



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 359 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

—

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1005)

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 54th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts entitled, “Report 5—Socio-Economic Gaps on First Nations Reserves—Indigenous Services Canada, of the 2018 Spring Reports of the Auditor General of Canada”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, any recorded division deferred until Wednesday, November 28, 2018, immediately before the time provided for Private Members' Business be deferred anew to immediately after the time provided for oral questions that day.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS

FIREARMS

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by Canadians from several ridings, including the Bay of Quinte, Kingston and the Islands, and Cambridge. Petitioners call on the House of Commons to respect the rights of law-abiding firearms owners and reject the Prime Minister's plan to waste taxpayers' money studying a ban on guns that are already banned.

PHARMACARE

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Kildonan—St. Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have four petitions to present today. The first one is from the residents of Kildonan—St. Paul, to draw attention of the House of Commons to the issue of amending the Canada Health Act, by adding prescription medications prescribed by a licensed practitioner to the definition of “covered services” in accordance with established formulary, and develop a universal, evidence-based sustainable public drug plan that contains purchasing power to secure the best available pricing, a list of essential medicines addressing priority health needs, and the ability to expand a comprehensive permanent plan that would promote the health and well-being of all Canadians.

HEALTH

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Kildonan—St. Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, secondly, I have a petition from the residents of Kildonan—St. Paul and other ridings asking that we ensure fair access to health care for north Winnipeg, capital region. Petitioners urge the provincial government to reverse its decision to close the emergency rooms in north Winnipeg.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Kildonan—St. Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition relates to infrastructure. The residents of Canada and Kildonan—St. Paul call on the Government of Canada to make the extension linking Chief Peguis Trail from Main Street west to Brookside Boulevard an immediate priority.

Government Orders

VISITORS VISAS

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Kildonan—St. Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my final petition is that the residents of Canada, and in particular Kildonan—St. Paul, call on us to grant Ukrainian nationals with biometric passports visa-free travel to Canada for periods of stay up to 90 days, given Canada's long-standing relationship with Ukraine.

* * *

[Translation]

LABELLING OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOODS

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by hundreds of people from the greater Montreal area. They say that genetically modified foods are not labelled in Canada. Internationally, 65 governments require GMO labelling.

Public opinion polls have shown that the vast majority of Canadians support this measure, that consumers have the right to know what is in their food, and that more and more genetically modified foods are being sold in Canada.

The petitioners are calling on the House of Commons to adopt Bill C-291, which was introduced by my colleague from Sherbrooke and would make the labelling of genetically modified foods mandatory.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 2

BILL C-86—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-86, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage of the said bill and not more than one sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the third reading stage of the said bill; and

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

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period. I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places so the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

The hon. member for Carleton.

● (1010)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister is now limiting debate on his massive 800-page omnibus budget bill, so I have some questions for him if he has the courage to stand up in his place and answer those questions.

The deficit is three times what he promised this year. He said it would be about \$6 billion during the election campaign, and instead it is \$18 billion. Next year, the budget was supposed to balance itself. That is only a month from now, 2019. That was the year we were supposed to be deficit-free. That tiny, temporary deficit was supposed to be gone. Now, the government admits not only will it not be gone, it will be bigger next year than it is this year as this Prime Minister stacks another \$20 billion on the national credit card.

When governments use deficit spending to buy products and services in a tight economy, they drive up prices for consumers. When they go out and borrow \$20 billion more a year, they compete with homeowners and consumers for credit, and drive up interest rates. In other words, deficits not only drive up taxes tomorrow, they drive up the cost of living today.

Therefore, will the finance minister tell the House how much his massive deficits are driving up interest rates on Canadians trying to pay their mortgages?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to talk about our record in the three short years since we had the privilege of forming government.

After 10 years of Conservative inaction, we committed to Canadians that we would invest in the middle class and that we would help grow our economy. We have delivered on that promise through the implementation of the Canada child benefit that has raised well over 300,000 children out of poverty and through the middle-class tax cut that cut taxes for nine million middle-class Canadians and raised them on the richest 1%. The average Canadian family is \$2,000 better off now than under the Harper Conservatives.

