



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 232 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, November 8, 2017**

---

**Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan**

## **CONTENTS**

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 8, 2017

The House met at 2 p.m.

[English]

---

*Prayer*

---

● (1405)

[English]

**The Speaker:** It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of *O Canada* led by the hon. member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound.

[Members sang the national anthem]

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[Translation]

### DAVIE SHIPYARD

**Mr. Michel Boudrias (Terrebonne, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Davie Shipyard is one of the best shipyards in North America, perhaps even one of the best in the world, but what good is having the best shipyard in North America if no ships are being built there? Liberal inaction could cost the Davie shipyard 600 jobs by the end of November and as many as 800 jobs if nothing is done by Christmas. Workers are worried, and the National Assembly is too, because Ottawa is doing nothing.

In Quebec City today, Quebec parliamentarians unanimously adopted the following motion:

That the National Assembly recognize the expertise of the Davie Shipyard in Lévis;

That it call on the federal government to adjust its national shipbuilding strategy to ensure that Quebec receives its fair share of federal contracts; and

That the National Assembly call on the federal government to award Quebec the contracts associated with its plan to replace Coast Guard and Royal Canadian Navy ships, which includes the acquisition of a second Resolve-class oiler replenishment ship.

We hope that, for once, Ottawa will listen. If the federal government does nothing, it alone will be responsible for the loss of hundreds of jobs between now and Christmas.

\* \* \*

### REMEMBRANCE DAY

**Mr. Colin Fraser (West Nova, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in the days leading up to Remembrance Day, many veterans visit schools to talk to students about the meaning of November 11.

Last Friday, I was honoured to attend a Remembrance Day ceremony organized by the Maple Grove Education Centre's Memorial Club. This student-led club participates in dozens of ceremonial events each year with the help and guidance of one individual in particular, Mr. Joe Bishara. For over three decades, Joe has been teaching youth in the Yarmouth area about the true meaning of respect, sacrifice, volunteering, and leadership. I thank Joe for his dedication and hard work in helping veterans tell their stories and ensuring students learn about the freedoms and values we hold dear as proud Canadians.

On November 11, I encourage everyone, especially our youth, to wear a poppy, attend a Remembrance Day ceremony, and take the time to thank a veteran from his or her community. Lest we forget. *N'oublions jamais.*

\* \* \*

### FRANK COULTER

**Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House to recognize the passing of one of Bruce—Grey's finest, Mr. Frank Coulter. Raised on a farm southwest of Owen Sound, he had a knack for sales and seemed destined to become involved in local business. His son Ted said that to get his first job with a local company he was told to sell a pickup truck's worth of baler twine by the end of the day. Frank was back by noon looking for more twine to sell. All of this would lead Frank to found Sprucedale Agromart, a business that would become, and remains today, a staple in Bruce—Grey agriculture.

He worked hard, he played hard. Frank was also a community man. He served on numerous foundations and boards and in 2000 was among a group of investors who fought to keep the OHL's Owen Sound Attack in the city.

While we mourn the loss of a community icon, we know that Frank is looking down on us, likely cheering on his prize racehorses and listening to his favourite song, *Tight Fittin' Jeans* by Conway Twitty. My sincere condolences go out to his family and friends. What a legacy Frank has left.

*Statements by Members***CANADA–MAURITIUS PARLIAMENTARY FRIENDSHIP GROUP**

**Mr. Gagan Sikand (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last week, my colleagues from both sides of the House and I established the Canada–Mauritius Parliamentary Friendship Group. As the newly elected chair of the group, I look forward to working with the honorary consulates general to maintain a positive and productive relationship between our two countries. I would like to acknowledge the Mauritian community in my riding of Mississauga—Streetsville, whose enthusiasm and support were the inspiration behind this friendship group.

Since being elected a little over two years ago, I have attended numerous events hosted by the community and I have always been received with great hospitality. I look forward to working with the community and members from both sides of the House and the Senate to plan future events for the group.

\* \* \*

**CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY**

**Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, trade contractors, who perform over 80% of all construction work in Canada, are disproportionately affected by payment delays because of their position in the construction pyramid that often leaves them waiting on payments from general contractors while still having to pay their staff, suppliers, and taxes. In my own riding of Windsor—Tecumseh, suppliers of materials and trades are an important driver of our local economy. When these companies do not get paid in a timely fashion, there are immediate effects on the livelihoods of my constituents. With public-private partnerships on the rise due to the government's Canada infrastructure investment bank, it is all the more important to protect our smaller contractors. In fact, prompt payment legislation has been passed in Ontario and it already exists at the national level in the U.S., the U.K., Australia, Ireland, and New Zealand. It should exist here as well.

\* \* \*

●(1410)

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Terry Beech (Burnaby North—Seymour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I consider myself incredibly lucky to have spent the majority of my life living on the Pacific Ocean. Like all Canadians, I know that our oceans are an important part of our history, our economy, and our way of life. My neighbours in Burnaby and North Vancouver are very concerned that we are taking our oceans for granted.

Our marine ecosystems face many real threats and it is up to all of us to not just protect our marine environment but to restore it. This is why we are so proud to deliver on our promise to protect 5% of our oceans by 2017. This is a significant achievement, especially considering that we had protected less than 1% of our oceans just two years ago. Our efforts represent the protection of hundreds of thousands of square kilometres of habitat. This is a significant step toward protecting 10% of our oceans by 2020.

On behalf of future generations who are counting on us to get this right, I want to thank all members of this House and all Canadians,

who are working hard every day to protect and restore our marine environment.

\* \* \*

**REMEMBRANCE DAY**

**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, during World War I, among a field of fallen soldiers, simple bright red flowers with a black centre began to appear.

However simple, the red poppy symbolism is powerful, representing the remembrance of those who gave the ultimate sacrifice, those heroes who volunteered to stand against our enemies, valiantly fighting for our freedoms and for their love of our country. So many made the ultimate sacrifice, unselfishly giving up the life they were living and the life they would have lived, so that Canadians would be secure to prosper in this great nation. Culminating Veterans' Week on Remembrance Day, the red poppy will once again unify the nation by showing these fallen heroes are not forgotten.

In my riding of Yorkton—Melville and across Canada, wreaths will be laid to commemorate Canada's fallen. As Canadians, we can never thank these soldiers and their families enough.

God bless the families of our fallen, God bless our servicemen and women, God bless Canada.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**REMEMBRANCE DAY**

**Mr. Fayçal El-Khoury (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, since 1918, we have commemorated 99 times the armistice and the sacrifices of the Canadians who died on the many battlefields around the world. May they rest in peace.

Our veterans, our soldiers, and many Canadians join together today to mourn the untimely death of one of their own. Even though time has passed, on this Remembrance Day, our thoughts are still with the families who are grieving. Our soldiers and other Canadians continue to fulfill their duty to protect our freedoms and preserve peace in the world.

On behalf of my constituents in Laval and all Canadians, I want to tell them how deeply grateful we are.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HAROLD WILFRED SHAUGHNESSY**

**Ms. Karen Ludwig (New Brunswick Southwest, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to be able to rise in the house today to share the story of Sergeant Harold Wilfred Shaughnessy, whose remains were buried in an unknown grave in France for almost 100 years before recently being discovered in June 2016.

Shaughnessy fought in the Battle of Hill 70. Local historian Darren McCabe's interest was piqued when he heard about this discovery and McCabe learned that Shaughnessy was a St. Stephen native from New Brunswick Southwest. This past August, Sergeant Shaughnessy received a full military burial at Loos British Cemetery in France 100 years after his death. In a eulogy to his great uncle, Jack Kennedy read a moving letter that the sergeant had written to his family in 2016, where he said, "Don't cry mother, we are coming back".

On Remembrance Day, the town of St. Stephen will place a special memorial banner at the cenotaph in remembrance of Sergeant Shaughnessy. We will remember them.

\* \* \*

#### OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT

**Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last year, the Prime Minister announced a five-year ban on all oil and gas development in the Arctic without consulting the communities that would be most affected. This moratorium costs the north prosperity, opportunity, and \$2.6 billion in planned investments. Recently, Northwest Territories Premier Bob McLeod issued a "red alert" on the territory's future. He said, "We need jobs. We need work. You want us to leave the North because we can't work there. You want us to live in a large park."

Liberals are taking away northerners' dreams and hopes and creating a nightmare for them. Between increased costs of living through imposed taxes and decreased jobs, this all adds up to a recipe for disaster for our north. In the words of the premier, "everything we have built is in jeopardy."

\* \* \*

•(1415)

#### PORCUPINE CARIBOU HERD

**Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.):**

*[Member spoke in Gwich'in]*

*[English]*

Mr. Speaker, this week the Gwich'in people of Yukon and the NWT are passionately lobbying senators, and their staff in Washington in a desperate plight to save the porcupine caribou herd and the livelihood that has sustained them for thousands of years.

The legislation permitting drilling in the pristine Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the calving grounds of the herd, is pending shortly in Washington, despite our battle of three decades against it.

We had a good day this week lobbying Congress. Kudos to CPAWS Yukon, who collected, in less than two weeks, over 6,000 signatures on a supporting petition. Please sign it.

Kudos to the Yukon Government and Canadian Wildlife Service, who joined us in Washington. Thanks to the Ministers of Environment, Global Affairs, Crown-Indigenous Relations, and the Prime Minister for their unwavering support.

#### Statements by Members

A special thanks to Canadian Ambassador MacNaughton, and the embassy staff, who have fought this battle for three decades to help the Gwich'in people save the caribou that are their lives, their hearts, and their souls.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]*

#### MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS IN LA PRAIRIE

**Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant (La Prairie, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the municipalities of Quebec went to the polls on Sunday. Elected municipal officials are democratic actors who play a key role in developing a vision for economic development, the environment, culture, and land use.

Today, I would like to commend all the people in La Prairie who made a point of getting out to vote. I would also like to congratulate all the candidates who participated in the municipal elections and who helped uphold our democratic tradition.

My heartiest congratulations to all the newly elected officials and to the mayors who were voted in for another term. They are Jocelyne Bates from Sainte-Catherine, Lise Poissant from Saint-Mathieu, Christian Ouellette from Delson, Normand Dyotte from Candiac, Donat Serres from La Prairie, Jean-Claude Boyer from Saint-Constant, and Johanne Beaulac from Saint-Philippe.

Well done, all of you.

\* \* \*

*[English]*

#### REMEMBRANCE DAY

**Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, a century ago this week 100,000 Canadians were fighting at Passchendaele. By the end of this week, 4,000 had died, and 12,000 were wounded. Victory, but at a tremendous cost.

At the same time, Canada was waging its toughest election in its history. One Canadian was part of both campaigns. Sam Sharpe was a sitting member of Parliament who fought with the 116th Battalion at Passchendaele. He was re-elected in that election, but never took his seat.

The mental cost of the Great War took its toll, and weeks after Passchendaele he was hospitalized. Tragically, Sam Sharpe died by suicide a few months later.

We must remember during Remembrance Week that there is a tremendous history, but tremendous tears in our military history. We must also know that for some the battles do not end when a ridge is taken, or when troops return home. The scars from services can linger, but so should our commitment to help and remember.

Lest we forget.

*Oral Questions***DIABETES DAY**

**Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today is Diabetes Day on the Hill.

Across Canada, 11 million people live with diabetes or pre-diabetes. I want to thank the representatives of Diabetes Canada here today for their hard work and advocacy.

To mark this day, I am launching the defeat diabetes step challenge. Each of us can lead by example, embracing a healthy lifestyle and increasing our physical activity. During the challenge, we will be tracking the footsteps of members who participate, and encouraging some friendly competition.

I challenge each member in this place to walk more, take the stairs, skip the bus, and do their part to champion physical activity, which can make a difference for those living with type-2 diabetes.

I hope you, Mr. Speaker, and all members will join the all-party diabetes caucus in the Commonwealth Room at 4:30, and take up the challenge. Together, we can defeat diabetes. It starts with step one.

\* \* \*

● (1420)

**NOKEE KWE**

**Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the outstanding work done by Nokee Kwe in my community of London. Nokee Kwe, in its innovative way, supports indigenous women in their transition to employment and education.

It is devoted to finding solutions to employment and learning barriers through positive voice, a program in which participants learn about social and digital media, photography, and writing. It is a hands-on project dedicated to empowering indigenous women by using storytelling to help them create positive personal narratives.

Not only does this program help build self-esteem, transferrable skills, and relationships, it also conveys positive portrayals of indigenous women in the larger community by sharing the content they create. For once, indigenous women can tell their own stories in their own voice.

Today, I wish to pay tribute to positive voice, its coordinator, and the strong and resilient women who take part in the program.

\* \* \*

**CYRUS WESLEY PECK**

**Mr. Phil McColeman (Brantford—Brant, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Colonel Cyrus Wesley Peck was born in Hopewell Hill, New Brunswick, on April 26, 1871. At the age of 16, he moved to New Westminster, British Columbia, and later Skeena. As a young man, he pioneered in the Klondike, and in 1915 set sail for England to fight in the Great War. While fighting in France, he was wounded in both legs, but he stayed on, and by 1916 he was given command of the regiment.

A Victoria Cross winner for conspicuous bravery, Lieutenant Colonel Peck was elected to the House of Commons while still serving overseas. He would dedicate much of his time as an MP working to establish pensions and benefits for returning soldiers.

Today, his Victoria Cross is displayed at the Canadian War Museum. He was a truly great Canadian.

Lest we forget.

\* \* \*

**INDIGENOUS VETERANS**

**Mr. Dan Vandal (Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, during a week in which we humbly honour all veterans who have served Canada, today we also recognize the contributions of first nations, Inuit, and Métis men and women whose sacrifices we can never forget.

This is a day when we take a moment to remember a veteran like Edith Anderson Monture from the Six Nations of the Grand River in Ontario, who, as a nurse in the Great War, tended to the wounded and the sick in an American military hospital in France.

[*Translation*]

When called to serve, indigenous peoples answered, and to this day, they continue to risk their lives to defend our Canadian values.

[*English*]

As we move forward in our journey of reconciliation, indigenous sacrifices, and accomplishments will never be forgotten.

I call on this House, and indeed I call on all Canadians, to join us in honouring our indigenous veterans today and throughout the week.

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

[*English*]

**TAXATION**

**Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's good friend and head of revenue for the Liberal Party, Stephen Bronfman, was named in the paradise papers. Earlier this week, the revenue minister promised a full investigation into those who were exposed in these documents.

Could the minister confirm to this House that Liberal Party insider Stephen Bronfman is included in this, and is currently under investigation?

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is fully committed to fighting tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance. In our first two budgets, we invested nearly \$1 billion, and our plan is working. We are working on four jurisdictions per year and hiring 100 auditors. There have been 627 cases transferred to criminal investigation, 268 warrants, and 78 convictions. We have tightened the rules for the voluntary disclosures program. We have imposed \$44 million in penalties on promoters and tax preparers—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Milton.

[English]

**Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, specificity does matter in this case.

The minister promised an independent investigation. However, this morning the Prime Minister defended his good friend and top fundraiser, stating he was satisfied with the assurances he received from Mr. Bronfman. The Prime Minister's political interference on behalf of his close friend is a clear signal to investigators that there is one rule for Liberals and another one for everyone else.

Could the minister confirm that the Prime Minister has pardoned Mr. Bronfman of any wrongdoing?

• (1425)

[Translation]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is well aware that billions of dollars are at stake. We have invested nearly \$1 billion to combat tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance. As Minister of National Revenue, I can assure everyone listening that no one is above the law.

[English]

**Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the minister did confirm that a full investigation will be undertaken with regard to the people named. She has confirmed it right now.

However, today the Prime Minister publicly interfered with this investigation, stating he would accept Mr. Bronfman's explanation, and considered the matter to be dealt with.

Is this how it works now? A wealthy friend of the Prime Minister, who is hiding millions of dollars offshore, picks up the phone, gives him a call, and the issue goes away.

Could the minister confirm that Stephen Bronfman is not under investigation by the Canada Revenue Agency?

[Translation]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is fully committed to fighting tax evasion and tax avoidance. The opposition knows very well that I cannot comment on specific cases as Minister of National Revenue.

However, I can say that we have invested nearly \$1 billion over the past two years, unlike the Conservative government, which did absolutely nothing for 10 years. Even Jean-Pierre Blackburn, a former minister of national revenue, publicly said that this was not a priority for the Conservatives.

**Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday, we learned that Stephen Bronfman, a close friend of the Prime Minister, was named in the paradise papers.

The Minister of National Revenue promised an independent investigation of these documents. Today, the Prime Minister said that he was satisfied with the explanations from his friend and Liberal Party bagman.

Could the Minister of National Revenue just tell us whether she agrees with her Prime Minister that his friend should not be investigated?

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues opposite for giving me an opportunity to tell those watching us at home about everything our government has done in the past two years. We created the Canada child benefit for Canadian families who need support. We gave more money to our families. We worked with low-income workers to help them keep a larger portion of their hard-earned money by increasing the working income tax benefit by \$500 million. We abolished the Harper EI reforms.

**Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the minister can keep repeating the same talking points, but Canadians are no fools.

The Prime Minister's political interference on behalf of his close friend is a clear signal to investigators that there is one rule for Liberals and another one for every other Canadian who pays taxes. The Prime Minister has the nerve to tell us that he is satisfied with the assurances that he has received from his friend and top Liberal Party fundraiser, who wants to avoid paying taxes like every Canadian does.

Is there a single member across the way who can look at us and have the courage to denounce this unacceptable situation?

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues opposite like it when we repeat ourselves so that they can understand what we are saying and hear the good news that we have for Canadians.

Fighting tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance has been and always will be a priority for me, as Minister of National Revenue, for our government, and for the Prime Minister. We invested nearly \$1 billion and we are getting a return on that investment. We are targeting four jurisdictions per year. We hired more than 100 auditors, 627 cases were transferred to criminal investigations, 268 search warrants have been executed—

**The Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques.

[English]

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the NDP will ask the finance committee to investigate the paradise papers and to call on Stephen Bronfman and former Liberal Senator Leo Kolber to explain to Canadians why their names, their firms, and their trusts are linked to tax havens. We hope the Liberal majority will support us, because the Prime Minister might be satisfied with explanations but Canadians are not.

*Oral Questions*

The Prime Minister likes to say that sunshine is the best disinfectant. The Liberals will have a chance to show it. Will they support an investigation or will they block it like they have done for the last two years?

• (1430)

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government understands that this is a multi-billion dollar issue, and we have made historic investments over the past two years to tackle it.

The Canada Revenue Agency now has the tools to review 100% of the tax returns filed by all large multinational corporations each year. This means it can properly identify large corporations and wealthy individuals that are likely to engage in tax schemes. No one is above the law.

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, that answer had nothing to do with the question that was asked.

Former senator Kolber and Stephen Bronfman, the chief fundraiser for the Liberal Party, have ties to a multi-million dollar trust in the Cayman Islands. That is serious. Tax havens cost us billions of dollars every year and increase inequality.

The paradise papers have revealed a great deal, but not everything. To get to the bottom of this, the NDP has moved a motion to invite these two individuals to answer our questions before the Standing Committee on Finance.

Are the Liberals going to vote for our motion and show that they have nothing to hide?

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is fully committed to combatting tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance, as the measures we have taken over the past two years clearly demonstrate. As for the committees, they are free to make their own choices, and I will respect their decision.

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, here is a quote: “Mr. Bronfman did nothing wrong. There is not a single wealthy Canadian who has not diversified their holdings through offshore tax havens”. Who said this? It was the Liberal member for Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel.

Here is another quote: “There are people who use a legal system and then later confirm that they acted legally”. Who said this? It was the Liberal member for Montarville.

The Prime Minister said that he is satisfied with Stephen Bronfman's explanations.

Is this why the Liberals are not tackling tax havens? Is that because they think it is okay for their millionaire friends not to pay taxes?

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, during the last election, our government made it very clear in our campaign platform that we were going to combat tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance.

Over the last two years, we have made historic investments, something that had not been done for the past 10 years. We made investments of nearly \$1 billion, which have allowed us to target four administrations per year and to work on hiring 100 auditors. There have been a number of criminal charges and even 37 convictions, totalling more than 50 years of imprisonment.

**Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, what she is not saying is that only \$40 million of that \$1 billion has been invested so far.

If I had any advice for the hon. member for Montarville and the hon. member for Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, it would be to ask their constituents whether they are happy about paying more taxes than Liberal insiders like Mr. Bronfman and Mr. Kolber.

[*English*]

It might be legal, but it does not mean it is moral. It is legal only because generations of Liberal and Conservative governments have made the laws that have made it legal.

We are the House of Commons and we can change laws. Will the government do it or will it block any initiative like it has done in the last two years?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is fully committed to fighting tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance. The \$1 billion that was allocated to the Canada Revenue Agency over five years comes from the public purse, from taxpayers.

We are very careful about how we spend taxpayers' money in order to ensure that it is spent properly and we get results. For two years, we have been targeting four jurisdictions per year—

**The Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

**Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Revenue said something very interesting a few minutes ago.

She said that, as minister, she cannot comment on specific cases. Is the minister aware that her boss, the Prime Minister, was more than willing to comment on the Stephen Bronfman case this morning? That is what is unacceptable.

If the Prime Minister has no problem talking about Stephen Bronfman, can the Minister of National Revenue pick up the phone, call the Prime Minister, and tell him to mind his own business because that guy is currently being investigated?

• (1435)

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is firmly committed to combatting tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance. Our investments over the past two years make that abundantly clear.

I would also like to tell my colleague opposite about all of the things our government has done over the past two years. We enhanced the Canada child benefit for the families that needed it most. We lowered taxes on the middle class. We are working to lower small business taxes. We abolished the Harper reform, which attacked people receiving EI benefits.



*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is not that the minister's comments are uninteresting, but she is not answering my question at all.

The Minister of National Revenue said that some cases were being investigated as a result of the paradise papers. One of the individuals implicated in those documents is the Liberal Party's chief fundraiser or bagman, Stephen Bronfman, who also happens to be a long-time close personal friend of the Canadian Prime Minister.

Can the minister finally confirm to Canadians that Stephen Bronfman and all Canadians implicated in the paradise papers are being seriously investigated?

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the member opposite well knows, I cannot comment on any specific cases, nor will I be able to at any point in the future. The credibility of the Canada Revenue Agency is at stake, because confidentiality of information is a priority there.

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

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** I would remind the hon. member for Edmonton Manning and others not to be talking when it is not their turn, when they do not have the floor. They know we have rules on this.

The hon. opposition House leader.

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister of National Revenue did not hear the news that this morning the Prime Minister commented on this case. In fact, he declared Bronfman innocent of all wrongdoing. Just days after the minister announced an investigation, the Prime Minister shockingly said that his billionaire buddy and chief Liberal bagman was innocent and pure as the driven snow.

It seems like the Minister of National Revenue recognizes that this is wrong. Does the Prime Minister recognize how irresponsible and reckless it is for him to unilaterally say that Stephen Bronfman is innocent?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is fully committed to fighting tax evasion and tax avoidance, to make sure the tax system is fair and equitable for all Canadians.

I can assure the House that I am very proud of the leadership role the CRA has taken on the international stage. Collaboration between tax administrations, including the exchange of tax information, is an essential tool to protect the integrity of Canada's tax base. That is why the agency conducted more than 990 audits and 42 criminal investigations focusing on offshore financial structures.

