

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 1, 2014

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

• (1405)

[English]

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

[Members sang the national anthem]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

AFRICAN INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Mr. Joe Daniel (Don Valley East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents of Don Valley East, today I pay tribute to the African Institute for Mathematical Sciences next Einstein initiative, funded by our government through the International Development Research Centre. The goals of AIMS are to promote mathematics and science in Africa, to recruit and train talented students and teachers, and to build capacity for African initiatives in education, research, and technology.

Congratulations to AIMS for opening its fifth centre of training, research, and outreach in mathematical sciences in Tanzania this October. This centre joins others in South Africa, Senegal, Ghana, and Cameroon. To date, they have graduated 731 alumni from 41 countries, and 30% were women. AIMS expects to graduate its one-thousandth scholar in 2015.

I invite all my colleagues to enjoy a reception and to hear the incredible story of AIMS in Africa, today at 5 p.m. in the Speaker's salon. I ask colleagues to join me in helping AIMS find the next Einstein in Africa.

* * *

NATIONAL SENIORS DAY

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today is National Seniors Day, and New Democrats wish to recognize and appreciate the hard work Canadian seniors have put into building thriving communities, organizations, and workplaces across this country.

Sadly, more than 260,000 seniors across the country are living below the poverty line. As more and more Canadians retire, that number will rise. The government must respond, but sadly, the Conservatives have failed to take action.

New Democrats know that something needs to be done, and that is the reason we have released a national seniors strategy on aging. It provides an urgently needed framework to eradicate seniors poverty; strengthen vital public services for seniors, including health care and affordable housing; and allow all Canadians to age with dignity.

We urge the government to show support for seniors and adopt my Motion No. 529.

* * *

BRIGHTON APPLEFEST

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, the municipality of Brighton celebrated the milestone 40th anniversary of its annual AppleFest. This unique festival, which recognizes Brighton's apple farming heritage, marks the beginning of the fall apple harvest season.

This year's AppleFest was the largest and busiest in recent memory, with a record 30,000 attendees over the weekend. Festival goers were able to shop local vendors at the street fair or browse the classics at the car show. An evening concert showcased Canadian greats Kim Mitchell and April Wine, and kids and parents alike were entertained by renowned wildlife filmmakers Chris and Martin Kratt, of *Wild Kratts*.

Brighton's 40th AppleFest surpassed everyone's expectations and provided an outdoor venue replete with something for everyone. I would like to take a moment to thank those numerous volunteers who were able to make this year's event possible. I also encourage a visit to this apple-growing region any time of the year.

*Statements by Members***PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA**

Mr. Arnold Chan (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House to acknowledge the People's Republic of China's 65th anniversary today. Much progress has been made in moving toward a modern China over this period. Despite this, challenges remain.

The Sino-Canadian relationship has long been strong. Whether it was the humanitarian actions of Dr. Norman Bethune, the opening of diplomatic relations in the early 1970s under Prime Minister Trudeau, or the Team Canada missions under Prime Minister Chrétien, Canada has been at the forefront with China.

Today, the world is watching Hong Kong exercise the guarantees that were established under the Basic Law agreement that was signed between the PRC and the United Kingdom in 1984. As noted yesterday by my hon. colleague from Thornhill, we would urge the Chinese government to respect the framework of the Basic Law, which speaks to the concept of one country, two systems.

We recognize the PRC's sovereignty over Hong Kong. At the same time, we in the Liberal Party would urge the government of China to act prudently and to allow peaceful democratic protests to occur.

* * *

GOVERNMENT OF NEW BRUNSWICK

Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC): Mr. Speaker, New Brunswick Liberals were elected to govern my province for the next four years. I am ready to work with them to advance the interests of my district. However, I am deeply concerned about premier-elect Brian Gallant's promise to establish a moratorium on developing our shale gas resources. Instead, Mr. Gallant believes an additional \$1 billion worth of projects will create a strong economy. Yet our \$12 billion in debt already totals \$16,000 for every man, woman, and child. He has also proposed, we think, the highest tax rate on top income earners in North America. We cannot tax ourselves into prosperity.

Decisions have repercussions. If Mr. Gallant does not allow shale gas jobs to be created in New Brunswick, more of our young workers will move to Saskatchewan for opportunity. They will, astoundingly, work in the very same industry the Liberals will not open back home.

Yes, my province will continue to receive transfers from Ottawa, but at a very high cost. Our towns will continue to empty out, and New Brunswick will be poorer for it.

* * *

● (1410)

*[Translation]***BROME-MISSISQUOI EQUALITY FORUM**

Mr. Pierre Jacob (Brome—Missisquoi, NDP): Mr. Speaker, many women have a hard time balancing work, study and family, and that affects their economic security. I believe that the inequalities many women face hinder their independence.

That is why I encourage people to go to the forum Brome-Missisquoi en égalité debates tomorrow, Thursday, at the Georges-

Perron community centre in Bedford. There will be a number of presentations on inequality and the importance of community action.

I congratulate the forum organizers and participants because the NDP shares their values. I also invite all members to sign the forum's statement of principles, which is on my Facebook page.

* * *

*[English]***CHARTERED PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTANTS OF CANADA**

Ms. Joyce Bateman (Winnipeg South Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today marks an historic event for the accounting profession in our country: the integration of the profession into the Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada.

Across our nation, provincial accounting bodies are unified, and when complete, there will be more than 190,000 CPAs in Canada. The unification of the accounting profession will best serve the public by establishing common codes of professional conduct, disciplinary systems, and licence regimes. It will also enhance the influence, relevance, and contributions of the Canadian accounting profession, both at home and abroad. It will provide a consistent national regulatory framework, which will facilitate labour mobility, the integration of foreign-trained professionals, and effective business across provincial borders.

As a proud chartered accountant, I look forward to becoming a chartered professional accountant. Congratulations to the leadership of CPA Canada on this very important milestone.

* * *

HEPWORTH-SHALLOW LAKE ROTARY CLUB

Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): I rise in the House today to congratulate the Hepworth-Shallow Lake Rotary Club on their 65th anniversary and to thank them for all the work they have done over the past 65 years.

Furthermore, I would like to sincerely congratulate Mr. Ed Ruth on the 50th anniversary of his membership with this club. This is truly an outstanding achievement. In his late 20s, Ed was the victim of an unfortunate accident that resulted in the loss of one arm. He was a hard-working man with a wife and three children to support. During this difficult time, it was this local rotary club that sought out Ed and offered him any assistance they could give. It was for this reason that Ed joined the rotary club, and he has been an active member ever since.

I believe that I speak for all Canadians in congratulating Ed on his outstanding commitment and unwavering support for his community over the past 50 years. Congratulations to both Ed Ruth and the Hepworth-Shallow Lake Rotary Club on these tremendous achievements, and all the best in their future successes.

SEAFORTH HIGHLANDERS ARMY CADETS

Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to rise today to recognize some outstanding young men and women from my riding.

The 1867 Royal Canadian Army Cadet Corps Seaforth Highlanders are here in Ottawa this week and on Parliament Hill all day today. There are 28 cadets and four chaperones from Newton-North Delta here in the gallery, and I want to take this opportunity to tell them that they are the reason I love my job. I appreciate their ideas, civic engagement, and energy. I am in absolute awe of this particular group and its commitment to loyalty, professionalism, mutual respect, and integrity as guiding principles.

These teenagers already stand out as community leaders. It is a privilege for me to represent them here in Parliament. I wish I could name them all, but due to time constraints, it is not possible. Therefore, I will profusely thank their group leader, Michael Marek, for his tireless efforts and advocacy on their behalf in arranging this visit. I am completely inspired by all of them.

* * *

WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS

Mrs. Susan Truppe (London North Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, October is Women's History Month in Canada. This year's theme, "Canadian Business Women—A Growing Economic Force", encourages us to look at Canadian entrepreneurs.

Women have made vital contributions to business and entrepreneurship throughout our history, and this continues today. RBC Economics reports that in 2011, majority-owned women's businesses contributed an estimated \$148 billion to the Canadian economy.

Throughout Women's History Month 2014, I invite all Canadians to discover and honour the accomplishments of women in business. Knowing this proud history can inspire enterprising women and girls across Canada to pursue opportunities in business and help build a stronger economy for all.

I am very proud of the women entrepreneurs in London, Ontario.

* * *

• (1415)

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have previously spoken in the House about the need to address the pressing issue of violence against women. Today, I am raising the particular issue of violence against immigrant women.

Systemic issues of gender inequality mean that immigrant women are frequently forced to relinquish their status in Canada, in order to escape domestically abusive relationships or abusive employers. These particular victims of violence are often slipping through the cracks of our immigration system because they are ineligible for refugee status or for consideration on humanitarian and compassionate grounds. Women in this situation rarely see their abusers brought to justice because they are removed from Canada before their cases can be resolved.

Statements by Members

As we prepare to debate the motion brought my colleague from Churchill to establish a coordinated national action plan to address violence against women, I call upon the government to examine the precarious situation of immigrant women who are victims of violence and who often have no recourse due to the loss of their immigration status.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

Ms. Roxanne James (Scarborough Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are living in a dark and dangerous world. The Islamic State has named Canada as a potential target for its violent terrorist actions.

Our Conservative government has taken strong action to keep Canadians safe from radical Islamists who wish to harm us. We have created new measures to strip citizenship from terrorists and to stop radicals from travelling overseas to engage in terrorism.

However, I noted media reports that the Liberal member for Malpeque said that there were no charges under the Combating Terrorism Act and that taking passports away from terrorists was "not enough". The member is wrong. I only need to point to a recent case in B.C. where an individual was charged for travelling to Syria to join Islamist fighters.

What is more, it appears that Liberals speak from both sides of their mouths because that member voted against stripping citizenship from terrorists, a move that four out of five Canadians agree with. This just shows, once again, that Liberals are in way over their heads with regard to national security.

* * *

BEDFORD VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS ASSOCIATION

Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Bedford Volunteer Firefighters Association just celebrated 75 years of service. I was very happy to be on hand to mark this milestone.

The fire service started out with 25 buckets, two ladders, and an axe hanging on the side of a shed. Although the equipment is much more advanced today, the service still relies upon the brave men and women who are there in an emergency.

Volunteer firefighters sacrifice their time and their safety to protect their communities. They often miss family gatherings, holidays, and certainly sleep, in the process.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the members of the Bedford Volunteer Firefighters Association.

* * *

IRAN

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am again advocating for Iranian prisoner Ms. Reyhaneh Jabbari.

Oral Questions

Ms. Jabbari continues to be at risk of imminent execution for defending herself and killing her attacker, who was attempting to rape her. She is only 26 years old and was recently transferred from Tehran's Evin prison to be executed and was told to say her good-byes to her family.

In April, a court postponed Jabbari's execution in the face of heavy international criticism, including an international petition with nearly 200,000 signatures.

This grim news that the execution will soon be carried out came as Iranian President Hassan Rouhani was speaking in New York at the United Nations, trying to put a moderate face on the regime.

Instead of increasing its number of executions, Rouhani's government should reform its judicial system to meet international law and respect jurisprudence. I urge the Iranian regime to respect Ms. Jabbari's rights. Her imprisonment and treatment are inhumane and unacceptable.

I once again call upon President Rouhani to exercise clemency, stay her execution, and suspend her sentence.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, despite having few answers about the mission, it is pretty clear Conservatives have made up their minds when it comes to deploying forces to Iraq.

New Democrats have a consistent approach. We believe in fighting extremism in ways consistent with Canadian values and focused on saving lives.

Meanwhile, Liberals have embraced all sides of every argument on this, on any given day. A couple of weeks ago, the leader of the Liberal Party told *The Globe* that he did not completely rule out sending jet fighters in the future. Later, he told the media that any mission must be non-combat.

Meanwhile, his foreign affairs critic was saying no to air strikes on Sunday morning, but backing away by sundown.

However, as the Liberal leader admitted, on September 17, "I think [the Leader of the Opposition]...from what I hear, has a lot more questions about Canada's involvement."

Canadians can count on New Democrats and the NDP leader to ask the tough questions and demand answers of the government.

* * *

• (1420)

NATIONAL SENIORS DAY

Mrs. Tilly O'Neill Gordon (Miramichi, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to rise in the House to pay tribute to National Seniors Day. Just today, Canada has been ranked the fourth best country in the world to live in as a senior. Our government accomplished this through the implementation of smart policies that promote greater care for seniors, such as the seniors horizon program and by putting more money back into seniors' pockets through the introduction of pension income splitting, which the leader of the

Liberal Party, shamefully, opposes. These actions are responsible for removing almost 400,000 seniors from the tax rolls completely.

I encourage all Canadians to find their own special way to celebrate the seniors in their lives, whether it is a visit, a hug, or even simply a "thank you" for all they have contributed to our lives. Canadians everywhere should take the time to recognize what seniors have done for us. I wish Canada a happy National Seniors Day.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

HEALTH

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the United States has diagnosed its first case of Ebola.

Can the Prime Minister tell Canadians what precautions are being put in place to prevent the spread of Ebola here in Canada?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada has not had any confirmed cases of Ebola.

[English]

On the contrary, the Public Health Agency has obviously been seized with this for some time. There are no concerned cases. The Public Health Agency believes that the risk to Canadians remains low. It is more than ready to respond if a case of Ebola does reach Canada.

I would point out that both the Public Health Agency and the Department of Foreign Affairs have recommended that Canadians avoid all non-essential travel to Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, how many Canadian soldiers are on the ground in Iraq?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition already knows the answer to that question.

There are 26 soldiers today. The government has authorized 69 soldiers, as is well known, and that is obviously a maximum. Those numbers will fluctuate depending on decisions of operational commitments.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we do in fact know that there are 26 soldiers, but the problem is that we asked the Prime Minister four times, on September 15, September 16, September 23 and September 24, and he gave us a different number.

The question that Canadians are asking themselves is this. How is it possible that the Prime Minister got something so simple so wrong? Why is he not able to tell Canadians straight up when we ask the question of how many Canadian soldiers are on the ground in Iraq?

Oral Questions

He did not give us the right answer then. How do we know it is the right answer today?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, once again, the government has authorized up to 69 personnel. People will come and go from the theatre. The decisions on the operational needs within that number will be made by commanders on the ground.

[Translation]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, are there any Canadian Forces in Syria right now?

[English]

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): No, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister said that he has no clue how long this war in Iraq will last. His foreign affairs minister, however, said that the fight against ISIS and groups like it could last a generation.

The United States has already been fighting ISIS under one name or another for over a decade. Is the Prime Minister really telling Canadians that he is ready for that kind of open-ended war in Iraq?

•(1425)

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, of course, the preamble to the question is false. In fact, the American military had entirely left the country of Iraq for the past couple of years.

The reality is that what has arisen, as we know, in Iraq and Syria is the establishment of a large terrorist caliphate dedicated to the spread of global jihad, and terrorist training and financing around the world.

President Obama has rightly judged this as not merely a threat to the region but a threat to all countries, including the United States and Canada. That is why, obviously, we are assisting to deal with it.

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is intent on going to war in Iraq. It is up to him to make that case to Canadians, but he has not even begun, nor has he been open about the 30-day combat role.

To start, exactly how many soldiers were deployed in the first week and how many soldiers will there be on Saturday, the last day of this mission for Canada?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the question was there.

As we all know, the government, and I think most Canadians, have judged that the situation in that part of the world is very serious. If it is allowed to continue to fester, it represents a very serious danger to the national security of this country and to Canadians.

This government, and Canadians, will work with our partners around the world to make sure that we minimize those threats to Canadians.

[Translation]

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister wants Canada to join a war in Iraq, he first needs to make

that case to Canadians. He can start by being open and transparent about the 30-day mission that is about to come to an end.

Saturday is the last day of the mission. We may have a debate on the issue next week. What will Canadian soldiers be doing in the meantime?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think that we have been clear about our government's position, as have other governments around the world. A terrorist caliphate has been established in that region, and it is a threat to the security of our country and the international community. That is why President Obama and the international community have responded.

We have been clear on that. It is the Liberal Party's position that is unclear.

[English]

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): This is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. We still do not have clear answers.

How does the Prime Minister expect Canadians to support a new mission if he continues his secrecy and evasiveness about the mission in which we are currently engaged?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know exactly what steps this government has taken. Canadians are also aware the government is contemplating further steps on which it will soon make a decisions.

Canadians do not know the position of the Liberal Party. However, what Canadians can be sure of is that we do not make decisions based on what happened 10 or 20 years ago. We make decisions based on what we have to do to protect the security of Canadians today and into the future, and that is what we will do.

[Translation]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, is the Prime Minister considering air strikes in Syria?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government has not made a decision. Once the government makes such a decision regarding air combat, we will have a debate and a vote in the House of Commons.

[English]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister told the *Wall Street Journal* that he had not "ruled anything out".

Will the Prime Minister confirm that this means that he has not ruled out large-scale Canadian ground deployment in Iraq?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): What I said, Mr. Speaker, was that we had not ruled out any requests made of us by our allies. All of our allies have ruled out large-scale ground deployment in Iraq and Syria, so obviously that is not something we are considering.

Oral Questions

●(1430)

[Translation]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, what is the total budget the Prime Minister has planned for Canada's involvement in Iraq? How much is this going to cost?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, any decisions made to date fall within the current National Defence budget. Our top priority when it comes to public safety is keeping Canadians safe. The government will spend what is needed to keep Canadians safe.

[English]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Leader of the Opposition, NDP): Mr. Speaker, is the Prime Minister really telling Canadians that he has no idea at all how much it will cost? Ballpark? Nothing?

What kind of budget are we talking about? How much will Canadians pay for the Prime Minister's war in Iraq? How much will it cost for this war in Iraq?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious issue to throw around terms like the member just threw around.

This is a counterterrorism military operation undertaken by the United States in close consultation with our NATO allies, with Arab allies and with the international community.

This is being done because ISIL represents an extremely serious threat to the globe. It represents a serious threat to this country. That is why we take appropriate actions.

* * *

*[Translation]***FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, war is not the only way to combat terrorism. There are many ways Canada could play an important role in Iraq and help save lives now. Just think—if my colleagues care to listen—of the 1.8 million Iraqis who have been displaced and are waiting for aid. Clearly, the members across the aisle have very little respect for them.

A month ago, the minister admitted that Canadian humanitarian aid in Iraq was insufficient. What has the minister done since then to increase that aid?

[English]

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with the human tragedies going on, first and foremost we have to look at what can do to stop this humanitarian crisis from growing. We see journalists being beheaded. We see women being sold into slavery. We see mass atrocities. We see genocide and attempts at ethnic cleansing.

Our first and foremost responsibility must be to work with President Obama, to work with President Hollande and to work with the civilized world to stop these barbaric activities from spreading.

*[Translation]***FINANCE**

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Budget Officer confirmed that the federal government downloaded all of the financial pressure related to the aging population onto the provinces by unilaterally modifying the health transfer indexing formula, even though the federal government has the means to shoulder its share of the burden in terms of health care for Canadians. Under the circumstances, why are the Conservatives determined to deprive the provinces of \$36 billion in health care funding?

[English]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, no government in Canadian history has provided more funding to the provinces for health care, and it continues to grow.

Unlike the old Liberal government that cut funding, we have increased health care transfers to the provinces and territories by nearly 60% to all-time record levels. Under our government, health care transfers have risen from over \$20 billion when we formed government to \$32 billion this year. It continues to grow.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the federal government should not be balancing the books on the backs of provinces. The Parliamentary Budget Officer's report clearly shows the government's fiscal sustainability has come at cost. Cuts to services and downloading the fiscal burden to provinces are going on.

If the federal government had not cut health care transfers by \$36 billion, the fiscal gap faced by the provinces and municipalities would be essentially eliminated. How does cutting federal funding improve health care for Canadians?