The party opposite likes to talk about its support for small business, but it is actually our government that cut taxes for small businesses from 11% to 9%, meaning small business owners will have, on average, \$1,200 more to reinvest in their businesses. That is real support for small business and job creators, which, I might add, have added over half a million full-time jobs in the three short years since we formed government.

Government Orders

We are very pleased with our record. We are very proud of this particular piece of legislation and the work that we are doing to grow our economy.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Madam Speaker, a time allocation motion for such a massive bill is unacceptable. This bill is 850 pages long, amends seven acts, and more.

The Liberals always spoke out so fiercely against bills this size when the previous government introduced them. Back then, the bills were about 300 pages long. This budget bill is almost three times longer.

The government is also silencing members who wish to have their say on this bill. We had barely any time to debate it. I believe we had two days, and now time is up. The NDP asked the government to split the bill so we could analyze it and take the time we need. I am sure most of the Liberal members have not had time to unpack even one-fifth of this bill.

How can the minister possibly think this is an appropriate and democratic way to proceed?

• (1015)

[*English*]

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, Canadians elected us to deliver on an ambitious agenda, which we are doing. This bill has been debated extensively in the House. In fact, there has been more than 15 hours of debate at second reading and report stage, which includes 22 Conservative members, eight NDP members and one member from the Bloc Québécois. At committee stage, it was studied by four separate committees. There were eight meetings, during which more than 45 witnesses spoke. We have accepted some amendments as a result of that careful deliberation. Canadians expect us to continue on our ambitious agenda and that is exactly what we are doing today.

Mr. Phil McColeman (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Madam Speaker, the broken promise made during the last election campaign to run small deficits and come back to balance is obviously something that was thrown out the window in the very early days of the current government.

The small business tax reduction was something Conservatives put on the books to do and Liberals chose not to do it until they were pressured by small business itself. Because they wanted to increase taxation on small business, small business rose up and made them reverse what they were going to do. That is the reality of the situation.

The reality of the situation is the Prime Minister said the budget will balance itself and yet Liberals cannot answer the basic question of when the budget will balance itself. These are fundamental promises made to people during election campaigns and yet Liberals come here and try to spin it, saying their desire to tax and spend is for the greater good of the Canadian public. It is not for the greater good. When will they balance the budget?

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, I find it hilarious that the member used the phrase “put on the books to do”. Conservatives had a decade to do this and clearly they did not. We, in fact, are the party

that moved forward with a commitment to support small business and are implementing those commitments.

Conservatives made a commitment to grow the economy and a decade of inaction led to a stagnation of the economy, where fewer jobs were created and businesses and our economy struggled. We now have one of the fastest growing economies in the G7. The unemployment rate is the lowest that we have seen in 40 years and there is wage growth. We are seeing all kinds of positive economic growth as a result of our ambitious agenda that we will continue to deliver for Canadians.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I know we had a late night last night, but I want to remind members that when someone has the floor, that person deserves respect. The hon. member for Brantford—Brant had an opportunity to ask a question. If he has other questions, he can stand and ask those, as opposed to yelling them across the way.

Questions and comments, the member for Vancouver East.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, during the campaign, the Liberals did not say to Canadians that they would spend \$4.5 billion to buy a leaky pipeline, but that is what they did.

Instead of doing that, why do we not see the government investing that money into green energy, into the future. Climate action is so necessary, not just for our generation today but for generations to come.

My question for the Minister of Finance is this. Why do the Liberals not reinvest that \$4.5 billion, which was used to buy the Kinder Morgan, now Trans Mountain leaky pipeline, into action that matters for the future, the environment?

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, I share the member's passion for the environment. That is why we have proposed a price on pollution. Canadians know that pollution is not free. We are all paying for the cost of storms, floods, droughts and wild fires, and extreme heat.