[*English*]

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's reckless words and actions have placed the Minister of National Revenue in an untenable and impossible position. The minister stated that her department was investigating this matter. However, before the investigation could barely begin, the Prime Minister already had made his finding of innocence.

This irresponsible behaviour is indefensible. Did anyone advise the Prime Minister of the legal implications of what he just did?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to combatting tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance.

I have said it before and I will say it again: I am very proud of our leadership role on the international stage. I want to reiterate that, with the historic investments that have been made, the CRA has been targeting four jurisdictions per year and conducting criminal investigations. No one is above the law. In Canada, the laws apply to everyone, no matter who they are.

[*English*]

**Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister knows all about investigations. After all, he is under investigation for having broken the rules on his private island getaway. However, that has not stopped him from interfering in the investigation of his billionaire fundraising friend, Stephen Bronfman, who has been implicated in the paradise papers.

How can Canadians trust those Liberals to investigate their fundraising friends when the Prime Minister has already appointed himself judge and jury, and has issued the acquittal?

• (1440)

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to combatting tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance.

The hypocrisy of the members opposite is really quite astounding. Even a former Conservative revenue minister publicly stated that investigating tax havens was not a priority for his government.

Neither I nor our government need any lessons from the party opposite. Canadians expect to have a fair and equitable tax system, and that is what we are giving them.

[*English*]

**Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we can understand that the Liberals do not like these investigations into their ethics. The Minister of Finance has already been found guilty of breaking the ethics code by the Ethics Commissioner, and the Prime Minister is under investigation as well. Now the Prime Minister has undermined an active investigation into Liberal billionaire fundraiser Stephen Bronfman.

How can Canadians trust the Liberal government to conduct an impartial investigation when it is more interested in protecting its friends than finding the truth?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we made investments of nearly \$1 billion in our first two budgets. We have a plan and it is working. We are targeting four jurisdictions per year, and we are working to finalize the hiring of 100 auditors. There were 627 cases transferred to criminal investigation, 268 search warrants executed, and 78 convictions.

*Oral Questions*

We tightened the rules governing the voluntary disclosures program, imposed \$44 million in fines on proponents and tax advisers, and—

**The Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I imagine that the government is also fully committed to combatting climate change. However, Canada still has one of the worst records in the world on this matter.

The UN says that member countries must take more urgent action if we are to meet the Paris targets.

The minister played world leader yesterday when she congratulated Nicaragua and Syria for signing the agreement even though her own government is failing to meet the targets it set for itself.

Can the minister set aside her tired, old talking points and tell us what more she plans to do to meet the targets?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. We are certainly committed to combatting climate change.

I was so proud to see the Prime Minister announce our plan with the provincial premiers and territorial representatives. Under this plan, we will put a price on carbon, eliminate coal, and make historic investments in clean infrastructure and public transportation.

I am very pleased to go to Bonn next week, where I will work with the whole world to combat climate change. We have a lot of work to do.

[*English*]

**Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in 2015, Canada announced \$2.65 billion over five years to support efforts for the poorest and most vulnerable countries to adapt to climate change. While welcomed, this promise delivers just a portion of Canada's fair share.

This week, leading into COP22, the OECD criticized Canada for failing to deliver on its meagre target to cut greenhouse gas emissions. Will the Liberals commit today to real action on our nation's promises to act on climate change?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are all in when it comes to climate action. We understand that we need to be taking action, that we have an economic opportunity to do this, and that we have an obligation to our children.

I am very pleased that I will be in Bonn next week where I will be working with countries around the world. We know we need to be helping support the poorest countries that are fearing the impacts of climate change, and many countries will be under water should we not stay under 2°C. We will be supporting them and we will be working with them.

I wish the party opposite would understand how important it is to listen and take action against climate change.

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

**The Speaker:** Order. Most members in all parties are able to sit through question period, hear things they do not always like, and yet not react. The public does not like at all when it hears that kind of thing, so I would ask the hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands and others not to react and not to interrupt.

The hon. member for Carleton.

\* \* \*

●(1445)

**ETHICS**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the revenue minister said that it is inappropriate for ministers to comment on individual tax cases. She said she would not comment today, tomorrow, or later, because the credibility of CRA is at stake, yet her boss, the Prime Minister, did exactly that. He publicly exonerated Stephen Bronfman, his top fundraiser, who may be under CRA investigation as part of the leaked paradise papers.

Can the hon. member assure us that CRA will ignore the Prime Minister's directive to acquit Mr. Bronfman?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the historic investments of nearly \$1 billion we have made in the Canada Revenue Agency show how dedicated we are to fighting tax evasion and tax avoidance.

This government has taken steps to help the agency crack down on wealthy individuals who are not paying their fair share and on tax professionals who facilitate non-compliance. The CRA has levied \$44 million in penalties on tax advisers, and a number of criminal cases are under way.

[*English*]

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the minister mentioned criminal investigations that are under way. Her department announced that it is doing a full review as to whether to pursue such investigations against 3,000 people named in the paradise papers, one of whom is the Liberal Party's top fundraiser, but the Prime Minister, the head of the entire government, has already exonerated him and signalled down to CRA that he did nothing wrong.

I ask again. Will the minister direct CRA to ignore the Prime Minister's political interference in this case?

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in the last fiscal year alone, investigations by the Canada Revenue Agency led to 37 convictions, more than 50 years of jail time, and millions of dollars in court-imposed fines. Thanks to this government's actions, starting in 2018, Canada will be able to automatically exchange financial information with other countries, allowing it to identify taxpayers with foreign bank accounts. As I said, no one is above the law.

\* \* \*

[English]

**TAXATION**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister protects his wealthy friends from paying taxes, we learned yesterday in the finance committee that the government continues to target people with diabetes with higher taxes.

Diabetes Canada testified that the government knew four months ago that the tax department was stripping away the disability tax credit from type 1 diabetics, and to this day, it is not aware of a single person who has had this credit reinstated.

Why is the government targeting hard-working Canadians and suffering diabetics with higher taxes while letting top Liberal fundraisers off scot-free?

[Translation]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is absolutely committed to ensuring that all Canadians receive the credits and benefits they are entitled to. The eligibility criteria for the disability tax credit for people with diabetes have not changed. It is important to recognize that far too many Canadians are struggling and need help. We are allowing low-income workers to keep more of their hard-earned money from every paycheque by further enhancing the working income tax benefit by an additional \$500 million per year, starting in 2019. We are keeping the promises we made to the middle class and to those most in need.

[English]

**Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday Diabetes Canada said at the finance committee that the Canada Revenue Agency is refusing to release valuable information that would help determine the impact of the mass refusal of disability tax credits for diabetics. Now diabetics have to pry, pull, and rip the information out of the minister's hands just to prove their case. Why will the minister not release this information, or does she have something to hide?

[Translation]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is firmly committed to ensuring that all Canadians receive the tax credits and benefits they are entitled to. We are moving forward with a national disability act that will remove barriers and improve access for all Canadians living with disabilities. We have made tax credits more accessible. Benefits are now the highest Canadians have ever received. We have simplified the forms for tax credits. We have hired specialized nurse practitioners, who are allowed to fill out the forms—

● (1450)

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Saskatoon West.

\* \* \*

[English]

**PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT**

**Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, CBC has reported that public servants at the Miramichi pay centre are working in a toxic environment. These workers deal with understaffing, a lack of training, and little support.

Hard-working, experienced public servants are crucial to solving the Liberals' pay system debacle. The Liberals do not seem to understand that workers need the proper tools to fix this fiasco. When will the government help these workers so that hard-working Canadians can get paid?

**Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on day two of my new job as public services and procurement minister, I was with the Prime Minister in Miramichi meeting the hard-working public servants who are leaving no stone unturned to make sure their colleagues get paid. We are doing everything to support them. Their health and well-being as they pursue this goal is of paramount importance to us, and we are doing everything we can to support them in that endeavour.

[Translation]

**Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, according to a CBC/Radio-Canada report today, not only do public servants in Miramichi have to cope with the extra workload brought on by this government's Phoenix fiasco, but also, the working environment at the public service pay centre is just plain toxic. There is a lack of training, there is not enough support to answer employees' questions, and so on. Those workers are dealing with Phoenix problems while handling paycheques for two-thirds of all public servants.

When will the Liberals give them the resources they need to do their jobs properly?

**Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on day two of my new job as Minister of Public Services and Procurement, I was in Miramichi with the Prime Minister to see just how hard public servants are working to fix the Phoenix problems. The well-being of those workers is of paramount importance to this government.

We will leave nothing to chance as we work to solve this problem.

*Oral Questions***EMPLOYMENT**

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we know that harassment and sexual violence are simply unacceptable. As we saw in the report that came out last week, many people experience harassment or sexual violence at work.

[English]

Canadians deserve to feel safe at work. Can the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour please update the House on actions taken by our government to make workplaces safer for all Canadians?

[Translation]

**Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we know that harassment and sexual violence are simply unacceptable.

[English]

This week our government took the very first step toward making our workplaces and federally regulated industries and Parliament Hill free from harassment and sexual violence. No government, however, can eradicate harassment and sexual violence alone. We live in a culture, especially here, where power imbalances and gender norms create tolerance for these unacceptable behaviours. I look forward to working with everyone, here and throughout the federally regulated sectors, to ensure that all Canadians are safe at work.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**TAXATION**

**Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, with great power comes great privilege for the Liberals.

It seems that the Minister of National Revenue likes to go over the record of the past two years. Let me join in: vacation on a private island, a villa in France, profits in numbered companies, and the chief Liberal fundraiser who hides millions of dollars in the Cayman Islands.

In the meantime, people with diabetes are being denied their tax credit for no reason and without warning. It is shameful. The Prime Minister is turning a blind eye to the tax avoidance in his own backyard and emptying the pockets of the most vulnerable.

When will he give back the tax credit these people are entitled to?

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government's record is far more solid than that of the previous Conservative government.

Canadian families in need are receiving the Canada child benefit, which is actually helping families. Low-income workers will get to keep more of their hard-earned money because we have increased the working income tax benefit by \$500 million a year starting in 2019. We abolished the Harper employment insurance reform. We promised to lower the small business tax to 9% by 2019—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Calgary Rocky Ridge.

[English]

**Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the finance committee learned that the wait time for a decision on the disability tax credit has recently gone from about three weeks to over 40 weeks and that since October 26, all applications have been frozen. We also heard that refunds are being delayed and that the application form was changed based on the minister's belief that most type 1 diabetics do not qualify.

One simple question: When will the minister stop saying that nothing has changed?

• (1455)

[Translation]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to ensuring that everyone receives the tax credits and benefits to which they are entitled. I repeat, the eligibility criteria for the tax credit have not changed.

It is important to recognize that far too many Canadians are struggling and need help. That is why our government has always taken a compassionate approach and helped those in need. We are supporting families in need through the Canada child benefit. That is what we are doing.

[English]

**Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have constituents who are already receiving letters from the Canada Revenue Agency informing them that they no longer are eligible for the disability tax credit. That is bad, but it gets even worse. Now the minister is threatening to take money directly out of their bank accounts. She is clawing back \$6,000 from one constituent already. We know that the minister knows this is happening and has okayed it.

Why are the Liberals going after disabled Canadians and the middle-class families that look after them? When is this foolishness going to stop?

[Translation]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives need to stop saying things that are just not accurate. Our government is committed to ensuring that all Canadians receive the tax credits and benefits to which they are entitled.

We are moving forward with a national disability act that will remove barriers by focusing on accessibility for all Canadians living with a disability.

I would remind my colleagues opposite that I was a social worker for 25 years. I worked with people who had health problems and with the disadvantaged—

**The Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton.

*Oral Questions*

[English]

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, representatives of Diabetes Canada testified yesterday that they have been trying to get a meeting with the minister to discuss devastating changes to the disability tax credit that render 80% of applicants ineligible. The minister's own officials confirmed what we have been saying. The minister made a change to the process in May without consultation or notification of vulnerable Canadians.

With Diabetes Canada here today, can the minister commit to meeting and hearing about their concerns directly, or will she continue her heartless attack on diabetics?

[Translation]

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is fully committed to ensuring that people receive the tax credits and benefits they are entitled to. I would like to assure my colleague opposite that we are working with our partners on an ongoing basis. We are meeting with them regularly, along with staff from my office.

I also want to emphasize that the eligibility criteria for the tax credit have not changed. The rules are the same and apply just as they always have. The law is the same. Nothing has changed.

\* \* \*

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

**Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is currently in Hanoi for the APEC summit.

There are more than 100 political prisoners in Vietnam, including human rights activists like Phan Kim Khanh, and the blogger known as Mother Mushroom, who is just 24 years old. She was sentenced to 10 years in prison.

The United States, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Canadian Youth for Human Rights in Vietnam, and Vietnamplify are all calling for immediate action.

Will the Prime Minister call on the Vietnamese government to release them?

**Mr. Matt DeCoursey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign, this government committed to advocating for human rights in all of our international commitments.

Our Prime Minister and our Minister of Foreign Affairs are currently in Vietnam and had the opportunity to talk about human rights in the country. We talk about human rights every opportunity we get. This visit will certainly include conversations on this topic.

\* \* \*

[English]

**FISHERIES AND OCEANS**

**Mr. Fin Donnelly (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, today marks day 76 of the occupation of two open-net salmon farms in the Broughton Archipelago. These coastal first nations never agreed to open-net salmon farms in their traditional territories. If the Liberals are serious about recognizing the UN

Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, this is the time to show it. Will the minister meet with B.C. and first nations governments to discuss moving these farms off wild salmon migration routes? It is a simple question: yes or no?

● (1500)

**Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the simple answer is yes. Every time I am in British Columbia, and often in Ottawa, I meet with representatives of the provincial government and indigenous leaders together. We often talk about the importance of aquaculture, science, and investment in wild pacific salmon, and what we can do to implement the recommendations of the Cohen commission. Along with my colleagues in the Liberal caucus from British Columbia, we also talk about those important issues all the time. I want to tell the member that we understand and accept the concerns and are working with the British Columbia government.

\* \* \*

**ETHICS**

**Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, meanwhile, to come back to the finance minister's illegal and unethical activity, for two years, he hid behind an ethical screen controlled by his political staff. For two years, he hid tens of millions of dollars in Morneau Shepell stock in Alberta, profiting from decisions he was making. For two years, he hid his French corporation from the Ethics Commissioner, who found him guilty of non-disclosure. The minister still owns numbered companies, and what those assets are remains a mystery.

Since apparently sunlight is the best disinfectant, will the finance minister pull the curtain back and let the sun shine in so Canadians can look inside what is in his other numbered companies?

**Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that, as all members of this House do, I have disclosed all of my assets to the Ethics Commissioner and will continue to do so. That allows us to get on with the work we are doing. I am particularly pleased to tell this House that we have passed the 500,000 jobs created mark since we have come to office. I am also pleased to say that the growth we have experienced over the last year is the best growth in a decade and is making a real difference for Canadian families. They are doing better and putting more money into the economy, and we are all better.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

**Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, after defending himself for weeks by claiming he had supposedly followed the rules of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, the Minister of Finance was found guilty of having hidden his French company. For two years, he also hid his assets in numbered companies, which allowed him to make millions in profit off industries that he, as a minister, is supposed to regulate in an entirely neutral fashion. These actions fall well short of meeting the highest standards of honesty and impartiality required of him in his mandate letter from the Prime Minister.

Why do all the Liberals feel they are above the law?

**Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am working with the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, and I will continue to work with her. That is very important. This way, we will be clear. That is the way to work for Canadians, which is our goal.

We have very good news for Canadians. In the past two years, 500,000 new jobs have been created in our country. That is very important for our economy and for Canadian families. Our economy is humming along. This is all very good news.

*[English]*

**Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, what is it with Liberals and exotic islands? We remember Bell Island, where the Prime Minister took the Liberal Party president and insiders. The Ethics Commissioner is looking into that. There are the Cayman Islands, where the Liberal Party's bagman has an offshore trust. The CRA is looking into that. There are the Bahamas and Barbados, where the finance minister has family companies. The Ethics Commissioner is looking into that. So many characters are having island adventures that the Prime Minister's nickname should be Gilligan.

When will this Prime Minister and his Skipper stop working for Liberal insiders and start working for Canadians?

*[Translation]*

**Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that is what we promised Canadians during the campaign, and we keep our promises. That is exactly what we are doing. Over the past two years, historic amounts have been allocated to the Canada Revenue Agency to combat tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance because that was a priority for Canadians. This money has made it possible for the CRA to target four jurisdictions per year and for charges to be laid. It has made it possible for us to hire auditors, transfer cases to criminal investigation, tighten the rules governing the programs for—

● (1505)

**The Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Brampton Centre.

\* \* \*

*[English]***HOUSING**

**Mr. Ramesh Sangha (Brampton Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the past two budgets saw the government make unprecedented

investments in housing. We know this is of the utmost importance and has a great impact on the lives of many Canadians.

Would the minister responsible for housing provide us with an update as to what those investments have achieved so far?

**Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me warmly thank our colleague from Brampton Centre for his great work on behalf of his constituents.

Our government believes that thousands of Canadians have not had access to affordable and adequate housing, and because of this we have invested historic amounts in the last two budgets. We will be launching, in a few weeks from now, the first-ever national housing strategy. That will set the stage for the most ambitious demonstration of federal housing leadership in over half a century. It will also set the stage for working with partners, many of whom have been waiting for us for a long time. We are back. We are here to stay.

\* \* \*

**VETERANS AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Phil McColeman (Brantford—Brant, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals talk about not breaking promises. Well, they broke their promise to veterans and took them back to court.

Yesterday we learned that veterans are being forced to wait longer and longer to get the benefits they earned. The number of homeless veterans has risen by 62% since the Liberals took power.

The Prime Minister is in Asia delivering on his priority, \$500 million in infrastructure handouts to the world's wealthy.

Can the Minister of Veterans Affairs tell us why are veterans are getting less while the Prime Minister gives half a billion dollars to wealthy bankers in Asia?

**Mr. Marc Miller (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have a sacred obligation to our veterans that when they come back broken, we will see to it that they mend.

We demonstrate our belief in this every day through the services and support we deliver to veterans and their families. We remain committed to a pension for life option, and will announce further details later this year.

We will remember.

[Translation]

### TAXATION

**Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in a letter that was sent to the Minister of Finance yesterday, the Government of Quebec states its intention to require that Netflix and other Internet giants pay their fair share of taxes, and it asks for the co-operation of the federal government. This is a matter of tax fairness for our business owners.

All of the parties in Quebec agree on this. The Government of Quebec reminded the federal government that, technically, sales tax should already apply to these services. My question is not for the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who has abdicated her responsibility and has been refusing to answer the Government of Quebec for a month now. Rather, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Quebec stands with its businesses and will not back down. Will the Minister of Finance work with Quebec to ensure that Internet giants pay their fair share, yes or no?

**Mr. Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we understand the concerns of the francophone cultural sector. I want to reassure and remind the cultural community of the historic investments we have made to support francophone culture.

We have made massive investments in arts and culture, over \$2.2 billion to be precise. We have reinvested in the Canada Media Fund to support French-language television and committed \$675 million to CBC/Radio-Canada. These investments have a tangible impact on our artists' lives.

\* \* \*

### AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

**Mr. Francis Drouin (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to supporting Canadian farmers by investing in the growth and innovation of Canada's agrifood sector. We have made considerable investments in Canadian farmers.

The 2017 budget set a clear target to increase our agricultural exports. We know that we have always been and will continue to be there for Canadian farmers.

Could the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food tell us about the steps we are taking this week to provide tax relief to our Canadian farmers?

[English]

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell for his question and great help on agricultural issues.

This week I announced that the government will provide tax relief for farmers who had their herds destroyed because of bovine TB. We are also designating the region where farmers can qualify for a livestock tax deferral due to floods and drought. I have also announced that we will maintain the cash purchase tickets for grain farmers.

### Oral Questions

This government has made sure and will continue to make sure that agriculture thrives in this country.

\* \* \*

• (1510)

### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

**Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Syria is a country from which thousands of refugees have fled to Canada. President Assad has murdered countless of his citizens. Canada's Armed Forces are helping to fight this tyrannical regime. However, during this Remembrance Week, the Minister of Environment shocked Canadians by praising Syria for supposedly taking action on climate change.

Instead of blaming her staff for the tweet, will the minister apologize to Canadians and to our Syrian refugees for legitimizing the murderous Assad regime?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have worked as a human rights lawyer. I absolutely agree. I am disgusted by the current regime in Syria, and the atrocities it is committing are completely inexcusable. A mistake was made. I take full responsibility as minister. We deleted the tweet within half an hour, and on my personal Twitter account, I said that it was unacceptable.

We are going to continue working with the people of Syria. They deserve a life free from violence. Canada will continue to support the Syrian people in reaching this goal, and achieving a long-term political solution.

\* \* \*

### RAIL TRANSPORTATION

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, Rails to Relevance is an annual project of Claremont high school, bringing bright young kids from this great public high school to Ottawa by rail—by VIA Rail.

The Canadian Transportation Act review by the Hon. David Emerson recommended that Canada cease to have a national passenger rail service. Can the Minister of Transport reassure this House that Canada is committed to national passenger rail, and will invest in and modernize a national VIA Rail service?

**Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to rail passenger service for Canadians. We have always been committed to it. I am a regular rail user. Once a week I go between Montreal and Toronto. I have had the pleasure of going across the country from Halifax to Vancouver. In fact, I would encourage Canadians who have never taken the train to go out and try that mode of transport. I think they would find it a very pleasant way to move across and to enjoy this magnificent country.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Boudrias:** Mr. Speaker, I seek the consent of the House to move the following motion: that this House recognize the expertise of the Davie shipyard in Lévis, which represents 50% of the country's production capacity; and that it call on the government to adjust its national shipbuilding strategy to take into account the production capacity of the Davie shipyard.

*Routine Proceedings*

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

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Joliette on a point of order.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A year ago, on October 26, 2016, the House voted down my Motion No. 42 on tax havens.

Specifically, my motion called on the government to amend section 5907 of the Income Tax Regulations in order to ensure that the income that a Canadian company brings back from its subsidiary in Barbados, or 22 other tax havens, will henceforth be taxed in Canada.

In my view, the vote was full of irregularities and should be retaken. The code of conduct for members of Parliament is part of our Standing Orders, which clearly prohibit an elected member from furthering his or her private interests. We now know that the Minister of Finance has companies located in tax havens. His family's company, Morneau Shepell, promotes the use of tax havens through pension funds and insurance companies. Adopting Motion No. 42 would have had a major impact on the minister's finances. It would have seriously impeded his ability to carry on business as usual. In the Journals of October 26, 2016, we see that the Minister of Finance took part in the vote and voted against Motion No. 42. In fact, with the notable exception of the hon. member for Cambridge, every Liberal member voted against Motion No. 42 because they were strongly urged to vote along party lines.

On pages 220 and 221 of the second edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, published in 2009, it says that members may not vote on questions in which they have a personal interest, and that any such vote may be challenged and disallowed.

• (1515)

**The Speaker:** Order.

Members cannot rise on a point of order in the middle of another point of order, but I appreciate that the hon. member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier wants to get the attention of the House.