●(1435)

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, again, Canadians know they are better off with this Conservative government. No government in Canadian history has provided more funding to the provinces for health care, and it continues to grow.

We are committed to a publicly funded, universally accessible health care system. We all use the health care system. We want to see a strong, sustainable health care system that is there for Canadians when they need it.

* * *

HEALTH

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, maybe the minister should read the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report and find out that they are downloading to the provinces.

Oral Questions

I am glad to see that the government has finally listened to the NDP on drug safety and taken action to ban imports from two Apotex factories. The ban comes after Health Canada received information from the Food and Drug Administration in the U.S.

However, the Auditor General warned three years ago that Health Canada was slow to react. Why does Health Canada have to rely on information from the U.S. before it takes action to protect the health and safety of Canadians?

Ms. Eve Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government will not tolerate drug safety risks. As soon as Health Canada was made aware of this information, it acted immediately to quarantine the medication. Additional safety testing took place, and all medication from all three plants will not be entering Canada. It has been fully quarantined.

Additionally, Vanessa's law is just making its way through the Senate right now. This is legislation that the opposition completely dragged its feet on all of last summer, forcing us into late night sittings. That legislation would allow Health Canada to enact hefty fines against pharmaceutical companies.

[Translation]

Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the U.S. FDA targeted Apotex in 2009 for unsafe drugs. Here, the government did nothing. It neglected Canadians' health. For months now, the NDP has been asking the minister to take action based on scientific data obtained by the Americans. The minister finally realized that she had to take action and stop the import of drugs from three Apotex factories. Well done. Stopping imports is good, but a mandatory recall would be better.

When will the minister impose a mandatory recall of the Apotex products she singled out yesterday?

[English]

Ms. Eve Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have just indicated to the House, all of the medication from these three plants will be quarantined. We will work with Apotex to identify if any of these medications are medically necessary and produce additional testing on those medications to ensure that Canadians and their health are protected.

Vanessa's law is critical, and we would urge the Senate to pass it with all due haste. Vanessa's law would give Health Canada the powers to levy hefty fines against pharmaceutical companies that put the health of Canadians at risk.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Ms. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, could the Prime Minister inform the House as to the projected total budget for the current 30-day deployment in Iraq?

Since I have just heard that this money is coming out of the current National Defence budget, could the Prime Minister tell us whether he plans to request supplementary funds from Parliament for this mission or future missions, given the substantial budget cuts to the defence ministry?

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on the last point, the hon. member is wrong. The budget for National Defence has gone up this year under this government.

With respect to this deployment, it is not over yet, but I know we are doing the right thing helping to protect the people of that area and taking a stand against this terrible terrorist organization.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Garneau (Westmount—Ville-Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, sometimes the government tells us that our special forces are advising and training the Kurdish Peshmerga forces, and sometimes it tells us that they are advising and training the Iraqi security services, including the army and the police forces.

Are we training and advising the Peshmerga forces or the Iraqi security services or both?

[English]

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what we have said is that we are providing support to the people of Iraq and Iraqi forces, particularly those near and around Erbil in the Kurdistan regional government area. The member opposite had the opportunity to join me to meet KRG officials and see first hand the types of challenges they face.

We want to be able to help the people who are trying to combat this terrible terrorist caliphate, so they can defeat it before it comes and wreaks havoc in Canada.

* * *

● (1440)

[Translation]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Marc Garneau (Westmount—Ville-Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister told us in the House that 69 soldiers were going to Iraq. Later, his Minister of Foreign Affairs told us there might be as many as 69. Today we learn there are only 26 soldiers.

Did the Prime Minister pull that number out of a hat or was it later decided that there was no need to have 69 soldiers? If so, why did the Prime Minister not inform Parliament?

[English]

Hon. John Baird (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister authorized up to 69 members of the Canadian Forces to provide training and assistance to stop the terrorist activities in Iraq. We said, in fact, a few dozen, and we find a few dozen are there.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we still have no idea what the government's strategy is for compensating the sectors affected by the trade agreement with Europe. Entire sectors of our economy are still waiting for an answer.

Oral Questions

How will the provinces affected by the higher cost of drugs be compensated? How will cheese producers, and particularly artisanal cheese producers, be compensated? We still do not know.

When will we have clear answers for Canadians?

[English]

Hon. Ed Fast (Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we said many times before, we will work very closely with the provinces and territories to address the issues that the member raises. We are very pleased that this last week we were able to celebrate the conclusion of negotiations and the release of the final text of the treaty.

This trade agreement is expected to increase economic activity in Canada by \$12 billion. That is the equivalent of 80,000 new Canadian jobs and \$1,000 for each Canadian family in additional income every year. This is a very good deal for Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last June, the House unanimously adopted an NDP motion.

The motion seeks to mitigate the negative impact of the trade deal with Europe on the dairy and cheese industries and reaffirm our support for the supply management system. We have not heard anything about this since the vote. This uncertainty is hurting investments, and it has to stop now.

When will the government announce the compensation it promised for dairy and cheese producers?

[English]

Hon. Gerry Ritz (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, CPC): Mr. Speaker, like the Minister of International Trade and like agricultural groups across our great country, we are excited about the potential to serve some 500 million new consumers in the European Union. In fact, I will be attending the SIAL food show in Paris coming up toward the end of the break week, and I know there are a number of cheese industry players from Canada there who are excited about being able to export into the European Union.

The member is a bit premature on her ask if there is going to be any hurt. I have had discussions ongoing with the dairy industry across Canada as to how best to address these new opportunities.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we now hear that the Europeans may not include investor state provisions in their trade agreement with the United States. The question, then, is why are Conservatives so adamant that it be in the deal for Canada, especially when it means that the U.S. would get a better deal and Germany may never ratify CETA?

Hon. Ed Fast (Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, obviously the member has not been following events. At the meeting of the EU trade committee just a couple of days ago, the new incoming trade commissioner for the EU said that she did not intend to reopen negotiations on this agreement. In fact, she said this trade agreement was good for the EU and that it addresses the EU's concerns over transparency and the right of member states to regulate in the public interest.

I would also remind the member that President Barroso of the EU also said this was an excellent deal for the EU. They have no intention of reopening these negotiations.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that does not say anything about whether Germany will ratify the deal.

What Canadians want is an explanation of why taxpayers' dollars were blown to treat European bureaucrats like royalty. We know that the last-minute decision to fly the EU delegation back to Europe cost over \$300,000, but what about the security costs incurred by the RCMP when they were told to deliver them to a cocktail party in Toronto? How much in total did this poorly planned photo op cost Canadian taxpayers?

Hon. Ed Fast (Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is the most comprehensive trade agreement Canada has ever signed. Now that the legal text is completed and has been released to the public, we want Canadian businesses to take advantage of this agreement now. This is an important agreement that opens up brand new opportunities for Canadian exporters and investors, and we were very pleased to have Presidents Barroso and Van Rompuy join hundreds of stakeholders from every sector of our economy to promote the benefits of this agreement.

* * *

● (1445)

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Ryan Leef (Yukon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last month, the Prime Minister announced one of the greatest discoveries in Canadian history: the discovery of one of the ships belonging to the ill-fated Franklin expedition. This was truly a historic moment for Canada. Franklin's ships are an important part of Canadian history, given that his expeditions, which took place nearly 200 years ago, laid the foundations for Canada's Arctic sovereignty.

Could the Prime Minister please update the House on this remarkable find?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for his question and also recognize his keen interest as a northerner in this particular issue, which is of interest to Canadians across the country and people around the world.

I am delighted to confirm that we have identified which ship from the Franklin expedition has been found. It is in fact the HMS *Erebus*.

[Translation]

I would like to say it again: we have identified which ship from the Franklin Expedition was found last month. It is in fact the HMS *Erebus*.

*Oral Questions***THE ENVIRONMENT**

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week, the Minister of Natural Resources quietly tabled a report on the impact climate change is having on our forests.

The report shows that climate change is completely disrupting boreal forest ecosystems and that the forestry economy has already been adversely affected by climate change.

What is the government doing to protect our boreal forests and mitigate the effects of climate change for forestry workers?

[*English*]

Mrs. Kelly Block (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government has invested significantly more into clean energy than the previous Liberal government, and the results are showing. We are proud of the fact that Canada relies on non-emitting sources for more than three-quarters of our electricity mix. In fact, the International Energy Agency rated Canada second in energy efficiency improvements between 1990 and 2010.

Our government will continue to invest in Canadian companies that are developing innovative and sustainable technology, and the opposition should be ashamed for not supporting these initiatives.

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there must be something wrong with the translation there, because the question was on the forestry sector and a report that the minister himself tabled, which showed that the government is not only failing on climate change but that it is also failing the forestry sector.

The minister's report says that climate change threatens the industry, which is responsible for over 500,000 Canadian jobs, yet Canada's single biggest source of greenhouse gas emissions, the oil and gas sector, is still unregulated by the federal government despite years of consultation and promises. Why is the government putting its oil industry friends ahead of over half a million forestry workers?

Mrs. Kelly Block (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for her question on such an important economic driver of rural communities all across Canada.

Our government understands how important forestry is for job creation and economic growth. I am proud that economic action plan 2014 builds on our government's success on this file by focusing on innovation and on protecting it from threats such as forest pests. We are focusing on diversifying our markets.

* * *

PRIVACY

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first CSIS spies on law-abiding Canadians, then it shares that intelligence with the oil industry. When CSIS actions were challenged, SIRC appointed its former pipeline company board member to investigate whether CSIS crossed the legal line in spying on anti-pipeline groups.

Now lawyers from CSIS are attempting to limit the scope of the investigation by SIRC. Could the minister tell us why CSIS is doing this? Does he endorse the idea of scaling back an already compromised investigation?

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is important for our agency to protect all Canadians, and I have full trust that it will do its job in a diligent way, while respecting Canadian laws.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Rosane Doré Lefebvre (Alfred-Pellan, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, or CSIS, has no reason to spy on environmental groups. Just because a group is fighting to protect the environment does not mean that it is a threat to national security. The government promised to investigate CSIS's wrongdoing, but we have learned that the organization's lawyer is trying to limit the scope of the investigation. He apparently wants to rewrite the complaint filed by the victims.

Why is the government trying to hide the reasons why it is spying on its own citizens?

• (1450)

Hon. Steven Blaney (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, CPC): Mr. Speaker, agencies in our country keep Canadians safe while respecting Canadian laws. They have my full confidence.

These groups, which even include former members of the NDP, will continue to do their job and protect Canadians.

* * *

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today's media reports that the finance minister's comment that economic growth alone will reduce the debt as a percentage of the GDP is considered a statement of fact by economists and is similar to one made earlier this year by the Liberal leader.

Do the Conservatives believe now that the Minister of Finance was wrong when he said that a growing economy will cut debt, or do they now, as most economists do, accept it as a statement of fact?

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, spending billions of dollars that one does not have does not balance budgets. Canadians, and this side of the House, know that it only creates large, unsustainable deficits.

On the other hand, with balanced budgets, the debt-to-GDP ratio will fall as GDP rises. That is just a mathematical fact. Therefore, allow me to confirm for the Liberal leader what every Canadian knows: budgets do not balance themselves.

*Oral Questions***TAXATION**

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, even the Canadian Taxpayers Federation is now attacking the Conservatives' new income splitting scheme. It said it was:

...written on the back of an envelope...[and] denounced by every credible economic think tank, representing every shade of the political spectrum.

The federation is right. Everyone from the C.D. Howe Institute to the late Jim Flaherty to the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives said it is bad policy.

Will the Conservatives listen to the experts and drop their regressive new income splitting scheme?

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, as our Prime Minister has said, income splitting was a good policy for Canadian seniors and it will be good policy for Canadian families.

The Liberal leader should explain why he has pledged to reverse income splitting. Seniors across the country are saving thousands of dollars each year thanks to pension income splitting. This type of Liberal Party arrogance toward middle-class families and seniors is becoming all too familiar.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

Mr. Claude Gravelle (Nickel Belt, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Budget Officer has confirmed that the provinces cannot shoulder the burden of the many challenges posed by our ageing population all by themselves. Dementia-related diseases cost the Canadian economy \$33 billion. The federal government must do its part.

Will the minister respond to the concerns of Canadians and the provinces who are meeting in Banff, and also support my national dementia strategy that Canadians are calling for?

[*English*]

Ms. Eve Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as of late last year, there is a national plan to tackle the growing dementia onset and related illnesses.

We are working with our international partners on this very important and emerging issue. Since 2006, research investments in dementia have increased by over 67%, and we are working with these G7 counterparts to support additional research and to find a cure by 2025.

* * *

SENIORS

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today is National Seniors' Day, yet despite the fact that the number of seniors in Canada will double by 2036, there is no seniors strategy from the government.

A growing consensus of groups, including the Canadian Medical Association, the Canadian Nurses Association, CARP, the National Pensioners Federation, the Congress of Union Retirees, and the Wait Time Alliance, are calling for a national aging strategy.

Seniors are waiting. When will the Conservatives finally listen and put in place an aging strategy?

Hon. Alice Wong (Minister of State (Seniors), CPC): Mr. Speaker, our strategy is to continue to work hard for seniors across Canada.

We will continue with our record support of seniors through initiatives such as increasing funding to community-based projects for seniors, which both the NDP and the Liberals voted against.

Our low-tax plan has helped to remove nearly 400,000 seniors from the tax rolls completely, which again both the Liberals and the NDP opposed.

A policy the Liberal leader has promised to repeal, pension splitting for seniors, is keeping hard-earned money in their pockets where it belongs.

* * *

● (1455)

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Mr. Terence Young (Oakville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, manufacturing is a high-tech, high-skilled economic engine in Canada and a significant employer for many Canadians, including those in my riding of Oakville.

Our government is supporting the manufacturing sector by keeping taxes low, reducing red tape, and promoting trade abroad and skills training at home.

Just over a year ago, our government made a strategic investment in the Oakville assembly plant that has helped transform it into one of Ford's most innovative facilities.

Can the minister explain how our government is focused on encouraging investment, strengthening Canada's economy, and creating high-quality jobs for Canadians?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today there is very good news out of Oakville: about 1,000 net new jobs have been created, above the commitment.

It is certainly very good news for Oakville, but it is better news beyond that. It affirms what KPMG said when it said that Canada has the most tax-competitive economy in the world. It affirms what our government has been doing with our auto innovation fund in investing in the auto sector with repayable loans that are coming back to taxpayers, and it affirms what our government is doing by signing free trade agreements around the world, which means that these vehicles that are being made in Oakville, Essex, and everywhere else can be freely traded around the world, creating jobs at home through world sales.

* * *

HEALTH

Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we have heard, is the International Day of Older Persons, a day set aside when we should be celebrating for our seniors.

However, as we celebrate our parents and our grandparents, we must take time to give back to them.

Oral Questions

Dementia, as my colleagues have indicated, robs people of their memories and their independence, and it hurts those we love the most. Worse yet, it is a problem of aging that is attacking many people.

I would like to hear from the minister, since there is a provincial meeting happening right now, what the plans are for caregivers and families. Is there any way that the government will come back and surprise us with a dementia strategy made in Canada, not in the G8?

Ms. Eve Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in fact, we recently hosted experts from around the world to focus on improving the lives of patients.

We have \$31.5 million to create and support the Canadian Consortium on Neurodegeneration in Aging, and our investment since 2006 amounts to over \$850 million for neuroscience research. We also provide the caregiver tax credit.

All Canadians are very much concerned about our aging parents.

* * *

[Translation]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, all of New Brunswick is up in arms because of VIA Rail's latest plan to transfer the responsibility for stations on the Montreal-Halifax line to municipalities—as if small municipalities were in a better financial position to look after train stations than VIA Rail and the federal government. Come on. That is just insulting.

Will the minister make VIA Rail listen to reason and tell it that there is no way that the company can off-load its problems to New Brunswick municipalities and that it must accept its responsibilities?

[English]

Mr. Jeff Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, CPC): Mr. Speaker, obviously VIA Rail's primary objective is to provide a safe and efficient passenger rail service. In keeping with this objective, VIA is responsible for providing service in as cost-effective a manner as possible.

For our part, our government supports a passenger rail network that meets the needs of today's travellers while supporting the efficient use of taxpayer dollars. The minister has met in the past with l'Association francophone des municipalités du Nouveau-Brunswick and the Union of Quebec Municipalities to discuss VIA Rail in this region, and the minister is happy to meet and discuss the Ocean line further with this organization as well.

* * *

SENIORS

Ms. Joyce Bateman (Winnipeg South Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today is National Seniors Day, and I would like to thank all of the seniors across this great country of Canada who have helped build, and continue to contribute to, this great country. Just today, Canada has been ranked fourth-best country in the world to live in as a senior. That is up from fifth place last year.

Could the Minister of State for Seniors please explain to the House how our government accomplished this?

Hon. Alice Wong (Minister of State (Seniors), CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government accomplished this by making record commitments to seniors across Canada through cutting taxes, introducing policies like pension income splitting, increasing the GIS, and more, all of which are found in my new "Government of Canada: Action for Seniors" report, available on my website.

Even though the Liberals and NDP continue to oppose these initiatives, our government knows what matters most to seniors, and we will continue to stand up for them in the House.

* * *

• (1500)

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Ryan Cleary (St. John's South—Mount Pearl, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a moratorium is looming on northern shrimp on the Grand Banks. The big worry is how the quota cuts will be handed down. If DFO follows its outdated last-in, first-out policy that favours big business offshore licence holders, many of which have foreign ownership, rural Newfoundland and Labrador, our plants, and our fishermen will be pounded again this year.

Will the minister agree to a fair process and stand by the principle of adjacency, whereby those closest to the resource benefit from the resource?

Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the decision to prohibit directed fishing of shrimp in 3L was not surprising. Several other groundfish stocks will be seeing an increase in total allowable catch, such as redfish, Greenland halibut, and witch flounder.

We know that effective fisheries management must rely on scientific advice. I hope that the member is not suggesting that we ignore science, and fish stocks collapse.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Peterborough, Cons. Ind.): Mr. Speaker, the government has placed a priority on providing safe drinking water on first nations reservations and has made significant progress in this regard over the last several years dealing with the most urgent cases.

Curve Lake First Nation in my riding is, however, facing challenges, as its water treatment system is stretched well beyond its capacity and useful life. Maintenance of the system is actually causing financial hardship. The due diligence for a replacement system has been completed, and the application for funding is with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs.

Can the minister comment on the status of the application, or if not, would he review the file and respond in writing to my office and Curve Lake First Nation by providing an update on the status of the application?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, CPC): Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have made significant progress in recent years because of the investments of this government. As to that particular application, the member will understand that without prior notice, I cannot comment on the status, but I will surely look into the matter and advise him as I can.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of Her Excellency Mireya Aguero de Corrales, Secretary of State of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Honduras.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: I would also like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of a delegation of partners and team members from Parks Canada who are from the Franklin search expedition team.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Hon. Julian Fantino (Minister of Veterans Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, two copies of the government's official response to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs report titled "The New Veterans Charter Moving Forward". We will indeed move forward immediately with several initiatives as we continue to improve veterans benefits and services while consultations are undertaken with the Veterans Ombudsman and veterans stakeholders on the more complex proposals.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Deepak Obhrai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and for International Human Rights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaties entitled "Agreement Between Canada and the Federal Republic of Nigeria for the Promotion and Protection of Investments", done at Abuja, on May 6, 2014; and "Agreement between Canada and the Republic of Serbia for the Promotion and Protection of Investments", done at Belgrade on September 1, 2014. An explanatory memorandum is included with each treaty.