Our government has a plan to protect the environment and grow the economy, and it is working. Our emissions are down. Canadians have created over half a million full-time jobs since we were elected. We know we need to do more. That is why we are going to move forward on ensuring a price across Canada on what we do not want, which is pollution, so we can get what we do want, which is lower emissions, cleaner air, new business opportunities and more money in the pockets of Canadians.

We know that Andrew Scheer's plan—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the member that she is not to mention the names of individuals who sit in the House. I would ask her to wrap up, so other questions can be asked.

• (1020)

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, I apologize.

Government Orders

We know that the Leader of the Opposition's plan is to follow Stephen Harper by making pollution free again. We are taking action to protect our climate and to ensure the health of this place for generations to come.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, now more than ever, the Liberals are showing that they have no respect for the promises they made, for Canadians or for this House.

They want to limit debate once again today on a mammoth bill that is more than 800 pages long and that directly affects the public purse.

Let us not forget that the Liberals were elected just three short years ago on a promise to run three small deficits, with no deficit by 2019. They ran three huge deficits totalling over \$60 billion in three years, and we have no idea when they plan to return to a balanced budget. They have definitely jettisoned any possibility of clearing the deficit by 2019. It is shameful.

I call on the Minister of Finance to show some honour and dignity and stand up in this House to tell us when he plans to balance the budget.

[*English*]

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to represent the Government of Canada today to defend our record on growing the economy. In fact, after 10 years of slow growth, Canada's economy has rebounded and we now have one of the strongest records of growth in the G7.

The economy has created over half a million full-time jobs since we have been in office. We see growth in all different sectors. We see employers with positive attitudes, in fact having new problems as a result of the lowest unemployment rate in over 40 years.

As the Minister of Employment, when I travel across the country now and meet with employers, one of the biggest challenges they have is not enough talent. That is a testament to how fast our economy is growing under our leadership.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members again that if they have questions, to stand as opposed to yelling them across the way. I know some may be tired, however, there are still rules to be followed.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Madam Speaker, just recently, I participated in a “Chew on This” event in my community. People of a multi-faith community came together and talked about how we could address poverty in our community, what we were doing and the steps we could be taking.

One thing that is interesting, because it is organized by Dignity for All, is that many of the requests that have been put forward by Dignity for All in respect of an indexed Canada child benefit and the Canada workers benefit have been addressed by our government and have been in our past budgets.

Perhaps the minister could help us understand what our government is doing to address poverty issues in to ensure everyone has opportunities.

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, that is a fantastic question, because in fact the kinds of actions we have been taking since we formed government have the goal of ensuring that the most vulnerable Canadians have an opportunity to participate as fully, as every other Canadian, in our society, in our economy.

Things like our historic housing plan, the housing strategy; the Canada child benefit, which cannot be overstated as it has lifted over 300,000 children out of poverty; a poverty reduction strategy that has concrete targets that we can actually measure our progress; the work I do as the Minister of Employment, ensuring decent work and modernizing the Canada Labour Code so the most vulnerable workers in our federally regulated workplaces have basic protections as employees; and the list goes on and on.

I am extremely proud of the record of the government on ensuring every Canadian has a fair chance to succeed. We will continue to invest in the kinds of things that help people move along the continuum to prosperity and to ensure they have fairness in their opportunities in our country.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, 42 years ago Prime Minister Trudeau promised to legislate pay equity for Canadian women's equal pay. It did not happen. Successive Liberal and Conservative governments delayed action.

Three years ago the NDP had the current Liberal government to change its agenda and include pay equity. We were delighted that the Liberals said yes. The next three years were a black hole. We did not know what was happening. Ostensibly there were consultations with the NGOs. Then pay equity legislation was bundled into this 800-page omnibus bill. It has been rushed through at every stage. Even still, the NGOs that had been working on this and the human rights lawyers who had been litigating this issue in court for three decades proposed very specific amendments, which I was honoured, along with the member for New Westminster—Burnaby, to advance at the finance committee a week ago.