The hon. member for Joliette.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance had a private interest in the motion on tax havens being defeated. As I was saying, according to *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, I challenge the Minister of Finance's vote, as well as the vote of all those he could have influenced. I urge you to disqualify them.

As indicated on page 214 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, “On being elected, Members of the House of Commons become trustees of public confidence. Members must place the public's interests over their private interests and derive no personal benefit or gain from their decisions.”

I know this because the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner is responsible for enforcing the code of ethics and the Conflict of Interest Act. She does an amazing job. This is not about the ethics of a single member of Parliament. This is about the result of a vote and the integrity of the House of Commons as an

institution presided over by the Speaker. We are here, at the heart of representative democracy, at the heart of the bonds of trust that need to exist between the public and its representatives and without which the House of Commons has no legitimacy. In light of the irregularities and the appearance of conflicts of interest that tainted the vote on Motion No. 42 on tax havens, I think that the vote should be overturned and taken again.

**The Speaker:** I thank the hon. member for Joliette for his comments.

At first glance, this seems to me to be a matter of debate, but I will consider the matter and then come back to the House, if necessary.

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[*Translation*]

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Matt DeCourcy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, Canada's National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security 2017-22.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the governments response to 13 petitions.

\* \* \*

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE****FISHERIES AND OCEANS**

**Mr. Scott Simms (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans entitled “Supplementary Estimates (B) 2017-18”.

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS****POOR HOUSE COMMEMORATION DAY**

**Mr. Guy Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Sara Lauzon, a young, dynamic constituent in Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, asked me to present a petition, calling upon the House of Commons to pass a motion recognizing April 14 of every year as poor house commemoration day in Canada. This day would commemorate the lives of Canadian citizens that died or lived in an asylum, a house of refuge, or a poor house facility in Canada.



The suggested date for the holiday is April 14 due to the act respecting mentally incompetent persons and their estates passed in Alberta in 1937.

• (1520)

[*Translation*]

#### HOUSING

**Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present two petitions. The first one has to do with affordable housing in Canada.

Over 1.6 million families do not have access to affordable housing and are spending more than 30% of their income on housing. Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes access to affordable housing as a basic human right and not a privilege.

The people of Canada are calling on the House of Commons to pass Bill C-265 sponsored by my colleague from Hochelaga in order to implement a national housing strategy to advance and promote the right to housing.

#### LOCAL FOOD

**Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls on the federal government to implement a national strategy to promote purchasing local foods in order to support our farmers, especially since agriculture represents one in eight jobs in Canada.

It also calls on Public Works and Government Services Canada to implement a local foods procurement policy for Canada's 48,000 federal institutions. These two petitions are signed by people back home.

#### WATER QUALITY

**Hon. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, water quality in Lake Champlain has deteriorated over the years due to the proliferation of cyanobacteria.

Residents of the Lake Champlain area demand that the mandate of the International Joint Commission be reviewed to resolve the issue of the quality of the water in Lake Champlain.

[*English*]

#### THE ENVIRONMENT

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

The first petition deals with the pressure to live up to the Paris accord targets and to ensure that the global average temperature does not exceed 1.5°C, and certainly stays below 2°C.

The petitioners call for reductions in greenhouse gases as well as support for the developing world to the global south that is hardest hit and least to blame.

#### WILD SALMON

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls upon the government to put in place the 75 recommendations in the Cullen report on wild salmon to protect wild salmon from the toxic fish factories that dot the coast of B.C. and Atlantic Canada.

#### *Routine Proceedings*

##### SHARK FINNING

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, the last petition, once again, from petitioners in Saanich—Gulf Islands, calls on the government to stop the trade in shark fins. Canada does not allow the practice of finning sharks, but we still allow the trade, distribution, and sale of these products that threaten the global shark population.

##### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions I wish to table today.

The first petition is signed by over 220 Canadians who call on the government to look at the human rights abuses that continue in Vietnam under the communist government. They draw the government's attention to the situation for Miss Tran and Miss Nguyen, who have become political dissidents and are imprisoned because they shared material on their blogs and on the Internet that outlined the human rights abuses as well as the environmental crisis in Vietnam.

##### FALUN GONG

**Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is signed by over 670 petitioners.

The petitioners call on the government to look at the Chinese government for its continued violations of the human rights of Falun Gong practitioners. In particular, they draw to the attention of members of Parliament the fate of Ms. Qian Sun who is a Canadian citizen and who was arrested in February of this year in Beijing for practising Falun Gong.

##### RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

**Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present some 31 petitions with over 1,300 signatures of residents from both inside and outside my constituency.

The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to abandon any attempt to appeal section 176 of the Criminal Code, and to stand up for the rights of all Canadians to practise their religion without fear of recrimination, violence or disturbance.

##### INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

**Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, today I would like to table a petition on the implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This is a very important issue and priority for the people of North Island—Powell River. I am honoured to represent such a large and diverse indigenous population.

It should come as no surprise that Bill C-262 has received a lot of consideration and support. I am proud to see so many people actively supporting the implementation of UNDRIP and the principles of reconciliation.

*Routine Proceedings*

● (1525)

## SMALL BUSINESS

**Mr. Len Webber (Calgary Confederation, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition today from people in and around Calgary. This petition was submitted by Dr. Jasmine Hall.

The petitioners are concerned about recently proposed tax changes. They are concerned that the proposed changes will make it more difficult for small businesses to be profitable. They are also concerned that millions of jobs will be at risk if Canada's primary job creators are unfairly taxed.

The petitioners ask that the government abandon its proposed tax changes. They say that they target Canada's small businesses and the jobs they create.

## PALLIATIVE CARE

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I present a petition on behalf of a number of residents from Sydney, Sydney River, Howie Centre, Main-à-Dieu, East Bay, and Big Pond.

The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to specifically identify hospice palliative care as a defined medical service covered under the Canada Health Act so provincial and territorial governments can work with the federal government to ensure these services are provided within the various communities across the country.

The petition is signed by over 120 residents. I know they have worked hard to provide hospice services in the Cape Breton region. They believe this certainly would be worthwhile for the government to pursue.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1173, 1175, 1176, 1179 to 1181 and 1186.

[Text]

Question No. 1173—**Mr. Gordon Brown:**

With regard to the U.S. State Department's approval of a possible Foreign Military Sale to the Government of Canada of ten F/A-18E Super Hornet aircraft, eight F/A-18F Super Hornet aircraft, and associated parts and spare equipment as issued on September 12, 2017: (a) what is the government's projected life span of the 18 aircraft; (b) what is the government's projected cost for the annual operation of the 18 aircraft; (c) what is the government's projected cost for the operation of the 18 aircraft over the projected life span; (d) what is the government's projected cost for the annual maintenance of the 18 aircraft; (e) what is the government's projected maintenance cost over the projected life span of the 18 aircraft; (f) what additional infrastructure will have to be installed at Canadian Armed Forces bases to accommodate the training, operation, and maintenance of the 18 aircraft; (g) what current infrastructure will have to be modernized in order to accommodate the training, operation, and maintenance of the 18 aircraft; (h) what is the projected cost for the additional and modernized infrastructure; (i) what is the anticipated timeline to train current CF-18 Hornet pilots to operate (i) the F/A-18E, (ii) the F/A-18F; (j) what is the anticipated timeline to train current CF-18 maintenance crews to work on (i) the F/A-18E, (ii) the F/A-18F; (k) what analysis was done to determine the interoperability of the 18 aircraft with NATO allies; (l) for each of the above questions, did the government perform the same analysis and or cost estimation for the aircraft manufacturers that provided a response to the CF-18 Replacement Industry Consultation Questions, Summer 2016; and (m) what other aircraft did the government study as a potential interim purchase?

**Mr. Jean R. Rioux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as clearly laid out in Canada's new defence policy, a modern fighter jet fleet is essential for defending Canada and Canadian sovereignty, including in our northern skies, enabling continental security, and contributing to international peace and stability.

Through the new defence policy, "Strong, Secure, Engaged", the government has committed to an open, fair, and transparent competition to replace our aging fleet of CF-18 fighter jets with 88 modern airframes.

We have simultaneously engaged governments and our partners in industry to explore the option of procuring an interim fleet of fighter jets to fill the fighter capability gap. Our goal is to ensure that we are able to meet our NORAD and NATO commitments simultaneously, while safeguarding our ability to be responsive to threats domestically.

The Government of Canada is continuing to explore the potential acquisition of 18 interim aircraft to supplement the CF-18 fighter aircraft fleet until the completion of the transition to the permanent replacement aircraft. No decision has been made yet. The government had previously considered the possibility of acquiring 18 Super Hornets. We are also actively looking at other options through discussions with other F-18 users, including Australia. Once all of the information is available, the options will be considered to assess whether they can meet our requirements at a level of capability, cost, schedule, and economic value that is acceptable to Canada.

The operational life span of this interim fleet would start at delivery and not end before the completion of the transition to the CF-18 permanent replacement aircraft.

Question No. 1175—**Ms. Marilyn Gladu:**

With regard to the government's proposed legalization of marijuana: will there be a maximum tetrahydrocannabinol percentage in legalized products and, if so, what is that percentage?

**Mr. Bill Blair (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and to the Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is the government's intention to set regulatory requirements that would standardize the amount of tetrahydrocannabinol, THC, in certain cannabis products and to indicate the amounts of THC on product labels. In this way, consumers will have clear information upon which to make decisions about consumption and the risks they are taking.

Currently, under the access to cannabis for medical purposes regulations, ACMPR, the maximum allowable limit of THC in cannabis oil is 30 milligrams per milliliter. As well, for capsules of cannabis oil, in dosage form, the ACMPR limits the amount of THC per capsule to 10 mg. Health Canada is currently evaluating whether these limits will remain the same in the forthcoming regulations under the proposed cannabis act.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1176— Ms. Marilyn Gladu:**

With regard to the Protecting Canadians from Unsafe Drugs Act (Vanessa's Law): (a) for each provision in the Act, when did it come into force; and (b) for each provision in the Act which is not yet in force, why is it not in force and when will it come into force?

**Mr. Bill Blair (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and to the Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Protecting Canadians from Unsafe Drugs Act, Vanessa's Law, received royal assent on November 6, 2014.

Many of its provisions came into effect when the legislation received royal assent. These provisions include important new safety measures, such as the ability of the Minister of Health to recall unsafe drugs and medical devices, compel information, order a label change, and disclose confidential business information when needed to prevent a serious risk of injury to human health. It also gave the court the ability to impose tougher fines and penalties, and to obtain an injunction to stop or prevent the commission of an offence. This allows Health Canada to take necessary action when there is a risk to the health of Canadians.

Other Vanessa's Law measures require consultations with stakeholders and the development of regulations before they can be implemented. When developing regulations, Health Canada must consult broadly, including with the stakeholders who will be required to follow those regulations, as well as interested and impacted Canadians. Input is sought in many different ways, including publication of discussion papers, face-to-face meetings, webinars, and the publication of the proposed regulations in the Canada Gazette. All regulatory proposals must obtain governor in council approval and undergo publication in the Canada Gazette, part I and part II. This gives all Canadians a chance to provide meaningful input on the policy and development of regulations.

A number of regulatory proposals are under development, as outlined in the notice of intent published in June 2016, to require industry to undertake further tests and studies; require therapeutic products authorization holders to disclose foreign risk information; allow the minister to impose terms and conditions on marketing authorizations; and allow the minister to order a reassessment.

Three of these, namely, tests and studies, reassessment, and foreign risk information, were pre-published in the Canada Gazette, part I, in June 2017 for public consultation. Additionally, white paper consultations were held this past spring for two other Vanessa's Law measures: public release of clinical information in drug submissions and medical device applications; and mandatory reporting of serious adverse drug reactions and medical device incidents by health care institutions. These regulatory proposals are targeted for Canada Gazette, part I, pre-publication in late 2017 and spring 2018, respectively. The remaining Vanessa's Law proposals, including disclosure of clinical information, are under development.

**Question No. 1179— Mr. John Barlow:**

With regard to the proposed changes to small business taxation announced on July 18, 2017: (a) what studies have been conducted by the government regarding the effect the proposed changes would have on individual farm ownership, intergenerational farm ownership, and specifically the ability to pass down family farms from generation to generation; (b) what are the specific details of each study referred to in (a), including (i) who conducted the study, (ii) date, (iii) findings, (iv)

methodology, (v) website where findings can be located, if applicable; and (c) what are the details of any briefing notes on the subject, including for each the (i) date, (ii) title, (iii) sender, (iv) recipient, (v) subject matter, (vi) summary, (vii) file number?

**Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government assesses issues arising under the tax system on an ongoing basis. It relies on a range of approaches and information sources to develop an in-depth understanding of potential issues, including the statistical analysis of tax return data, the monitoring of the tax literature, and consultations with the Canada Revenue Agency, academics, tax professionals, and other stakeholders.

When the analysis identifies a need for action, options are developed and assessed against a range of criteria such as their impact on the fairness of the tax system, economic efficiency, and the ease of administration of the tax system.

This process was followed in the development of the proposals contained in the consultation document released on July 18, 2017. Tax data and other information were used to assess the scope of the issues and the impact of different options. In particular, the number of businesses that could be affected by the various options to estimate the fiscal impact of the proposals was assessed, within constraints imposed by available data.

Draft legislation was also released for two of the three proposals contained in the consultation document. Stakeholders, including farmers, were invited to comment on the proposals and the draft legislation. Stakeholders were also specifically invited to provide their views and ideas on whether, and if so how, it would be possible to better accommodate genuine intergenerational business transfers in the Income Tax Act while still protecting the fairness of the tax system.

The government will not be moving forward with measures relating to the conversion of income into capital gains. During the consultation period, the government heard from business owners, including many farmers and fishers, that the measures could result in several unintended consequences, such as in respect of taxation upon death and potential challenges with intergenerational transfers of businesses. The government will work with family businesses, including farming and fishing businesses, to make it more efficient, or less difficult, to hand down their businesses to the next generation.

In the coming year, the government will continue its outreach to farmers, fishers, and other business owners to develop proposals to better accommodate intergenerational transfers of businesses while protecting the fairness of the tax system.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1180— Mr. John Barlow:**

With regard to the proposed changes to small business taxation announced on July 18, 2017: (a) what studies have been conducted by the government regarding the effect the proposed changes would have on individual farm ownership, intergenerational farm ownership, and specifically the ability to pass down family farms from generation to generation; (b) what are the specific details of each study referred to in (a), including (i) who conducted the study, (ii) date, (iii) findings, (iv) methodology, (v) website where findings can be located, if applicable; and (c) what are the details of any briefing notes on the subject, including for each (i) date, (ii) title, (iii) sender, (iv) recipient, (v) subject matter, (vi) summary, (vii) file number?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):**

Mr. Speaker, protecting the health and safety of Canadians is a top priority for our government. That is why we are taking a careful, regulatory approach to cannabis legalization.

Officials have been working actively to determine the most appropriate course forward on our international obligations.

We are committed to working with our global partners to best promote public health and combat illicit drug trafficking?

**Question No. 1181— Ms. Rachel Blaney:**

With regard to accessing the Guaranteed Income Supplement (GIS) when a couple may be considered to be living apart for reasons beyond their control and when the couple didn't qualify together at the married rate: (a) could couples qualify for GIS benefits at the individual rate if living apart for reasons beyond their control before January, 2017; (b) why did the 1989 policy directive allow for couples to qualify for GIS based on individual income if it wasn't the intent of the Old Age Security Act; (c) did the 1989 policy directive continue from 1989 to January, 2017; (d) what prompted the government to clarify its position; (e) was the government aware that this would affect seniors; (f) how many times has this topic been discussed with the government and has the question been raised with the Minister or Deputy Minister and, if so, has the Minister provided a response and, if so, what was the response; (g) has there been any briefing with detailed information on the matter and for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is (i) the date, (ii) the title and subject matter, (iii) the department's internal tracking number; (h) has the government done any studies on the effect of this clarification and, (i) if not, why not, (ii) if so, how many studies have been conducted and which one is the latest, (iii) what are the conclusions and recommendations of these studies; (i) was a gender-based analysis completed to assess how many women would be impacted by this clarification; (j) how many seniors have been refused GIS following these clarifications in 2017; and (k) how many seniors have been grandfathered in since 2017 and will continue to receive their entitlement as per the previous rules and operational policy?

**Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, old age security, OAS, benefits are intended to provide partial income security for seniors in recognition of the contributions that they have made to Canadian society and the economy. Low-income pensioners are entitled to additional assistance through the guaranteed income supplement, GIS. The GIS is calculated based on income to ensure that these benefits are provided to seniors most in need.

The GIS is paid at a different rate based on whether seniors are single or part of a couple. This reflects the different economic realities of single seniors and senior couples.

Since 1971, the Old Age Security Act has contained a provision that allows low-income couples in receipt of the GIS and who are forced to live apart for reasons beyond their control to receive their benefits at the higher single rate, based on their individual incomes. The intent of this provision was to recognize the increase in cost of living where one member of a couple remained in the matrimonial home while the other was required to go into a chronic care facility,

nursing home, or home for the aged. These couples are often described as being "involuntarily separated". In budget 2016, the OAS Act was amended to extend this provision to involuntarily separated couples where one member receives the GIS and the other receives the allowance. These amendments came into force on January 1, 2017.

In January 2017, the department issued an administrative policy direction to front-line Service Canada staff in order to reflect the expanded scope of the provisions for GIS/allowance couples. The department also took the opportunity to clarify the intent of the legislation with respect to eligibility for the involuntary separation provisions.

Specifically, the policy guidance was amended to state that couples must first qualify for the GIS on the basis of their joint income before the involuntary separation provisions could be applied. The policy direction was consistent with the intent of the GIS, which is to target assistance to those most in need. In order to address any possible situations where individuals had been paid under these provisions while their combined income was above the allowable threshold, a "grandfathering" clause was included to ensure that no current beneficiaries would see a reduction in their benefits.

Shortly thereafter, the department began to receive a number of enquiries from members of Parliament and clients with respect to this policy guidance. As a result, the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development has asked his officials to undertake a further analysis on the impact of the January 2017 policy directive. It became apparent that the implementation of this policy guidance was disadvantaging modest income couples. The minister has therefore tasked the department to correct this issue, by assessing the eligibility of couples involuntarily separated based solely on their individual incomes.

The department has already begun identifying senior couples who were affected by the January 2017 policy direction, a process that will be completed by the end of October. Departmental officials will subsequently reassess the benefit entitlement of any couples who were impacted by the January 2017 directive. The number of couples impacted by the directive is expected to be low.

**Question No. 1186—Mr. Kelly McCauley:**

With regard to the Prime Minister's trip to Fogo Island in April 2017: (a) what are the details of each expenditure, including (i) flights, (ii) vehicle rentals, (iii) accommodations, (iv) meals and per diems, (v) other transportation costs, (vi) other expenses, (vii) security; and (b) of the expenses incurred in (a) which expenses were incurred, and what is the breakdown, by the following groups of individuals (i) the Prime Minister and his family, (ii) ministerial exempt staff, including staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, (iii) departmental staff, (iv) the RCMP and other security?

**Mr. Peter Schiefke (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Youth), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did not travel to Fogo Island in April 2017.

*Speaker's Ruling*

[English]

**QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the government's response to Questions Nos. 1174, 1177, 1178, 1182 to 1185 and 1187 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 1174—**Mr. Larry Miller:**

With regard to fines issued to the Canadian Coast Guard by Transport Canada or any other government department or agency, since November 4, 2015: what are the details of each fine, including for each the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) location where violation occurred, (iv) law or regulation which was violated, (v) details of incident report, (vi) was the fine paid by taxpayer funds and, if not, who paid the fine?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1177—**Mr. Chris Warkentin:**

With regard to relocation costs for exempt staff moving to Ottawa since December 6, 2016: (a) what is the total cost paid by the government for relocation services and hotel stays related to moving these staff to Ottawa; and (b) for each individual reimbursement, what is the (i) total payout, (ii) cost for moving services, (iii) cost for hotel stays?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1178—**Mr. Chris Warkentin:**

With regard to salary ranges for Ambassadors and Consul Generals: what is the current Treasury Board salary range for each individual Ambassador and Consul General, broken down by location?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1182—**Mr. Dan Albas:**

With regard to the revocation of citizenship by the government, since November 2016, and broken down by month: (a) how many individuals have had their citizenship revoked, and in each instance what was the (i) age of the individual, (ii) sex of the individual, (iii) specific reason for their citizenship revocation; and (b) for each of the reasons listed in (a)(iii), what is the total number given, broken down by reason?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1183—**Mr. Jamie Schmale:**

With regard to the review related to moving expenses announced by the President of the Treasury Board in September 2016: (a) what is the current status of the review; (b) when did the review begin; (c) when is the review expected to be completed; (d) if the review has been completed, what were the findings and recommendations; (e) what are the parameters of the review; (f) who conducted the review; and (g) when did the Prime Minister receive a copy of the review's findings?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1184—**Mr. Jamie Schmale:**

With regard to the purchase of carbon offset credits by the government, broken down by department, agency, and crown corporation: (a) what is the total amount purchased in carbon offsets since September 19, 2016; and (b) what are the details of each individual purchase, including, for each, the (i) price of purchase, (ii) date of purchase, (iii) dates of travel, (iv) titles of individuals on trip, (v) origin and destination of trip, (vi) amount of emissions purchase was meant to offset, (vii) name of vendor who received the carbon offset payment?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1185—**Mr. Kelly McCauley:**

With regard to the 2017 Paris Air Show: (a) how many government representatives attended the event; (b) of the attendees in (a), how many employees attended from each government department; (c) how many non-governmental representatives attended the event; and (d) for each of the employees in (a) and (c), what were the (i) accommodation expenses, (ii) meal and per diem expenses, (iii) overall cost of all expenses?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1187—**Mr. Kelly McCauley:**

With regard to the government's pilot project testing of Smart Building technology in 13 buildings: (a) what is the cost for the 13 pilot project buildings, broken down by project; (b) what is the energy use for the 13 pilot project buildings, broken down by building; (c) what was the energy use for the 13 pilot project buildings prior to the Smart Building project, broken down by building and month for two years pre-conversion; (d) what was the energy cost for the 13 pilot project buildings prior to the Smart Building project, broken down by building and month for two years pre-conversion; (e) what was the energy use for the 13 pilot project buildings in the Smart Building project, broken down by building and month, post-conversion; and (f) what was the energy cost for the 13 pilot project buildings in the Smart Building project broken down by building and month, post-conversion?

(Return tabled)

[English]

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

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

**MOTIONS FOR PAPERS**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** 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.

\* \* \*

**POINTS OF ORDER**

## STANDING ORDER 69.1—BILL C-63—SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker:** I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised on November 3, by the hon. member for Carleton concerning the applicability of Standing Order 69.1 to Bill C-63, a second act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2017 and other measures.

[Translation]

I would like to thank the hon. member for Carleton for raising this matter, as well as the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby, the hon. member for Calgary Shepard, and the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader for their comments.

[English]

The hon. member for Carleton asked that the Chair use the authority granted under Standing Order 69.1 to divide the question on the motions for second and, if necessary, third reading of Bill C-63, as he argued the bill contained measures not announced in the budget of March 22, 2017.