* * *

●(1505)

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today I have three reports from the interparliamentary delegation. Pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present, in

both official languages, the "Report of the Canadian Parliamentary Delegation respecting its participation at Meetings of the Bureau of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs", held in New York City on May 19, 2014; "Report of the Canadian Parliamentary Delegation respecting its participation at the Meeting of the Subcommittee on Finance and the 269th (extraordinary) Session of the IPU Executive Committee", held in Geneva, Switzerland, from June 29 to July 1, 2014; and "Report of the Canadian Parliamentary Delegation respecting its participation at the Parliamentary Meeting of the 20th International AIDS Conference", held in Melbourne, Australia, from July 19 to 24, 2014.

Mr. Joe Preston (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian Delegation of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association respecting two different visits. The first was a bilateral visit to Jamaica, the Republic of Trinidad, and Barbados in April, 2013; and the second was a bilateral visit to Washington, D.C., September 13 to 15, 2013.

* * *

FISHERIES ACT

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-629, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act (invasive carp).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduced an act today to amend the Fisheries Act to deal with invasive carp.

Currently, more than 20 federal and provincial policies and regulations are used to keep Asian carp out of the country, but they vary from province to province, and fines are often subjective and issued by judges.

Why would we need to do this? It is because we need to provide protection for our ecosystem, protection for our fishing industry, and protection for our sport fishing industry. Asian carp are intrusive and eat the types of materials that other fish do, which ends up starving our fish population. They are very dangerous, as we have seen in the Mississippi River.

The bill would change the system and would be a pan-Canadian strategy. First, it would make it illegal to import live, invasive carp of all types and would require that any dead carp be eviscerated or technically gutted. Second, it would allow the Canadian Border Service Agency to seize and send carp back to their country of origin immediately. This is important for our men and women on the front lines in Canada so that they are able to defend us with this actual protection.

Last, it would increase fines. They would be \$15,000 for individuals and \$75,000 for companies guilty of smuggling in Asian carp on the first offence. The fines could rise to as much as \$1 million and \$4 million respectively for repeat offences.

It is vital that we start protecting our Great Lakes and other Canadian waterways from these invasive species. This bill is a step in that direction.

Routine Proceedings

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

SUPPORT FOR VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS ACT

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-630, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Employment Insurance Act (volunteer firefighters).

She said: Mr. Speaker, after my bill for volunteer firefighters, Bill C-534, was rejected, a number of volunteer fire departments wrote to tell me how disappointed they were that Conservative and Liberal members had chosen to defeat the bill.

That is why I decided to introduce the bill once again. It contains the same legislative provisions as the previous version and will enable volunteer firefighters to be absent from their work to respond to emergency calls. This will help small municipalities recruit and have access to volunteer firefighters.

The bill also includes provisions regarding the Employment Insurance Act, to ensure that volunteer firefighters who are receiving EI benefits do not get caught in an administrative holdup if they participate in training or respond to an emergency call in that capacity.

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

• (1510)

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Preston: Mr. Speaker, I will give it another try.

If the House gives its consent, I move that the 18th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs presented to this House yesterday be concurred in.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

PETITIONS

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present petitions on behalf of constituents from my riding of Red Deer and from across western Canada.

First, there are numerous petitioners who have requested that Parliament make changes to the current drinking and driving laws.

FALUN GONG

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I also have a petition requesting Parliament to end the persecution of Falun Gong.

AGRICULTURE

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to table petitions signed by over 500 Canadians from Edmonton, Stony Plain, Busby, Red Deer, Two

Hills, Sherwood Park, Smoky Lake, Mayerthorpe, Barrhead, Tofield, and Redwater in Alberta; and Saint John, New Brunswick.

The petitioners call upon the government not to pass Bill C-18, which restricts farmers' rights to save, reuse, and sell seeds, and to instead enshrine those rights.

CANADA POST

Ms. Judy Foote (Random—Burin—St. George's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I present a petition today on behalf of the residents of the community of McCallum, which is an isolated community in the riding of Random—Burin—St. George's. The petitioners call on the government to change its mind with respect to the closure of Canada Post offices. They are also saying that the reduction in hours makes it very difficult for them to receive mail.

In a lot of cases in rural communities, the post office is the only federal presence that exists, and it is very much part of the social fabric and economy of the community. The petitioners are asking the government to go after Canada Post and to try to work with it to impress on the corporation not to follow through with its plans to close and reduce the number of hours of operation.

AGRICULTURE

Hon. Laurie Hawn (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition that the people of Canada recognize the inherent rights of farmers.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to refrain from making any changes to the Seeds Act or the Plant Breeders' Rights Act in Bill C-18. They call upon Parliament to enshrine the inalienable rights of farmers to save, reuse, selectively exchange, and sell seeds.

DEMENTIA

Mr. Malcolm Allen (Welland, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I present a petition today on behalf of members of my riding and surrounding areas. The petitioners call on the government to support the bill from my good friend and colleague from Nickel Belt on a national dementia strategy.

All members of this House are well aware of family members or friends who have been affected by dementia. Indeed, this country needs a national strategy on dementia, because this problem is only going to be exacerbated and get worse as the aging population gets larger.

CANADA POST

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition signed by numerous residents from cities like Dieppe and all over southeastern New Brunswick. They are very concerned about the government's cuts to Canada Post, which have affected service to people in smaller, rural communities. Thousands of employees have been laid off, as members know. Millions of households will go without door-to-door mail service. This is a concern for seniors and persons with disabilities. All over New Brunswick, people are worried about these cuts.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners call on the government to reverse the cuts and work with Canada Post to restore the service and save these jobs.

FIREARMS

Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present today.

The first petition is from citizens across southern Alberta who ask that they be free to use firearms for recreational use. The petitioners ask that the Government of Canada fix the legislation so that unelected bureaucrats can no longer control weapons classification.

SPECIES AT RISK

Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is again from citizens from across southern Alberta. The petitioners ask that the House of Commons rescind the Species at Risk Act.

EMERGENCY PROTECTION ORDER

Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the third petition is also from southern Alberta. The petitioners ask that the strategy on the greater sage grouse in Canada be rescinded.

NUCLEAR WASTE

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present.

The first petition is signed by over 100 people who are supporting Motion No. 515 regarding the Ontario Power Generation's proposed deep geographical repository storage of nuclear waste in Kincardine.

The petitioners are asking that the motion be respected and that this process be halted at this point in time to ensure that nuclear waste is stored safely.

• (1515)

ABORTION

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is on the protection of human life from the time of conception and fertilization.

The 25 petitioners are calling for a review, because it has been 40 years since the right has been debated in Parliament. They are calling for the protection of the lives of unborn children.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, I table a petition signed by many residents of Winnipeg North. The petitioners call on the government to commit to developing a new health care accord, which would replace the 2004 accord.

It is interesting how much the government tries to take credit for the record amount of financing going toward health care today. That is because of former prime minister Paul Martin and the long-term investment he made to health care.

The residents of Winnipeg North ask, once again, that the Government of Canada make a long-term commitment to the ongoing financing of health care in Canada.

SAKINAW SALMON

Mr. John Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to present a

petition on behalf of grade 7 students from Pender Harbour Elementary/Secondary School in the riding I represent. They are concerned about salmon, particularly the Sakinaw salmon, and the efforts that Canadians can make to ensure this salmon survives into future generations.

The Speaker: There are still several members rising and we are quickly running out of time for petitions, so I will ask members to be very brief so we can accommodate everybody.

IMMIGRATION

Ms. Peggy Nash (Parkdale—High Park, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present a petition on behalf of several Canadians. Some are from my riding, but some are from other provinces, such as Quebec and even Newfoundland.

These people are petitioning the House of Commons to issue a temporary residency permit for the Pusuma family, which is in sanctuary with their 5-year-old daughter. The family has been called to testify before the Law Society of Upper Canada, which has found that its lawyer may be guilty of professional misconduct. There is evidence that never was introduced in his case which could allow the family to stay in Canada. They are pleading for a temporary resident permit.

[*Translation*]

CANADA POST

Mr. Mathieu Ravnignat (Pontiac, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to rise in the House to present a petition signed by about 100 Canadians who oppose the Canada Post cuts and who recognize, as my constituents do, that eliminating home mail delivery is detrimental to seniors and people with disabilities. I am therefore pleased to present this petition.

[*English*]

BISON

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions that I will present quickly.

The first is on a national bison day. The petitioners note that the bison is the largest mammal in North America. It has religious significance to first nations and it has agricultural significance.

The petitioners therefore call on Parliament to name August 9, 2015, as the first national bison day.

JUSTICE

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is on prostitution.

The petitioners request that the House of Commons makes it a criminal offence to purchase sex from a man, woman or child, and a criminal offence for pimps, madams or others to profit from the proceeds of sex.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Matthew Kellway (Beaches—East York, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present a petition to protect the Don River. The signatories note that the changes to the Navigable Waters Protection Act leave only 62 rivers and 97 lakes under protection.

Therefore, they call upon the Government of Canada to restore protection to the Don River and restore the environmental assessment process for previously protected bodies of water.

[Translation]

DEMENTIA

Ms. Nycole Turmel (Hull—Aylmer, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour as well of presenting a petition from a number of people from Pembroke, Petawawa, Gatineau and Hull—Aylmer concerning the implementation of a national strategy on dementia and health care for persons afflicted with Alzheimer's disease. This petition calls on the House to pass Bill C-356. Many of us have acquaintances, family members or friends who have Alzheimer's or dementia, and it is very important to have a national strategy to protect people suffering from these diseases.

[English]

COSMETICS INDUSTRY

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

The first petition is from residents of London, Ontario, and Banff, Alberta. The petitioners call for a ban on the use of animal testing for cosmetics.

• (1520)

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from residents from throughout British Columbia. The petitioners call on the government to reject the so-called northern gateway project proposal for supertankers and pipelines across northern B.C.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Patrick Brown (Barrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from close to 1,000 constituents about Bill C-18. The petitioners encourage the House to refrain from making changes to the bill.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Patrick Brown (Barrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition from 100 constituents about missing aboriginal women and girls across Canada.

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Ms. Hélène LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present a petition signed by several residents of LaSalle—Émard about the cuts at Canada Post, specifically with regard to the alleged end of home mail delivery. People are very concerned, and this will have a negative effect on many residents of Montreal's densely populated core neighbourhoods. People are also

Routine Proceedings

concerned about job losses and privatization. The people who signed the petition are asking the government to consider alternatives.

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Andrew Cash (Davenport, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the people of Davenport from streets like Via Italia, Dufferin and Lansdowne.

The petitioners call on Parliament to enshrine in legislation the inalienable rights of farmers and other Canadians to save, reuse, select, exchange and sell seeds. They also call on Parliament not to make changes to the Seeds Act or to the Plant-Breeders' Rights Act through Bill C-18.

[Translation]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. Pierre Jacob (Brome—Missisquoi, NDP): Mr. Speaker, like my colleague from Pontiac, I hear from people in my riding all the time about the Conservative government's cuts to the CBC. Every day, I get petitions signed by people opposed to the cuts.

Today I am presenting one such petition signed by 60 residents of Brome—Missisquoi. They are asking the government to ensure stable, adequate funding for our public broadcaster and to stop the cuts. People across the country are asking for this, and I encourage the government to grant their request.

[English]

The Speaker: If we are going to get everybody in, we are going to have to redouble our efforts to be brief.

The hon. member for York South—Weston.

DEMENTIA

Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions.

The first petition calls on the government to implement a national strategy for dementia and the health care of persons afflicted with Alzheimer's or other dementia-related diseases.

CANADA POST

Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the other petition calls on the government to order Canada Post to restore home delivery.

DEMENTIA

Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from several Nova Scotians who support the MP for Nickel Belt's national strategy for dementia, contained in Bill C-356. It is a national scourge that needs a comprehensive strategy to address it.

I am proud to present the petition in support of this action.

Government Orders

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Beauharnois—Salaberry, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by over 2,600 people who oppose the elimination of services at Canada Post, given the number of jobs that will be lost and because this is an essential public service that seems to be heading towards privatization.

Many people, including CUPW members, postal workers and ordinary Canadians, have joined forces to act on this. I am very pleased to be able to present this petition in the House today, because many jobs are at stake and many community organizations, small business owners and citizens will lose services.

[English]

DEMENTIA

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House with respect to petitions from St. Charles, Chelmsford, Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury. The petitions are with respect to Bill C-356, An Act respecting a National Strategy for Dementia, which was introduced by my colleague from Nickel Belt.

The recommendations in here are quite impressive. Having a sister who was diagnosed just 10 years ago, at the age of 50, with Alzheimer's, the bill is quite important.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Claude Gravelle (Nickel Belt, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition from various communities in my riding, from Blezard Valley, Hanmer, Val Caron, Val Therese and Capreol.

The petitioners ask the minister to present legislation on behalf of the Government of Canada to protect consumers from price gouging by gasoline retailers.

In my riding of Nickel Belt, prices vary by as much as 10¢ per litre, and that is price gouging.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Craig Scott (Toronto—Danforth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am tabling a petition from over 500 members of my riding of Toronto—Danforth, calling on Parliament to refrain from making any changes to the Seeds Act through Bill C-18.

I will leave it at that, even though I have many other petitions.

• (1525)

[Translation]

Ms. Christine Moore: Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize because when I introduced my bill on volunteer firefighters, I referred to the previous version of my bill and inadvertently said “Bill C-534”, when I should have said Bill C-504. I ask that the Journals be corrected.

[English]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PROTECTING CANADIANS FROM ONLINE CRIME ACT

BILL C-13—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

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

That in relation to Bill C-13, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Canada Evidence Act, the Competition Act and the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters 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 consideration of the third reading stage of the said bill; and

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

The Speaker: There will now be a 30-minute question period. I will ask members to keep their questions or comments to around about a minute and responses to a similar length.

The hon. member for Gatineau.

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Mr. Speaker, shame on the government and on the Minister of Justice, who seems to forget he is also the Attorney General of Canada, for the 78th motion for time allocation.

[Translation]

It is absolutely incredible.

Bill C-13, which is before us right now, is not just any bill. The same thing happened with the prostitution bill last week. We had roughly half a day of debate on Bill C-36. Third reading of that bill is planned for Friday. The same thing will happen with Bill C-13, but that comes as no surprise.

Government Orders

[English]

My request to split the bill was rejected. My request at committee to wait for the decision from the Supreme Court of Canada, which was rendered a day after we finished the clause-by-clause, to suspend so we could read it was denied. We have time allocation at second reading, time allocation at report stage and at third reading.

[Translation]

Manon Cornellier wrote an extraordinary piece on this a year ago, saying that time allocation was becoming the norm in the House of Commons: “There was a time when limiting debate was the exception and invariably caused outrage [including that of the Conservatives]”.

Last week, Michael Spratt, of *iPolitics*, wrote:

[English]

The Conservatives proposed a controversial law that would expand the state’s Internet surveillance powers.

The bill was attacked by experts...as unconstitutional...The Conservatives have the gall to claim that the decision confirms what they’d been saying all along — that the new law is justified. Black is white, love is hate, peace is war—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Order, please. Could the hon. member could put the question. She has had almost two minutes now.

Ms. Françoise Boivin: I am right there, Mr. Speaker, but considering the time we are having on Bill C-13, could you give me a tiny leeway?

Mr. Spratt goes on to say:

In short, the government is doing its best to obscure the fact that our highest court has articulated the constitutional limits of invasive police investigative techniques...

If the minister cannot change reality, is rushing it and blurring it the next best thing?

•(1530)

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, contrary to what was stated by my friend, there has been significant debate. There has been opportunity both inside and outside the House to look at this significant issue.

However, let us not lose sight of what the bill is about. The bill is about protecting people. It is in response to a very real need. Cyber-intimidation, cyberbullying, cybercrime is a very serious issue in this country today and we have seen instances where it literally cost young people their lives. Therefore, when we are talking about the provisions to improve the Criminal Code, to improve the ability to investigate online crime, we are talking about in some cases modernizing sections of the Criminal Code that were in place pre-Internet. Issues of intimidation and harassment are by necessity being updated in the legislation.

It is of the essence that we do this in a timely fashion and that we do this in a way that is respectful of the courts, which it is. With technology continuing to move at breakneck speed, I would suggest that languishing and repeating the same lines over and over about splitting the bill and that we should always go to the courts first, that is not the role of the democratically elected body of the House. It is certainly not the view shared by the government that we do

everything only at the behest and at the request of the Supreme Court.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Beauséjour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we share the minister's view and the government's view and I think the view of all Canadians that cyberbullying and cyber-intimidation is a horrible crime. We have seen in the minister's own province the tragic results that it can inflict on families. There are other examples, unfortunately, in other parts of the country. All of us recognize the need to modernize the Criminal Code to give law enforcement authorities the appropriate balanced tools to ensure that people who participate in this kind of heinous crime are prosecuted to the full extent of the law and that the law is modernized, as he said, to recognize that this kind of offence is something that we all abhor.

We also share the concern of many Canadians around privacy rights, around the importance of protecting private information, about not allowing police authorities or other governmental agencies to have access to private information, to Internet information, of Canadians who are law-abiding persons. I know in a previous version of the bill there was some concern around warrantless searches where authorities may perhaps have been allowed to go beyond what had been a traditional standard required of police authorities.

I am wondering if the minister could reassure us that warrantless searches and the appropriate balance between the privacy rights of Canadians is respected while at the same time allowing the full prosecution of these horrible offences to take place.

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, that is in fact the very crux of the issue, striking that balance between protection of online activity while at the same time giving police modern powers with judicial oversight. There were certainly criticisms and legitimate concerns raised in the past and with respect to the bill about unlawful access online to information. The bill requires judicial oversight. The bill does not create new powers for police that go beyond the Criminal Code. It does not allow for any new online investigation without judicial oversight.

It is important that people understand that if the police want to use the powers contained in Bill C-13, they by necessity have to get a warrant from a judge, so the judicial oversight provisions are here. They are alive and present in the bill. They are also respectful and responding to recommendations that came from a very intense consultation with provinces and territories, not to mention what we heard at committee and not to mention what we have heard from experts such as the Federal Ombudsman for Victims of Crime who said:

This legislation, if passed, will help to provide tools necessary to assist in reducing cyberbullying and in providing victims with much-needed supports.

It will empower the police to protect people online.

Government Orders

● (1535)

Mr. Bob Dechert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister had an opportunity to hear the words of Mr. Glen Canning, the father of Rehtaeh Parsons, when he testified before the House of Commons justice committee in May this year. He said:

I do believe, if properly enforced... Bill C-13 would have made a difference to Rehtaeh. I will never know if the police had the power and ability to stop that photo from spreading. If they had, it's quite possible I'd be looking at my daughter's picture in a yearbook instead of a newspaper article.

He went on to say:

I respect privacy as much as any Canadian does; however, I believe Bill C-13 is not about an invasion of privacy. It's about allowing police officers to effectively address the many challenges of instant mass communication and abuse. Technology has changed our lives dramatically, and we need to provide new tools so police officers can hold accountable those who use this technology to hurt and torment others.

I wonder if the minister could tell us how he interprets Mr. Canning's comments in respect to the need to pass the bill quickly.

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I recall well the words of Mr. Canning, Rehtaeh Parsons' father, as well as her mother and other witnesses, family members, who have suffered the pain, the indignity, humiliation and ultimately the untimely loss of life as a result of persistent and pernicious online bullying.

The non-consensual distribution of intimate images can literally take lives. I cannot emphasize enough, as my friend has said and Mr. Canning and others have said, the urgency with regard to moving the legislation forward, putting in place those necessary protections found in the Criminal Code and giving the police the power to intervene and pre-empt and prevent the type of activity that led to the death of Rehtaeh Parsons, Amanda Todd and others.

That early intervention is what allows a parent to have the natural joy they should expect in seeing their children grow up, graduate and go on to lead healthy and productive lives. That is what is at stake.