I spent from 9 a.m. until noon moving amendments that had been recommended to pay equity legislation by the Teamsters, by CUPE, by Equal Pay Coalition Ontario, by the Canadian Labour Congress and the Liberals voted every amendment down. They said that they knew best, much better than the labour activists and the human rights lawyers who had been litigating this.

Why did the government refuse every amendment on pay equity and why is it ramming this budget bill through now with no changes?

• (1025)

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, I am incredibly proud to be the minister who has introduced pay equity, along with my colleagues, for Canadian women in federally regulated workplaces. They will see equal pay for work of equal value. This legislation was carefully crafted, in consultation, as the member opposite referenced, with NGOs, experts, employers and workers to ensure we had the balance right.

Government Orders

On one hand, the member opposite is saying that it took too long for this legislation to come forward and on the other hand, the member is saying that we are moving too quickly.

Canadian women are expecting us to act now. We are proud of this legislation. We look forward to employers and federally regulated sectors coming up with proactive pay equity plans in the near future.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, as the debate right now is on the issue of time allocation and not on the substance of Bill C-86, I want to once again make it clear that the use of time allocation as a routine proceeding is completely unacceptable. I ask the hon. minister to reconsider.

In the substance of her remarks in answer to a question, she said that this legislation and the government's actions would protect Canadians for generations to come. I would have to correct her. As it now stands, we have not protected the next generation much less generations to come.

I urge the minister to read the IPCC report on what we must do to reduce emissions, so we can hold to 1.5°C and no more.

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, Canadians elected us to move forward on a very important agenda. It is an ambitious agenda, one on which we have moved diligently to ensure we can actually enact it. This is an important part of that agenda.

In fact, the bill has been debated extensively in the House. We have seen more than 15 hours of debate. It includes 22 Conservative members, eight NDP members, one member from the Bloc Québécois. At committee stage, which there were four committees studying the legislation, we have had eight meetings in which more than 45 witnesses have spoken.

We have made a commitment to work diligently on behalf of Canadians to enact the agenda for which they voted three years ago. I am proud to be part of a government that takes those commitments seriously.

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Madam Speaker, the government members, as they often do, stand and say that Canadians elected them to blah, blah or in 2015 Canadians voted for blah, blah. However, the legacy of the government is going to be a government that said a whole bunch of things in 2015 and then did a whole bunch of different things in the three years following.

We hear that in questions from members of all parties regarding things that the Liberals said around closure, omnibus bills, electoral reform. Of course, in their 2015 platform, they said, "After the next two fiscal years, the deficit will decline and our investment plan will return Canada to a balanced budget in 2019."

My question for the minister is clear. There is a very clear promise regarding a balanced budget in 2019. She has a lot of very rosy things to say about the Canadian economy, so what is the rationale, what is the reason the government would give to the Canadian people for the fact that it is running so desperately behind its promised projection for the balance it made just three years ago?

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, Canadians chose a different approach in the last election. They chose a government that had the confidence to invest in Canadians, to invest in Canadian businesses and to help our economy grow. Just three short years later, we see

that approach is working. Over half a million full-time jobs have been added to our economy by small and medium-sized business that have seen prosperity, that have seen the opportunities and are looking to grow themselves and contribute to the growth of our economy.

We ended the Conservative approach of sending child benefit taxes to millionaires so we could provide more support to nine out of 10 Canadian families. Believe me, this is providing those families with the confidence that they will have what they need to raise children, who are happy and healthy and can fully participate in Canadian society.

We are proud of our record. We know we are on the right track. Canadians know we are on the right track. We will continue to work hard to achieve a Canada where everybody has a fair chance to succeed.

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is quite interesting to note that the Conservatives want a balanced budget. Where are they exactly going to cut? I would remind the House that the balanced budget they had when they were in government was made on the backs of veterans, indigenous peoples and indigenous children. Indeed, it was a very dark decade.

The question before us today is this. Do we invest in people today or do we see a long-term loss in health, education, economic potential and the potential of Canadians? This budget is about investing in the human potential of Canadians, ensuring people have the tools to be successful. We can invest today or we can cut and we will have to pay the costs later on as a Canadian society.