*Speaker's Ruling*

He noted, for example, that the summary indicated that a measure in part 2 of the bill was implementing a change to the GST/HST rebate for public service bodies announced on September 8, 2017. He also argued that the measures concerning the taxation of agricultural and fisheries co-operatives in part 1, and those concerning beer made from concentrate in part 3, were not in the budget, nor were three measures from part 5, namely division 5 regarding the Bank of Canada, division 11 concerning judges, and division 13 regarding payments to discharge debt.

The hon. member also argued that the monies authorized in part 5, division 2, regarding the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, AllB, far exceeded what was announced in the budget.

In his budget speech, the Minister of Finance indicated that the government would be investing \$256 million in the AllB over five years, while clause 176 of the bill authorizes the minister to spend \$375 million U.S., or roughly \$480 million Canadian.

While he indicated that he did not feel strongly about having a separate vote on each of the other measures, the hon. member for Carleton was particularly keen on having a separate vote on this measure. He thought the Standing Order provided the Speaker with such authority, given that the bill authorized quite a bit more spending than what was announced in the budget.

• (1530)

[Translation]

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby argued that the bill was in fact an omnibus bill, insofar as it contained measures not announced in the budget. He also noted that this was specifically the case in relation to the measures concerning agricultural and fisheries cooperatives and those concerning beer from concentrate. Furthermore, he argued that the inclusion of such measures meant that Bill C-63 could not qualify for the exemption provided in the Standing Orders for budget implementation bills and that therefore the entire bill should be treated as an omnibus bill.

[English]

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader, in his intervention, sought to reassure the House that certain measures were indeed arising out of the budget. He pointed out that the plan for Canada to become a member of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank was indeed announced in the budget, and that the bill operationalizes that plan. He also argued that the amendments to the Judges Act in division 11 give effect to the intention announced in the budget to implement the recommendations of the 2015 Judicial Compensation and Benefits Commission. The changes relating to the Bank of Canada in division 5, he contended, are part of the government's plan to bolster the tool kit for managing the resolution of Canada's largest banks, as announced in the budget.

Finally, he insisted that the Standing Order does not foresee the division of a bill for the purposes of debate or committee referral, but only for the purpose of voting at second and third reading.

[Translation]

The hon. member for Calgary Shepard argued that in coming to a decision, the Speaker should be inspired by the procedure in the Quebec National Assembly in relation to motions to divide bills. He

argued that the Chair should not confuse the principles contained in a bill with the field of legislative action it addresses. While the measures in the bill all deal with economic policy, he did not think that the Speaker should conclude that they are all interrelated. He also raised a number of points that were less specifically about Bill C-63, but concerned the mechanics of implementing a decision to divide a question, which he argued are unaddressed by the Standing Orders. In particular, he raised issues relating to amendments to the second and third reading motions, referral to committee, report stage and consideration of Senate amendments.

[English]

Yesterday, in response to a point of order from the hon. opposition House leader, I delivered a first ruling concerning the new Standing Order 69.1 on omnibus bills. This Standing Order empowers the Speaker to divide the question on the motion for second and third reading of a bill in circumstances where the bill contains a number of unrelated provisions.

The matter before us today concerns paragraph (2) of that Standing Order, which makes an exception for budget implementation bills. That paragraph reads as follows:

69.1(2) The present Standing Order shall not apply if the bill has as its main purpose the implementation of a budget and contains only provisions that were announced in the budget presentation or in the documents tabled during the budget presentation.

• (1535)

[Translation]

The question for the Speaker, then, is whether or not the measures identified by the hon. member for Carleton and the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby correspond to provisions announced in the budget.

Let me first say that establishing such a link is not always obvious. The budget document itself is almost 300 pages, while the supplementary tax information represents another 100 pages. The Chair has done its best to review the material in arriving at this decision.

[English]

Let me first deal with the measures in the bill relating to the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. The hon. member for Carleton acknowledged that these measures were indeed announced in the budget. The only issue is whether or not the variance in the amount invested is sufficient to sever this relationship.

*Government Orders*

In my view, the spirit of the Standing Order was to provide for a separate vote when new or unrelated matters were introduced in the budget implementation bill. The fact that the amounts are higher, though I admit the variance is considerable, does not, in my opinion, make the matter of the AIBB markedly different from what was announced in the budget.

I believe it is understandable that, in between the time the budget is presented and the time the budget implementation bill is introduced, a change in circumstances could produce such a variation. I do not believe it is necessary to insist on an identical amount when the overall policy initiative is substantially the same. Therefore, I do not believe it would be appropriate to have a separate vote on this matter.

[*Translation*]

Let me turn now to the other issues raised by hon. members. I am willing to accept the arguments from the hon. parliamentary secretary that division 5 of part 5 regarding the Bank of Canada and division 11 of part 5 regarding judges' compensation flow out of measures announced in the budget. Therefore, I believe it is appropriate that those measures be included in the general vote at second reading and, if necessary, at third reading.

[*English*]

However, in relation to the other matters raised by the hon. members for Carleton and New Westminster—Burnaby, I have been unable to find a link between them, and what is contained in the budget documents. The parliamentary secretary did not refute the contention that these matters were indeed new and unrelated to the budget.

Accordingly, I believe that I can and should exercise the powers granted to me in the Standing Order to divide the question at second reading and, if necessary, at third reading.

Having come to this conclusion, the question is, how to effect such a division? The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby argues that the entire bill should be subject to division. Since it does not solely implement measures announced in the budget, he believes the exemption in Standing Order 69.1(2) no longer applies.

As I stated earlier, I believe the purpose of the Standing Order is to allow such a division in relation to those matters which are unrelated to the budget, accepting that the purpose of the remainder of the bill is to implement the budget.

[*Translation*]

The measures relating to agricultural and fisheries co-operatives are contained in clause 48. Those concerning changes to the GST/HST rebate for public service bodies are contained in clauses 139 and 163. Part 3 of the bill deals with amendments to the Excise Act in relation to beer made from concentrate. Clauses 165 to 168 make up this part. Finally, division 13 of part 5 deals with changes to the Financial Administration Act in relation to the discharge of debt. This measure is contained in clause 261. Each of these initiatives will be the subject of a separate vote at second reading and, if necessary, at third reading. All remaining elements of the bill will be combined in a single vote, which will be taken last. This means there will be five votes when the debate at second reading concludes.

● (1540)

[*English*]

I wish to underscore that the Chair has not ordered that each of these measures become the subject of a separate bill, or the object of a separate referral to committee. The Standing Order is clear that the Speaker has the power to divide the question at second reading, and at third reading for the purposes of voting only. There remains a single debate on the motion for second reading of Bill C-63.

In response to the questions raised by the hon. member for Calgary Shepard, the motion for the second reading of the bill is still subject to the usual amendments: a hoist amendment, a reasoned amendment, or an amendment to withdraw the bill and refer the subject matter to committee.

I do not believe the Standing Order allows me to create five separate second reading motions for the purpose of debate, each individually subject to amendment. When the debate concludes, I will put the question on each of the five groups of clauses as described above. Those groups that are adopted will constitute the order of reference to the Standing Committee on Finance. Those that are rejected will not be referred to committee, and will no longer form part of the bill. In such a case, I will also order a reprint of the bill for the committee's use.

[*Translation*]

When and if the Committee reports the bill, assuming no other instruction from the House, it will form the subject of a single report, with or without amendments. Members will then be free to submit report stage motions to amend the bill as they see fit. I will rely on the usual rules at report stage in relation to the selection and grouping of motions for debate and voting, though the groupings may indeed reflect the divisions I've announced today. That's a decision I will come to when I see what motions have been submitted. The vote at third reading will be conducted in a similar way to the vote at second reading, assuming all of the identified elements are still part of the bill by the time it reaches that stage.

[*English*]

I appreciate this is a new practice for the House, and I thank hon. members for their attention and patience as I explained how I intend to implement it.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2017, NO. 2

The House resumed from November 7 consideration of the motion that Bill C-63, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2017 and other measures, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

*Government Orders*

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in this House to speak to Bill C-63, the budget implementation bill, a second act to implement certain provisions of the budget, that was tabled earlier this year, in March.

As always, my comments are made on behalf of the residents of Davenport, who I am blessed to serve and who always inspire me with their passion for life, their love for their families, their love of community, and their desire to do their part to make our community, our country, and our world a better place.

In talking about the budget implementation bill, I would like to focus on what our budget this year does for women, for seniors, and, if I have time, for workers.

On women, our budget this year produced the first-ever budget gender statement, an assessment of how gender was considered in budget 2017 measures. For me this is vital to do, because I believe it is important to be transparent on how budgetary measures and spending are impacting women. This budget gender statement will not be a panacea for gender equity, but it will help the Canadian government assess and target how we can best allocate our resources so that both our men and women are supported equally. It is a long time coming, as there are many other countries that have already done this, but I am so glad we are doing it now and that we have committed to doing this on an ongoing basis.

One of the biggest stresses for Davenport parents continues to be the high cost of day care. Therefore, I was pleased to see that over \$7 billion over a 10-year period was committed in budget 2017 to support and create more high-quality, affordable child care spaces across Canada. I know that our Minister of Families, Children and Social Development has worked hard with all the provinces to create a framework to foster fully inclusive early education and child care services across the country while respecting the needs and circumstances of each jurisdiction. Under the agreement, the federal government will send billions of dollars to the provinces and territories to focus on creating new child care spaces for families. Our plan is anticipated to create up to 40,000 new, affordable, accessible spaces across Canada over the next few years.

This is a good beginning. Indeed, this is a great beginning, and I think we need to go further and do more. Until we close the gap in women's participation in the workforce, until we ensure that every single family in Canada has access to affordable child care in this country, we have not finished our job.

There is currently a 10 percentage point gap between the labour force participation rates of men and women in Canada. According to the International Monetary Fund and a large body of research from a number of places around the world, the more women who enter the workforce, the more productive its economy will be. The best way to boost women's participation rates is to ensure not only affordable day care but also maximum flexibility for women in the workforce.

At this point, too many families in my riding still have to make a choice between either having one spouse at home to take care of the kids or having both parents work to earn enough to cover the high cost of day care in downtown Toronto, where the monthly costs are around \$1,200 per month. Therefore, while we have made enormous, laudable progress, our work is not yet done.

One of the key areas I am very proud of that does support families and is helping with some of the costs of day care is our Canada child benefit. This is a huge benefit for working middle-class families in Davenport. I asked for the numbers to date with respect to the amount of money going to Davenport families, and what I received was this: from July 2016 to June 2017, there were a total of 9,210 payments, with an average payment of \$5,880 for the year. The total amount that went to Davenport families over that one-year period was \$54,164,000. That is an enormous amount. I know that Davenport families are very happy to have received this. I know that it goes a long way to support them, to support their lives, and to support their families.

I also should note that in the recent fall economic statement, which was released on October 24, the government announced that it would strengthen the Canada child benefit by indexing it to an annual increase in the cost of living, effective July 2018, which is two years earlier than planned. This will put more money in the pockets of Canadians immediately to help with the ever-increasing cost of living.

There is great progress and support for both women and families in our budget this year.

● (1545)

Now I want to move on to seniors. In the cold air of November that is a harbinger of the winter to come, the past summer now seems so long ago, but I did a lot of canvassing during the summer, and I had an interaction with a Davenport senior that is seared in my mind. The woman saw me canvassing, and she came up to me to tell me to make sure to tell the Prime Minister not to forget seniors. I relayed to her all the things we had done to support seniors. I told her we were going to continue to work hard to make sure that seniors continue to feel supported.

According to Statistics Canada, Canada's elderly poverty rate has fallen by a remarkable 25%, from 37% in 1976 to 12% in 2010. However, since the mid- to late 1990s, poverty rates have actually been growing among seniors, and 60% of low-income seniors are women. Therefore, I was very proud that as of July 2016, our government increased the guaranteed income supplement to \$947 a month for the most vulnerable single seniors. We also restored the age of eligibility for OAS and GIS to 65 from 67. That will also go a long way to support our seniors, sooner rather than later, and make sure that they do not fall anywhere near the poverty level. I am pleased to say that this year's budget would take even more steps to support our seniors.



*Government Orders*

We have invested \$6 billion over 10 years for home care. That will go a long way for those who want to be taken care of at home and not in hospitals. We have committed \$2.3 billion over two years to expand affordable housing, which is expected to improve the housing conditions for all seniors, especially senior women. We provided an additional \$4 million over two years to the enabling accessibility fund to improve the accessibility of public spaces. I know that is something that was very important for my mum, so I am glad that is something we have introduced right across the country. I am very proud of our Minister of Finance, who reached a historic agreement to enhance the Canada pension plan to ensure that there will be more money for Canadians when they retire.

A lot of work has been done to support our seniors. I want to give a shout-out to a couple of my colleagues who are doing such a tremendous job in terms of trying to make sure we create a national seniors strategy. They are my colleague from King—Vaughan and my colleague from Nickel Belt.

Finally are workers. The world of work is rapidly changing. What I hear are a lot of concerns about more contract work. We hear that there is more precarious work. There is more artificial intelligence and a continued loss of manufacturing jobs. In general, with the advances in communications technology, there is an anticipated way of working in the future that is causing quite a bit of consternation among many Davenport residents and among Canadians in general. Therefore, I am proud that our government has taken action to support workers who are looking to train in different jobs. There is also support for workers who are trying to improve or upgrade their skills, and there is more support in general for workers in an ever-changing workforce. Some of those changes include \$2.7 billion over six years to boost skills training and employment supports for unemployed and underemployed Canadians. Under the labour market transfer agreements, we have put in \$132 million over four years to expand flexibility within the employment insurance program to enable more unemployed workers to pursue self-funded training while remaining eligible for EI benefits.

I do not have time to go through the rest of the amazing things we are doing to support workers. There is more that needs to be done. One of the key areas I am hoping our government will start looking at is a basic income as a way to support workers in the future.

I will end on a wonderful note. Our economy is doing well. Over the last two years, we have created over 450,000 new full-time jobs. We have a historic low unemployment rate of 6.2%, the lowest since 2008. We have a youth unemployment rate at a historic low of 10.3%. Canada is the fastest growing economy in the G7, with an average rate of 3.7% over the last year. I know that more good news is to come.

I appreciate the wonderful opportunity to present on behalf of the residents of Davenport today, and I urge all my colleagues to support Bill C-63.

● (1550)

**Mr. Guy Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the residents of Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, my constituents, are very concerned that the recent economic update from the finance minister suggested that over the

next six years, we are going to add \$100 billion to Canada's national debt.

According to the finance minister's figures in that document, the interest paid per year will rise from \$24 billion per year to \$32 billion per year in 2022. The constituents of Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry ask how we can possibly afford that increase in interest each and every year. When they think about it, that is \$3 billion a month, and that is if the interest rate stays the same.

I wonder what the constituents of Davenport think of increasing the interest on Canada's national debt by \$3 billion per month.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, I did a lot of canvassing over the summer. I did reach some doors where I had similar questions.

What I was said to them was the following. Canada has one of the best balance sheets in the world. We have probably the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio in the world. We have a lot to be proud of. We have an economy that is growing faster than all other economies at the moment. We are spending responsibly. That was validated by the IMF when Christine Lagarde came here just over a year ago.

We are spending responsibly, we are investing in infrastructure, we are investing in our future, and we are doing everything we can to keep our debt at a manageable level.

● (1555)

**Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, there are many things we can agree on. I am going to bring to my colleague's attention, as I have to her colleagues, the Labour Code changes.

One of the areas I am concerned about is the unpaid leave for domestic violence. I am hoping the government will be open to listening to experts, both legal experts and people who work in the area of domestic violence. The challenge for many in those circumstances, who are often mostly women, is that their ability to take an unpaid leave to deal with creating a safe plan, hiring a lawyer, and perhaps finding a new place to live will not happen right away. It will happen over months or a year. However, when they come home to their abusive partners with a paycheque that is less, because they have taken unpaid leave, that might be a serious safety issue for that family and that partner.

I am encouraging the government to look at that again and to make those paid days for domestic leave.

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of areas we need to continue to look at to better support our workers across this country. I appreciate the member putting a wonderful idea on the table.

*Government Orders*

I will say that I am very proud of what we have done so far in terms of supporting workers. I asked the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour a question in the House today about an announcement made this week about measures we are taking to protect workers from harassment and sexual violence in the workplace.

I know we will take more steps to support our workers in the days and years to come.

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, during the election, we campaigned that an economy that works for the middle class is an economy that works for everyone.

The member has done a lot of work with immigrants in her community. Could the member comment on how these changes we are putting forward will help immigrants in her community?

**Ms. Julie Dzerowicz:** Mr. Speaker, in Davenport we are very blessed to have 52% of the people in my riding born in other countries. They are very happy with the changes introduced in the budget not only this year but last year. Mainly it is because we actually spent quite a bit of time and money and resources making our system more efficient. For example, to process spouses went from 26 months to 12 months. That is just one of the many great changes new Canadians are seeing in our system that will very much benefit not only our immigrants but our economy, both today and tomorrow.

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join this debate on the budget implementation bill. I have seen many of these go through and I can say that I am really pleased with what I have seen in it. It is going to make a significant difference in the lives of all Canadians. As always, it is an honour to rise in the House today to speak about the budget implementation act, Bill C-63.

Our government is making intelligent investments that will have a direct impact on job creation and strengthening our economy while at the same time creating opportunities for success for all Canadians.

Our government is taking the right steps to give all Canadians, including the middle class especially, a brighter future. Allow me to take this opportunity to tell everyone about some of these investments and what I consider to be the right steps.

For example, the richest 1% of Canadians will be asked to pay a little more tax than others so that we will be better able to provide the middle class with some tax breaks they very much need. This tax cut has directly benefited nine million Canadians and is something that we Canadians will be proud of.

Second, let me talk about the Canada child benefit. The Canada child benefit has lifted hundreds of thousands of children out of poverty. I know this for a fact because many of these children are in my riding of Humber River—Black Creek, and I will mention some of their stories.

Two weeks ago, I had the pleasure of hosting the hon. Minister of Families, Children and Social Development in my riding of Humber River—Black Creek, and as we walked through Yorkgate Mall, we encountered a constituent who was expecting her first child. The hon. minister and I took this opportunity to explain the financial opportunities this new mother stood to gain from our government's

new Canada child benefit. This constituent, about to be a new mother for the first time, was overjoyed with a sense of relief to know that there would be financial help from the government and she thanked us for making a difference in her life and the life of her baby.

It would be a good idea to dig even deeper into the numbers on how the Canada child benefit is helping ridings like mine and many others throughout Canada. As of July 2017, there were a total of 12,250 payments provided in the riding of Humber River—Black Creek, which directly impact more than 20,000 children, who are so much better off as a result of the Canada child benefit. Their moms have extra money to be able to invest in everything from winter clothes to assisting with dancing or piano lessons, things they certainly could not do before. With some families, that money is putting more food on the table.

The average payment to a family is \$770, and families in my riding have already received a total of almost \$10 million dollars. That is \$10 million dollars more that has gone into the riding of Humber River—Black Creek to help the single moms, the families, the children to have a better quality of life. That is all part of the budget implementation act. It is making a difference in their lives in that one riding. Repeat that throughout our country and think how much better off so many families and children are. These numbers cannot be ignored and do make a significant difference.

It is stories like these that allow me to rise today and speak confidently that the bill would help make a positive difference for Canadian families. The investments our government has made in people, in our communities, and in our economy are working. Canada has the fastest growing economy in the G7 and we are reinvesting the benefits of that growth back to the people who contribute most to that success.

Because of Canada's strong economic growth, our government's bottom line is better and we can, as a result, do even more to help the middle class and those working hard to join it. With lower taxes on small business, more support through the Canada child benefit, and an enhanced working income tax benefit, it will be an enormous help.

One of the things I have often heard from some of the parents or families who come into my office is that if they go to work, they will be worse off because everything they make will get clawed back. The working income tax benefit will help those families so they can go out and get a second job and not be penalized for it.

• (1600)

When the Canada child benefit was first introduced in July 2016, the extra money in parents' pockets had an immediate effect on consumer confidence and economic growth. Canada, as I said, has the fastest growing economy in the G7, giving our government the flexibility to reinvest a lot of these benefits.

*Government Orders*

With the increased cost of living increases to the CCB starting in July 2018, two years ahead of schedule, for a single parent with two children making \$35,000—and I have a lot of them in my riding of Humber River—Black Creek—the strengthened CCB will mean \$560 more next year, tax free, for books, skating lessons, or warm clothes for winter. The added confidence these increases bring to families is proven to have an immediate impact on economic growth.

Because the economy is growing so well, we are allowing low-income workers, including families without children and a growing number of single Canadians, to keep more hard-earned money from every paycheque by further enhancing the working income tax benefit by an additional \$500 million per year, starting in 2019. This enhancement is in addition to the \$250-million annual increase that will come into effect as part of an enhancement to another program the Liberals are strengthening, the Canada pension plan, to help people have a more secure retirement. That is very much top of mind for a lot of people given what has happened recently with Sears. We saw what happened with Nortel previously. These events really shake the foundations of many people. Taken together, the two enhancements that we have made will boost the total amount our government spends on WITB by about 65% in 2019, increasing benefits and expanding the number of Canadians who qualify.

Let us talk a little more about cutting taxes on small businesses. Our government committed to reducing the small business tax rate to 9% from 11%, effective January 2019. That represents a considerable amount for many small businesses. We want them to flourish and grow, while ensuring that Canadian-controlled private corporation status is not used to reduce the personal income tax obligations of high-income earners rather than supporting small businesses. This is about reinvesting money back into businesses so they will grow, can hire additional people, and certainly do much better. This means up to \$7,500 in federal corporate tax savings per year to help entrepreneurs and innovators do what they do best. Small businesses are a key driver of our economy and a cornerstone of communities across the country. As our plan works to grow the economy, small businesses see the benefits of that growth with lower taxes.

As we continue to move forward, we want to ensure that the average Canadian has a good quality of life and can take the opportunities the government is trying to provide them by tax advantages that only the richest individuals, using high-priced accountants, were able to take advantage of in the past. Instead, the government has listened to small business owners, professionals, farmers, and fishers and will move forward in a way that protects all of them, innovators and entrepreneurs as well. As we lower taxes on small business, we are committed to ensuring that they support business growth and investment and not give personal tax advantages to the wealthy over the middle class.

We are doing very well. As I said earlier, we are the fastest growing economy in the G7; we have the lowest debt to GDP ratio and have created over 500,000 more jobs, many of them full-time, good jobs, in the last two years; the economy is great, and our country is doing very well. I am very happy to support Bill C-63 and hope that everyone in the House realizes the benefits to all Canadians of supporting it.

• (1605)

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague for receiving the *Maclean's* Parliamentarian of the Year award for being a mentor. It is certainly well deserved.

However, on this particular issue, I am not sure I want her to be mentoring anyone. There were a number of things she totally ignored in her comments. She ignored the fact that this budget will increase our debt. In fact, the interest costs alone will rise by \$9 billion per year to \$33 billion a year by 2021. She talked about not having personal tax advantages for the rich. I am wondering if she was including the finance minister and Prime Minister in that. It does not seem like it from some of the questions that have come up. She talked about the small business tax cut. My colleague and all of her colleagues know that there is no way that would have happened were it not for the immense pressure put on them by the opposition and hundreds of thousands of Canadians who protested the proposed tax changes that were going after so-called tax cheats. Because of the pressure by the opposition and Canadians who were going to be negatively impacted, the government capitulated and reduced the small business tax credit, which is a good thing. However, to imply that the government members it out of the goodness of their hearts is a little rich.