An alarmist attitude has been expressed by some, including some of the so-called experts, that this is going to allow police to snoop online. The police are more interested in catching child pornographers, terrorists and those who are preying on the elderly with online fraud schemes. These are the types of activities we are out to enable police to intervene on, investigate and ultimately prevent.

[Translation]

Ms. Charmaine Borg (Terrebonne—Blainville, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that we are talking about the urgency of adopting provisions on cyberbullying. The NDP has always said that we need to adopt this part very quickly. Nonetheless, we want to properly assess the parts that may cause serious problems when it comes to protecting Canadians' privacy.

What is more, the Minister of Justice responded to my colleague from Gatineau by saying:

[English]

"It is not our duty to slow things down here".

[Translation]

I am sorry, but it is our responsibility. As parliamentarians, we must be sure to uphold the Canadian Constitution and Supreme Court rulings.

Can the Minister of Justice tell me why he does not even want to sit down and address the Supreme Court ruling to see whether the provisions of Bill C-13 are indeed constitutional?

[English]

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, it is because I rely, not on the advice of the member opposite, but on the advice of departmental officials, lawyers and those who argue the case, those who are involved intimately in tracking the Spencer decision and drafting this legislation. This is not some sort of a fly-by-night written on the back of an envelope piece of legislation. This has been in the works for some time. It has been studied extensively. We have heard from numerous experts and we have heard from the people most affected, the victims. They have told us of the urgency.

The member said, just a moment ago, that they are not trying to hold up the bill. There have been some 20 speakers from the NDP on the bill. We have ample time to look at the bill in further detail, not this type of banter back and forth in the House of Commons but in committee.

Therefore, when it comes to the constitutionality of Bill C-13, we believe strongly that this not only passes constitutional muster, but it does what it is intended to do. That is to allow police, with judicial oversight, to do proper investigations that protect the public at large.

● (1540)

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in his last answer, the minister indicated there has been wide consultation and that the bill has been informed by officials within his department. My question is with respect to the role of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada and whether his opinions and his views on the bill should be taken into account. He testified at committee that he had numerous concerns with regard to the bill, whether it is the immunity that is afforded to telephone companies, or the lack of any reporting required by telephone companies as to the volume and types of inquiries they receive for voluntary disclosure.

Given these concerns expressed by the Privacy Commissioner of Canada, concerns that were subsequently, basically, confirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada in the Spencer decision, could the minister inform the House of the importance, if any, and relevance of the opinion of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada with respect to the bill?

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, of course, independent watchdogs, offices, ombudsmen, people like the Privacy Commissioner and the privacy office have indeed voiced their opinions, as have many others, as have experts.

Here is a stunning revelation for everyone. Sometimes experts disagree. Sometimes lawyers even disagree, or parliamentarians.

We believe, fundamentally, the legislation not only respects the Spencer decision, it answers the questions that have been asked with respect to judicial oversight and it answers with respect to the constitutionality of the bill itself. It is an attempt to modernize the tools that are in the hands of the police to allow them, with that judicial oversight, to investigate very sophisticated criminal activity online.

I remind my friend that the Spencer decision does not require amendments to Bill C-13. In fact, this decision addresses very plainly the ability for the police to obtain private information with a valid warrant.

Nothing in Bill C-13 is intended to create any new powers to obtain information without a warrant, as has been suggested by some members of the NDP. Simply put, the bill puts forward privacy safeguards, which are built into the legislation and built into the investigative powers of the bill. It is tailored to meet those expectations around privacy, but at the same time allow the police to do this critically important work of protecting the public from online criminality.

Quite frankly, we know this online criminality is prolific, growing and in some cases is causing young people, because of intimidation and harassment, to take their own lives. That is what is at stake.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, as we are now debating time allocation in response to what the Minister of Justice and the government House leader have moved, I want to again address the disservice to this place, the disrespect, indeed the contempt toward this place and the role of individual members of Parliament that is constituted in 78 time allocations in this Parliament.

I know that you, Mr. Speaker, are considering carefully the motion I brought forward, the question of privilege I brought forward on September 15, and the numerous legal opinions that lean in the direction of concluding that our ability to do our job, which is a matter of privilege, to hold the government to account, is significantly compromised, in fact savaged, by the constant application of time allocation.

I referred to the decision of Mr. Justice Binnie and the Vaid decision in 2005, that the heart and essence of what we do as MPs is to hold the government to account. The ability to do that job requires adequate time for debate.

I understand the Minister of Justice believes we have had more than enough time for debate. However, the reality is that the privacy commissioners of this country, many of them, believe the bill would violate rights of privacy. Lawyers and experts with the Canadian Bar Association believe it will not stand the test of a Supreme Court challenge, yet we are asked to rush it through.

This is a violation of our rights. I ask the Minister of Justice to reconsider. We shared the same law school. I would like to think we share something else, which is respect for Parliament.

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I have been around this place a little while, since 1997, and I sat, literally, where the member is sitting.

Government Orders

We hear the hyperbole of “savaging democracy” and “stifling debate”. As I have told the member, we have had significant debate on the bill. We have had examinations at committee. We have had input from attorneys general and justice ministers at the provincial and territorial level. We have had input from lawyers and experts of well-renowned reputation when it comes to cyber and the use of Internet, and the use of the modern information age.

Now is the time to move forward. Now is the time to make actual progress on the legislation and the insertion of Criminal Code amendments that will help protect people from the scourge of online criminality. That is what this is about.

We can argue procedural points in the House of Commons, but there is no getting away from the fact that, and I believe my colleague from Saanich—Gulf Islands would agree, as a lawyer, as a person with a legal background, there is a necessity and a pressing need to modernize our Criminal Code and bring forward amendments that empower our investigators and our courts and our entire system of justice to improve upon a system that has been outdated, and is proven to be lacking when it comes to the necessary protections for online criminality.

These sections of the Criminal Code were put in place prior to the Internet. We have talked about and I reiterate that this does not create new police powers. It does not give them new investigative powers without judicial oversight. That was very much considered, both in the drafting and presentation of the bill. It was also very much considered in the wake of the Spencer decision, which I remind members, just for emphasis, was a case involving possession and distribution of child pornography.

Let us come back to reality. Let us come back to the importance of having legislation and Criminal Code amendments that will protect Canadian citizens, protect our ability to do the important work of online investigations that will prevent the likes of what we saw in the terrible tragedy of Rehtaeh Parsons.

• (1545)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Ève Pécelet (La Pointe-de-l'Île, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of the elements that the Privacy Commissioner of Canada indicated may be unconstitutional is the fact that there are no oversight mechanisms for information sharing.

We know that the Supreme Court already struck down a section of the Criminal Code—I believe it was section 184—saying that it was unconstitutional not because it granted access to data without a warrant but because this type of access without a warrant did not include any sort of review mechanism for government decisions.

Is the minister prepared to tell us today that his bill is constitutional even though it grants access to data without a warrant and without oversight from the judiciary or an officer of Parliament? It is my understanding that the Supreme Court already ruled on the constitutionality of those kinds of measures.

Government Orders

[English]

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, that is a false dichotomy in the question because, in fact, this bill would not create warrantless access. That is a mythology. It is an incorrect, factually wrong statement that is being repeated time and time again by members opposite.

This bill would require and necessitate judicial oversight. It does not attempt to go around that power. It does not propose to bestow new powers on the police to perform warrantless search. They would have to get access with a judicially authorized warrant.

That was the very crux, the *ratio decidendi*, of the Spencer decision. It talked about the fact that people have a reasonable expectation of privacy when they go online. I do not know whether all Canadians actually believe that when they go online; we know there is lots of hacking that is not being done by the government that puts some of that data at risk.

The reality is that this legislation is about modernizing the Criminal Code sections, about putting in the hands of the police tools with judicial authorization that would allow them to go after fraud artists, child pornographers, and those who are using the Internet to intimidate and harass people. They could go after those who are taking part in activities that in the real world, not the virtual world, clearly would be criminalized.

That is what we are attempting to do through this bill. It is modernizing it. It is moving us into the 21st century, into the modern age of technology. That is what we are doing. To suggest that we should split the bill and put the Criminal Code sections in one part and put the police powers in another is like saying we should give somebody a paddle but not a boat.

• (1550)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as can be seen by the different lines of questioning, there is a great deal of interest in this bill, and one can understand why. It is because it is of great importance to Canadians. My colleague from New Brunswick and the Liberal Party critic have expressed both concern and a rationale as to why it is important that the legislation ultimately continue to go through.

However, the motion before us right now is again that of time allocation. Despite our great interest in debating this legislation, the government is using time allocation to force through its legislative agenda.

It is important for us to recognize that no other government in the history of Canada has used time allocation in the manner the current government has chosen to do so. There are no exceptions whatsoever. The only way the government has been able to get its legislative agenda through is to implement time allocation for virtually every aspect of the legislation it has brought before the House.

My question to the minister is this. Does he not recognize that there is much valuable information and many ideas that members of Parliament from all sides, I suspect, would have contributed by participating in this debate, if the government had not once again used time allocation to force through legislation? On the other hand, if the government had separated out aspects of the legislation, I

suspect we could have passed components of it months ago if the political will had been there from the government side.

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, one thing is certain: that member who just spoke will always have his time on the floor of the House of Commons. To his credit, I do not think there is a member who has participated more in debates of all kinds and on all subject matter.

He may be able to hoodwink some people who are here, or perhaps those who do not follow Parliament closely, but I have been around a while, as has my friend from Calgary, and I can say that there were prior governments that used time allocation. Time allocation was not invented by the current government. It is a way to manage House time. It is a way to move important legislation that has clearly become stalled.

We have heard 20 members from the NDP alone on this subject. We have heard members from the Liberal Party pronounce themselves. We will have an opportunity to examine it further. The other place, as the procedure moves along, will pronounce itself.

The bill is of importance. It is timely. It is urgent. It puts in place a regime that ensures judicial oversight. It gives the police the powers that they need, but they must act with discretion. They must, of course, as we do, respect the Supreme Court and its interpretation of the law.

We believe now is the time to move forward for the protection and the betterment of the administration of justice in Canada.

[Translation]

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Mr. Speaker, I still remember what the minister said in response to the question asked by my colleague from Chicoutimi—Le Fjord after a time allocation motion was moved.

The member had worked on putting a stop to bullying and had moved a motion on this topic, but the motion was defeated by the Conservatives. He asked the minister whether the minister wanted to hear what he had to say, and the minister replied that he did not feel inclined to listen. He at least gets points for honesty.

We are getting that same message today with this time allocation motion. The minister absolutely does not want to hear what people have to say, and he is even denigrating what we say, as if we were just repeating ourselves. However, each one of us is interested in different parts of the bill.

For example, my colleague from Terrebonne—Blainville is very much interested in online privacy, while I am particularly interested in cyberbullying.

We are interested in as many topics as our constituents give us. However, it seems that the government is not interested in listening to us and it could not care less about what we have to say.

Does the minister not realize that just six clauses in this bill address the topics he talks about all the time, namely cyberbullying and the distribution of images, and that the rest of the bill addresses other topics such as telecommunications theft and other—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Order. The hon. Minister of Justice.

Government Orders

[English]

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, of course I am interested in what she and members here have to say. That is why I follow this debate very closely. That is why I am here. That is why I go to committee. I go to committee, I suspect, as much as or more than any minister in our government. I go to take part in the debates that matter. I go to put forward the government's position, to back up with facts and figures the legislation that we bring forward and to bring rigour to the debate and examination that naturally follow in this place.

It gives me the opportunity to talk about more than just the debate and the legislation. Our government has also put in place a strategy with \$10 million in funding to help with the creation of new crime prevention products. We now have in place the Get Cyber Safe campaign, which I know the members opposite would heartily support. It enables Canadians to get more information about how to protect themselves and their families from online threats, including cyberbullying. I know the hon. member is very interested in and very supportive of all of these efforts.

There is a National Bullying Awareness Week, which I know all members here embrace. The government created a special section on children and cyberbullying that has tips and help for teens on the use of social media.

All of this, including the private sector work being done through the needhelpnow.ca website, when coupled with this legislation, will make our youth safer. That is something I know members opposite and government members can agree on.

• (1555)

Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in this debate on time allocation, it is interesting to listen to the Liberal members opposite complain about our government's use of time allocation.

I was here from 1993 for 13 miserable years of Liberal governments, and the Liberals used time allocation all the time. They did not complain when it was them.

Then when we listen to the NDP, we see that the reason we have to use time allocation is that members opposite repeat the same message again and again. A certain amount of repetition is reasonable, but they say the same thing over and over again. They are being mischievous. The reality is that they understand the need for us to use time allocation, because, quite frankly, they are not being responsible with all the time that is made available, which is hours in the House and hours at committee. They must start to be more responsible.

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I know that the member is a long-standing member of this place, and I do share his observations with respect to the necessity of managing House time.

We are now entering, as we all know, a very busy time. There are many bills and legislative initiatives, including private members' bills from the opposition, as well as the budget. All of this requires management of House time.

We have had sufficient debate on this legislation. It is time to move it forward for all of the reasons that we have discussed over the

last half-hour. These reasons include the necessity to give the police the powers and the judicial oversight they need in order to prevent and pre-empt the type of online harassment and criminality that have caused harm and heartbreak in so many households in Canada.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put the question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

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

• (1635)

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

(Division No. 239)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Aspin	Baird
Barlow	Bateman
Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Bezan
Blaney	Block
Braid	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinoogee	Butt
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Chisu
Chong	Crockatt
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Del Mastro
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Grewal	Harper
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn

Government Orders

Hayes	Hiebert	MacAulay	Mai
Hillyer	Hoback	Martin	Masse
Holder	James	Mathysen	May
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Michaud
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Kerr	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Lake	Lauzon	Mulcair	Murray
Lebel	Leef	Nantel	Nash
Leitch	Lemieux	Nicholls	Nunez-Melo
Leung	Lizon	Pacetti	Papillon
Lobb	Lukiwski	Patry	Péclet
Lunney	MacKay (Central Nova)	Perreault	Plamondon
MacKenzie	Maguire	Quach	Rafferty
Mayer	McColeman	Rankin	Ravignat
McLeod	Menegakis	Raynault	Regan
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	Rousseau	Saganash
Nicholson	Norlock	Sandhu	Scarpaleggia
Obhrai	O'Connor	Scott	Sellah
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz	Sgro	Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-
O'Toole	Paradis	sor)	
Payne	Poilievre	Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Preston	Rajotte	St-Denis	Stewart
Reid	Rempel	Sullivan	Thibeault
Richards	Ritz	Toone	Tremblay
Saxton	Schellenberger	Trudeau	Turmel
Seeback	Shea	Valeriote	Vaughan— 122
Shipley	Shory		
Smith	Sopuck		
Sorenson	Stanton		
Storseth	Strahl		
Sweet	Tilson		
Toet	Trost		
Trottier	Truppe		
Uppal	Valcourt		
Van Kesteren	Van Loan		
Wallace	Warawa		
Warkentin	Watson		
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)			
Weston (Saint John)			
Wilks	Williamson		
Wong	Yelich		
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)		
Yurdiga	Zimmer— 146		

NAYS*Members*

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
Angus	Aubin
Bélanger	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Boivin
Borg	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Brisson
Brosseau	Byrne
Caron	Casey
Cash	Chan
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary
Comartin	Côté
Cotler	Cullen
Cuzner	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseault
Easter	Eyking
Foote	Freeland
Freeman	Garneau
Garrison	Genest
Giguère	Godin
Goodale	Gravelle
Groguhé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Hsu
Hughes	Hyer
Jacob	Jones
Julian	Kellway
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larose	Latendresse
Laverdière	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leslie	Liu

PAIRED

Nil

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

[*English*]

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

[*Translation*]

It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for London—Fanshawe, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, National Defence.

[*English*]**REPORT STAGE**

The House resumed from September 22 consideration of Bill C-13, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Canada Evidence Act, the Competition Act and the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): When this matter was last before the House, the hon. member for St. John's East had completed his remarks, but had not yet taken questions and comments.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Burnaby—New Westminster.

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have just seen for the 78th sad time the use of time allocation and closure by the government. It is a sad record that stands even worse than the former Liberal government's record. There is an appalling lack of respect for the Canadian public, discussion and debate.

Government Orders

The problems with this bill, though we agree with it in principle, are the questions around constitutionality and the government trying to ram through the bill without due regard for putting in place the kinds of amendments that make it constitutional and avoid the problems that the government has seen half a dozen times so far this year, with courts rejecting government legislation. With this idea of ramming the bills through, unfortunately, there are things like a court system and constitution that have to be respected.

Does my colleague from St. John's East feel the government has done its due diligence in this bill, given that it is so controversial, that there are concerns about its constitutionality and that there are real concerns about the impacts that go far beyond cyberbullying?

● (1640)

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague's question is important because it has to do with the differential role between what the House of Commons does and what the Supreme Court of Canada does. The Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that legislation coming before the House meets the constitutional standard.

We have a case now before the federal court with an affidavit and suggestion. From the government's point of view, if there is some possibility, maybe a 5% possibility, of an arguable case that a law is constitutional, it is good enough for the government. I do not think is right.

It is the constitutional responsibility of the government to ensure that legislation coming before the House meets the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Serious questions have been raised and they ought to be answered first. As well, the government should have a broader view of constitutionality than the narrow one it seems to follow.

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise again to take part in this debate on this important legislation. As members opposite would know, the legislation is intended very much to protect people, young people in particular, our most vulnerable; to protect seniors from online criminality and fraud that could defraud them of their life savings; to protect individuals from the security breaches and attacks that we know are happening regularly online.

The bill is about modernizing sections of the Criminal Code, respecting precedent, including recent Supreme Court decisions, and respecting the Constitution. However, it is about modernizing in a way that takes Criminal Code sections from the age of the rotary dial phone into the 21st century, the Internet age. We have more information available at our fingertips now and youth are more able to access information than at any other time in world history. Therefore, it stands to reason that we would want to bring legislation forward that would similarly modernize the Criminal Code and the rules that govern online criminal activity.

The bill is about amending the Criminal Code in a way that would create a new offence of the non-consensual distribution of intimate images. It would also update a number of offences and the investigative tools that allow police to use modern technology to police the Internet, so to speak, by amending other statutes such as the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act.

Bill C-13 would also allow Canada to co-operate with like-minded countries in the investigation of cybercrime. I know my friend from Lévis—Bellechasse, the Minister of Public Safety, fully appreciates, from his daily interactions with police and investigators, that they need this capacity to protect people from online criminality. The portions of the bill that we are bringing forward are consistent, related, and support the common objective to give the police the ability to prevent online criminal acts.

Bill C-13 would also achieve these goals in a balanced way, something that was recognized by many of the witnesses who have already given testimony and appeared before the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, where the bill was thoroughly examined.

Following this review at the committee and to reflect concerns about the difficulty of forecasting the impact that these important changes to the law and the amendments that were adopted by the committee, this was done as part of the parliamentary process and in recognition of the contributions of members and witnesses. It was done in a way that proposes changes to Bill C-13.

An important change was that after seven years of coming into force, there will be a thorough review. This is not an uncommon provision, but when breaking new ground, as the bill would do, it provides sufficient time to lapse before we assess the implementation and the impacts of the reforms.

I mentioned that the thorough review of the bill by the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights took place. This review involved 10 committee meetings, hours of examination, with appearances by over 40 witnesses. Many of the witnesses came to urge the committee to pass the legislation, to move forward and address the serious problems particularly around cyberbullying. We heard from people like Glen Canning, who tragically lost his daughter to a very pernicious and persistent act of cyberbullying. Therefore, there is urgency in bringing this legislative movement forward.