• (1030)

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, I share the member's passion and perspective. When we invest in people and Canadian society, when we invest in our small and medium-sized business, that it is good fiscal policy. It is very expensive to do nothing.

We are very committed to sound fiscal management as we continue to make investments that will contribute to that long-term economic growth. That is exactly what we are talking about here today. We are talking about investing in Canadian families. We are talking about eliminating child poverty.

We want to help our children grow up in a society in which they are not hungry, in which they have the same opportunities as their peers. We are contributing to the next generation of profit, of wealth, of growth, of business, of profitable employees and business owners. When we invest in giving people a fair chance, Canadians do not let us down. They take that chance, they take that opportunity and they contribute directly to their communities and to their country.

Government Orders

Ms. Georgina Jolibois (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to remind the minister and the government of the realities on the ground when it comes to poverty, child poverty, and lack of infrastructure for communities on reserves across Canada. Our indigenous youth across Canada are struggling and they do not have the support of the government by investing in their future.

How can the government sit here and falsely give us information, saying that Canada is great and it is moving forward when it is not? When I hear about suicides, when I hear about roads being inaccessible, when I hear about job cuts in my riding and across northern Canada, I want to hear an effective plan from the government.

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, we share the passion of the member opposite for equity for indigenous people. As the Minister of Employment, one of my proudest moments was being able to increase the aboriginal skills education training program to ensure equity for indigenous people looking to improve skills training. Not only that, we have invested in housing and we have invested significantly in ending boil water advisories.

Of course there is more to do. We continue to work with indigenous leaders and communities to ensure we can work in partnership, unlike the Conservative government that did not invest in indigenous communities. It did not support indigenous people with respect to equity. For a decade, it did not increase the aboriginal skills education training program, which is just one example of inequity.

We are taking a different approach. We are working with indigenous communities. We are investing in those things that we call the social determinates of health, things like housing and health care. We are transforming child welfare. We are on a good journey together. I am proud to be part of a government that works collaboratively with indigenous peoples for equity and for that equal shot at success.

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise today again on time allocation called on a budget bill of over 800 pages. Should we be surprised by this? Unfortunately, no. We have a government that promised not to introduce omnibus bills, yet we have a bill that is almost 900 pages long.

The Liberals campaigned on multiple things, such as deficits of no more than \$10 billion. They have broken that promise. They promised decreasing deficits over their term. They have broken that promise. They promised to return to a balanced budget in 2019. They have broken that promise. What they are really breaking is their responsibility to future generations.

We heard one minister talk about how the government is building for future generations. I would like the Minister of Finance to explain how he feels he is doing the right thing, when what he is really doing is passing on increasing debt to these future Canadians. A deficit of nearly \$20 billion for each of three years is \$600 of debt for every man, woman and child. Every man, woman and child is \$600 further in debt every year because of the government. This is the debt load it is building.

Here the Liberals are today trying to stop debate on the bill so that we cannot point out the flaws in their omnibus bill. I would like the minister to answer. Why are they doing that?

• (1035)

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, when the Conservatives were last in government, annual GDP growth was just 1%, and Canadians were worried that we might be headed into a recession. Under our plan, GDP growth has rebounded, and Canada now has one of the strongest records of growth in the G7, at 3%. This was the strongest growth of all G7 countries last year. We are proud of our record.

During the last election, Canadians chose a different approach. They chose between the Conservative plan for austerity and cuts, and one could argue that it was the NDP plan as well, and our government's plan to invest in the middle class and build an economy that works for everyone.

When Canadians feel that they have a fair chance to succeed, when their children have a fair chance to succeed, they invest in themselves, they invest in their communities and they invest in this country. In fact, Canadians are proving just that.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, the minister earlier said that the government is doing a whole lot on the climate action file. I would just remind the government that it actually adopted Harper's targets, and even at that, it is not going to meet those targets.