Finally, my question relates to infrastructure. She commented about the infrastructure they are investing in, but the problem they are not talking about is where they are investing in infrastructure, namely Asia. There is nearly \$500 million, almost half a billion dollars, being invested in the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, which Canada will have about a 1% say after investing that money. We know that the infrastructure investments that bank will be making will benefit Canadians, but will cost Canadians all kinds of money. How can she really honestly support that kind of spending?

*Government Orders*

●(1610)

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro:** Mr. Speaker, investing in infrastructure is a fabulous way of creating jobs and wealth and helping to grow the economy. Over \$36 billion in projects have already been announced and are under way through our infrastructure plan. By investing in both the Asian infrastructure bank and our own infrastructure bank, it will provide lots of opportunity to invest in bridges and sewers. So many things throughout our country that have been neglected for many years by many governments will now receive infrastructure investments that will help keep our cities strong. Cities have clearly not had the money to do that, which has led to many bridge and road collapses. This money will begin to ensure that we are building a strong Canada that will stay attractive to many other people to live and invest in.

**Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, on this side, we certainly welcome some of the changes proposed to the Canada Labour Code that would prohibit unpaid internships unless they are educational, and provide flexibility within the workplace for people to take important leaves.

I want to draw to her attention one of the leaves I find problematic, and that is unpaid leaves for victims of domestic violence. I want to point out to her the issues that may be a barrier to victims accessing that leave. Because it is unpaid, it will put victims in a vulnerable state within domestic relationships where one partner is controlling the other economically. If that individual is coming home with a paycheque that is less than what it should be, it could actually put the family and the individual in harm's way. I encourage her to support looking at this particular part and being open to amendments at committee.

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro:** Mr. Speaker, one of the best parts of this budget implementation act is this whole issue of flexible work arrangements. We just have to recognize that we are in the 21st century. Many women are working, many families experience pain and difficulty together and need to find ways for their employers to give them the help they need. Certainly, my colleague raises a very good point, but as with everything, we have to start to introduce change. As we go forward at committee, I am sure there will be a variety of amendments that will be costed out. The flexible work arrangements are something moving us in a much more positive way throughout Canada.

**Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, with regard the budget implementation act, I would like to talk about the climate around investment these days.

It is important to understand that while the government can create jobs, programs, and a number of different things, it is ultimately entrepreneurs who create the work, the employment, and the wealth in our country. I say that because one of the things the government fails to understand, or one of the challenges it has had over the last little while, is the uncertainty that small businesses face.

There is a number of issues and a number of things the Liberals are trying to do in stimulating the country, such as universal child benefit and other that obviously will make families better off. We do not have a problem with that. The challenge we have is the instability of what entrepreneurs face. Let me give an example.

While we were in government, we did a number of things to try to encourage entrepreneurs to start businesses. I used the acronym called "TIRE" because it was a multi-pronged approach. We lowered corporate taxes to one of the lowest in the G7, down to 25%. We can say okay, it was great that we lowered corporate taxes, but what did that do? That was just one thing in a number of things we did, but it was important to create certainty for entrepreneurs to flourish.

Let me talk about the acronym of TIRE and what it stands for. The "T" stands for taxes and trade. One of the things we did was lowered taxes for corporations because we wanted to increase investment in Canada and we wanted to create a favourable environment to encourage other crown corporations and individuals to invest here.

The second thing we did was trade. We worked on the CETA deal, which we pretty much got to the finish line. It was nice to see the Liberals complete it. However, we were there. We negotiated it over the four years we were in government.

The second one was TPP, another agreement we worked on and had actually signed it but were waiting for ratification on it. This is important because Canada has about 35 million people and they cannot possibly sell all their goods to each other. We are definitely a trading nation. These are important things. We count very heavily on the U.S. That number used to be 85% to 90%. I realize now it is down to 75%. However, we need to create other opportunities. This was one of the reasons why we worked on trade along with taxes.

The "I" in TIRE, is infrastructure, investments, and immigration reform. We worked on these things. We spent major amounts of money in infrastructure across the country, and we got it out in record time. The Liberal government has also promised infrastructure money, but we have not seen a whole lot in the first two years. There is always some concern with a half billion dollars going to the Asia Infrastructure Bank, but the budget officer has said that almost \$2 billion have been unspent at this point in time.

The "R" stands for research and development, and red tape reduction. If we look at the R and D, the government continues to spend money on it and continues to commit money to it. These are good things, but sometimes it misses the mark. We have talked about superclusters being important. My challenge is that as a small business person, it is very hard to access those things. Most businesses in the country are small businesses. While there is probably nothing wrong with the concept of superclusters, the challenge is that money needs to go to entrepreneurs and small businesses.

*Government Orders*

Entrepreneurs tell us all the time that it is always difficult to raise capital. If we look at some of these things, this always seems to be the number one issue. When we look at places like San Francisco, silicon valley, Boston, Israel, and a number of other places around the world, there is great entrepreneurship. A lot of times Canadian companies have to go south of the border to raise money for second rounds, third rounds, VC rounds, and those kinds of things. These are some of the things with which we are challenged. When we look at R and D, absolutely important is the number of programs. The government has programs such as SR&ED a few others that are effective and helpful.

I sat on the red tape reduction committee. We travelled the country, and red tape was another thing that frustrated entrepreneurs to no end. We have to find ways to continue. One of the things we implemented was the one for one rule. When a new regulation was introduced, we would reduce a regulation.

One of the challenges is this. The federal government regulates a number of areas. However, then there are provincial and municipal jurisdictions and each of these add a layer and make it difficult for entrepreneurs to get started.

• (1615)

The last thing, the “E” in TIRE, is entrepreneurship and the economy. One of the things I always tell people when I talk to them about business is that there is a whole suite of things that we need to do in order to encourage entrepreneurship in this country. Right now, there are obviously a number of incubators and accelerators. Members are obviously familiar with Communtech in Waterloo, which does an amazing job. There are a number of other incubators and accelerators across this country. I always wonder if it would not make sense, as we move forward, to encourage colleges and universities to look at making that part of their mandate. I realize that is not always possible, but I think if we are going to teach entrepreneurship, if we are going to talk to people about starting businesses, then we also have to give them a place to actually help hone their craft.

Some of the things that are helpful for incubators are, obviously, that there is access to capital and money, that there are mentors, and that there is an environment where there is a chance to work and feed off what is going on with other individuals. As I visited a number of incubators in Silicon Valley, one of the things that was amazing was this whole issue of like-mindedness. People could come together, share their ideas, have access to capital, and all those other things.

However, one of the things we struggle with in this country is that we do not have a culture of entrepreneurship. I talk to students taking business programs all the time and ask them what they think they are going to do. They tell me that once they get their MBA, they want to work for a big company. Now, there is nothing wrong with working for a big company, but one of the challenges we have in this country is that we do not have enough people willing to start businesses and be entrepreneurial.

As I look at these things that we worked on as a government, I use TIRE, where the “T” is for taxes and trade; the “I” is for infrastructure, investments, and immigration reform, which is trying to help businesses bring in the people they need; the “R” is for R and

D, and red tape reduction; and, of course, the “E” is for entrepreneurship and economy.

One of the things that has been a challenge with the latest implementation, or the thought process of taxes and taxation, has been the uncertainty for small businesses. I have literally had all kinds of phone calls coming into my office. People were saying that they were not happy and were not sure what they were going to do.

I co-hosted a round table here on Parliament Hill as the co-chair of the entrepreneur caucus with my colleagues. We had the CFIB and a number of individuals. We had a high-net-worth accountant, who represents a lot of money. He said that since this has happened, over \$1 billion has gone south of the border. Now, we are never going to see a press release sent out on who was going to invest in Canada but will not now. Money is fluid, and it can move in different directions. Quite frankly, when there is uncertainty, it makes it a challenge.

I also want to talk about the unintended consequences of some of the proposed tax changes. Remember, in previous years, it took the Carter commission four years to look at tax changes and another six years to implement them, which is over a decade. However, this was done in less than 75 days in the middle of the summer.

Doctors are a segment of people who were singled out as not paying their fair share of taxes. I have an individual in my office who lives in my riding but has a practice in Welland. She is a dermatologist, and her husband is an orthopaedic surgeon. She feels totally vilified with what is going on here. She and her husband have over \$400,000 in debt, with another \$100,000 for her to set up her practice in Welland. She said that if things do not change that, in two years when her lease runs out, she will be moving south of the border. I am not saying that every doctor is leaving, but there are certainly individuals out there who do not feel like the hard work and time they put in is going to be rewarded.

As I look at some of the budget implementation act, I see large deficits, which are for a time when the economy is not doing that well. Right now, the economy has been doing relatively well. What happens if we continue to spend all of this money that is for a rainy day? Our growth is better than average, and maybe better than expected, but I believe that on the horizon we will see less than 2% growth, or 1% and change, over the next couple of years.

If we stack up some of things that are going on here, such as the uncertainty with the tax proposals, the fact remains that it is still hard for entrepreneurs to access money. When we look at taxing passive income, it makes it very discouraging for people trying to grow the economy, create jobs, and, quite frankly, trying to help Canada grow as a nation.

I would encourage my friends on the other side of the House to reconsider what they are looking at, where they are going with these tax changes, and the deficit, because there will be lasting and long-term results.

*Government Orders*

•(1620)

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member across the way for his intervention today, and for giving us the letters T-I-R-E to consider and to remember the points he has given. It always helps when in a presentation to have something to refer to.

My question is whether the TIRE was flat or not, and whether maybe we did not get economic growth with \$150 billion in increased debt in the country. Our strategy of investing in the middle class seems to be getting the growth that the previous government did not get by giving tax breaks to the wealthy.

Could the member comment on the different strategies that are being used by the member's party and our party?

**Mr. Dean Allison:** Mr. Speaker, I can assure the members that the TIREs were full, we were running on all four TIREs, and everything was working well.

We can look at what happened with the great economic downturn in 2008. It was Canada that actually did better than any country in the G7. It was Canada that led the way in growth. While other countries had this huge fall, we continued to maintain.

We spent money. It was the opposition that said we needed to spend more. We spent what we felt was important at the time to get the economy back on track. I will just say that we want to be careful looking at this quarter. Things are well, but I believe there are huge troubles on the horizon. We have mortgage rates that are going to change in January. They are going to raise the benchmark by over 2% to qualify for first-time homebuyers or for homebuyers in general. That will mean that less than 75% of what homebuyers qualify for in 2017 is not going to be there.

There is a whole bunch of these small cuts that are happening. I would encourage the members to be cautious, because as we move forward into 2018 and 2019, I really believe there are storm clouds on the horizon.

•(1625)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my Conservative colleague for his speech in the House on the budget implementation bill.

He talked a lot about business owners. Whenever I meet with small business owners back home, they often tell me about unfair credit card fees. Some businesses are paying extraordinary sums to credit card companies. Some small businesses are paying more than \$200,000 per year.

I would like to know whether this is also an issue for small and medium-sized business owners in my colleague's riding.

Do they talk a lot about how the government has not done a thing to better regulate credit card fees?

[*English*]

**Mr. Dean Allison:** Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I pay attention to on a regular basis are the surveys that come out from CFIB.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business, which has members all across this country, has a great pulse on what is going on in the world of small and medium-sized businesses. One of the things that continues to come up is credit card fees for CFIB.

What I would say to the member is that this is an issue that continues to come up, time and time again, as an issue of concern. It is one of the things that we looked at when we were in government, and one of the things that I believe needs still more work.

[*Translation*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia, Indigenous Affairs; the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, National Defence; and the hon. member for Langley—Aldergrove, Taxation.

[*English*]

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for this debate in the House tonight, for the government bringing forward budget 2017, and now for Bill C-63. The government's actions are in line with and directly support the four initiatives of the Guelph and Wellington poverty elimination task force, by looking at the four areas of income inequality, affordable housing, food insecurity, and health inequities.

There is an old African proverb that states, "If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go with others." This government knows that working together with others, and other orders of government, is crucial. In fact, the whole-of-government approach is the way forward.

On the first point of income inequality, the goal of the Guelph and Wellington poverty elimination task force is that all members of the community have the income, resources, and opportunities to fully participate in the community. Of people living in poverty, 70% are currently working. According to Statistics Canada, Canada has one of the highest proportions of low-paid workers among similarly industrialized countries.

The government believes that the working income tax benefit can do much more to improve the financial security of low-income working Canadians. To this end, in the 2017 fall economic statement, the government is announcing its intention to further enhance the working income tax benefit by \$500 million a year, starting in 2019. The maximum Canada pension plan retirement benefits for workers will also be increasing over time by 50%. The government has increased the guaranteed income supplement payments to seniors by up to \$947 a year, which is going to help 900,000 low-income seniors, 70% of whom are women.

*Government Orders*

The Canada child benefit has helped to stimulate the economy. Our economy is growing at 3.7%, leading the G7, and we have created more than 500,000 jobs since it was introduced. There are 12,000 families or 24,000 kids in my riding who receive a total of \$8 million per month tax-free. This is an enormous boost to the Guelph economy. The budget implementation act will now index these funds two years ahead of schedule due to the strong growth we have in our economy.

Economic opportunity is the best way to address income inequality. This legislation will take the next steps for our innovation and skills plan, an agenda that focuses on people and addresses the changing nature of the economy to ensure that it works for all Canadians. Bill C-63 will enact several key parts of our plan, including \$600 million in new financing for clean technology firms, and \$400 million to put in place the venture capital catalyst initiative.

The second point that the poverty elimination task force is looking at is affordable housing, with the goal that everyone in Guelph and Wellington can find and maintain an appropriate, safe, and affordable place to call home. The government will invest more than \$11.2 billion over 11 years through the national housing strategy to provide low-income Canadians with improved access to adequate and affordable housing. This is the most significant investment in housing that has ever been made in the history of Canada.

Through the rental construction financing initiative, the government will also offer more than \$2.5 billion over the next four years in low-cost loans to support the construction of new rental housing to help increase the supply of rental housing. Budget 2017 also proposes a total investment of \$2.1 billion over the next 11 years to expand and extend funding for the homelessness partnering strategy beyond 2018-19. Our national housing strategy will be announced over the next few weeks. We will be meeting with members of the Guelph and Wellington poverty elimination task force to discuss implications for Guelph and how we can work together.

The third point is food insecurity. Everyone has to have access to affordable and healthy food in a dignified manner. We have a shared objective federally. In fact, the agriculture committee that I sit on has repeatedly heard from witnesses on the food policy, addressing the nutritional food that Canada needs to focus on, and working with partners like food banks to reduce food waste and to improve food distribution within our communities.

● (1630)

The Canada child benefit has been mentioned a lot today. It has helped lift 300,000 children out of poverty. Thanks to this benefit, by the end of this year, it is estimated that child poverty will be reduced by 40% from where it was in 2013.

For a single parent with two children and \$35,000 of income, the acceleration of the Canada child benefit will contribute \$560 toward the increasing cost of feeding children. This increase means more nutritious food for lower-income children and families, allowing for a more engaged and active student population in our schools.

To address food insecurity within indigenous communities, they need employment opportunities. Budget 2017 invests \$50 million in

the aboriginal skills and employment training strategy, providing the knowledge indigenous peoples need to sustain themselves and build their communities.

Finally, on health inequities, everyone in Guelph and Wellington has to have access to affordable health services. Drug prices in Canada are among the highest in the world. Patented drug prices in Canada are 17% to 37% higher than those in France, Italy, the U.K., Australia, Spain, the Netherlands, and New Zealand. Canada's generic drug prices are also comparatively high.

We have heard from Canadians about the need for improved access to prescription medications and lower drug prices. Through budget 2017, we are investing over \$140 million over five years to help improve access to pharmaceuticals and support innovations within the health care system, but we know there is a lot more to do.

People may be wondering how these two policies, federal and municipal, are so well aligned and how this can happen. In truth, if a government believes in the whole-of-government approach and serving its people, there can be no other way. Our government understands the needs of our communities, both large and small, from coast to coast to coast, and is prepared to offer communities what they need to realize their goals.

The results of the past two years justify the trust Canadians placed in this government in the 2015 election. We promised we would work together, and we are. I am confident that the measures in budget 2017 and the budget implementation act will continue this positive trend, build our communities, help the most vulnerable, and have a successful economy together.

● (1635)

**Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, something I have heard is quite concerning. Some telephone calls have come into my office. As members know, I am focused on the Indigenous and Northern Affairs file. The calls are from people who are expressing significant concern. They are asking how the government can spend half a billion dollars on infrastructure in Asia, through the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, when we have so many desperate needs at home. They ask why the government is putting heated trailers at the border for people when people in the north are freezing.

*Government Orders*

When the member says that the government is taking care of vulnerable people, I would like him to provide an answer on how spending half a billion dollars to provide infrastructure in Asia or backstopping investors in Asia is helping people in the north, as its communications adviser suggested.

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield:** Mr. Speaker, when we participate in international activities, such as the infrastructure bank, and we are setting up an infrastructure bank within Canada to also attract international investment, it makes us participate in the investment of world development, both in Canada and abroad. We will be looking at significant investments in infrastructure that Canadians will not be paying for by themselves. They will pay for it in partnership with other countries, similar to what we will do in China.

**Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, recently in my riding, I had the wonderful opportunity to meet with several doctors. As the representative of North Island—Powell River, a huge challenge for us is attracting health care professionals to the region. The doctors talked about their concerns on the impacts of the small business tax to these types of communities. One thing that is really important for the House and the Prime Minister to hear is how hurt these doctors were by the comments the Prime Minister made about rich doctors and how much of a ramification that had on their offices. People have gone into their offices to chastise them for this.

What I notice is missing from the bill has nothing to do with tax fairness across the board. I see a focus on small business and not at the significant tax loopholes that the very wealthy use every day to not pay their fair share. What are the member's thoughts on this specific issue and how those impacts are meaningful in communities like I represent?

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield:** Mr. Speaker, the member's question looks at how we work as a country together. Because physicians serve our communities in so many ways and they give so much to our communities, how do we ensure our communities are there for them when they need them as well?

When we look at tax fairness and tax inequities in our system, we will be helping their patients, developing communities, increasing the economy, and helping them to continue to contribute to Canada, which they do in such a great way.

**Mr. Matt DeCoursey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the people in Guelph know how diligently my colleague works on the innovation file. I have had the pleasure of working with him on a number of initiatives. As the chair of a subcommittee on innovation through our Atlantic growth strategy, I have discovered a lot of opportunities available to Atlantic Canadians. Could my hon. colleague talk about how our focus on innovation is helping companies, entrepreneurs, and people in his community thrive in this growing economy?

• (1640)

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield:** Mr. Speaker, I almost never have a conversation without innovation coming up in some way, so I appreciate the member coming at this from this angle. Innovation in Guelph and innovation elsewhere includes social innovation. Through the investments our government is making, we see a social innovation that is contributing to our economy, to our environment, and developing social benefits for all Canadians. I thank the hon.

member for his focus on innovation. Social innovation is a very important part of our strategy going forward.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to speak to Bill C-63, a second act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2017 and other measures, which I will strongly oppose.

I would like to talk about Sunday's municipal elections in Quebec. There are 37 municipalities in the riding I represent, and it spans 3,200 kilometres. I would like to congratulate all of the candidates who ran in the municipal elections and all those who won. I care about having a good working relationship with other representatives. I look forward to working with the newly elected officials. I would also like to celebrate the fact that more women were elected mayor. I am very proud to say that we now have more women mayors back home. This is good news.

In my speech today, I want to talk about the issues that are not part of the Liberal government's bill. For example, the government is not doing anything about credit card fees, and more recently, it refused to work with us, the provinces, and other stakeholders to create a universal pharmacare program. I also want to talk about how the government is refusing to remedy tax unfairness by facilitating the intergenerational transfer of family farms. The last issue I will touch on is employment insurance.

I will start with credit card fees, which cost Canadian merchants tens of thousands of dollars. It is their second-largest expense after salaries. Small retailers make up more than 50% of the Canadian economy. For example, a Saint-Boniface service station called Alimentation Lemoine & Auger in my riding pays \$30,000 per year in credit card transaction fees. That is a lot of money. Canadian small businesses pay the highest credit card transaction fees in the world. The Liberal government should do like other countries, such as Australia and EU countries, which have capped fees at 0.5% or less.

This is a measure that the Liberal government should have introduced for small business owners. We really would have liked to see some progress. We would have liked for the government to stand up for small business owners in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada. There is a supermarket owner in Laval who spends nearly \$200,000 on credit card fees. The government needs to act now to better regulate those fees.



*Government Orders*

Last month, the NDP used an opposition day to raise a debate in the House of Commons on the need to adopt a universal pharmacare program. In the riding that I represent, the population is aging, so I care about health-related issues. We had a debate in the House of Commons, but unfortunately, the Liberal government decided to vote against our motion.

That day, representatives of the Centre Avec des Elles in Saint-Gabriel-de-Brandon and the Centre des femmes l'Héritage in Louiseville came to attend question period. They also got to meet several MPs. These people from my riding, who came to the House the day that we moved an opposition motion on the need for a universal pharmacare program, could not believe that the government was going to vote against such a measure, when, unfortunately, the cost of prescription drugs is rising every year.

• (1645)

The people I represent did not think it was the right approach to lowering the cost of drugs. They were really frustrated to see the Liberal government's inaction and unwillingness to act. We would have really liked to see something in the budget for this. However, there is nothing yet again. There is no action on the part of the Liberal government.

I had the honour of being the agriculture and agrifood critic since 2015 after being the deputy critic from 2012 to 2015. I have been a member of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food since 2012. I am the longest serving member of the committee. Anything that has to do with the transfer of farms and fishing businesses is really important. We know that Canada's population is aging and that succession and planning is not going well.

My colleague from Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques introduced a bill to address a fiscal injustice in the transfer of farms. Unfortunately, that bill was defeated in the House of Commons before it could be referred to a committee. We think it is disgraceful that the government is doing nothing to help the next generation of farmers in Canada.

I would also like to raise the matter of employment insurance. I represent a rural riding where many people work in seasonal industries. These people depend on EI, but they do not always have access to it, sadly. The budget contained no changes or assistance to give workers access to employment insurance. Currently, 15,000 Canadians are having to contend with the spring gap. This needs to be discussed, because during the campaign, the Liberal Party said it would fix the problem by improving the system and making it so that these people have access to EI.

There have been some minor changes, but the Liberal government has not carried out a comprehensive reform to improve access to employment insurance for workers in the agriculture, fisheries, forestry, and tourism sectors. These sectors are incredibly important to the economy, and we need to make sure we support the people working in them.

The unemployed workers' movement in Quebec claims that the Liberal government has not reformed the employment insurance system. Forty-four percent of Canadians will not be eligible for employment insurance. That is a lot of people, a lot of Canadians

and Quebeckers who need reform and change so they can access EI when they need it. This is really important to them.

We really hoped to see some progress on reducing inequality. We know that a special committee was formed to examine pay equity. A report entitled "It's Time to Act" was even published. The government committed to taking action, but not today, tomorrow, or even in a year. It is going to introduce a bill on pay equity to ensure that women and men earn equal pay for work of equal value. It is going to take until the end of 2018. I am trying to understand why the government is dragging its feet on introducing a bill that would truly further equality.