Those most passionate that we heard at the committee were victims, those who had felt the sting of the loss resulting from ongoing harassment and humiliation online. In several of the cases, the people who had lost loved ones because of this modern plague of cybercrime urged the government and committee members to move post-haste in getting these provisions to the Criminal Code in place.

The insidiousness of some of this behaviour is troubling in the extreme and what happens in the virtual world can have deadly consequences in the real world. While some witnesses expressed concern about the proposals, most witnesses saw the wisdom of the bill. They congratulated the government on taking action to address cybercrime, which, I am quick to add goes far beyond just the legislative initiatives.

Government Orders

•(1645)

We have put in place programs and assistance to help with getting information into schools and spreading the word, particularly to young people, about how they can get help and how they can help remove some of these offensive images that cause them such stress and anxiety. That type of information is very important, as well as the improvement and modernization of the investigative tools, which require judicial oversight and the authorization of a judge before that type of information is sought.

This is a comprehensive and balanced bill. It is about protecting the public through this new offence that is designed to address the aspects of cyberbullying. In particular, it is about modernizing existing offences and the investigative tool kit. It is very much there to give the police the ability to do in a virtual world what they do in the real world, and to seek out those who are causing this type of harm through the Internet.

[*Translation*]

The offence of non-consensual distribution of intimate images prohibits the sharing of intimate photos or photos containing nudity without the consent of the individual shown in the photos.

[*English*]

It is important to respond in this manner to cyberbullying, which involves activities that can cruelly humiliate and shame its targets. It can cause irreparable emotional and psychological harm to the victim. There are far too many of these cases that we could enumerate here. Suffice it to say, the pain being felt and experienced by the families is unquantifiable. The anonymity of what happens online sometimes emboldens people and empowers some to act in a cruel and wicked fashion.

Bill C-13 would respond directly to recommendations that were made in a June 2013 federal, provincial and territorial report. Therefore, there is broad support and consensus among our provincial and territorial partners to move in this fashion. The report was unanimously supported by my predecessor, the Minister of Public Safety, as well as all of those provincial attorneys general and public safety ministers.

I also alluded to the committee, which heard from a number of victims of cyberbullying and sadly the parents of some deceased victims, many of whom have now become advocates for change to better address the scourge of cyberbullying. Most of these witnesses expressed strong and unconditional support for the proposals found in Bill C-13.

In particular, and his name has been mentioned previously, Mr. Glen Canning expressed serious concern to the committee about the challenge faced by police in responding to modern crime using outdated tools. He also expressed his belief that had Bill C-13 been law, it could have had a positive impact and might have saved his daughter, Rehtaeh Parsons.

These are compelling arguments to be made for passing the bill. Further delays would leave more people vulnerable, simply put, and online crime to go unchecked. The alarmist rhetoric and some of the partisan banter here is not going to change that. Moving the bill forward will in fact fill the gap.

I hope the House understands just how important the proposed legislation is. Our police need these modern tools for modern times. Criminals are certainly using the Internet to great effect, and it is time to fight back. Bill C-13 would give the police the means to investigate and hold offenders accountable online, just as in the real world. It would provide the police with increased, judicially authorized, 21st century police tools and techniques.

I urge all members to support the bill. It is a balanced, necessary approach to putting in place offences and investigative tools that would provide the means to respond to criminal law challenges in this century and those that arise from cyberbullying.

•(1650)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Justice for his speech at report stage.

The committee did not have a chance to examine the Spencer decision and see how it relates to and affects Bill C-13, even though I asked the committee to do so, since we finished the clause-by-clause study on June 12 and the Supreme Court handed down its decision on June 13.

A number of experts have said that the decision tears Bill C-13 apart. The minister seems to be saying that that is not the case. Does he not believe that the burden of proof has been diminished? Besides the fact that it is used in other sections of the Criminal Code, how is privacy still being protected when the burden of proof required for the police to obtain private information on Canadian citizens is being diminished?

In other words, the expression “reasonable and probable grounds to believe” has been replaced by “reasonable grounds to suspect”, which seriously undermines the previous standard.

[*English*]

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I still firmly believe that the protections are there, that the protections do in fact exist. When it comes to the judicial oversight that is required in order for a warrant to be granted, the standard the member referred to may be described as less, but it is still going to be in the decision-making power of the judge. Therefore, to cast aspersions on the judiciary, to suggest somehow they are going to make improper decisions in granting that warrant, I would suggest is not helpful in this regard.

We are very much putting our trust, our confidence and our faith in the system to work when it comes to those important decisions. Let us not lose sight of the enormity of the challenge that the police are facing and the insidious nature of what is taking place online without the proper oversight. We know that there is an explosion of activity happening on the Internet. We know we do not have sufficient tools, which is why we are acting in this regard. We know that efforts have been made not only in this Parliament, but going back some years by previous governments to move in this direction. This is not a new issue. This is not a new phenomenon. What is urgent is that we put these tools in place, that we allow greater protections and afford the police greater ability to protect people from online crime.

Government Orders

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all agree on the aspects of the bill that deal with the non-consensual disclosure of intimate images. The problem, as the minister knows, is with the non-consensual distribution of subscriber information, which is done without a warrant and on a voluntary basis.

My question for the minister relates to the advice that he receives from the Department of Justice. It is the Department of Justice lawyers who put together the bill. At the time they put together the bill, their view of the appropriate safeguards around subscriber information was in accordance with what the law was at the time the bill was put together. That changed in Spencer. That changed when the hearings were finished. In the Spencer case, it was those Department of Justice lawyers who argued that subscriber information does not attract a reasonable expectation of privacy. Given that the advice that the minister received in putting together the bill was subsequently found to be incorrect by the Supreme Court of Canada, does he not agree that it is now time to go back to the drawing board?

• (1655)

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, no I do not. I do not think it will come as a surprise to the member or anyone in the House that I do not agree with that assessment. In fact, I can assure him that those same justice lawyers who helped craft the bill, who researched extensively the policing powers and the privacy balance that has to be sought and achieved, their advice remains consistent and the same. That is that Bill C-13, as currently drafted, does not in fact create new police powers. It does not enable them to go around existing requirements under the law to respect privacy.

I am little surprised and somewhat flummoxed by the position of the Liberal Party because it was its members who brought forward similar provisions in the past, through private member's bills, and spoke very favourably for the same supportive updating of the Criminal Code. In fact, the member for Beauséjour who was here a moment ago said the old tools, the old laws and regulations in common law around search warrants, lawful access, et cetera, have not kept up with the technology that organized crime is using. A former justice minister from the Liberal Party, Mr. Ujjal Dosanjh, said the police want to be able to apprehend or disrupt gang activity and they are at a disadvantage because of the state of the law in this area.

I do not know how the member from the Liberal Party squares those comments with his reluctance to support the bill.

Mr. David Wilks (Kootenay—Columbia, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-13, the protecting Canadians from online crime act, now that it has been reported back to the House by the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

Without the provisions contained in Bill C-13, there would be no tool in the Criminal Code to enable the preservation of computer data and ensure important evidence would not be deleted prematurely. In addition, without these provisions, there would be no tool designed for the production of specific types of data such as transmission data. Nor would there be a tool to assist in tracking a communication by using one order that could be served on multiple providers when it was revealed that the person under investigation was hopping from one hiding place to the next, from one server

provider to the next, simply to cover his or her tracks. Bill C-13 would bring the kind of balance Canadians expect from a 21st century system of justice.

I want to address some basic principles so everyone understands what is at stake.

The new preservation tools are crucial. With regard to the storage of data, Canada's telecommunications industry is, in many ways, unregulated. We do not have laws for mandatory data retention, contrary to what exists in the European Union, and many Canadians believe we should not have such laws. Bill C-13 does not change that.

There are a number of providers with a variety of business practices. This is not a criticism of those practices. There are many reasons why data should be deleted. Some of those reasons have to do with privacy, but not all of them. Sometimes it is cheaper. Sometimes it is just the way technology is designed. However, sometimes these circumstances are consciously exploited by criminals trying to hide their trail and get away with their crimes.

The creation of the preservation tools reflects the diversity of legitimate business practices and acknowledges the fact that the industry is not required to retain data. However, we must understand the consequences of our choices. This also means that vital data could be deleted before production orders could be obtained from a judge enabling that data to be disclosed.

Preservation demands and preservation orders act as the first step in a lawful investigation. These tools ensure the data at least exists long enough for a judge to assess the evidence brought before him or her and determine if it should be disclosed to the police so it could assist in an investigation and eventually be brought forward in open court.

Let us consider the next step: the production of evidence. The new production orders provide the necessary set of investigational powers that enable a judge to grant specific types of data as specified in the order, which could be obtained by the police. This is another aspect that has not been understood in the media or by some witnesses who appeared before the committee. The new tools are not about disclosing data in general. It may be easy to grasp that these provisions would give law enforcement the specific tools it needs in the modern world of computers and complex telecommunications. However, there is another side to it.

The provisions in Bill C-13 ensure that a judge is aware of precisely what type of data is being sought by the police in relation to a specific investigation. This is quite unique. Most countries around the world do not provide their judges with this ability to carefully consider the circumstances and to uphold the rights and freedoms of the people and their jurisdiction by granting the authorities access to only one sort of data and not another. If the police do not need access to every kind of data, why should that be permissible?

Government Orders

These new tools make clear that police forces can obtain what is needed, but not more. If they can convince the judge that they need access to a particular type of data in order to assist in the investigation, then the judge can empower them to obtain that data from a service provider, but only that type of data, not every type of data that the service provider might have. This type of precision, this new approach, increases accountability, transparency and privacy protection. It is a new model for our new high tech reality. It is the right balance of freedom and protection for Canadians.

● (1700)

These are not simple issues and they do not deserve to be dismissed by misguided motions to delete vital provisions from Bill C-13. We must begin to understand that in a complex telecommunications network, where the Internet enables mobile phones, laptops and tablets to send data through the air in the blink of an eye, there are different types of data going through the network, data which can have diverse characteristics. We need different tools for those different types of data. The warrant for a tracking device and the warrant for a transmission data recorder are examples of those kinds of tools. They are crucial tools to combatting cyberbullying and online crime in general.

The current dial number recorder provisions in the Criminal Code were put in place when most Canadians did not have a cellphone and were not surfing the web. This is not the kind of technology that police face today when conducting criminal investigations.

The new transmission data recorder provisions can be used for collecting data from both telephones and the Internet. We all know that in today's world, a cellphone can be used to place a call, surf the web, or send a text message or a digital photograph. The transmission data recorder reflects this reality. It is not restricted to one type of data from one type of device. Again, a much more cautious approach has been taken than headlines would have one believe.

We must look carefully at the details. The new provision is important because it establishes appropriate safeguards. The transmission data recorder may be a mouthful to say and it may be difficult to understand some of the technological wording, but basically it is about the data that devices send to each other to connect into the network.

There are many different bits of data that could fall under the definition of transmission data, making a long, complicated list looking daunting. However, there are three things to remember.

First, police officers have to get approval from a judge. They must present evidence to a judge in order to use a transmission data recorder.

Second, the transmission data recorder is basically about mapping networks. It is about identifying devices and messages. It is not focused on identifying an individual person. That means it is not centred on the sort of attribution that was the focus of the Supreme Court of Canada's recent decision in *Spencer* in June 2014.

Third, and this is absolutely important, the police cannot use this provision to intercept what people say or text to each other or the digital photos that they send. The provision is crystal clear about this. It specifically states that it cannot be used to collect content.

That means the transmission data recorder cannot be used to intercept voice. It cannot be used to collect text messages. It cannot be used to read the content of emails. It cannot even be used to read the subject line of an email. It cannot be used to collect a digital photo. To do that sort of thing would be to conduct an interception. To conduct an interception, the police would need a full-blown wiretap authorization, and that is the way it should be.

The police need the right tools, but Canadians need their privacy protected. Bill C-13 would strike the balance.

The warrants for the tracking device and the transmission data recorder not only improve police capabilities, but also strengthen the privacy protections for Canadians generally by ensuring that judicial standards are respected for different types of data.

Let us use another example to make that clear. The amended tracking order provisions distinguish between tracking things and tracking people. Now the existing provisions in the Criminal Code do not make the distinction. Therefore, if the police were tracking a package, like a drug shipment, that is one thing. However, if the police are trying to track a person, using a device usually carried or worn by the person, the new provision demands that the police meet a higher threshold of proof. The police must bring more compelling evidence before a judge, before that judge would permit a tracking warrant to be used to follow a person's movements. That is the way it should be.

The new provisions enhance privacy protections above the old provisions in the Criminal Code. The old tool is not good enough in today's society. The new provisions strike the balance between law enforcement needs and privacy protections.

I call upon all members to give their full support to Bill C-13 to ensure its swift passage.

● (1705)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, earlier we debated a time allocation motion on this bill. The Conservatives told us that this was urgent and we needed to vote right away. However, if this was so urgent, why did they not support Bill C-540, introduced by my colleague from Dartmouth—Cole Harbour? Indeed, much of that bill is repeated in Bill C-13.

[*English*]

Mr. David Wilks: Mr. Speaker, we have some leading precedence to this. The bill needs to be through by December 22. If it is not, then certain things will happen.

Government Orders

However, from a perspective of Bill C-13, the bill recognizes the importance of modernizing the Criminal Code and police techniques. Police forces cannot work in the century behind us right now. They need to get into the 21st century. The bill would do that.

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Kootenay—Columbia for his service on the justice committee. He brings a perspective to the committee from his many years of police work that is extremely valuable.

I would like to ask him about the immunity provision contained in the bill. We heard a lot about it during the hearings. We have heard the government say that the immunity provision really does not do much. It does not convey any new powers.

We did not hear anyone at committee say, “We asked for this”. We did not hear that from law enforcement. We did not hear from any telco, so they could not tell us whether they asked for it.

Could the member offer any rationale for why it was there? What was the demand for an enhanced immunity for telephone companies included in the bill?

Mr. David Wilks: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that it was codifying what was already in existence. We need to understand that those businesses were already under an existing rule of law, and that will remain in place.

Mr. Bob Dechert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I join with the Liberal justice critic in complimenting the member for his experience as a police officer and how that helps the committee do its work.

In respect of that, I thought he made a good speech about what was meant by the term “transmission data recorder”. A lot of comment has been made in the House and elsewhere about the difference between the standard of reasonable grounds to believe versus reasonable grounds to suspect.

As a police officer, could he tell us what is necessary to prepare that kind of warrant application before the court, how much more time is required to prepare a warrant under the threshold of reason to believe and how would that delay an investigation in a matter where a young person was being harassed over the Internet?

• (1710)

Mr. David Wilks: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his good work on the justice committee.

The fact is that the police need time, especially in this electronic age, to put investigational tools together and the information that is required for a warrant.

When we talk about a preservation order, that is only to hold data in place so police forces can then go back to a judge to ask for additional warrants to actually look at it. Otherwise, they are not even looking at it. They are just providing the opportunity to do that.

However, police need that time. In this digital age where everything, as I said in my speech, can be moved in the flash of a light, police officers need to slow it down so they can create the proper evidence and information for the judge to make a good decision on reasonable and probable grounds.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to this bill, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Canada Evidence Act, the Competition Act, and the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act.

The title is cited as “protecting Canadians from online crime act”, and I have to say at the beginning that I am constantly bothered by the way the government names its bills.

The naming of the bill goes to the heart of the way the government operates in titling its various legislation. There is a lot of spin and a certain amount of deception, because this bill would not actually protect Canadians from online crime in any discernible way. It would provide investigative tools to police and new offences, but all this assumed conduct would be in progress or would have already occurred; it would not be prevented by this legislation.

It has to be said, in fairness to the government, there is some preventive aspect in the fear of the penalties among people who would do these kinds of things. However, as is so often the case with the Conservatives, the title is exaggerated and, I would say, deceptive. Members have heard me say a number of times in this House that we have now had eight years of deception from the current government.

The principal incentive behind this legislation has been the growing problem of cyberbullying, which has led to some tragic consequences. There is no question cyberbullying is a scourge on our society and that cyberbullying is a particular strain on our young people. We could go through all kinds of cases of that, and other speakers have. The Liberals are supportive in principle of legislative measures that would provide law enforcement with additional tools to combat cyberbullying. This is an area where the Criminal Code urgently needs to be updated to reflect the realities of modern technologies.

We believe, however, that legislative measures alone, while helpful, are insufficient to combat cyberbullying, and we urge the government to commit to a broader, more holistic strategy to deal with cyberbullying that also includes public awareness resources for parents, kids, and the general public.

The Liberals introduced cyberbullying legislation in the last session that would have modified some Criminal Code offences to cover modern technology, as is done in Bill C-13. The Conservative members and the New Democrats voted against that legislative measure in the last session.

The Liberals, while in government, also introduced legislation that would have addressed new technologies back in 2005. The current government is only now figuring out that police need these tools to keep up with technologies that are increasingly a part of today's crime.

Government Orders

We believe that a balance must be struck between civil liberties and public safety, particularly when it comes to warrants that may be intrusive and overly broad. We do not support the measures that were in Bill C-30, the previous bill, which even the Conservatives had to withdraw because of Canadian outrage. Sadly, some of this bill duplicates the rejected Bill C-30, such as word-for-word reproductions of the change to subsection 487.3(1) of the Criminal Code and, except for one word, the changes to sections 492.1 and 492.2 regarding warrants.

We are very concerned about efforts to reintroduce “lawful access”, which the Conservatives promised was dead. Why the current government continues to tag on measures that push the envelope, so to speak, on privacy issues makes no sense to me. The immediate issue is important and cannot be lost, so we feel we have to support it, but why do the Conservatives play politics with everything, using cyberbullying to get what they wanted in the old Bill C-30?

• (1715)

My colleague, the member for Charlottetown, raised a question in the House in which he asked the minister to split the bill, but that was refused. That would have made a lot of sense, in that both aspects of the bill could have been studied in their own right and the cyberbullying aspect of the bill could have been dealt with very rapidly.

This omnibus bill touches upon everything from terrorism to telemarketing to cable stealing to hate speech, and in some parts is an affront to both democracy and the legislative process.

In particular, the bill resurrects elements of the old Bill C-30, Vic Toews' famous “either stand with us or with the child pornographers” bill when he was the previous justice minister. Many in this House will remember that.

The past justice minister, now the Minister of National Defence, promised Canadians on February 11, 2013, while killing Bill C-30:

We will not be proceeding with Bill C-30 and any attempts that we will continue to have to modernize the Criminal Code will not contain the measures contained in C-30, including the warrantless mandatory disclosure of basic subscriber information or the requirement for telecommunications service providers to build intercept capability within their systems.

He went on to say:

We've listened to the concerns of Canadians who have been very clear on this and responding to that.

I heard what the previous speaker said, and he dealt with this issue somewhat. However, there is a real question in this legislation as to whether the minister's words hold true or not. Again, it goes to the heart of why the bill was not split so that both aspects could be dealt with appropriately.

We must ensure that adequate protections are included in the bill to protect the civil liberties and privacy interests of ordinary Canadians. We are very concerned that with this omnibus bill, under the guise of cyberbullying prevention, the government is slipping things through the back door.

Ultimately, while we agree the Criminal Code must be updated to keep pace with technology, the hodgepodge bundling of bills is highly problematic. Some of it, such as the changes to the hate

speech provisions and the introduction of the cable stealing offence, has been presented without any explanation of why the modifications are being made and without making any rational connection to cyberbullying.

We agree with the need to address cyberbullying and support the creation of a new offence for the unwanted distribution of intimate images. We also agree that some of the Criminal Code sections being modified are woefully out of date and must be amended to better reflect modern technology.