The government brags about the housing file. It says that it has a national affordable housing program. The truth of the matter is that 90% of that money will not flow until after the next election. For people who are homeless today, who are in desperate need of a home, shelter and a safe place to go, does the minister actually think it is appropriate to defer the money flowing to build housing until after the next election?

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, in fact, in our first budget, we invested \$5.8 billion in housing across this country. It was just a down payment. We have an ambitious housing strategy that will eliminate homelessness by 50% in a decade. In fact, investments were made in the member opposite's riding in affordable housing, as she may know. If not, we are happy to tell her about those investments at any point.

This is one of the reasons I went into politics. As a former executive director of a homeless shelter in northwestern Ontario, I can tell the member that investing in affordable housing is one of the best ways to actually help people out of poverty and move people along the continuum of ensuring that they have a fair chance at success. It was my extreme pleasure to be one of the ministers able to talk about the housing strategy when it was launched.

Government Orders

I will continue to work with my colleagues from any side who want to work on this issue with us, because it is incredibly important. It will contribute to prosperity and a fair chance for every Canadian.

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Madam Speaker, here we are again with an 800-plus page budget implementation act, and who is answering the questions? It is not the Minister of Finance. It is the Minister of Employment. Now she brags that there have been 15 hours of debate on a massive budget implementation bill, yet here is the Minister of Employment answering the questions. Perhaps it is because she is used to this undemocratic process. After all, this is the minister who forced Bill C-89 through the House with limited debate. In the other place, the unelected place, she allowed a massive study and allowed them to come in as witnesses. This is the same minister who took away the right to a secret ballot for unionization, yet here is the Minister of Employment answering questions, because the Minister of Finance will not.

Will she answer one simple question? When will the budget be balanced?

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Madam Speaker, as tempting as it is for me to talk about the record of the member opposite's party in its relationship with organized labour, I will pass on that temptation and stay focused on our incredible record of ensuring prosperity for every Canadian in this country.

We were elected through the vision of Canadians who saw a different way. For over a decade, the previous government led austerity budgets and invested in the wrong things. This led to the stagnation of growth, leading to a loss of hope by Canadians that there would be a bright future for themselves and for their children. We have reversed that. We see one of the fastest growing economies in the G7. We see the lowest unemployment record in 40 years.

As the Minister of Employment, it is my privilege to meet with employer groups all across this country. One of the things they tell me they need most profoundly is new talent, and that is because we have one of the highest records of employment since the forties. Canadians are working at full capacity.

We are proud of our record. We are ensuring that Canadians have the money they need to raise their children, whether it is through the Canada child benefit or the middle-class tax cuts, which will result in an average of \$2,000 more per couple across this country.

When Canadians feel confident in the economy, they invest in themselves, they invest in their communities and they help grow our economy.

● (1040)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith the question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.

[*English*]

The question is as follows. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

Call in the members.

● (1120)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 951*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Brisson	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCoursey	Dhalwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Freeland	Fuhr
Garneau	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jordan
Jowhari	Khalid
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Long	Longfield

Government Orders

Ludwig
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Morrissey
Nassif
Ng
Oliver
Oueltette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Murray
Nault
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodríguez
Romanado
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Zahid— 156

Rankin
Rempel
Sansoucy
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stetski
Sweet
Trost
Van Kesteren
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga— 115

Rayes
Saganash
Saroya
Shipley
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Tilson
Trudel
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[English]

Order. I wish to inform the House that because of the proceedings on the time allocation motion, Government Orders will be extended by 30 minutes.

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from November 26 consideration of Bill C-86, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Nick Whalen (St. John's East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is exciting to be here today to support the budget implementation bill and specifically the legislation establishing the college of patent agents and trademark agents. This is at subdivision D of division 7 of part 4 of the budget implementation bill.

This is an important element of the government's IP strategy. Taken as a whole, that strategy will ensure that Canada's intellectual property regime is modern and robust, and that it supports Canadian innovations in the 21st century.

Patent and trademark agents are a key component of the innovation ecosystem, as they help inventors to secure exclusive IP rights. I was the only Newfoundlander who was a patent agent at the time of my election. Although I am not practising in that area of law now, I have some pretty good information regarding the need for a college of patent agents and a college of trademark agents.