I think everyone agrees that there is still work to be done. It is 2017. The government claims to be feminist, but it needs to walk the talk. This bill needs to pass quickly. We are deeply disappointed to see so many things missing from this budget, especially since the government is always saying that it can do better.

[*English*]

The government should have done better with this legislation.

• (1650)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pat Finnigan (Miramichi—Grand Lake, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I salute my colleague, the member for Berthier—Maskinongé. She also sits on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food. I want to thank her for her hard work.

Let us look at our budget since we have been in power. There are still many things we would like to do, this I know. There is obviously still much to be done.

We increased the Canada child benefit, which was great. We increased the old age security pension, which was also great. Then, we lowered the retirement age from 67 to 65. On the agriculture front, we allocated \$250 million to producers and \$100 million to processors.

These are some of the positive things we have done in the past two years. There is much to do, of course, but will my colleague at least acknowledge that our government has been very busy? We still have a lot left to do. Does she have anything to say about that?

**Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

This Liberal majority government is halfway through its mandate. Indeed, it has taken some positive steps, and we must recognize that the government has taken action and implemented measures. We agree, and congratulate and thank them for some things. However, they made a lot of promises. It has been two years, and Canadians expected more.

*Government Orders*

The government really needs to reduce tax inequities. A bill has been introduced to do so. My colleague and I both sit on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-food. Everyone who appears before the committee talks about the importance of fixing the unfair tax measures affecting the transfer of family farms. This is one thing the Liberal government could have done. It should have done it. This measure could have been included in the budget. We would have liked to have seen the bill at least make it to committee.

There are a number of measures that we like, but the government must do better. Canadians expect more.

[English]

**Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her very thorough listing of measures for which ordinary families are waiting.

It appears the government feels it has a lot of money to spend. It is going to send hundreds of millions of dollars over to China to develop infrastructure around the world, and yet, it cannot seem to find the time, the money, or the heart, to provide pharmacare.

The Liberals say we are all in this together, and yet, they vote against every single private member's bill and motion we table. That includes calls for the right to affordable housing, and the right to affordable medicines, so people do not have to decide whether they are going to pay their rent or buy their medicine.

Could the member speak to the fact there are many working families, and many people trying to get into the middle class who are not benefiting yet from the government?

**Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau:** Mr. Speaker, Canadians had a lot of high hopes in 2015. They put their trust and confidence in a Liberal government. The Liberals did a great campaign. However, Canadians are starting to realize they are not getting what they thought they would out of the government.

Before being elected, I worked at quite a few jobs to make ends meet. Many constituents in my riding work really hard, and they still do not make ends meet. In Quebec, we have a great system where we have affordable child care. It was a promise this government made, to develop affordable child care. We are not there yet. The Liberals have created no new child care spaces.

On pay equity, they realize they have to act, but they keep pushing it back. Why do women have to wait for pay equity? It does not make sense. The government says it is feminist, but it does not show us. Where is the bill? Why do women have to wait?

Canadians are disappointed and frustrated, and that is why we are voting against Bill C-63.

• (1655)

**Mr. Matt DeCoursey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to speak, on behalf of the people of Fredericton, the riding I have the pleasure to represent, to Bill C-63, the budget implementation act No. 2, which will help us conclude our budgetary measures for 2017.

[Translation]

This bill contains some of the important measures from our government's second budget. These measures are in line with our plan to continue to create jobs, stimulate the economy, and offer Canadians more opportunities to succeed.

[English]

In just two short years our government has accomplished a great deal. I hear from people in Fredericton, Oromocto, Maryland, and the Grand Lake region that they like what we are doing. They like the tax cut for the middle class. They like that we have enhanced the Canada child benefit, lowered the eligibility age for the old age pension to 65 from 67, and expanded old age security for low income seniors.

As a result of this government's efforts to ease the burden on our middle class, nine million Canadians are now paying less tax. This tax cut provides about \$3.4 billion in annual tax relief to the middle class. Single individuals, who benefit, will see an average tax reduction of \$330 every year. Couples, who benefit, will see an average tax reduction of \$540. To help pay for this middle-class tax cut, we raised taxes on the wealthiest 1% of Canadians.

We also decreased small business taxes from 11% to 10.5%, and it will drop even further, down to 10% on January 1, and then down again to 9% by 2019.

In the fall economic update, the government announced another enhancement to the Canada child benefit. As a result of this change, an average Canadian family with two children will see about \$200 more in the Canada child benefit payments next year and about \$500 more in 2019. In New Brunswick, this amounts to 71,000 recipients, with a total investment of \$499 million.

The Canada-New Brunswick early learning and child care agreement signed in August will see the federal government invest close to \$30 million in improving early learning and child care for pre-school-aged children. By the end of the three year agreement this funding will build a high quality early learning and child care system that New Brunswick families can rely on.

While I am on the subject of supporting families, let me remind the House that Fredericton welcomed more than 500 Syrian refugees, more per capita than any city in Canada.

With an aging population, one-third of which is expected to be over the age of 65 by the 2030s, support for New Brunswick seniors is essential.

During our first year in government, we restored the eligibility age for old age security and the guaranteed income supplement back to 65. We increased the GIS top-up benefit for single seniors by up to \$947 per year. We enhanced the Canada pension plan as well.

*Government Orders*

Budget 2017 further ensures that seniors continue to receive the support they deserve by committing \$125.1 million to improve home care for seniors in New Brunswick.

Over the next 11 years, we will invest \$3.2 billion to support affordable housing priorities, including initiatives to support safe and independent living for seniors.

[*Translation*]

Over these 11 years, we will invest an additional \$5 billion to establish a national housing fund to help seniors and the most vulnerable.

• (1700)

[*English*]

New Brunswick is the ideal place to rollout bold and transformative approaches that will enable healthy aging. The federal government's \$16.6 million investment in the University of New Brunswick's Centre for Healthy Living is an excellent example.

AGE-WELL, Canada's technology and aging network, recently partnered with the New Brunswick Health Research Foundation and Fredericton's York Care Centre to open a new national innovation hub in Fredericton.

[*Translation*]

AGE-WELL is a network of federally funded centres of excellence that advance innovation in the field of technology and aging in the interest of all Canadians.

[*English*]

The federal government's first health care deal will enable seniors to live longer, healthier lives in their own homes, and reduce financial and administrative burdens on our already over-stretched health care system.

As chair of the Atlantic growth strategy subcommittee on innovation, I can assure the House that the federal government is committed to empowering Atlantic Canadian entrepreneurs through innovation. Under the Atlantic growth strategy, the government is taking bold action to create more middle-class jobs, strengthen local communities, and grow the economy. The AGS will enhance and enrich Atlantic Canada's innovation ecosystem.

[*Translation*]

Recently designated community of the year for startups in Canada, Fredericton has built a well-earned reputation as an entrepreneurial hub and a centre of innovation.

Thanks in part to the University of New Brunswick's essential role, the innovation ecosystem of this city is attracting a larger number of creative entrepreneurs.

[*English*]

In our 150th year of Confederation, as we prepare to once again take on a more active and dynamic role in the world, we are committed to the vision of Canada's new defence policy. To meet this commitment, the federal government is investing in an agile, multi-purpose, combat ready military, operated by highly trained and well-equipped women and men.

Over the next 10 years, defence spending will increase by more than 70%, which means that 5th Canadian Division Support Base Gagetown, Canada's second-largest military base and home of Canada's army, will take on an even bigger role as an economic generator in our local economy.

Earlier this year, I took part in a ribbon cutting ceremony for a new tactical armed patrol vehicle facility, a \$26 million investment by this federal government. When we add this \$26 million investment to the \$38 million investment in critical infrastructure upgrades at Base Gagetown last year, we get a clear picture of just how big an economic generator Base Gagetown is to the Fredericton region and to all of New Brunswick.

[*Translation*]

This investment in infrastructure is certainly important, but the federal government's investment in the Canadian Armed Forces is even more important.

[*English*]

For example, since January 1, all troops deployed on international operations have been exempt from federal income tax on their CAF salary up to a pay level of lieutenant colonel. This is in addition to existing allowances that compensate for hardship and risk. Other investments include \$198.2 million over the next 10 years to implement a new total health and wellness strategy, providing a greater range of health and wellness services and programs.

There is also an increase of \$6 million per year to modernize family support programs, such as military family resource centres, and a new 1,200-person Canadian Armed Forces transition group that would help CAF members and their families transition back into CAF following illness or injury, or into civilian life at the conclusion of their military service.

Budget 2017 would continue to improve the lives of veterans by focusing on three important themes: ensuring the financial security for ill and injured veterans, investing in education and career development to help veterans transition into post-military life, and supporting families.

In the 150th anniversary of Canada's Confederation and with Remembrance Day just a few days away, I want to underscore the sacrifices that our women and men in uniform have made in service to our country. We are here because of them, and we will remember them.

*Government Orders*

•(1705)

**Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, certainly, on this side, we all agree that we could do no greater activity this coming weekend than to take the time at many different events in our ridings to pay tribute to the men and women in uniform who have fought and died for the very values that we hold dear, so I thank my hon. colleague for that.

In his speech, the member talked about entrepreneurship, innovation, and innovation hubs, which we certainly applaud on this side. I am blessed to have in my riding Communitech, which is an incubator that is going worldwide. I certainly applaud the work the people there do. However, it is not good enough to encourage innovation in these incubators, get people excited about projects they have developed for use by Canadians, and then to have repressive policies placed on them that actually make it hard, or almost impossible for them to actually start the business in which they have invested so much energy.

Recently this summer, on July 18, we had this proposal to change the tax system for small and medium-sized enterprises, and to go after the so-called tax cheats. I have spoken to people in my riding who currently have small businesses, and have created their own enterprises. Even though they are already created, they are actually thinking of moving them south of the border, because of the repressive tax scheme we have here.

If a company that is already here in Canada finds it impossible to continue to operate under this scheme, how in the world would it be possible for a fledgling start-up company, that has not even gotten its own business started yet, to put roots in the ground and establish that business and create jobs here in Canada?

**Mr. Matt DeCoursey:** Mr. Speaker, I look forward to being at the cenotaph in downtown Fredericton on Saturday. My thoughts will be with the people in Oromocto at their ceremony, in New Maryland, at Barkers Point, and in the Grand Lake region. My thoughts will also be with those who are holding Remembrance Day ceremonies while I am here in Ottawa this week.

I mentioned that Fredericton was recently named Canada's entrepreneurship start-up capital. We are home to UNB, Canada's most entrepreneurial university, with incubators such as Planet Hatch and Energia, which the government supported in its launch. We have focus clusters on cybersecurity, on green energy, and on smart grid growth.

The Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, through the Atlantic growth strategy, is focused on supporting the start-up and life-cycle of entrepreneurs in our community, through supporting them in innovative new processes.

In addition, as I said in my speech, we are lowering the small business tax burden from 11% to 9%. The government will always be there for small businesses right across the country. Finally, after 10 years, small businesses in Atlantic Canada can also count on the government's support.

**Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I want to share with the member how much I appreciate his city. On 9-11, I was stranded in Fredericton when the towers came down.

Fredericton was very kind to all of us who were in an international meeting.

I would like to ask the hon. member a question about global co-operation, work of the federal government on climate change and clean energy. What is troubling to me is there are several things missing from the budget. One is a tiny inkling of a measure to begin bringing down the \$5 billion to \$6 billion perverse subsidies to the fossil fuel industry, which Canada has committed to bringing down expeditiously.

Second, regrettably, there is nothing in this budget, which is one of the big topics happening at COP22, which is happening as we speak, and that is a just transition while providing capacity building. When Canada signed on to the Paris agreement, it committed to contributing toward capacity building.

Could the member speak to why he thinks the government has not stepped forward to support the provinces in building capacity for those workers who would like to get into the renewable energy sector?

•(1710)

**Mr. Matt DeCoursey:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's comments about the generosity of people in Fredericton. It has certainly been my experience over the course of my life.

I have had the pleasure of travelling abroad and witnessing first-hand the impact our contributions have made to the global climate fund through other infrastructure development banks and in places like the South Pacific that are losing coastline.

Canada is a leading contributor in helping with coastal degradation and renewal projects. We are a leading contributor through those multilateral funds. We also have local initiative funds that are putting people on the ground in these developing countries to work to help tackle climate change matters.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the House today about the Liberal government's economic update.

Halfway through their term in office, the Liberals seem to be celebrating, but we think their economic update is cause for concern. What worries us the most is that this Liberal government seems to be hurting the very people it says it wants to help. Are the measures it announced mere smokescreens? That is a perfectly legitimate question and one we should be asking. That is what scandals like the paradise papers seem to suggest.

The government is making the middle class, job creators, farmers, and even our most vulnerable citizens, such as diabetics, pay for the deficit. Meanwhile, it is turning a blind eye to Liberal friends who avoid paying taxes in Canada.

Before telling everyone else how to do things, maybe the Liberal government should get its own house in order. A Fraser Institute report showed that 81% of middle-class families have been paying more tax during the Liberals' two years in office than they were paying under the former Conservative government at the end of its term in office. On average, each family is paying \$840 more per year.

*Government Orders*

The Liberals answer by telling us not to worry, because the economy is growing. We know that the economy is growing right now despite the Liberals, not because of them. The measures being taken by the Liberal government now will not really have an effect until a few years from now, and the positive growth we are seeing is a direct result of our Conservative measures taken by the previous Canadian government.

The Minister of Finance also confirmed that the Liberals will borrow \$20 billion this year to pay for their spending spree. This is on top of the \$25 billion they borrowed in the first year of this government's mandate. They answer by telling us again not to worry and that the budget will magically balance itself, but no one knows when. The truth is that by announcing a \$20 billion deficit again this year, the Liberals are breaking another election promise they had made, which was to not exceed a \$10 billion deficit in the first two years, and that is already a huge amount, all things considered. Now it is going to be double that for each year.

That is not all. The government broke a second promise because the Prime Minister promised to balance the budget by 2019. Now, we have learned that he has no plan to ever balance the budget. If I understand the Liberals' message correctly, that means that the Minister of Finance is racking up debt twice as quickly as planned and that the deficit will continue to steadily grow for several more years. There is no escaping it. Someone will have to pay the bill at one point or another. That someone will be our children and grandchildren and all middle-class Canadians.

By way of evidence, first, the Liberals eliminated the universal child care benefit. Then, they did away with the children's fitness tax credit and the children's arts tax credit. They also eliminated the post-secondary education and textbook tax credit, not to mention the fact that they did away with income splitting as soon as they took office. That is not all. Next, they cancelled plans to reduce the small business tax rate and employment insurance contributions, while increasing payroll taxes and creating a new carbon tax.

That is still not all. We must not forget that the Liberals eliminated income splitting; halved the TFSA contribution limit; scrapped the public transit tax credit, even though they claim to be a green government; introduced an Uber tax; and raised taxes on beer, wine, and spirits. Finally they tried to impose a tax on health and dental benefits and even on employee discounts for retail and restaurant workers, who need a bite to eat and are trying to save a few dollars on each meal at the end of their shift. Now that is really mean-spirited.

The Liberal government's strategy involves trying to smother the flames of its out-of-control spending by asking the middle class to come to the rescue.

• (1715)

The problem with this Liberal government is that it seems to be completely out of touch with Canadians. It seems to belong to a different class, the small percentage of wealthy people. This leads it to make decisions that make no sense to most Canadians who are living from paycheque to paycheque. When these Canadians found out that the Prime Minister and his family spent their vacation on a private island at the enormous cost of \$215,000 and that taxpayers would have to foot the bill, no one could understand it. How can the

Prime Minister believe that he acted responsibly? How could he have made that decision without seeing that it was problematic, contradictory, and hypocritical? How can he be concerned about the growing tax burden on Canadian families when the measures that have been put in place do not affect his family fortune?

Maybe the Liberal government needs to be reminded that the interest on the debt exceeds \$15 billion per year. I am not talking about the deficit; I am talking about the interest on the debt. Those billions are gone and will never be invested. Increasing the deficit by \$50 billion will not help us deal with the debt, which has grown that much in just two years. The \$15 billion annual interest on the debt could pay for three tunnels between Quebec City and Lévis, three Champlain bridges, or 187,500 kilometres of repaired roads, which is the equivalent of 12 trips across Canada and back from coast to coast. It could pay for 40 huge multi-purpose arenas, four major hydroelectric dams, 500,000 daycare spaces, 11,500 affordable housing units, 2,500 MRI machines in hospitals, 75 F-18 fighter jets, 1,625 water treatment plants on reserves, or 300 rail bypasses for places like Lac-Mégantic. As an aside, we are still waiting for the results of that study.

The Liberals will reply that they created the Canada child benefit, but that benefit, which gives families a maximum of \$560, is a smoke screen. Indeed, for every \$560 a family receives, it will have to write off its share of the deficit. It will simply be added back into the line of credit. This year alone, after each family receives its Canada child benefit, it will still have to pay another \$3,547.90 sooner or later to cover the cost of the deficit. What the Liberal government gives with one hand, it takes back with the other. All they are doing is leaving this debt to future generations.

These reminders and new perspectives might give the Liberals some idea of the repercussions of their out-of-control spending on Canadians. What we need, and what the Conservative government would deliver, is sound management of public finances, lower taxes, greater justice for victims, and a more affordable lifestyle for all Canadians. This must begin with a crackdown on tax avoidance and tax evasion, which does not appear to be one of this Liberal government's priorities, as we learned this week, based on how it is protecting the Liberal Party bagman. This close friend of the Prime Minister is suspected of hiding money in tax havens, as shown by investigations by several internationally recognized media venues.

Unfortunately, we are now dangerously on the wrong track with this other update and this other budget tabled in 2017.

*Government Orders*

• (1720)

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):**

Mr. Speaker, there are many parts of the member's speech that I take some exception to. I sat in opposition and saw a Harper government do absolutely nothing to deal with issues such as tax avoidance, or anything of that nature. I sat in opposition when the Harper government allowed the debt to grow to \$160 billion. We have seen so much progress within two years of this administration, far more than we saw in 10 years of the Harper government.

The member talks about tax fairness. What did the Conservative members opposite do when it came to increasing the taxes of Canada's wealthiest? They voted against it. What did they do when it came to the tax break for Canada's middle class? They voted against it. What did they do on the Canada child benefit enhancement? They voted against it. What did they do on the guaranteed income supplement? They voted against it.

Why is their voting record so bad when it comes to representing real Canadians?

[Translation]

**Mr. Alain Rayes:** Mr. Speaker, it really seems as though the hon. member on the other side of the House missed the point of my speech. I wonder if he even bothered to listen to what I said.

He is going after the former government, but his government is the one that is hypocritical with respect to our current fiscal situation. This government has a minister who was found guilty of a conflict of interest by the Ethics Commissioner. This government's Prime Minister went to a private island to spend taxpayer money. This government cancelled income splitting for families, which allowed them to save on taxes. This government is irresponsibly putting our families, children, and grandchildren in debt, without any plan to return to a balanced budget.

The government's budget is, quite simply, mind-boggling. The people watching right now know better. They understand what is going on. We cannot wait to change sides in the House.

**Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his speech.

[English]

I would like to ask him specifically about the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. In this budget implementation act, the government is taking a half a billion dollars and giving it to wealthy bankers to build infrastructure in Asia, not in Canada. We have heard examples of the government taking away money from diabetics. We have heard of it taking away money from people with autism. It has taken money away from people suffering from mental health conditions, and it is giving money away to the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank.

I want to talk about priorities and get the member to talk about the priorities of his constituents. When he was campaigning, did anyone say, "Please give away a half a billion dollars to an infrastructure bank in Asia instead of taking care of Canadians' interests first"?

[Translation]

**Mr. Alain Rayes:** Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague for his highly relevant question. I would have liked to talk about the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank and the Canada infrastructure bank, which the government is in the process of setting up, but I had only 10 minutes to speak.

It makes absolutely no sense that this government is taking money from Canadians and investing it in an Asian Infrastructure Bank that will develop infrastructure located not in Canada, but on the other side of the ocean. This infrastructure is not even in our own country.

Since the members on the other side of the aisle dispute our extremely severe, yet legitimate, criticism of their budget, I must also talk about the credits and money this government is taking away from our most vulnerable citizens, like diabetics. This government is clawing back money that these people are entitled to, money that helps them provide for their needs, and using it to fund its own reckless, out-of-control spending.

• (1725)

[English]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 69.1, the first question is on clause 48 in relation to agricultural and fisheries co-operatives.

As this is the first time the Chair will put the question on groups of clauses separately, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 69.1, I would like to explain that given the absence of any detailed instructions in the Standing Orders, I intend to follow a procedure similar to that outlined in Standing Order 76.1(8) for the putting of the question on amendments at report stage, that is, the calling in of members and the taking of any recorded division requested in relation to any group of clauses being deferred until all of the questions have been put.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this clause?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of this clause will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on this clause stands deferred.

The next question is on clauses 139 and 163 in relation to the GST/HST rebate applications by public service bodies.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt these clauses?

*Government Orders*

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

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

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on these clauses stands deferred.

The next question is on clauses 165 to 168 in relation to beer made from concentrate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is the pleasure of the House to adopt these clauses?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of these clauses will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Speaker:** The recorded division on these clauses stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on clause 261 in relation to discharge of debt.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this clause?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of this clause will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

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

*And five or more members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The recorded division on this clause stands deferred.

[*English*]

The next question is on the remaining elements of the bill.

Is the pleasure of the House to adopt all the remaining elements of the bill?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of all the remaining elements of the bill 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:** The recorded division on all the remaining elements of the bill stands deferred.

● (1730)

[*Translation*]

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division at second reading stage of the bill.

Call in the members.

● (1800)

[*English*]

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 69.1, the first question is on clause 48 in relation to agricultural and fisheries co-operatives.

● (1810)

(The House divided on clause 48, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 387*)

**YEAS**

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arya	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Barsalou-Duval	Baylis
Beaulieu	Beech
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brisson
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings	Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen	Choquette
Christopherson	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Di Iorio
Donnelly	Drouin

*Government Orders*

Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseau	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Gameau
Garrison	Gerretsen
Gill	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Hardcastle
Hardie	Harvey
Hehr	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Julian
Khalid	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinity
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Medicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Moore	
Morneau	Morrissey
Murray	Nassif
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	Ouellette
Paradis	Pauzé
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Stewart
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Tootoo
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Whalen
Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Young
Zahid— 205	

**NAYS**

## Members

Aboultatif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Arnold
Barlow	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Brassard
Brown	Calkins
Carrie	Chong
Clarke	Clement
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Doherty
Dreeshen	Egliniski
Falk	Fast
Gallant	Généreux
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Hoback
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kusie	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Leitch
Liepert	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	McCaulley (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
O'Toole	Poilevre
Rayes	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Shiple	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Strahl	Sweet
Trost	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vecchio
Viersen	Wagantall
Warawa	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Zimmer— 82

**PAIRED**

## Members

Monsef Thériault— 2

**The Speaker:** I declare clause 48 carried.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on clauses 139 and 163 in relation to GST/HST rebate applications by public service bodies.