We strongly disagree, however, with the use of omnibus legislation that precludes nuanced discussion and debate on disparate issues. Moreover, we strongly disagree with the reintroduction of the universally panned legislation on lawful access from the old Bill C-30.

In short, we believe the provisions of the bill would unnecessarily infringe the civil liberties and privacy interests of Canadians. While we support this legislation, we want to place on the record that, as has happened in the past with the government's so-called crime agenda, the courts could ultimately find that many of the provisions of Bill C-13 would be illegal.

It would have served the government and Canadians well had the government accepted some of the concerns that were raised, allowed some amendments at committee, and, most notably, accepted the demand by my colleague, the member for Charlottetown, to split the bill, with the cyberbullying elements contained in a stand-alone bill rather than in what we are now debating.

• (1720)

Mr. Bob Dechert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member mentioned the concept of splitting the bill. We have heard a lot about this, and we heard about it in committee.

I do not know if he has had an opportunity to read the testimony from the justice committee's hearings on this bill. He would note that the committee studied it for 10 days. It heard from more than 40 witnesses, and there was extensive discussion about the investigative powers provisions of the bill. I fail to understand what more could be added if a separate study of all that was done again, with the same witnesses coming before the committee again.

The member probably heard Mr. Canning's comments when he said that we need this bill and that the police need these tools to prevent another tragedy such as the one that befell his daughter, Rehtaeh Parsons.

I would like to read the comments of Mr. Allan Hubley, who is the father of Jamie Hubley, who was bullied right here in Ottawa. He said:

Bill C-13 in my view is meant to help reduce cyberbullying and help police obtain the evidence needed to punish those among us who prey on our beautiful children. Our children need you to use your power as parliamentarians to protect them. Parents across Canada are watching and hoping you will do something to help them.

Government Orders

Remember the words of Churchill and please ensure change is progress by passing this bill and giving law enforcement the tools needed.

I wonder if the member could comment on that and tell us if he still thinks that this bill needs to be delayed and split and studied another time.

Hon. Wayne Easter: Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary, to a certain extent, misses the point. The bill should have been split long ago. We are not suggesting that today.

We accept the reality that we have to support this bill, but a better process could have been instituted whereby there could have been more debate on both aspects.

The fact of the matter is that telephone companies were not witnesses. No one involved in the Spencer case in the Supreme Court was invited as a witness.

I am sure that you know already, Mr. Speaker, that I am not on the justice committee. However, at the committee that I operate in, because of the government majority there is a certain weighting toward witnesses that the government wants, witnesses who will talk their language. If I might say so, the way the Conservative government operates in committee has undermined the committee process, and it is undermining the very essence of how democracy works in this country.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

Sometimes it feels as though the debate on Bill C-13 is a dialogue of the deaf. There are two things going on at the same time here. There is the section that deals with cyberbullying and the illegal distribution of images. Then, there is the much more complex section that takes up about 40 of the bill's 52 pages. Some witnesses in committee expressed some serious concerns about this part. The Supreme Court also examined the issue in *R. v. Spencer*.

The NDP submitted 36 amendments in committee, but they were all rejected. I mentioned a dialogue of the deaf, since we all tried to split the bill so that we could make sure everything was done right. The parliamentary secretary asked what other witnesses the committee could have heard from. We could have heard from experts to explain how the Spencer ruling affects the bill. That did not happen, since the ruling came after the study was done.

Could my colleague speak to that?

• (1725)

[*English*]

Hon. Wayne Easter: Mr. Speaker, the member basically confirms her own point by raising the fact that there were 36 amendments. None were carried. There was an amendment by the Liberal member for Charlottetown to have a compulsory review in three years. Those might not be the exact words that were used, but it was amended by the committee to do it in seven years. That is a wee bit of progress, in that there is a compulsory review in place.

However, it comes back to my original point: this is a government that is operating in a very dictatorial way. It fails to take ideas from all members of the House, including the opposition parties, that would make bills better. These ideas would do a better job for all

Canadians, and perhaps even prevent some of the Supreme Court challenges that are being tossed back at the government as legislation that does not meet the test of the charter.

Mr. Mike Wallace (Burlington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to speak to Bill C-13.

I will put my speech aside, because I want to respond to the accusations just made by the member opposite. I am actually the chair of the justice committee, and as chair, part of my responsibility is to make sure that everyone gets a fair opportunity to be heard. I think members of the committee work very well together, to be perfectly honest.

The way it has worked and will continue to work at committee is that each party is able to submit the names of witnesses they would like to hear from. Based on the numbers we get, we ask members to prioritize who they would like to hear from, because time may run out.

If I recall correctly, there was no set time for this particular bill. If the committee did not hear from certain segments, it was because those witnesses were not recommended or brought forward. The committee did not call those witnesses not because the government was trying to do something inappropriate but because the witnesses were not asked for. The government cannot be blamed for not calling witnesses who were not asked for.

Conservatives had an opportunity to ask for witnesses. New Democrats asked for witnesses and the Liberals asked for witnesses. I take some offence that the member said this was not done appropriately. It was absolutely done appropriately. It was done in this committee in dealing with Bill C-13 and is done for all other legislation that comes to the committee.

I think the committee is operating well, and everyone has an opportunity to have their say. If parties, including my own, want to hear from witnesses, they can put them on the list. There will be a discussion as to how many meetings there will be on it, and then we will hear from those witnesses. That is how it has worked and will continue to work as long as I am in the chair. We will see if that continues.

I also want to respond to the issue of splitting this omnibus bill. I have the bill in front of me. It is in French and English, as all bills are. It is 53 pages long, plus 12 pages of explanatory notes. It is not a very big bill. If members can read it in both languages, that is great, but let us assume that most read in one language or the other. That would make it about 25 or 26 pages long. It did not need to be split, in my view. I think there is lots of opportunity to talk about all the issues. It is not a very difficult bill to grasp. I think someone could read it in a few hours.

There are a number of issues in the bill, but the process at committee did not limit members to talking about just certain parts of the bill. Members could have brought forward witnesses and we could have had a discussion, which we did, on all parts of that bill. I have to take some offence on the issue of what happened.

Government Orders

As we know, as the minister and the previous speaker on this side have pointed out, the bill would do a number of things, but in general, it would create a new offence for the distribution of non-consensual pictures on the Internet.

I did not know how big a problem it was, to be perfectly honest. I had not really experienced it in my office or had anyone come to see me. I took the opportunity to ask my daughters, who just graduated and are in university now. They were able to illustrate to me a number of actual cases, in their own high school, of young women who had had photos taken of them that were then posted on different people's sites as revenge or cyberbullying. This was a surprise to me.

That does not make the news. What makes the news is when it goes too far and the bullying is so egregious that someone, unfortunately, takes his or her life. Then it makes big news. This is a problem that is happening every day in every community across this country, so we needed to act.

There was mention of the previous legislation that was brought forward in Bill C-30, and appropriately so. The government recognized that there were some issues that needed to be dealt with, so we brought it back, took it off the table, and redid the bill.

● (1730)

We made changes based on the public and the response in this House in terms of the changes that needed to be made. I believe that those were made. Do we get credit as a government for making those changes? No, and the previous speaker criticized us, saying that we did not do it right in the first place.

I am sure that opposition members believe that they are perfect, and maybe even some of us think we are perfect on this side, but let us be honest. We had a bill in front of us, we recognized that there were some issues, we took it back, and we made changes and improvements. We addressed those problems and brought something back that we could all pass.

I am not sure what the NDP are doing. I heard from the last speaker that the Liberals are supporting the bill going forward, and I appreciate that.

I do not think as a government that we should be criticized for hearing the concerns and then making changes. I will agree that there were a number of amendments put forward, 30-some amendments, and one, on a review period, did pass, which I personally supported. I do not vote on the committee as the chair, but I do support that.

As we all know, it takes some time for legislation, especially with the Criminal Code, to get through the system, get in place, and get tested in practice. I think it will take some time before this piece of legislation is tested, and that length of time for the review is appropriate.

The other issue we heard a lot about was that the bill would give the police a lot more power than they already have. I think the issue on Bill C-30 was that it looked like the police could do things without a warrant. Well, this bill would clearly resolve that issue, in my view.

Bill C-13 clearly indicates that for preservation orders and for the police to be able to do their jobs in terms of attacking the problem of

cyberbullying in particular cases, they need judicial support to move forward.

I think it is important to give the police those tools. In this electronic environment of the Internet, things move so fast, on or off, we need to be able to do that.

We experience that around here all the time. If a member of Parliament makes a mistake or does something on the Internet, and somebody catches it, a few hours later, if not less, it is gone. We have all experienced that in this House with members of Parliament doing things on electronic systems.

When it is a criminal activity, we need to have the police able to go after it quickly. We need to give them those tools to make that happen. I am very supportive of the opportunity for the police to be able to do their work.

We have been asked as a government to do something about the cyberbullying problem. This is not an easy area to legislate. We cannot legislate cyberbullying to stop. It is not that easy. I appreciate that we have looked at opportunities and issues in terms of addressing cyberbullying through our legal system, which is what this bill would do.

Bill C-13 would give the police better tools to track and trace telecommunications. It would streamline the process of obtaining multiple warrants so that the police could execute their jobs.

The witnesses we saw whose families were affected by cyberbullying were fully supportive of what we were doing. I want every member of this House to think about that. If it was their son or daughter whose photo was online and who was being bullied, would they want the police to be able to act to resolve the issue and have a penalty for cyberbullying? I believe the answer is yes, and it is yes for the vast majority of Canadians. That is why we need to support Bill C-13.

● (1735)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, who is also the chair of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

In my opinion, he is taking offence at very little; we are not criticizing him for the number of meetings that were held or the quality of the witnesses. However, we asked some witnesses whether it would not be more prudent to wait for the Supreme Court's ruling, which was handed down just a few hours after the time provided for the clause-by-clause review had ended.

On one hand, I agree with my colleague that this is an important issue and that we want to help the victims, parents, families and everyone involved so that they can rest easy. On the other hand, I want to be able to guarantee them that the work we are doing here will not be dismissed out of hand by an impending ruling.

Government Orders

It would have been wiser to wait for the ruling. That was certainly a valid request. It is impossible to conduct a study without knowing the outcome of the ruling. We cannot ask constitutional experts questions about a ruling that has not yet been issued. There is no need to take offence to that. In this case, we did not feel as rushed as we did in other cases, but it certainly would have been better to wait until the ruling was handed down.

I would like to hear my colleague's comments on that. How could the witnesses share their opinions on a ruling that had not yet been issued?

[*English*]

Mr. Mike Wallace: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague across the way. She does an excellent job on behalf of her party at committee.

It would not be wise for this committee or any committee to wait until the Supreme Court decides on the issue. I am not a lawyer, but if we look at the decision that was brought down, it defined activities of the police, but it did not change what was in the bill.

The wheels of justice move relatively slowly in this country. Getting legislation through the House moves slowly. Cyberbullying is one of those areas that is not moving slowly. It is progressing every single day. We needed to act, and we acted appropriately.

If in the future, after this is reviewed, if changes to legislation need to be made based on rulings from the Supreme Court, that can happen, but we should not have to wait until the Supreme Court has decided on everything. As elected officials, we decide here in the House.

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair of the justice committee for his speech. There are a couple of matters he raised that I would invite him to come back to. First, toward the end of his speech, he indicated that every single witness who appeared before the committee whose family was touched by cyberbullying was strongly in favour of the bill. I would ask him to recall the testimony of Carol Todd, the mother of Amanda Todd, who spoke very passionately about not wanting to see privacy rights taken away in the name of her daughter. I would invite the member to perhaps adjust what he said with respect to that generalization on the part of victims.

I also want to come back to his comments with respect to witnesses. As the chair of the committee, he would be very well aware that the Liberal Party requested that the wireless association of Canada testify, but it was not invited. We did not hear from telephone companies. Could the member provide us with any explanation as to why the government did not invite telephone companies? Are the opposition parties solely to blame for the fact that we did not hear from telephone companies, companies that are going to receive immunity under the bill?

● (1740)

Mr. Mike Wallace: Mr. Speaker, I will start with the second question first. If there are witnesses that any of the parties wanted to see but did not invite, it is their fault that they did not hear from them. If the Conservative Party did not desire to hear from telephone companies and did not put them on the list, they would not be invited. I do not recall any telephone companies being on the list to

be invited. My recommendation to the committee is that if there are people or organizations that members want to see, get them on the list. If they are a priority, make them a priority. As a group, we will decide how many meetings to have, and it is usually based on how many witnesses we have. If there are only a few witnesses, there are fewer meetings.

With regard to Carol Todd, she did not want privacy rights trampled on, and I do not believe the bill tramples on any privacy rights.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Terrebonne—Blainville, but she has just three or four minutes.

Ms. Charmaine Borg (Terrebonne—Blainville, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since I do not have a lot of time, I will get straight to the point.

Cyberbullying is an extremely important issue and the NDP wants to do something about it. We suggested splitting the bill in order to pass this part quickly. I want to reiterate that, because it seems that the members across the way are under the impression that this issue is not important to us. That is not true.

We are deeply concerned about the fact that the government is in the process of creating an entirely new system to gain access to personal information. I heard Conservative members say that this will change nothing when it comes to accessing personal information, but that is not true. Providing protection to Internet service providers who voluntarily comply with a request and hand over information, or who do so on their own initiative, is extremely problematic.

We have the Supreme Court's ruling in the Spencer case before us. We have not really had the chance to hear what the government has to say about this. We do not even know whether this bill is constitutional. I am not sure. Some telecommunications companies, such as Telus and Rogers, have even said that they no longer respond to requests from government agencies because they now believe it is not constitutional. Why can the government not open its eyes and realize that such things as an IP address do indeed constitute personal information?

As the court stated in its ruling, you need a warrant to obtain this information. There have been decisions against creating an entire system, a back door, for calling a telecommunications company to obtain personal information. I believe that the government has a duty to consider this before simply cutting off debate and quickly moving to a vote.

I would like to add that we are constantly being told that these requests are made in exceptional circumstances. That is not true. We saw that the Canada Border Services Agency made more than 13,000 requests in one year. Only two of these requests were listed as being required for national security reasons. I am sorry, but their argument does not hold water.

Government Orders

Furthermore, we were told that these requests are transparent and subject to review. However, there is no transparency. There is absolutely no oversight. When I asked the government in writing for the data for the past 10 years from all agencies, it did not have the data. The government has no record of the requests. How can we have a transparent system without even having the necessary data?

• (1745)

The Deputy Speaker: Order. 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 report stage of the bill now before the House.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2, 4 and 7 to 9. A negative vote on Motion No. 1 requires the question be put on Motion No. 5.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1825)

[*Translation*]

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

(Division No. 240)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Angus
Ashton	Aubin
Bellavance	Benskin
Bevington	Blanchette
Boivin	Borg
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Brousseau	Caron
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Côté
Cullen	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseau	Fortin
Freeman	Garrison
Genest	Giguère
Godin	Gravelle
Groguhé	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Hughes

Jacob	Julian
Kellway	Lapointe
Latendresse	Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
May	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair	Nantel
Nash	Nicholls
Nunez-Melo	Papillon
Patry	Péclet
Perreault	Plamondon
Quach	Rafferty
Rankin	Ravignat
Raynault	Rousseau
Saganash	Sandhu
Scott	Sellah
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Stewart	Sullivan
Thibeault	Toone
Tremblay	Turmel— 92

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Armstrong	Aspin
Baird	Barlow
Bateman	Bélangier
Bennett	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Bezan	Blaney
Block	Boughen
Braid	Brison
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinoogee
Butt	Byrne
Calandra	Callkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Casey
Chan	Chisu
Chong	Cotler
Crockatt	Cuzner
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Del Mastro
Devolin	Dreeshen
Dubourg	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Falk	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Foote	Freeland
Galipeau	Gallant
Gameau	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodale
Goodyear	Gosal
Gourde	Grewal
Harper	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer
Hoback	Holder
Hsu	Hyer
James	Jones
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lamoureux
Lauzon	Lebel
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	Leaf
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
Lunney	MacAulay

Government Orders

MacKay (Central Nova) MacKenzie
 Maguire Mayes
 McColeman McGuinty
 McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood) McLeod
 Menegakis Miller
 Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
 Murray
 Nicholson Norlock
 Obhrai O'Connor
 O'Neill Gordon Opitz
 O'Toole Pacetti
 Paradis Payne
 Poilievre Preston
 Rajotte Regan
 Reid Rempel
 Richards Ritz
 Saxton Scarpaleggia
 Schellenberger Seeback
 Sgro Shea
 Shipley Shory
 Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
 Smith
 Sopuck Sorenson
 Stanton St-Denis
 Storseth Strahl
 Sweet Tilson
 Toet Trost
 Trotter Trudeau
 Truppe Uppal
 Valcourt Valeriot
 Van Kesteren Van Loan
 Vaughan Vellacott
 Wallace Warawa
 Warkentin Watson
 Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
 Weston (Saint John)
 Wilks Williamson
 Wong Woodworth
 Yelich Young (Oakville)
 Young (Vancouver South) Yurdiga
 Zimmer— 185

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 2, 4 and 7 to 9 defeated.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

• (1835)

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 241)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)

Andrews

Angus
 Aubin
 Bellavance
 Benskin
 Blanchette
 Borg
 Brahmi
 Brosseau
 Caron
 Cash
 Charlton
 Chisholm
 Christopherson
 Côté
 Cullen
 Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
 Day
 Dionne Labelle
 Doré Lefebvre
 Dubourg
 Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
 Easter
 Foote
 Freeland
 Garneau
 Genest
 Godin
 Gravelle
 Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
 Hsu
 Hyer
 Jones
 Kellway
 Lapointe
 Laverdière
 LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
 Liu
 Mai
 Martin
 Mathysen
 McGuinty
 Michaud
 Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
 Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
 Murray
 Nash
 Nunez-Melo
 Papillon
 Pécelet
 Plamondon
 Rafferty
 Ravignat
 Regan
 Saganash
 Scarpaleggia
 Sellah
 Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
 Sims (Newton—North Delta)
 Sitsabaesan
 Stewart
 Thibeault
 Tremblay
 Turnel
 Vaughan— 127

Ashton
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bevington
 Boivin
 Boutin-Sweet
 Brison
 Byrne
 Casey
 Chan
 Chicoine
 Choquette
 Cleary
 Cotler
 Cuzner
 Davies (Vancouver East)
 Dewar
 Donnelly
 Dubé
 Duncan (Etobicoke North)
 Dusseault
 Eyking
 Fortin
 Freeman
 Garrison
 Giguère
 Goodale
 Grogulé
 Harris (St. John's East)
 Hughes
 Jacob
 Julian
 Lamoureux
 Latendresse
 LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
 Leslie
 MacAulay
 Marston
 Masse
 May
 McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
 Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
 Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
 Mulcair
 Nantel
 Nicholls
 Pacetti
 Patry
 Perreault
 Quach
 Rankin
 Raynault
 Rousseau
 Sandhu
 Scott
 Sgro
 St-Denis
 Sullivan
 Toone
 Trudeau
 Valeriot

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
 Adler
 Albas
 Alexander
 Ambler
 Anderson
 Aspin
 Barlow
 Benoit
 Bernier
 Blaney
 Boughen
 Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
 Brown (Barrie)
 Butt

Adams
 Aglukkaq
 Albrecht
 Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Anders
 Armstrong
 Baird
 Bateman
 Bergen
 Bezan
 Block
 Braid
 Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
 Bruinooge
 Calandra

Government Orders

Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chisu	Chong
Crockatt	Daniel
Davidson	Dechert
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Grewal	Harper
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	James
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lauzon
Lebel	Leef
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
Lunney	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mayes	McColeman
McLeod	Menegakis
Miller	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Nicholson	Norlock
Obhrai	O'Connor
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
O'Toole	Paradis
Payne	Poilievre
Preston	Rajotte
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Ritz
Saxton	Schellenberger
Seeback	Shea
Shipley	Shory
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Tilson
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Truppe
Uppal	Valcourt
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vellacott	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 150

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 defeated.