Given the rising importance of IP in the innovation economy and the central role of patent and trademark agents, it is time to have a professional oversight body responsible for maintaining the high standards that are expected of trusted advisers. As a bonus, this would address long-standing gaps in the current framework for regulatory oversight, which previously lacked clarity and transparency and was without a binding code of professional conduct. Given the importance of the profession, good safeguards here are needed to ensure that agents do the jobs they do well and have the trust of their clients and of Canadians more broadly.

While there is no evidence suggesting a large problem with agent conduct, the need for modernization is imperative now that communications with IP agents are protected by statutory privilege in the same way as solicitor-client advice. This is an extraordinary right that requires ethical guidelines to prevent its abuse.

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Allison
Arnold
Beaulieu
Benzen
Berthold
Blaikie
Block
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Choquette
Cooper
Davies
Diotte
Dubé
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Hughes
Jolibois
Kelly
Krmiec
Kwan
Laverdière
Lobb
MacGregor
Maguire
Marcil
Mathysen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nater
Nuttall
O'Toole
Pauzé
Poilievre

Albas
Alleslev
Anderson
Aubin
Benson
Bergen
Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Brassard
Calkins
Caron
Clarke
Cullen
Deltell
Dreeshen
Dusseault
Egliniski
Falk (Provencher)
Fortin
Garrison
Gladu
Gourde
Hoback
Jeneroux
Julian
Kent
Kusie
Lake
Liepert
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Malcolmson
Martel
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McColeman
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Quach

Government Orders

The college of patent agents and trademark agents act would establish an independent regulator, specifically a college, for the professional oversight of IP agents in the public interest. The college would administer a licensing system to ensure that only qualified professionals are authorized to provide agent services. As an independent regulator, it would also be responsible for enforcing a code of professional conduct to ensure that IP agents continue to deliver high-quality advice.

The college would also be responsible for implementing requirements for continuing professional development to ensure that agents stay informed of the ever-evolving IP practice landscape. Ultimately, these measures would raise the bar of IP professional services in Canada.

The college would have an investigations committee to receive complaints and conduct investigations into whether or not a licensee has committed professional misconduct or been incompetent. A separate disciplinary committee would have the authority to impose disciplinary measures if it is decided that a licensee has in fact committed professional misconduct or been incompetent.

Finally, this bill also creates new offences for claiming to be a patent agent or a trademark agent, or for the unauthorized representation of another person before the Canadian patent office or the office of the registrar of trademarks. These offences are intended to serve an important consumer protection function to ensure that innovators are receiving representation from qualified, licensed agents.

I would like now to speak about the important features that have been built into the legislation to ensure that the regulation is undertaken within the public interest and with the public interest as the priority.

Careful consideration was given to ensuring that the legislation supported the public interest in a competitive marketplace of well-qualified and professional IP agents. For example, the college would be governed by a board of directors that includes public interest representatives appointed by the minister, and patent and trademark agent representatives elected by members of the college itself.

Further measures directed toward safeguarding the public interest include providing the minister with the authority to review the board's activities and, if necessary, to direct the board to undertake any action to ensure regulation in the public interest. Another measure requires the board to report to Parliament annually on its activities.

The framework for the legislation takes into account comments from stakeholders over the course of several public consultations. During these consultations, risks were identified relating to the fact that many IP agents are also lawyers. Concerns were expressed about dual regulation, that is that lawyers and agents would be subject to two potentially conflicting regulatory schemes.

In recognition of this potential for overlap, the legislation would ensure minimal regulatory conflict for lawyers who may also be agents. In addition, where appropriate, the college's investigations committee would be authorized to refer a complaint to another body that has the duty to regulate another profession, for example a law society for a lawyer.

In fact, in my experience as someone who has been regulated as an engineer, regulated as a lawyer in three different jurisdictions, and regulated as a patent agent and a trademark agent in two different countries, I appreciate the concern that might exist about over-representation or over-regulation, as well as the concern that might be raised by conflicts in ethical obligations.