● (1815)

[*English*]

(The House divided on the clauses 139 and 163, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 388*)

**YEAS**

## Members

Aboultatif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alghabra	Alleslev
Allison	Amos
Anandasangaree	Anderson
Angus	Arnold
Arya	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Beech	Bennett



Government Orders

- Benson
- Bergen
- Berthold
- Bibeau
- Blaikie
- Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
- Block
- Bossio
- Boudrias
- Brassard
- Breton
- Brosseau
- Caesar-Chavannes
- Cannings
- Carré
- Casey (Charlottetown)
- Chong
- Christopherson
- Clement
- Cullen
- Dabrusin
- Davies
- Deltell
- Dhillon
- Diotte
- Donnelly
- Drouin
- Dubourg
- Duguid
- Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
- Duvall
- Easter
- Ehsassi
- Ellis
- Eyking
- Fast
- Fillmore
- Fisher
- Fortier
- Fragiskatos
- Fraser (Central Nova)
- Fuhr
- Garneau
- Généreux
- Gill
- Godin
- Goodale
- Gourde
- Grewal
- Hardcastle
- Harvey
- Hoback
- Housefather
- Hutchings
- Jones
- Jowhari
- Kelly
- Khalid
- Kitchen
- Kusie
- Lake
- Lametti
- Lapointe
- Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
- LeBlanc
- Lefebvre
- Leslie
- Liepert
- Lobb
- Long
- Ludwig
- MacAulay (Cardigan)
- MacKenzie
- Maguire
- Maloney
- Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
- Mathysen
- May (Cambridge)
- McCaughey (Edmonton West)
- McCrimmon
- McGuinty
- McKenna
- McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
- Mendicino

- Benzen
- Bernier
- Bezan
- Bittle
- Blair
- Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
- Boissonnault
- Boucher
- Boutin-Sweet
- Bratina
- Brisson
- Brown
- Calkins
- Caron
- Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
- Chen
- Choquette
- Clarke
- Cooper
- Cuzner
- Damoff
- DeCoursey
- Dhaliwal
- Di Iorio
- Doherty
- Dreeshen
- Dubé
- Duclos
- Duncan (Etobicoke North)
- Dusseault
- Dzerowicz
- Eglinski
- El-Khoury
- Erskine-Smith
- Falk
- Fergus
- Finnigan
- Fonseca
- Fortin
- Fraser (West Nova)
- Fry
- Gallant
- Garrison
- Gerretsen
- Gladu
- Goldsmith-Jones
- Gould
- Graham
- Hajdu
- Hardie
- Hehr
- Holland
- Hussen
- Iacono
- Jordan
- Julian
- Kent
- Khera
- Kmiec
- Kwan
- Lambropoulos
- Lamoureux
- Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
- Laverdière
- Lebouthillier
- Leitch
- Levitt
- Lightbound
- Lockhart
- Longfield
- Lukowski
- MacGregor
- MacKinnon (Gatineau)
- Malcolmson
- Masse (Windsor West)
- May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
- McColeman
- McDonald
- McKay
- McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
- McLeod (Northwest Territories)
- Mihychuk

- Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
- Soeurs
- Moore
- Morrissey
- Murray
- Nater
- Ng
- O'Connell
- Oliver
- Ouellette
- Paupé
- Peterson
- Philpott
- Poilievre
- Quach
- Raves
- Rempel
- Rioux
- Rodriguez
- Rudd
- Rusnak
- Saini
- Sangha
- Sarai
- Scarpaleggia
- Schmale
- Serré
- Shanahan
- ShIPLEY
- Sidhu (Brampton South)
- Simms
- Sopuck
- Sorenson
- Stanton
- Stetski
- Strahl
- Tabbara
- Tassi
- Trost
- Van Kesteren
- Fry
- Gallant
- Vaughan
- Viersen
- Wagantall
- Warkentin
- Webber
- Wilkinson
- Wong
- Young
- Zimmer— 287

- Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Érables)
- Morneau
- Motz
- Nassif
- Nault
- Nicholson
- Oliphant
- O'Toole
- Paradis
- Peschisolido
- Petitpas Taylor
- Picard
- Poissant
- Qualtrough
- Reid
- Richards
- Robillard
- Rota
- Ruimy
- Sahota
- Samson
- Sansoucy
- Saroya
- Schieffe
- Schulte
- Sgro
- Sheehan
- Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
- Sikand
- Sohi
- Sorbara
- Spengemann
- Ste-Marie
- Stewart
- Sweet
- Tan
- Tootoo
- Trudel
- Van Loan
- Vandenbeld
- Vecchio
- Virani
- Warawa
- Waugh
- Whalen
- Wilson-Raybould
- Wrzesniewskij
- Zahid

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Monsef

Thériault— 2

The Speaker: I declare clauses 139 and 163 carried.

[Translation]

The next question is on clauses 165 to 168 in relation to beer made from concentrate.

● (1825)

(The House divided on clauses 165 to 168, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 389)

YEAS

Members

- Aboultaif
- Albrecht
- Alghabra
- Allison
- Anandasangaree

- Albas
- Aldag
- Alleslev
- Amos
- Anderson



*(Division No. 390)*

## YEAS

## Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arya	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brisson	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Cannings
Caron	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chen
Choquette	Christopherson
Cullen	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeCoursey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Di Iorio	Donnelly
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Gameau
Garrison	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hehr
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Julian	Khalid
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathysen	
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Medicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Soeurs	
Moore	Morneau
Morrissey	Murray
Nassif	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petipas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant

*Government Orders*

Quach	Qualtrough
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Stetski
Stewart	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Tootoo	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Whalen	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Young	Zahid— 198

## NAYS

## Members

Abouttaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Arnold
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Boudrias
Brassard	Brown
Calkins	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeschen
Eglinski	Falk
Fast	Fortin
Gallant	Généreux
Gill	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Hoback	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kusie
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch	Liepert
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacKenzie	Maguire
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz	Nater
Nicholson	O'Toole
Pauzé	Poilievre
Rayes	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Shiple	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Ste-Marie	Strahl
Sweet	Trost
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vecchio	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong
Zimmer— 89	

## PAIRED

## Members

Monsef	Thériault— 2
--------	--------------

**The Speaker:** I declare clause 261 carried.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

The next question is on the remaining elements of the bill.

• (1840)

(The House divided on the remaining elements, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 391)

## YEAS

## Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Di Iorio
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Gameau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Hardie
Harvey	Hehr
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Khalid	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
May (Saarich—Gulf Islands)	McGuinty
McDonald	McKenna
McKay	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Mihychuk
Mendicino	
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Morneau	
Morrissey	Murray
Nassif	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Qualtrough	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Rusnak

Sahota  
Samson  
Sarai  
Schieffe  
Serré  
Shanahan  
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)  
Sikand  
Sohi  
Spengemann  
Tan  
Tootoo  
Vandenbeld  
Virani  
Wilkinson  
Wrzesnewskyj  
Zahid — 165

Saini  
Sangha  
Scarpaleggia  
Schulte  
Sgro  
Sheehan  
Sidhu (Brampton South)  
Simms  
Sorbara  
Tabbara  
Tassi  
Vandal  
Vaughan  
Whalen  
Wilson-Raybould  
Young

## NAYS

## Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Angus
Arnold	Aubin
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Benson
Benzen	Bergen
Bernier	Berthold
Bezan	Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Boudrias	Boutin-Sweet
Brassard	Brousseau
Brown	Calkins
Cannings	Caron
Carrie	Chong
Choquette	Christopherson
Clarke	Clement
Cooper	Cullen
Davies	Deltell
Diotte	Doherty
Donnelly	Dreeshen
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseault	Duvall
Eglinski	Falk
Fast	Fortin
Gallant	Garrison
Généreux	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Hardcastle
Hoback	Julian
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Laverdière	Leitch
Liepert	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacGregor
MacKenzie	Maguire
Malcolmson	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathysen	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Moore
Motz	Nater
Nicholson	O'Toole
Paupé	Poilievre
Quach	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Sansoucy
Saroya	Schmale
Shiple	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Ste-Marie	Stetski
Stewart	Strahl
Sweet	Trost
Trudel	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vecchio
Viersen	Wagantall
Warawa	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Zimmer — 122

## PAIRED

## Members

Monsef

Thériault— 2

**The Speaker:** I declare the remaining elements of the bill carried.  
[English]

The House having agreed to the entirety of Bill C-63, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2017 and other measures at this second reading stage, the bill will now be read a second time.

Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Finance.

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

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

## PORTUGUESE HERITAGE MONTH

The House resumed from November 1 consideration of Motion No. 126.

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 126 under private members' business.

• (1850)

[English]

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

(Division No. 392)

## YEAS

## Members

Aboultarif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alghabra	Alleslev
Allison	Amos
Anandasangaree	Anderson
Angus	Arnold
Arya	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Beech	Bennett
Benson	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boucher
Boudrias	Boutin-Sweet
Brassard	Bratina
Breton	Brisson
Brosseau	Brown
Caesar-Chavannes	Calkins
Cannings	Caron
Carrie	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chen
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Clarke
Clement	Cooper
Cullen	Cuzner

Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeCoursey
Deltell	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Di Iorio
Diotte	Doherty
Donnelly	Dreesen
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Easter	Eglinski
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Falk
Fast	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Gallant
Gameau	Garrison
Généreux	Gerretsen
Gill	Gladu
Godin	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Gourde	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hehr
Hoback	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Julian
Kelly	Kent
Khalid	Khera
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Leitch
Leslie	Levitt
Liepert	Lightbound
Lobb	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	Lukiwski
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKenzie	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maguire	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathysen	
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Érables)
Soeurs	
Moore	Mormeau
Morrissey	Motz
Murray	Nassif
Nater	Nault
Ng	Nicholson
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Toole
Ouellette	Paradis
Pauzé	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poilievre	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Rayes	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy

*Private Members' Business*

Rusnak  
Saini  
Sangha  
Sarai  
Scarpaleggia  
Schmale  
Serré  
Shanahan  
Shipley  
Sidhu (Brampton South)  
Simms  
Sopuck  
Sorenson  
Stanton  
Stetski  
Strahl  
Tabbara  
Tassi  
Trost  
Van Kesteren  
Vandal  
Vaughan  
Viersen  
Wagantall  
Warkentin  
Webber  
Wilkinson  
Wong  
Young  
Zimmer— 287

Sahota  
Samson  
Sansoucy  
Saroya  
Schieffe  
Schulte  
Sgro  
Sheehan  
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)  
Sikand  
Sohi  
Sorbara  
Spengemann  
Ste-Marie  
Stewart  
Sweet  
Tan  
Tootoo  
Trudel  
Van Loan  
Vandenbeld  
Vecchio  
Virani  
Warawa  
Waugh  
Whalen  
Wilson-Raybould  
Wrzesnewskyj  
Zahid

Bibeau  
Blaikie  
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)  
Block  
Bossio  
Boudrias  
Brassard  
Breton  
Brosseau  
Caesar-Chavannes  
Cannings  
Carrie  
Casey (Charlottetown)  
Chong  
Christopherson  
Clement  
Cullen  
Dabrusin  
Davies  
Deltell  
Dhillon  
Diotte  
Donnelly  
Drouin  
Dubourg  
Duguid  
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)  
Duvall  
Easter  
Ehsassi  
Ellis  
Eyking  
Fast  
Fillmore  
Fisher  
Fortier  
Fragiskatos  
Fraser (Central Nova)  
Fuhr  
Garneau  
Généreux  
Gill  
Godin  
Goodale  
Gourde  
Grewal  
Hardcastle  
Harvey  
Hoback  
Housefather  
Hutchings  
Jones  
Jowhari  
Kelly  
Khalid  
Kitchen  
Kusie  
Lake  
Lametti  
Lapointe  
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)  
Lebouthillier  
Leitch  
Levitt  
Lightbound  
Lockhart  
Longfield  
Lukiwski  
MacGregor  
MacKinnon (Gatineau)  
Malcolmson  
Masse (Windsor West)  
Mathysen  
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)  
McColeman  
McDonald  
McKay  
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)  
McLeod (Northwest Territories)  
Mihychuk  
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)  
Moore  
Morneau  
Motz

Bittle  
Blair  
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)  
Boissonnault  
Boucher  
Boutin-Sweet  
Bratina  
Brison  
Brown  
Calkins  
Caron  
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)  
Chen  
Choquette  
Clarke  
Cooper  
Cuzner  
Damoff  
DeCoursey  
Dhaliwal  
Di Iorio  
Doherty  
Dreeschen  
Dubé  
Duclos  
Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
Dusseau  
Dzerowicz  
Eglinski  
El-Khoury  
Erskine-Smith  
Falk  
Fergus  
Finnigan  
Fonseca  
Fortin  
Fraser (West Nova)  
Fry  
Gallant  
Garrison  
Gerretsen  
Gladu  
Goldsmith-Jones  
Gould  
Graham  
Hajdu  
Hardie  
Hehr  
Holland  
Hussen  
Iacono  
Jordan  
Julian  
Kent  
Khera  
Kmiec  
Kwan  
Lambropoulos  
Lamoureux  
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)  
Laverdière  
Lefebvre  
Leslie  
Liepert  
Lobb  
Long  
Ludwig  
MacAulay (Cardigan)  
MacKenzie  
Maguire  
Maloney  
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)  
May (Cambridge)  
McAuley (Edmonton West)  
McCrimmon  
McGuinty  
McKenna  
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)  
Mendicino  
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)  
Morrissey  
Murray

Nil

## NAYS

## PAIRED

Members

Monsef

Thériault— 2

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

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**FEDERALLY FUNDED HEALTH RESEARCH**

The House resumed from November 2 consideration of the motion.

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 132 under private members' business in the name of the hon. member for Kitchener Centre.

• (1855)

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

(*Division No. 393*)

## YEAS

Members

Aboultatif  
Albrecht  
Alghabra  
Allison  
Anandasangaree  
Angus  
Arya  
Ayoub  
Bagnell  
Barlow  
Baylis  
Beech  
Benson  
Bergen  
Berthold

Albas  
Aldag  
Alleslev  
Amos  
Anderson  
Arnold  
Aubin  
Badawey  
Bains  
Barsalou-Duval  
Beaulieu  
Bennett  
Benzen  
Bernier  
Bezan

*Private Members' Business**(Division No. 394)*

Nassif  
Nault  
Nicholson  
Oliphant  
O'Toole  
Paradis  
Peschisolido  
Petitpas Taylor  
Picard  
Poissant  
Qualtrough  
Reid  
Richards  
Robillard  
Rota  
Ruimy  
Sahota  
Samson  
Sansoucy  
Saroya  
Schiefke  
Schulte  
Sgro  
Sheehan  
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)  
Sikand  
Sohi  
Sorbara  
Spengemann  
Ste-Marie  
Stewart  
Sweet  
Tan  
Tootoo  
Trudel  
Van Loan  
Vandenbeld  
Vecchio  
Virani  
Warawa  
Waugh  
Whalen  
Wilson-Raybould  
Wrzesnewskyj  
Zahid

Nater  
Ng  
O'Connell  
Oliver  
Ouellette  
Pauzé  
Peterson  
Philpott  
Poilievre  
Quach  
Rayes  
Rempel  
Rioux  
Rodriguez  
Rudd  
Rusnak  
Saini  
Sangha  
Sarai  
Scarpaleggia  
Schmale  
Serré  
Shanahan  
Shipley  
Sidhu (Brampton South)  
Simms  
Sopuck  
Sorenson  
Stanton  
Stetski  
Strahl  
Tabbara  
Tassi  
Trost  
Van Kesteren  
Vandal  
Vaughan  
Viersen  
Wagantall  
Warkentin  
Webber  
Wilkinson  
Wong  
Young  
Zimmer — 286

## NAYS

Nil

## PAIRED

Members

Monsef Thériault — 2

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

\* \* \*

● (1900)

[English]

## CANADIAN BILL OF RIGHTS

The House resumed from November 3 consideration of the motion that Bill C-325, An Act to amend the Canadian Bill of Rights (right to housing), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-325.

● (1905)

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

Angus  
Barsalou-Duval  
Benson  
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)  
Boutin-Sweet  
Cannings  
Choquette  
Cullen  
Donnelly  
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)  
Duvall  
Garrison  
Hardcastle  
Kwan  
MacGregor  
Masse (Windsor West)  
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)  
Pauzé  
Sansoucy  
Stetski  
Tootoo

## YEAS

Members

Aubin  
Beaulieu  
Blaikie  
Boudrias  
Brosseau  
Caron  
Christopherson  
Davies  
Dubé  
Dusseau  
Fortin  
Gill  
Julian  
Laverdière  
Malcolmson  
Mathysen  
Moore  
Quach  
Ste-Marie  
Stewart  
Trudel — 42

## NAYS

Members

Aboultaif  
Albrecht  
Alghabra  
Allison  
Anandasangaree  
Arnold  
Ayoub  
Bagnell  
Barlow  
Beech  
Benzen  
Bernier  
Bezan  
Bittle  
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)  
Boissonnault  
Boucher  
Bratina  
Brisson  
Caesar-Chavannes  
Carrie  
Casey (Charlottetown)  
Chong  
Clement  
Cuzner  
Damoff  
Deltell  
Dhillon  
Diotte  
Dreeshen  
Dubourg  
Duguid  
Dzerowicz  
Egliniski  
El-Khoury  
Erskine-Smith  
Falk  
Fergus  
Finnigan  
Fonseca  
Fragiskatos  
Fraser (Central Nova)  
Fuhr  
Gameau  
Gerretsen  
Godin  
Goodale  
Gourde  
Grewal  
Hardie  
Hehr  
Holland

Albas  
Aldag  
Alleslev  
Amos  
Anderson  
Arya  
Badawey  
Bains  
Baylis  
Bennett  
Bergen  
Berthold  
Bibeau  
Blair  
Block  
Bossio  
Brassard  
Breton  
Brown  
Calkins  
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)  
Chen  
Clarke  
Cooper  
Dabrusin  
DeCoursey  
Dhaliwal  
Di Iorio  
Doherty  
Drouin  
Duclos  
Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
Easter  
Ehsassi  
Ellis  
Eyking  
Fast  
Fillmore  
Fisher  
Fortier  
Fraser (West Nova)  
Fry  
Gallant  
Généreux  
Gladu  
Goldsmith-Jones  
Gould  
Graham  
Hajdu  
Harvey  
Hoback  
Housefather

*Private Members' Business*

Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Kelly	Kent
Khalid	Khera
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kusie	Lake
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leitch	Leslie
Levitt	Liepert
Lighbound	Lobb
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Lukiwski
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKenzie
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Maloney	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Medicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	
Morneau	
Morrissey	Motz
Murray	Nassif
Nater	Nault
Ng	Nicholson
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Toole
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisoldo	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poilievre
Poissant	Qualtrough
Rayes	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Saroya	Scarpaleggia
Schieffke	Schmale
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shiple
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sopuck
Sorbara	Sorenson
Spengemann	Stanton
Strahl	Sweet
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Trost
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Vecchio
Viersen	Virani
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Whalen
Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Wong	Wrzesnewskyj
Young	Zahid
Zimmer— 243	

**PAIRED**

Members

Monsef

Thériault— 2

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

[Translation]

**FIREARMS ACT**

The House resumed from November 7 consideration of the motion that Bill C-346, An Act to amend the Firearms Act (licences), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-346 under private members' business.

● (1915)

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

*(Division No. 395)***YEAS**

Members

Aboultarif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Arnold
Barlow	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Brassard
Brown	Calkins
Carrie	Chong
Clarke	Clement
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Doherty
Dreeshen	Eglinski
Falk	Fast
Gallant	Généreux
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Hoback
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kusie	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Leitch
Liepert	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Motz
Nater	Nault
Nicholson	O'Toole
Poilievre	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Shiple
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Strahl
Sweet	Trost
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vecchio	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong
Zimmer— 83	

**NAYS**

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arya	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Beech	Bennett
Benson	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio



Boudrias  
 Bratina  
 Brison  
 Caesar-Chavannes  
 Caron  
 Casey (Charlottetown)  
 Choquette  
 Cullen  
 Dabrusin  
 Davies  
 Dhaliwal  
 Di Iorio  
 Drouin  
 Dubourg  
 Duguid  
 Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)  
 Duvall  
 Easter  
 El-Khoury  
 Erskine-Smith  
 Fergus  
 Finnigan  
 Fonseca  
 Fortin  
 Fraser (West Nova)  
 Fry  
 Garneau  
 Gerretsen  
 Goldsmith-Jones  
 Gould  
 Grewal  
 Hardcastle  
 Hehr  
 Housefather  
 Iacono  
 Jordan  
 Julian  
 Khera  
 Lambropoulos  
 Lamoureux  
 Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)  
 Lebovillier  
 Leslie  
 Lighthound  
 Long  
 MacAulay (Cardigan)  
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)  
 Maloney  
 Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)  
 Mathysen  
 May (Cambridge)  
 McCrimmon  
 McGuinity  
 McKenna  
 McLeod (Northwest Territories)  
 Mihychuk  
 Soeurs)  
 Moore  
 Morrissey  
 Nassif  
 O'Connell  
 Oliver  
 Paradis  
 Peschisolido  
 Petipas Taylor  
 Picard  
 Quach  
 Rioux  
 Rodriguez  
 Rudd  
 Rusnak  
 Saini  
 Sangha  
 Sarai  
 Schiefke  
 Serré  
 Shanahan  
 Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)  
 Sikand  
 Sohi  
 Spengemann  
 Stetski  
 Tabbara  
 Tassi

Boutin-Sweet  
 Breton  
 Brosseau  
 Cannings  
 Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)  
 Chen  
 Christopherson  
 Cuzner  
 Damoff  
 DeCoursey  
 Dhillon  
 Donnelly  
 Dubé  
 Duclos  
 Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
 Dusseault  
 Dzerowicz  
 Ehsassi  
 Ellis  
 Eyking  
 Fillmore  
 Fisher  
 Fortier  
 Fragiskatos  
 Fraser (Central Nova)  
 Fuhr  
 Garrison  
 Gill  
 Goodale  
 Graham  
 Hajdu  
 Hardie  
 Holland  
 Hussen  
 Jones  
 Jowhari  
 Khalid  
 Kwan  
 Lametti  
 Lapointe  
 Laverdière  
 Lefebvre  
 Levitt  
 Lockhart  
 Longfield  
 MacGregor  
 Malcolmson  
 Masse (Windsor West)  
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)  
 McDonald  
 McKay  
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)  
 Mendicino  
 Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-  
 Morneau  
 Murray  
 Ng  
 Oliphant  
 Ouellette  
 Pausé  
 Peterson  
 Philpott  
 Poissant  
 Qualtrough  
 Robillard  
 Rota  
 Ruimy  
 Sahota  
 Samson  
 Sansoucy  
 Scarpaleggia  
 Schulte  
 Sgro  
 Sheehan  
 Sidhu (Brampton South)  
 Simms  
 Sorbara  
 Ste-Marie  
 Stewart  
 Tan  
 Tootoo

Trudel  
 Vandenberg  
 Virani  
 Wilkinson  
 Wrzesnewskyj  
 Zahid — 199  
 Vandal  
 Vaughan  
 Whalen  
 Wilson-Raybould  
 Young

## PAIRED

Members

Monsef

Thériault — 2

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

[*English*]

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, as will the debate on the motion to concur in the 13th report of the Standing Committee on Finance.