[English]

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

[Translation]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

● (1840)

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

(Division No. 242)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler	Anders
Anderson	Andrews
Armstrong	Aspin
Baird	Barlow
Bateman	Bélanger
Bennett	Benoit
Bergen	Bernier
Bezan	Blaney
Block	Boughen
Braid	Brisson
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinooge
Butt	Byrne
Calandra	Calkins
Cannan	Carmichael
Carrie	Casey
Chan	Chisu
Chong	Cotler
Crockatt	Cuzner
Daniel	Davidson
Dechert	Devolin
Dreeshen	Dubourg
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dykstra	Easter
Eyking	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Foote
Freeland	Galipeau
Gallant	Garneau
Gill	Glover
Goguen	Goldring
Goodale	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Grewal	Harper
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	Hsu
James	Jones
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kent
Kerr	Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lake	Lamoureux
Lauzon	Lebel
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	Leef
Leitch	Lemieux
Leung	Lizon
Lobb	Lukiwski
Lunney	MacAulay
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Maguire	Mayes
McColeman	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	McLeod

Menegakis	Miller
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Murray	
Nicholson	Norlock
Obhrai	O'Connor
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
O'Toole	Pacetti
Paradis	Payne
Poilievre	Preston
Rajotte	Regan
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Ritz
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Seeback
Sgro	Shea
Shipley	Shory
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Smith	
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	St-Denis
Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Tilson
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Trudeau
Truppe	Uppal
Valcourt	Valeriotte
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vaughan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 183	

NAYS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Angus
Ashton	Aubin
Bellavance	Benskin
Bevington	Blanchette
Boivin	Borg
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Brosseau	Caron
Cash	Charlton
Chicoine	Chisholm
Choquette	Christopherson
Cleary	Côté
Cullen	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dewar	Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseau
Fortin	Freeman
Garrison	Genest
Giguère	Godin
Gravelle	Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Hughes	Hyer
Jacob	Julian
Kellway	Lapointe
Latendresse	Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Énard)	Leslie
Liu	Mai
Marston	Martin
Masse	Mathysen
May	Michaud
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair	Nantel
Nash	Nicholls
Nunez-Melo	Papillon
Patry	Péclat
Perreault	Plamondon
Quach	Rafferty
Rankin	Ravignat
Raynault	Rousseau
Saganash	Sandhu
Scott	Sellah

Routine Proceedings

Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaiesan
Stewart	Sullivan
Thibeault	Toone
Tremblay	Turmel — 92

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1845)

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

The House resumed from September 29 consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion to concur in the first report of the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

The question is on the amendment.

● (1850)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 243*)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
Angus	Ashton
Aubin	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Boivin
Borg	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Brisson
Brosseau	Byrne
Caron	Casey
Cash	Chan
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary
Côté	Cotler
Cullen	Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dewar
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseau
Easter	Eyking
Foote	Fortin
Freeland	Freeman
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Giguère
Godin	Goodale
Gravelle	Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu	Hughes
Hyer	Jacob
Jones	Julian
Kellway	Lamoureux

Routine Proceedings

Lapointe	Latendresse	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	Nicholson
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie	Norlock
Liu	MacAulay	O'Connor
Mai	Marston	Opitz
Martin	Masse	Paradis
Mathysen	May	Poilievre
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	Rajotte
Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Rempel
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Ritz
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mulcair	Schellenberger
Murray	Nantel	Shea
Nash	Nicholls	Shory
Nunez-Melo	Pacetti	Sopuck
Papillon	Patry	Stanton
Pécllet	Perreault	Strahl
Plamondon	Quach	Tilson
Rafferty	Rankin	Trost
Ravignat	Raynault	Truppe
Regan	Rousseau	Valcourt
Saganash	Sandhu	Van Loan
Scarpaleggia	Scott	Wallace
Sellah	Sgro	Warkentin
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
Stewart	Sullivan	Wong
Thibeault	Toone	Yelich
Tremblay	Trudeau	Young (Vancouver South)
Turnel	Valeriotte	Zimmer — 149
Vaughan — 127		

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Aspin	Baird
Barlow	Bateman
Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Bezan
Blaney	Block
Boughen	Braid
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)	Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Brown (Barrie)	Bruinooge
Butt	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Carrie
Chisu	Chong
Crockatt	Daniel
Davidson	Dechert
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Dykstra	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Galipeau
Gallant	Gill
Glover	Goguen
Goldring	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Grewal	Harper
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hilleyer	Hoback
Holder	Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kent	Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lauzon	Lebel
Leef	Leitch
Lemieux	Leung
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacKay (Central Nova)	MacKenzie
Maguire	Mayes
McColeman	McLeod
Menegakis	Miller

Nil

PAIRED

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

The next question is on the main motion.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1855)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 244*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Ambler	Anders
Anderson	Armstrong
Aspin	Baird
Barlow	Bateman
Benoit	Bergen
Bernier	Bezan

Government Orders

Blaney
Boughen
Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Barrie)
Butt
Calkins
Carmichael
Chisu
Crockatt
Davidson
Del Mastro
Dreeshen
Dykstra
Fantino
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Fletcher
Gallant
Glover
Goldring
Gosal
Grewal
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hayes
Hillyer
Holder
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerr
Lake
Lebel
Leitch
Leung
Lobb
Lunney
MacKenzie
Mayes
McLeod
Miller
Nicholson
Obhrai
O'Neill Gordon
O'Toole
Payne
Preston
Reid
Richards
Saxton
Seeback
Shipley
Smith
Sorenson
Storseth
Sweet
Toet
Trottier
Uppal
Van Kesteren
Vellacott
Warawa
Watson
Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)
Williamson
Woodworth
Young (Oakville)
Yurdiga

Block
Braid
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
Bruinooge
Calandra
Cannan
Carrie
Chong
Daniel
Dechert
Devolin
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Falk
Fast
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Galipeau
Gill
Goguen
Goodyear
Gourde
Harper
Hawn
Hiebert
Hoback
James
Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kent
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
Lauzon
Leaf
Lemieux
Lizon
Lukiwski
MacKay (Central Nova)
Maguire
McColeman
Menegakis
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Norlock
O'Connor
Opitz
Paradis
Poilievre
Rajotte
Rempel
Ritz
Schellenberger
Shea
Shory
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Tilson
Trost
Truppe
Valcourt
Van Loan
Wallace
Warkentin
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
Wilks
Wong
Yelich
Young (Vancouver South)
Zimmer — 150

Christopherson
Côté
Cullen
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Day
Dionne Labelle
Doré Lefebvre
Dubourg
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Easter
Foote
Freeland
Gameau
Genest
Godin
Gravelle
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Hsu
Hyer
Jones
Kellway
Lapointe
Laverdière
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Liu
Mai
Martin
Mathysen
McGuinty
Michaud
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Murray
Nash
Nunez-Melo
Papillon
Péclet
Plamondon
Rafferty
Ravignat
Regan
Saganash
Scarpaleggia
Sellah
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)
Sitsabaesan
Stewart
Thibeault
Tremblay
Turmel
Vaughan — 127

Cleary
Cotler
Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver East)
Dewar
Donnelly
Dubé
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Eyking
Fortin
Freeman
Garrison
Giguère
Goodale
Groguhé
Harris (St. John's East)
Hughes
Jacob
Julian
Lamoureux
Latendresse
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
Leslie
MacAulay
Marston
Masse
May
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Mulcair
Nantel
Nicholls
Pacetti
Patry
Perreault
Quach
Rankin
Raynault
Rousseau
Sandhu
Scott
Sgro
St-Denis
Sullivan
Toone
Trudeau
Valeriotte

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CANADA-KOREA ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PROSPERITY ACT

The House resumed from September 30, consideration of the motion that Bill C-41, An Act to implement the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the Republic of Korea, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the second reading stage of Bill C-41.

NAYS

Members

Allen (Welland)
Angus
Aubin
Bellavance
Benskin
Blanchette
Borg
Brahmi
Brosseau
Caron
Cash
Charlton
Chisholm

Andrews
Ashton
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevington
Boivin
Boutin-Sweet
Brisson
Byrne
Casey
Chan
Chicoine
Choquette

Government Orders

● (1905)

[English]

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

(Division No. 245)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Ambler
Anders	Anderson
Andrews	Angus
Armstrong	Ashton
Aspin	Aubin
Baird	Barlow
Bateman	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benoit	Benskin
Bergen	Bernier
Bevington	Bezan
Blanchette	Blaney
Block	Boivin
Borg	Boughen
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Braid	Brisson
Brosseau	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinooge	Butt
Byrne	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Caron
Carrie	Casey
Cash	Chan
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Chisu
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary
Côté	Cotler
Crockatt	Crowder
Cullen	Cuzner
Daniel	Davidson
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dechert
Del Mastro	Devolin
Dewar	Dionne Labelle
Donnelly	Doré Lefebvre
Dreeshen	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault	Dykstra
Easter	Eyking
Falk	Fantino
Fast	Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Fletcher
Foote	Fortin
Freeland	Freeman
Galipeau	Gallant
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Giguère
Gill	Glover
Godin	Goguen
Goldring	Goodale
Goodyear	Gosal
Gourde	Gravelle
Grewal	Groguhé
Harper	Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
Harris (St. John's East)	Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
Hawn	Hayes
Hiebert	Hillyer
Hoback	Holder
Hsu	Hughes
Jacob	James
Jones	Julian
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kellway	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)

Kent	Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Latendresse	Lauzon
Laverdière	Lebel
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)
Leef	Leitch
Lemieux	Leslie
Leung	Liu
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	Mayes
McColeman	McGuinty
McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)	McLeod
Menegakis	Michaud
Miller	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)	
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	
Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)	Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
Mulcair	Murray
Nantel	Nash
Nicholls	Nicholson
Norlock	Nunez-Melo
Obhrai	O'Connor
O'Neill Gordon	Opitz
O'Toole	Pacetti
Papillon	Paradis
Patry	Payne
Péclet	Perreault
Plamondon	Poilievre
Preston	Quach
Rafferty	Rajotte
Rankin	Ravignat
Raynault	Regan
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Ritz
Rousseau	Saganash
Sandhu	Saxton
Scarpaleggia	Schellenberger
Scott	Seeback
Sellah	Sgro
Shea	Shipley
Shory sor)	Sims (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Wind-)
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	Sitsabaesan
Smith	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
St-Denis	Stewart
Storseth	Strahl
Sullivan	Sweet
Thibeault	Tilson
Toet	Toone
Tremblay	Trost
Trottier	Trudeau
Truppe	Turnel
Uppal	Valcourt
Valeriote	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vaughan
Vellacott	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to)
Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga	Zimmer— 276

NAYS

Members

May— 2

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF EXTRACTIVE CORPORATIONS OUTSIDE CANADA ACT

The House resumed from September 25 consideration of the motion that Bill C-584, An Act respecting the Corporate Social Responsibility Inherent in the Activities of Canadian Extractive Corporations in Developing Countries, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-584 under private members' business.

• (1910)

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

(Division No. 246)

YEAS

Members

Allen (Welland)	Andrews
Angus	Ashton
Aubin	Bélangier
Bellavance	Bennett
Benskin	Bevington
Blanchette	Boivin
Borg	Boutin-Sweet
Brahmi	Brisson
Brosseau	Byrne
Caron	Casey
Cash	Chan
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary
Côté	Cotler
Cullen	Cuzner
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Davies (Vancouver East)
Day	Dewar
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dubé
Dubourg	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseauit
Easter	Eyking
Foote	Fortin
Freeland	Freeman
Garneau	Garrison
Genest	Giguère
Godin	Goodale
Gravelle	Groguhé
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Hsu	Hughes
Hyer	Jacob
Jones	Julian
Kellway	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Latendresse
Laverdière	LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard)	Leslie
Liu	MacAulay
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
Michaud	Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mulcair
Murray	Nantel
Nash	Nicholls

Nunez-Melo	Pacetti
Papillon	Patry
Péclét	Perreault
Plamondon	Quach
Rafferty	Rankin
Ravignat	Raynault
Regan	Rousseau
Saganash	Sandhu
Scarpaleggia	Scott
Sellah	Sgro
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaiesan	St-Denis
Stewart	Sullivan
Thibeault	Toone
Tremblay	Trudeau
Turmel	Valeriot
Vaughan— 127	

NAYS

Members

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

Private Members' Business

Storseth	Strahl
Sweet	Tilson
Toet	Trost
Trottier	Truppe
Uppal	Valcourt
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vellacott	Wallace
Warawa	Warkentin
Watson	Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)
Weston (Saint John)	Wilks
Williamson	Wong
Woodworth	Yelich
Young (Oakville)	Young (Vancouver South)
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 150

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

● (1915)

INSTRUCTION TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN (VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN)

The House resumed from September 30 consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 504 under private members' business.

The question is on the amendment.

● (1920)

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

(Division No. 247)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Adler	Aglukkaq
Albas	Albrecht
Alexander	Allen (Welland)
Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Ambler
Anders	Anderson
Andrews	Angus
Armstrong	Ashton
Aspin	Aubin
Baird	Barlow
Bateman	Bélanger
Bellavance	Bennett
Benoit	Benskin
Bergen	Bernier
Bevington	Bezan
Blanchette	Blaney
Bloch	Boivin
Borg	Boughen
Boutin-Sweet	Brahmi
Braid	Brison
Brosseau	Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)	Brown (Barrie)
Bruinooge	Butt
Byrne	Calandra
Calkins	Cannan
Carmichael	Caron
Carrie	Casey
Cash	Chan
Charlton	Chicoine
Chisholm	Chisu
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Cleary

Côté	Cotler
Crockatt	Cullen
Cuzner	Daniel
Davidson	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Vancouver East)	Day
Dechert	Del Mastro
Devolin	Dewar
Dionne Labelle	Donnelly
Doré Lefebvre	Dreeshen
Dubé	Dubourg
Duncan (Vancouver Island North)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Dusseauit
Dykstra	Easter
Eyking	Falk
Fantino	Fast
Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)	Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Fletcher	Foote
Fortin	Freeland
Freeman	Galipeau
Gallant	Garneau
Garrison	Genest
Giguère	Gill
Glover	Godin
Goguen	Goldring
Goodale	Goodyear
Gosal	Gourde
Gravelle	Grewal
Grogulé	Harper
Harris (Scarborough Southwest)	Harris (St. John's East)
Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)	Hawn
Hayes	Hiebert
Hillyer	Hoback
Holder	Hsu
Hughes	Hyer
Jacob	James
Jones	Julian
Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)	Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
Kellway	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kent	Kerr
Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)	Lake
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Latendresse	Lauzon
Laverdière	Lebel
LeBlanc (Beauséjour)	LeBlanc (LaSalle—Énard)
Leaf	Leitch
Lemieux	Leslie
Leung	Liu
Lizon	Lobb
Lukiwski	Lunney
MacAulay	MacKay (Central Nova)
MacKenzie	Maguire
Mai	Marston
Martin	Masse
Mathysen	May
Mayes	McColeman
McGuinty	McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
McLeod	Menegakis
Michaud	Miller
Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)	Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)	Mulcair
Murray	Nantel
Nash	Nicholls
Nicholson	Norlock
Nunez-Melo	Obhrai
O'Connor	O'Neill Gordon
Opitz	O'Toole
Pacetti	Papillon
Paradis	Patry
Payne	Péclet
Perreault	Plamondon
Poilievre	Preston
Quach	Rafferty
Rajotte	Rankin
Ravignat	Raynault
Regan	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Ritz	Rousseau
Saganash	Sandhu
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Scott
Seeback	Sellah
Sgro	Shea
Shipley	Shory

Private Members' Business

Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)
 Sims (Newton—North Delta)
 Sitsabaiesan
 Sopuck
 Stanton
 Stewart
 Strahl
 Sweet
 Tilson
 Toone
 Trost
 Trudeau
 Turmel
 Valcourt
 Van Loan
 Vellacott
 Warawa
 Watson
 Sky Country)
 Weston (Saint John)
 Williamson
 Woodworth
 Young (Oakville)
 Yurdiga

Smith
 Sorenson
 St-Denis
 Storseth
 Sullivan
 Thibeault
 Toet
 Tremblay
 Trottier
 Truppe
 Uppal
 Van Kesteren
 Vaughan
 Wallace
 Warkentin
 Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to
 Wilks
 Wong
 Yelich
 Young (Vancouver South)
 Zimmer— 276

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment carried. The next question is on the main motion.

Hon. John Duncan: Mr. Speaker, I think if you seek it, you would find unanimous consent to unanimously adopt Motion No. 504, as unanimously amended, in the previous vote.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. government House whip have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Ms. Judy Foote: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals agree to apply the vote, but the member for Guelph was not here for the last vote and we want to include him in this vote.

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

(Division No. 248)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
 Adler
 Albas
 Alexander
 Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Anders
 Andrews
 Armstrong
 Aspin
 Baird
 Bateman
 Bellavance
 Benoit
 Bergen
 Bevington
 Blanchette
 Block
 Borg
 Boutin-Sweet
 Braid
 Brosseau
 Brown (Newmarket—Aurora)
 Bruinooge
 Byrne
 Calkins

Adams
 Aglukkaq
 Albrecht
 Allen (Welland)
 Ambler
 Anderson
 Angus
 Ashton
 Aubin
 Barlow
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Benskin
 Bernier
 Bezan
 Blaney
 Boivin
 Boughen
 Brahma
 Brison
 Brown (Leeds—Grenville)
 Brown (Barrie)
 Butt
 Calandra
 Cannan

Carmichael
 Carrie
 Cash
 Charlton
 Chisholm
 Chong
 Christopherson
 Côté
 Crockatt
 Cuzner
 Davidson
 Davies (Vancouver East)
 Dechert
 Devolin
 Dionne Labelle
 Doré Lefebvre
 Dubé
 Duncan (Vancouver Island North)
 Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
 Dykstra
 Eyking
 Fantino
 Findlay (Delta—Richmond East)
 Fletcher
 Fortin
 Freeman
 Gallant
 Garrison
 Giguère
 Glover
 Goguen
 Goodale
 Gosal
 Gravelle
 Grogue
 Harris (Scarborough Southwest)
 Harris (Cariboo—Prince George)
 Hayes
 Hillyer
 Holder
 Hughes
 Jacob
 Jones
 Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission)
 Kellway
 Kent
 Kramp (Prince Edward—Hastings)
 Lamoureux
 Latendresse
 Laverdière
 LeBlanc (Beauséjour)
 Leef
 Lemieux
 Leung
 Lizon
 Lukiwski
 MacAulay
 MacKenzie
 Mai
 Martin
 Mathyssen
 Mayes
 McGuinty
 McLeod
 Michaud
 Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue)
 Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)
 Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot)
 Murray
 Nash
 Nicholson
 Nunez-Melo
 O'Connor
 Opitz
 Pacetti
 Paradis
 Payne
 Perreault
 Poilievre
 Quach
 Rajotte
 Ravignat
 Regan
 Rempel

Caron
 Casey
 Chan
 Chicoine
 Chisu
 Choquette
 Cleary
 Cotler
 Cullen
 Daniel
 Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
 Day
 Del Mastro
 Dewar
 Donnelly
 Dreeshen
 Dubourg
 Duncan (Etobicoke North)
 Dusseault
 Easter
 Falk
 Fast
 Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Foote
 Freeland
 Galipeau
 Garneau
 Genest
 Gill
 Godin
 Goldring
 Goodyear
 Gourde
 Grewal
 Harper
 Harris (St. John's East)
 Hawn
 Hiebert
 Hoback
 Hsu
 Hyer
 James
 Julian
 Keddy (South Shore—St. Margaret's)
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Kerr
 Lake
 Lapointe
 Lauzon
 Lebel
 LeBlanc (LaSalle—Énard)
 Leitch
 Leslie
 Liu
 Lobb
 Lunney
 MacKay (Central Nova)
 Maguire
 Marston
 Masse
 May
 McColeman
 McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood)
 Menegakis
 Miller
 Moore (Port Moody—Westwood—Port Coquitlam)
 Morin (Laurentides—Labelle)
 Mulcair
 Nantel
 Nicholls
 Norlock
 Obhrai
 O'Neill Gordon
 O'Toole
 Papillon
 Patry
 Péclet
 Plamondon
 Preston
 Rafferty
 Rankin
 Raynault
 Reid
 Richards

Adjournment Proceedings

Ritz	Rousseau
Saganash	Sandhu
Saxton	Scarpaleggia
Schellenberger	Scott
Seeback	Sellah
Sgro	Shea
Shipley	Shory
Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor)	
Sims (Newton—North Delta)	
Sitsabaiesan	Smith
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	St-Denis
Stewart	Storseth
Strahl	Sullivan
Sweet	Thibeault
Tilson	Toet
Toone	Tremblay
Trost	Trottier
Trudeau	Truppe
Turnel	Uppal
Valcourt	Valeriote
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vaughan	Vellacott
Wallace	Warawa
Warkentin	Watson
Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country)	
Weston (Saint John)	
Wilks	Williamson
Wong	Woodworth
Yelich	Young (Oakville)
Young (Vancouver South)	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 277	

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion, as amended, carried.