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

### INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

**Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, last June, I asked a question about a request for supply arrangement, also known as an RFSA, that was issued by the Parks Canada Agency on May 5, 2017.

The RFSA is for interpretive exhibit writing. The description states:

The Parks Canada Agency (PCA) requires the services of Contractors capable of providing National Parks, National Historic Sites and National Marine Conservation Areas throughout Canada complete interpretive product planning and interpretive writing services (including development of thematic framework) for all types of non-personal media including a range of visitor experience products, such as panels, brochures, touchscreens, sculptures, artifact displays, multi-media and exterior signs. The interpretive writing must be in keeping with Parks Canada's emphasis on facilitating memorable visitor experiences.

This next section is key to this evening's discussion:

The writer will work closely with the site and park staff, the product developer and designer, historians, scientists, and other Parks Canada staff.

That sounds like excellent work. I love to see panels and displays in our cherished national parks that inform and educate, and even entertain our visitors. However, there is a problem. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission's report called on the federal government to do things differently. Call to action No. 79 states:

We call upon the federal government, in collaboration with Survivors, Aboriginal organizations, and the arts community, to develop a reconciliation framework for Canadian heritage and commemoration. This would include, but not be limited to:

- i. Amending the Historic Sites and Monuments Act to include First Nations, Inuit, and Métis representation on the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada and its Secretariat.
- ii. Revising the policies, criteria, and practices of the National Program of Historical Commemoration to integrate Indigenous history, heritage values, and memory practices into Canada's national heritage and history.
- iii. Developing and implementing a national heritage plan and strategy for commemorating residential school sites, the history and legacy of residential schools, and the contributions of Aboriginal peoples to Canada's history.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

I would like to mention that my friend across the floor, the member for Cloverdale—Langley City, has moved private member's Bill C-374 to address part one, and include first nations, Inuit, and Métis on the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada. My party and I support his bill.

The government, including the Parks Canada Agency, has committed to respecting the rest of call to action No. 79. Yet, this RFSA makes no mention of indigenous expertise. It has no requirement to consult with first nations, Métis, or Inuit communities. It talks clearly about the need to work with Parks Canada staff, designers, historians, and scientists, but leaves our indigenous communities out in the cold.

I ask again, as I did last May, will the government honour the history and sites of our indigenous people, recognize their expertise, and work with them by changing this RFSA to properly recognize and include indigenous heritage?

• (1920)

**Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question, and for the passion he shows on issues relating to parks and indigenous reconciliation.

Parks Canada is committed to implementing the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's call to action 79, and is doing so in a manner that ensures indigenous voices and perspectives are very much present in our national historical narrative. The agency works with more than 300 indigenous communities across the country in conserving, restoring, and presenting Canada's natural and cultural heritage. This includes implementing advisory bodies and co-operative management boards that ensure indigenous perspectives are reflected not only in cultural and historical programming, but also in conservation science and the day-to-day operational decisions of our heritage places.

Beyond call to action 79, Parks Canada is committed to developing a system of national heritage places that recognizes both the invaluable contributions of indigenous peoples and the traditional use of these special places. In addition, Parks Canada is working with indigenous partners to develop interpretive materials and activities at national parks, national historic sites, and national marine conservation areas, that are respectful of indigenous traditions, cultures, and contributions to Canada's heritage.

During 2017, existing indigenous visitor experiences were enhanced and new experiences were offered in collaboration with indigenous communities and businesses as part of an initiative that received \$4.7 million in funding through budget 2016.

The RFP in question seeks interpretive writing services that might cover any aspect of Parks Canada's broad mandate to present Canada's natural and cultural heritage. The member should be assured, we very much hope that indigenous businesses will bid on this work and will be focused on bringing their perspectives and expertise to this initiative. It is always Parks Canada's expectation that indigenous perspectives be considered and included wherever relevant in all aspects of its interpretive programming and works to provide opportunities to indigenous businesses that have positive socio-economic benefits for local communities while offering

unique, meaningful, and memorable learning experiences to Canadians and international visitors.

• (1925)

**Mr. Wayne Stetski:** Mr. Speaker, this RFSA is scheduled to be on Parks Canada's website until 2020. It is a pretty simple fix. I will read the line again: "The writer will work closely with the site/park staff, the product developer/designer, historians, scientists and other Parks Canada staff."

I would ask again that they add "indigenous people" to this and make sure indigenous people are properly respected in their work.

**Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson:** Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my remarks, we are very concerned to ensure indigenous peoples and their perspectives, histories, and culture are reflected in the context of the discussions around Canada's parks.

We will continue to do that in every effort going forward, and we will reflect on that as we consider all of the RFPs that we are going to be issuing going forward.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to rise in adjournment proceedings tonight to address my friend, the parliamentary secretary on national defence, about a question I originally raised on June 8. Here we are a few months later talking about the defence policy review process and the report released to the public by the Minister of National Defence. The concern we raised at that time, and still have, is that although the defence policy has some good things in it, it is under-resourced, and there is a bit of a shell game going on with respect to where the money is going to come from.

The Liberals have cut \$12 billion from the defence budget in budget 2016 and budget 2017. There was just under \$4 billion cut in budget 2016 and just over \$8 billion cut in budget 2017. That has a huge impact on our ability to have a capable force that is ready to deploy to defend Canada's sovereignty, to work with our allies, and to stand up for those who cannot stand for themselves around the world.

As we know, the Liberals have broken a number of promises as they relate to our Canadian Armed Forces, including on peacekeeping. They still have not made any decisions on deploying 600 peacekeeping troops, spending \$450 million, and deploying 150 police officers. In fact, under the Liberal government, peacekeeping has dropped to an all-time low of only 88 peacekeepers from Canada participating in United Nations' missions around the world this month. That is something the Liberals should be quite ashamed of, especially with the Minister of National Defence hosting a UN peacekeeping conference in Vancouver on November 14 and 15.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

There are some major gaps in the defence policy review the Liberals came out with. First of all, it was done in isolation and was not informed by foreign policy. If we look at the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia, when they have done their defence policies, they have done them in collaboration with foreign policy reviews at the same time. What we have are some major shortfalls in the defence policy because of that.

We do not have any plans to replace our submarines. We need to have the ability to protect Canada from approaching threats in our waters, to protect our seaways, and to protect the Arctic, in particular. Submarines are stealthy. Our adversaries have them. Actually, there has been a huge proliferation of submarines.

We still have not been able to get to a point where we are ordering any fighter jets. We are two years into the mandate, and the defence policy is calling for 88 fighter jets, but the Liberals still have not been able to deliver a single fighter jet to replace our aging CF-18s, and the options they are presenting are quite embarrassing.

The Liberals are not matching the NATO aspirational target of spending 2% of GDP on our military. They are getting to 1.4%, and they are doing it through some very creative accounting by stealing some money from Foreign Affairs, stealing some money from the Coast Guard, and stealing money from Veterans Affairs through pensions to build up the budget beyond what it actually is spending on National Defence.

It is time for the Liberals to get serious about actually resourcing our troops properly.

• (1930)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean Rioux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for this question. I know he is deeply dedicated to the men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces, and I am grateful to him for it.

On June 7, the Minister of National Defence announced the new defence policy, “Strong, Secure, Engaged”.

This policy is a comprehensive, carefully considered plan for the next 20 years, and it is built around military members and their families.

This new policy is based on a solid commitment to increase funding to the Canadian Armed Forces by more than 70% over the next 10 years.

The new defence policy provides an additional \$62.3 billion on a cash basis over 20 years. The money that was not spent in the first few years allowed us to build this fund, including \$6.5 billion over the next six years.

This amount includes additional operational funding for maintaining existing equipment, as well as for new initiatives, plus additional funds for equipment and infrastructure. By 2026-27, the annual defence budget will be almost \$33 billion. As the new deputy minister of defence said in committee on October 30:

...the launch of Canada's new defence policy has been monumental...a once in a generation opportunity.

The new defence policy is a clear acknowledgement of the importance of the Canadian Armed Forces. The funding plan we have committed to is supported by external costing experts and has been verified by external accounting firms.

This stable funding will also allow us to make major defence investments that meet our current needs while also enabling us to plan for the future.

Since taking office, our government has made great strides. The program to refit and modernize the Halifax-class frigate is almost complete, and the program to deliver tactical armoured patrol vehicles is going well. In addition, now the entire fleet of light armoured vehicles is going to be upgraded. We have also signed a contract for the new fixed-wing search and rescue aircraft. We are about to post the invitations to tender for the permanent replacement for our fighter fleet, and the construction of the Arctic offshore patrol ships is moving forward nicely.

Furthermore, in the new policy, we committed to building 15 Canadian surface combatants and two joint support ships to ensure that the Royal Canadian Navy has the capabilities required to fulfill the missions it is assigned.

Canadians can see from our actions that we are committed to ensuring that the Canadian Armed Forces and their personnel are well equipped and properly supported. Canadians can see that in our new policy.

Canada must get involved in the world. We have an important role to play, but to get involved in the world we must first ensure that our country is safe.

The new defence policy and its sound funding plan will ensure that thanks to the Canadian Armed Forces, Canada will be strong and safe and fully engaged in the world. That is what Canadians expect and that is what we are committed to.

[*English*]

**Mr. James Bezan:** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives believe that our men and women in uniform deserve the best equipment, training, and support available. That requires substantial investments to be made today, not 20 years from now. Unfortunately, we have learned that the majority of the funding in the defence policy will not be available until after the next election, when we are government, and the government will not tell us where it will come from. The Liberals are running huge deficits. They will have to go into deficit to do any of the spending they have said they will do. It is still underfunded compared to what the military needs. In fact, one of the witnesses at the Standing Committee on National Defence today said that we would have to come up to the 2% if it was to carry the weight that was expected of it, not only to defend our country and sovereignty but to participate in NATO as well.

The parliamentary secretary talked about procurement on navy ships. It is a mess, especially on the Surface Combatants. The Arctic offshore patrol vessels, the Harry DeWolf class, which started under the Conservatives, are the only ships being delivered on time.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

The Conservative Party knows the joint support ships, along with the Surface Combatants, are being delayed because of interference from the government. That is why we say we need another interim auxiliary oil replenishment ship built by Davie to fill the gaps that have been created by the Liberals.

• (1935)

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean Rioux:** Mr. Speaker, Canada's new defence policy is realistic and its funding was carefully planned within the fiscal framework so as to be secure.

Unlike the Conservatives, who left us just enough to fund six surface combatants, we are funding 15 ships and we will ensure that the Canadian Armed Forces are well equipped.

We also have software that allows anyone within the department to understand the proposed initiatives within the policy and to track the progress made. Every defence team leader has this tracking software on their desktop and everyone can get involved in the implementation of various initiatives.

This system is updated regularly and we hope that this tool will become an important motivator for employees. Within the Department of National Defence, the message is clear. The minister, leadership, and the entire National Defence headquarters share a common goal and have just one wish, and that is to move forward and stay the course.

[English]

## TAXATION

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman. What an incredible member of Parliament he is, if only he could be the minister of defence here in Canada. Hopefully, that will happen one day soon. What an incredible job he does.

The question today is about the fairness or unfairness of the taxation of Canadians under the Liberal government.

Approximately a year ago, the Prime Minister announced that he was putting in place a mandatory tax on carbon in Canada and that all the provinces and territories would have to put a price on carbon. There are diverse opinions on whether that should be happening. I live in British Columbia, where we have had a carbon tax for a number of years. Therefore, the debate is not about carbon taxation, it is not about whether our climate is changing, but about tax fairness. The Prime Minister, in justifying placing a price on carbon, clearly promised on October 3, 2016, the following:

Provinces and territories will be able to have a choice in how they implement this pricing. They can put a direct price on carbon pollution, or they can adopt a cap-and-trade system....

He went on to say:

Whatever approach is chosen, this policy would be revenue-neutral for the federal government.

Shortly afterward, through a request to the Library of Parliament, we found out that this was not true. In fact, the government, in its budget projections, was estimating an increase in GST revenue coming to the federal government from charging GST on the carbon tax. Canadians are always willing to pay their fair share of the goods

and services tax. However, the government is now projecting that it will have millions of new dollars in revenue from Canadian provinces and territories by charging GST on the price of carbon. That is not fair.

I asked for input on this from a number of constituents, who said it should be stopped because it was not fair. In fact, it is not common sense. It shows a government with out of control spending that as a result needs to get more tax revenues from wherever it can. We are seeing that continue with the government charging increased taxes and taking away tax benefits for children with autism and people with diabetes, and the list goes on. This is a government that is out of control and needs to get tax revenue. The answer to the Liberal government's dilemma with budgets that are not balanced is to reduce its out of control spending.

Again my question for the government is this. Why does it believe it is fair to charge a tax on a tax when Canadians do not believe in that?

• (1940)

**Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for the opportunity to talk about carbon pricing and what we believe in, which is protecting the environment. That is an integral part to building a strong and prosperous Canada.

Canadians know that polluting comes at a cost. We see the costs of draughts, floods, and other extreme weather, but also the effects on our health. Canadians expect polluters to pay because it is the right thing to do for our kids, grandkids, and future generations.

Pricing carbon pollution is an essential component of the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change announced by Canada's first ministers in December 2016. Under the pan-Canadian framework, provinces and territories have the flexibility to choose between two systems: an explicit price-based system, either a carbon tax or a carbon levy and output-based pricing system, or a cap and trade system.

British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, and Quebec, representing over 80% of the population, have already implemented carbon pricing. The Government of Canada will introduce a backstop pricing system that will apply in jurisdictions that do not meet a federal carbon pricing benchmark.

As committed under the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change, the federal government will return direct revenues from the carbon price under the federal backstop to the province or territory of origin. For instance, this revenue can be used to cut taxes, to invest in clean innovation and infrastructure, or given straight back to Canadian families.

Details of the proposed federal option were outlined in a technical paper, which was released for public consultation on May 18. The government is assessing the many comments received on the proposed backstop option. As our Minister of Environment and Climate Change has stated clearly before, pollution is not free. A successful climate change strategy is one that puts a price on pollution so Canadians can make choices about their consumption habits to ensure they do not come at the expense of our environment.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

I encourage all members to learn everything they can about the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change. To us, making polluters pay is an important part of any serious climate plan, which the previous government unfortunately never delivered for Canadians. In fact, many Conservatives still have a hard time realizing the science regarding climate change.

Making polluters pay is important. It gives the incentive to companies to innovate and create cleaner solutions and, most important, to reduce pollution.

We are proud to be working together with provinces, territories, indigenous people, businesses, communities, and all Canadians to build a more sustainable, cleaner, more prosperous economy, and create good-paying middle class jobs now and for the future.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Mr. Speaker, I wish I could thank the member for his answer, but there was no answer. That is the problem in the House. The government said that it would be revenue neutral, no GST on the carbon tax, and yet it is charging carbon tax.

The government promised transparency, and we do not have that. It promised it would take care of seniors, and we do not have that. It promised Canadians would be further ahead with their government, and we do not have that. Taxes have increased. Most Canadians are now paying approximately \$800 a year more under the Liberal government. It does not answer questions, and the frustration level in the House and with Canadians is reaching a peak that is unhealthy.

When will the government start answering questions, even the basic questions that were asked here tonight? I ask the member to please answer the questions.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Joël Lightbound:** Mr. Speaker, I think the opposition is sometimes responsible for the level of cynicism. It would benefit from being more productive and constructive in its work.

They claim that the government has done nothing for seniors, but it is quite the opposite. One of the first things we did was increase the guaranteed income supplement by 10%, and we lowered the age of retirement from 67 to 65. As a result, we kept hundred of thousands of Canadian seniors from ending up in precarious situations. This means that we are not increasing social-assistance costs for the provinces. It is no surprise that there is more cynicism when members are claiming that the government does nothing for seniors. All parties would benefit from working harder.

With regard to the answer my colleague opposite expects, I very clearly said that we believe that putting a price on carbon pollution is a good thing. We want to work with the provinces on this and let them decide what they will do with the revenue. We think it is important that companies that pollute know that there is a cost to pollution, and that is the carbon tax. We believe that such a plan will encourage companies to innovate to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. That is our goal, a goal that the previous government also should have had.

• (1945)

**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 7:45 p.m.)

---



# CONTENTS

Wednesday, November 8, 2017

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Davie Shipyard</b>		Mr. Rayes .....	15151
Mr. Boudrias .....	15147	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15151
<b>Remembrance Day</b>		Mr. Caron .....	15151
Mr. Fraser (West Nova) .....	15147	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15152
<b>Frank Coulter</b>		Mr. Boulerice .....	15152
Mr. Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) .....	15147	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15152
<b>Canada—Mauritius Parliamentary Friendship Group</b>		Mr. Boulerice .....	15152
Mr. Sikand .....	15148	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15152
<b>Construction Industry</b>		Mr. Caron .....	15152
Ms. Hardcastle .....	15148	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15152
<b>The Environment</b>		Mr. Deltell .....	15152
Mr. Beech .....	15148	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15152
<b>Remembrance Day</b>		Mr. Deltell .....	15153
Mrs. Wagantall .....	15148	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15153
<b>Remembrance Day</b>		Ms. Bergen .....	15153
Mr. El-Khoury .....	15148	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15153
<b>Harold Wilfred Shaughnessy</b>		Ms. Bergen .....	15153
Ms. Ludwig .....	15148	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15153
<b>Oil and Gas Development</b>		Mr. Strahl .....	15153
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) .....	15149	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15153
<b>Porcupine Caribou Herd</b>		Mr. Strahl .....	15153
Mr. Bagnell .....	15149	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15153
<b>Municipal Elections in La Prairie</b>		Mr. Strahl .....	15153
Mr. Poissant .....	15149	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15153
<b>Remembrance Day</b>		Mr. Strahl .....	15153
Mr. O'Toole .....	15149	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15153
<b>Diabetes Day</b>		Mr. Strahl .....	15153
Ms. Sidhu (Brampton South) .....	15150	Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15153
<b>Nokee Kwe</b>		<b>The Environment</b>	
Ms. Mathysen .....	15150	Mr. Aubin .....	15154
<b>Cyrus Wesley Peck</b>		Ms. McKenna .....	15154
Mr. McColeman .....	15150	Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) .....	15154
<b>Indigenous Veterans</b>		Ms. McKenna .....	15154
Mr. Vandal .....	15150	<b>Ethics</b>	
		Mr. Poilievre .....	15154
		Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15154
		Mr. Poilievre .....	15154
		Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15155
		<b>Taxation</b>	
		Mr. Poilievre .....	15155
		Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15155
		Mr. Kmiec .....	15155
		Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15155
		<b>Public Services and Procurement</b>	
		Ms. Benson .....	15155
		Ms. Qualtrough .....	15155
		Ms. Trudel .....	15155
		Ms. Qualtrough .....	15155
		<b>Employment</b>	
		Ms. Dzerowicz .....	15156
		Ms. Hajdu .....	15156
		<b>Taxation</b>	
		Mr. Berthold .....	15156
		Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15156
		Mr. Kelly .....	15156
		Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15156
		Mr. Sorenson .....	15156

Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15156
Ms. Gladu .....	15157
Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15157
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Ms. Quach .....	15157
Mr. DeCoursey .....	15157
<b>Fisheries and Oceans</b>	
Mr. Donnelly .....	15157
Mr. LeBlanc .....	15157
<b>Ethics</b>	
Mr. Brassard .....	15157
Mr. Morneau .....	15157
Mr. Généreux .....	15158
Mr. Morneau .....	15158
Mr. O'Toole .....	15158
Mrs. Lebouthillier .....	15158
<b>Housing</b>	
Mr. Sangha .....	15158
Mr. Duclos .....	15158
<b>Veterans Affairs</b>	
Mr. McColeman .....	15158
Mr. Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	15158
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Nantel .....	15159
Mr. Casey (Charlottetown) .....	15159
<b>Agriculture and Agri-Food</b>	
Mr. Drouin .....	15159
Mr. MacAulay .....	15159
<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Mr. Fast .....	15159
Ms. McKenna .....	15159
<b>Rail Transportation</b>	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	15159
Mr. Garneau .....	15159

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Mr. DeCoursey .....	15160
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	15160
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Fisheries and Oceans</b>	
Mr. Simms .....	15160
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Poor House Commemoration Day</b>	
Mr. Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry) .....	15160
<b>Housing</b>	
Ms. Quach .....	15161
<b>Local Food</b>	
Ms. Quach .....	15161
<b>Water Quality</b>	
Mr. Paradis .....	15161

<b>The Environment</b>	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	15161
<b>Wild Salmon</b>	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	15161
<b>Shark Finning</b>	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	15161
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Bezan .....	15161
<b>Falun Gong</b>	
Mr. Bezan .....	15161
<b>Religious Freedom</b>	
Mr. Hoback .....	15161
<b>Indigenous Affairs</b>	
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River) .....	15161
<b>Small Business</b>	
Mr. Webber .....	15162
<b>Palliative Care</b>	
Mr. Cuzner .....	15162
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	15162
<b>Questions Passed as Orders for Returns</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	15165
<b>Motions for Papers</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	15165
<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Standing Order 69.1—Bill C-63—Speaker's Ruling</b>	
The Speaker .....	15165

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Budget Implementation Act, 2017, No. 2</b>	
Bill C-63. Second reading .....	15168
Ms. Dzerowicz .....	15168
Mr. Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry) .....	15169
Ms. Benson .....	15169
Mr. Longfield .....	15170
Ms. Sgro .....	15170
Mr. Albrecht .....	15171
Ms. Benson .....	15172
Mr. Allison .....	15172
Mr. Longfield .....	15174
Ms. Brosseau .....	15174
Mr. Longfield .....	15174
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) .....	15175
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River) .....	15176
Mr. DeCoursey .....	15176
Ms. Brosseau .....	15176
Mr. Finnigan .....	15177
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) .....	15178
Mr. DeCoursey .....	15178
Mr. Albrecht .....	15180
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) .....	15180
Mr. Rayes .....	15180
Mr. Lamoureux .....	15182
Mr. Strahl .....	15182
Division on clause 48 deferred .....	15182



Division on clauses 139 and 163 deferred.....	15183
Division on clauses 165 to 168 deferred.....	15183
Division on clause 261 deferred.....	15183
Division on remaining elements of bill deferred.....	15183
Clause 48 agreed to.....	15184
Clauses 139 and 163 agreed to.....	15185
Clauses 165 to 168 agreed to.....	15186
Clause 261 agreed to.....	15187
Remaining elements of bill agreed to.....	15189
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)	15189

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Portuguese Heritage Month**

Motion.....	15189
Motion agreed to.....	15190

**Federally Funded Health Research**

Motion.....	15190
Motion agreed to.....	15191

**Canadian Bill of Rights**

Bill C-325. Second reading.....	15191
Motion negatived.....	15192

**Firearms Act**

Bill C-346. Second reading.....	15192
Motion negatived.....	15193

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

**Indigenous Affairs**

Mr. Stetski.....	15193
Mr. Wilkinson.....	15194

**National Defence**

Mr. Bezan.....	15194
Mr. Rioux.....	15195

**Taxation**

Mr. Warawa.....	15196
Mr. Lightbound.....	15196

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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

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

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

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

---

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <http://www.ourcommons.ca>

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

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

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

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

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.noscommunes.ca>