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

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

• (1925)

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I suppose it only makes sense that the Conservatives want to starve the CBC of its funding. After all, if the government is bent on rewriting history, repackaging and rebranding our nation to reflect neo-liberal values, with an emphasis on the glories of war, without a single nod to the Canadian veterans who sacrificed for our country, or to changing the national colours from red and white to Conservative blue, then what better way to do it than to render our national broadcaster helpless in fulfilling its mandate to inform, unite, and educate Canadians about our shared history, values, and culture.

If I cannot appeal to the members on the opposite side of this House to consider the value of the CBC for its mandate to inform, unite, and entertain Canadians, then let me speak to the value Conservatives most consistently support: their pocketbooks.

In our heritage committee study of the Canadian music industry, we heard over and over again about the ways in which culture and the arts work hand in hand to create and sustain a vital and prosperous economy.

Mark Monahan, of Bluesfest, in his April 29 testimony to the heritage committee, stated that the “one thing...missing from the federal funding picture right now [is the] focus on economic development” with existing funding for the arts “...not really focusing on the deliverables like economic development and tourism”.

Broadcasts such as the CBC Radio's *Canada Live* series have sadly suffered the axe of Conservative cuts, along with *Arctic Air*; the 10-minute late night news broadcast formerly available to northern Canadians; *Connect with Mark Kelly*; *Dispatches*, with Rick MacInnes-Rae; and I could go on, but it makes me too sad.

Tracy Jenkins, of Lula Lounge, who testified before committee on May 6, stated that *Canada Live* was:

...crucial in helping us develop audiences for our programming and...artists.... We have really felt the impact of the loss of the initiative to do live recording for a future broadcast as this was an effective vehicle for reaching new listeners across the country and affirming the importance of artistic contributions being made by culturally diverse Canadian artists.

Put simply, investment in CBC Radio allows our Canadian music producers to be showcased in an affordable and viable format, putting money in their pockets and in the pockets of Canadian music producers, who spend their money in Canada.

More bang for the buck. Who has a problem with that?

We heard consistently from expert witnesses at the heritage committee this spring who told us that the arts have value, not only for the pleasure they provide but for the real and substantial contribution they make to economic development in Canadian communities and across the globe.

I have said it before and I will say it again: Conservatives who hold to the idea that we cannot afford to invest in the arts, or Liberals who cut funding in order to pad corporate tax breaks, are being penny-wise and dollar foolish. If the Conservatives understood the real value of investing in the CBC, they would not be slashing the funding. They would be making our national broadcaster part of their economic action plan.

Even Pierre Karl Péladeau, the former head of the Sun news chain, has come out in support of our national public broadcaster. Who ever thought we would see that day?

Will the Conservatives give up their war on culture?

• (1930)

Mr. Rick Dykstra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that was an interesting meander along a road that I am not quite sure was actually constructed to get anywhere, but it sure provided a lot of detours and exits along the way.

If I understand correctly, the hon. member was speaking about her concerns about the CBC. Then she was speaking about a music study that, if I recall correctly, she was a part of.

Adjournment Proceedings

That music study, if the member recalls, was completed before our summer break, so perhaps she forgot how successful that study was and how many witnesses came to present from the perspective that they believed the study was necessary. They also complimented all members, whether they be part of the government or the opposition, in terms of the need for the study.

The recommendations that came forward, almost all of which were supported by the NDP, brought forward a study that I think provided some very useful insight into the music industry in this country, the direction it needed to go in terms of improvement, and most importantly, the fact that Canadian music, both from a national perspective and from a future perspective, is in the best position it has ever been in the history of our country.

Therefore, while the member did go on a little about the CBC and what she claims are reductions, she tried to use the music study to build on her argument. However, if we look at the success of the music study, it is not anywhere near where she went with her negative comments about funding and the CBC.

I remind the member that on May 15 of this year, the House spent the better part of a day discussing the current financial situation facing the CBC. The government certainly understands the cultural importance as well as the economic value of investing in Canada's cultural industries, including the CBC. That is why in the budget we permanently renewed funding for a number of core arts and cultural programs offered by the ministry.

However, at the current moment, the CBC is facing a budget shortfall. That shortfall certainly is not because of a loss of government investment. In fact, according to the president of the CBC:

—a weak advertising market across the industry, lower-than-expected schedule performance in the key 25-54 year-old demographic on CBC Television, lower than expected ad revenues...and the loss of the NHL contract...have combined to create an important revenue shortfall....

It is because of our government's understanding of the importance of our national broadcaster that the CBC receives over \$1 billion a year from taxpayers. We respect the arm's-length relationship between the CBC and government. However, it is up to the CBC to manage its own day-to-day operations.

To be clear, and as Mr. Lacroix said, the challenges faced by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation are due to a loss of advertising revenue. They certainly are not due to the fact that this government does not make investment after investment year after year in the CBC.

Ms. Irene Mathysen: Mr. Speaker, I guess we are just going to ignore the fact that the Liberals in 1995 cut \$400 million from the CBC, and the current Conservative government cut another \$115 million, so that the CBC was in a situation where it could not keep up with the private sector. Of course its revenues fell. What did the Conservatives expect?

In 1991, the CBC mandate was to provide a conduit for Canadians of all ages, genders and origins to connect with each other in order to make real and progressive dialogue about our values, identity and the wonderfully unique personality of this country.

The Conservatives argue that the corporation is independent and that they have no say in how the business is run without acknowledging the fact that the death of a thousand cuts, which as I said was started by Liberals, continues through the Conservative reign. It is starving the CBC of the funding it needs so desperately to fulfill its mandate.

The CBC was created to work hand in hand with this Parliament in forging and preserving the Canadian identity, our diversity, creativity and talent. What is so threatening about it that they have to cut it?

Will the Conservative government finally agree to invest in the CBC and Radio-Canada so they can continue to tell the inspiring stories of—

• (1935)

The Deputy Speaker: The member has well exceeded her time.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Rick Dykstra: Mr. Speaker, that certainly was entertaining, to say the least.

The CBC already receives significant taxpayer funds, and it can operate within its existing budget.

We all understand the important role that CBC/Radio-Canada plays in remote and minority language communities all over the country. The member again mentioned the music issue. Let me just quickly state that Canada's sound, recording, and music publishing sector generates nearly \$568 million a year and provides 13,000 jobs to the Canadian economy. That is why our government just made the Canada music fund permanent in budget 2014.

I look forward to working with the member, despite her comments, on the heritage committee and talking about the very great things that the CBC and the film industry do for this country.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Ms. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative government is failing members of the Canadian Armed Forces and veterans in a dramatic way, and Canadians are losing trust in the government in terms of its care for members, their families, and veterans. That is a sad tale to have to tell, because every Canadian knows the dedication of our Canadian Armed Forces and the sacrifices its members make on our behalf.

Unfortunately, the Conservative government, while using armed forces members and their equipment for photographs and backdrops to enhance its own image, is not properly caring for members who are ill and injured, nor, with the recent budget cuts, is it providing them with proper equipment or replacing the military ships, planes, and equipment that these soldiers need.

Recently the last soldiers came home from Afghanistan. We Canadians celebrated their courage and dedication in that mission, their professionalism, and the incredible reputation that Canadian Forces members deservedly have on the world stage. Sadly, 158 soldiers died in combat during that mission.

Adjournment Proceedings

My question is about the 175 armed forces members who died from suicide while serving in the Canadian Armed Forces during the same time period. Almost 20 more died from suicide than from the mission itself.

Why did that happen?

The Liberals have been calling for adequate mental health support for returning soldiers ever since this combat mission started. In fact, under the Liberal government in 2003 it was identified that there would be a need for a great deal more mental health support as soldiers came back from deployments and experienced mental health challenges and injuries such as PTSD.

To this day, the Conservative government has failed to fill those spots with mental health professionals. As a result, we have injured soldiers who have to wait for many months, or in some cases years, to get treatment. Sadly, that is related to the kind of despair that can lead to suicide.

Canadians are losing trust in the government. It has now been almost a decade of deception on all levels, whether it is claiming that the budget would be stable and would be increased and then cutting it terribly or whether it is the portrayal of other governments, when it is the one that is cutting the budget and is providing the lowest level of funding as a percentage of GDP since the 1980s. This has to stop.

For the sake of our armed forces members, their mental health, and their families, the government has to confess to how it is letting them down and begin treating them properly and with respect.

● (1940)

Mr. James Bezan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am always interested in hearing the mathematically challenged Liberals talking about investments in the Canadian Armed Forces.

I am thankful, though, that I get this opportunity to discuss the important issue of suicide and health care generally, of our serving men and women in uniform. One death by suicide in the Canadian Armed Forces, one death by suicide in Canada is one too many. However, every death of a member of the Canadian Armed Forces is a tragedy that affects everyone on the defence team, as well as the wider military community. Our thoughts go out to the families, friends and colleagues who are dealing with the losses of their loved ones.

That is why our government has made significant investments in mental health care for the men and women who serve Canada in our armed forces. We have increased the military health budget by more than \$130 million, which includes boosting the mental health budget by over \$11 million, for a total of \$50 million a year.

Back in 2008, it was our government that created the joint personnel support unit and the integrated personnel support centres that span right across Canada. The quality of care available to our ill and injured soldiers since the creation of the JPSU and the IPSC is remarkable, and they did not exist under the Liberals. We have to remember, it was the Liberals who sent the Canadian Armed Forces, our brave men and women in uniform, to Afghanistan without a vote, without a debate and without any support for those coming

back from theatre dealing with PTSD and other operational stress injuries.

We have locations right across Canada for the integrated personnel support centres. The Canadian Armed Forces provides high quality care addressing the various mental health issues, from depression to anxiety to post traumatic stress disorders.

National Defence is working hard to reduce wait times through deliberate efforts to recruit and retain skilled mental health professionals, including psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, social workers and addictions counsellors. Due to these efforts, the forces now have over 400 mental health care workers. The last number I heard was 415. That is double what was under the previous Liberal government. Canada now has one of the highest ratios of mental health professionals to soldiers in NATO.

I can proudly say that we have doubled the number of mental health workers since the Liberals. As a result, last April the average wait time across the country was less than 10 days. Efforts to recruit will continue until every vacancy is filled.

When dealing with suicide, as with any mental health issue, prevention is key. That is why National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces are ensuring all military members receive suicide and mental health awareness education at various points throughout their career. This training helps members identify the early signs of distress in themselves, as well as in others, in their families and colleagues, and encourages everyone to seek help as soon as they need it.

As well, at all levels, Canadian Armed Forces leaders receive education about the importance of eliminating the stigma of mental health problems and other barriers to people seeking help for themselves and encouraging others in their units to do the same. Through the “Be the Difference” mental health awareness campaign, the forces are focused on communicating the idea that all members, regardless of rank or level, must help confront the stigma and support colleagues in need. The campaign reinforces the importance of camaraderie and support in the workplace and helps send the message that all military members can make a difference for someone affected by a mental health issue.

Furthermore, through the road to mental readiness program, the Canadian Armed Forces helps to ensure that prior to deployment, personnel and their families are best equipped for the stressors associated with battle.

The defence team is a family. The death of even one member in the Canadian Armed Forces is one too many. We will continue to work and make every possible effort to continue to treat mental health issues and prevent suicide in the Canadian Armed Forces.

Adjournment Proceedings

Ms. Joyce Murray: Mr. Speaker, indeed, every death by suicide is a tragedy. That is why it is so mystifying that the government for years now lists statistics rather than actually acknowledging it is failing our injured men and women in the armed forces. In all the years, almost nine years, it has failed to hire the mental health professionals that were identified as necessary ten years ago. Families are begging for help when a spouse has a mental health challenge being denied. Soldiers are begging not to be released out on to the streets because of their PTSD diagnosis being denied. It is sometimes months before their pension kicks in.

The government has let down the ill and injured soldiers with PTSD. Instead of really addressing this, can a whole government not hire a few hundred mental health professionals? It is denying the problem at the cost of our men and women in uniform and veterans. That is why the government has lost the trust of Canadians.

• (1945)

Mr. James Bezan: Those are not the facts at all, Mr. Speaker.

I have to say, when it comes to our military members, one suicide is too many. Even though the Canadian Forces have made great strides in investing in mental health issues, including suicide prevention, every time a member takes his own life is a tragedy that touches all of us.

That is why the government will continue to make suicide prevention and mental health care one of its highest priorities. We will continue to make sure the Canadian Armed Forces health services have the resources they need to provide high-quality care to our military members and adopt best practices.

The forces will keep up efforts of hiring and retaining mental health professionals and will also be part of the solution in this complex issue of working to reduce the stigma that far too often exists over mental health problems within families and within the military itself. We have to encourage everyone who needs help to seek that help.

Finally, I would like to thank our men and women in uniform for their commitment and hard work in the defence of Canada.

[*Translation*]

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

(The House adjourned at 7:47 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, October 1, 2014

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

African Institute for Mathematical Sciences		Mr. Harper	8095
Mr. Daniel	8091	Mr. Trudeau	8095
National Seniors Day		Mr. Harper	8095
Ms. Mathysen	8091	Mr. Trudeau	8095
Brighton AppleFest		Mr. Harper	8095
Mr. Norlock	8091	Mr. Trudeau	8095
People's Republic of China		Mr. Mulcair	8095
Mr. Chan	8092	Mr. Harper	8095
Government of New Brunswick		Mr. Mulcair	8095
Mr. Williamson	8092	Mr. Harper	8096
Brome-Missisquoi Equality Forum		Mr. Mulcair	8096
Mr. Jacob	8092	Mr. Harper	8096
Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada		Foreign Affairs	
Ms. Bateman	8092	Ms. Laverdière	8096
Hepworth-Shallow Lake Rotary Club		Mr. Baird	8096
Mr. Miller	8092	Finance	
Seaforth Highlanders Army Cadets		Mr. Caron	8096
Ms. Sims	8093	Mr. Sorenson	8096
Women Entrepreneurs		Ms. Davies (Vancouver East)	8096
Mrs. Truppe	8093	Mr. Sorenson	8096
Violence against Women		Health	
Mr. Rankin	8093	Ms. Davies (Vancouver East)	8096
National Security		Ms. Adams	8097
Ms. James	8093	Mr. Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord)	8097
Bedford Volunteer Firefighters Association		Ms. Adams	8097
Mr. Regan	8093	National Defence	
Iran		Ms. Murray	8097
Mr. Bezan	8093	Mr. Nicholson	8097
National Defence		Mr. Garneau	8097
Mr. Harris (St. John's East)	8094	Mr. Baird	8097
National Seniors Day		Foreign Affairs	
Mrs. O'Neill Gordon	8094	Mr. Garneau	8097
ORAL QUESTIONS		Mr. Baird	8097
Health		International Trade	
Mr. Mulcair	8094	Ms. Brosseau	8097
Mr. Harper	8094	Mr. Fast	8098
National Defence		International Trade	
Mr. Mulcair	8094	Ms. Brosseau	8098
Mr. Harper	8094	Mr. Ritz	8098
Mr. Mulcair	8094	Mr. Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	8098
Mr. Harper	8095	Mr. Fast	8098
Mr. Mulcair	8095	Mr. Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	8098
Mr. Harper	8095	Mr. Fast	8098
Mr. Mulcair	8095	Canadian Heritage	
Health		Mr. Leef	8098
Mr. Mulcair	8095	Mr. Harper	8098

Agriculture	
Mr. Brown (Barrie).....	8105
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Brown (Barrie).....	8105
Canada Post	
Ms. LeBlanc (LaSalle—Émard).....	8105
Agriculture	
Mr. Cash.....	8105
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	
Mr. Jacob.....	8105
Dementia	
Mr. Sullivan.....	8105
Canada Post	
Mr. Sullivan.....	8105
Dementia	
Mr. Chisholm.....	8105
Canada Post	
Ms. Quach.....	8106
Dementia	
Mrs. Hughes.....	8106
Gasoline Prices	
Mr. Gravelle.....	8106
Agriculture	
Mr. Scott.....	8106
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lukiwski.....	8106
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Lukiwski.....	8106

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Protecting Canadians from Online Crime Act	
Bill C-13—Time Allocation Motion	
Mr. Van Loan.....	8106
Motion.....	8106
Ms. Boivin.....	8106
Mr. MacKay.....	8107
Mr. LeBlanc (Beauséjour).....	8107
Mr. Dechert.....	8108
Ms. Borg.....	8108
Mr. Casey.....	8108
Ms. May.....	8109
Ms. Péclet.....	8109
Mr. Lamoureux.....	8110
Mr. Benoit.....	8111
Motion agreed to.....	8112
Report Stage	
Bill C-13. Report Stage.....	8112
Mr. Julian.....	8112
Mr. Harris (St. John's East).....	8113
Mr. MacKay.....	8113

Ms. Boivin.....	8114
Mr. Casey.....	8115
Mr. Wilks.....	8115
Ms. Boutin-Sweet.....	8116
Mr. Casey.....	8117
Mr. Dechert.....	8117
Mr. Easter.....	8117
Mr. Dechert.....	8118
Ms. Boivin.....	8119
Mr. Wallace.....	8119
Ms. Boivin.....	8120
Mr. Casey.....	8121
Ms. Borg.....	8121
Motions Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 7 to 9 negatived.....	8123
Motion No. 5 negatived.....	8124
Mr. MacKay.....	8124
Motion for concurrence.....	8124
Motion agreed to.....	8125

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House

Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics	
Motion for concurrence.....	8125
Amendment negatived.....	8126
Motion agreed to.....	8127

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada-Korea Economic Growth and Prosperity Act	
Bill C-41. Second reading.....	8127
Motion agreed to.....	8128
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee).....	8129

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Corporate Social Responsibility of Extractive Corporations Outside Canada Act	
Bill C-584. Second reading.....	8129
Motion negatived.....	8130
Instruction to the Standing Committee on the Status of Women (violence against women)	
Amendment agreed to.....	8131
Motion agreed to.....	8132

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	
Ms. Mathysen.....	8132
Mr. Dykstra.....	8132
National Defence	
Ms. Murray.....	8133
Mr. Bezan.....	8134

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

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