● (1125)

Whereas a lawyer, for instance, may have an ethical obligation to maintain strict solicitor-client privilege, an engineer is in fact required to put the public interest ahead of that interest. Therefore, it is important to note that there can be proper and reasonable conflicts in the ethics associated with different professions.

Patent agents are there to obtain the most protection possible for their clients' inventions or the broadest scope of trademark protection for their brands. Sometimes that might conflict with another ethical obligation that might apply in a different fashion to a lawyer or an engineer.

Balancing these is important and means making sure that when patent agents wear their patent agent hats, they are regulated as patent agents, and when they wear their lawyer hats they are regulated as lawyers, and when they wear their engineer hats they are regulated as engineers. This legislation allows for that nuanced differentiation.

We also heard during consultations that specific care must be taken to safeguard privileged information. Significant measures must be in place to ensure the appropriate handling and safeguarding of privileged information and to strictly control access to such information. To do so, the legislation draws upon safeguards and processes similar to those used by provincial law societies in order to safeguard privileged information in the investigation of college members.

More specifically, privileged information can only be used for the purpose of regulating agents. Disclosing privileged information to the college will not be considered a waiver of the privilege, and the privilege will be preserved for other purposes. Those purposes could be some type of lawsuit before the courts on solicitor-client privilege or the maintenance of the confidentiality of an inventor's right to an invention for having filed before first being disclosed to the public, for instance.

The act places strict obligations on employees and directors of the college, preventing them from disclosing privileged information, and further clarifies that the government cannot use its oversight authority to access privileged information. There is a strict process of court oversight to access and contest access to solicitor-client privileged information. These were of importance to the patent bar in the development of the legislation.

From my perspective, as someone who went through the process of becoming a patent agent, I can attest to the fact that an additional element is brought to bear on a regulated profession. Sometimes professions can be regulated in such a manner as to encourage more people to join the profession, and sometimes they can be regulated in a fashion that prevents new people from entering the profession.

Government Orders

The fact that the United States has 100 times as many patent agents or practitioners as Canada does with only 10 times the population demonstrates that our regime for licensing patent agents has become too restrictive.

The creation of an independent college will have the extra function of aligning the college's role of growing the profession with the public's interest in having more patent agents available to help inventors spur the creation of these assets. Patent and IP assets simply do not exist if they are not filed and registered, and if professional advice is not brought to bear.

It is not like in copyright, where people create a new work and then own the rights to that work. In the patent and trademark space, it is the professionals who assist the creators or the brand makers in protecting, acquiring and preserving those rights, both at home and abroad. If that work is not done, there is no asset to protect. Canada needs probably 10 times more patent and trademark agents than it currently has in order to have the same level of asset creation as the United States. This is important in the 21st-century economy.

In conclusion, the college of patent agents and trademark agents will be responsive to stakeholder input and follow international best practices in professional regulation. Care was taken with the legislation to establish well-structured bodies to ensure proper independent oversight, with an option for the government to intervene only if necessary. The checks and balances included in the legislation will ensure regulation in the public interest.

As a whole, I would encourage all members to support the budget implementation act, including this subdivision of part 7.

● (1130)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Whitby, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in his support of Bill C-86, my hon. colleague talked about IP and IP strategy. As a member of the industry committee, I can attest that it really is important to understand that a comprehensive IP strategy helps businesses not just to protect their IP on the home front, but to grow and succeed and then be able to export to international markets.

I am wondering if my hon. colleague can also talk about what he is hearing from small businesses in his riding about this strategy, its comprehensiveness, the fact that it would include education and the ability to grow and prosper, and how it has impacted businesses in his riding.

Mr. Nick Whalen: Madam Speaker, I really appreciate the work of the industry committee members. They have a lot of very interesting files. With my professional background, I think I would probably bring too much bias to that committee. I do read their reports with a lot of great interest. It is nice to see what a fresh perspective brings to those topics that are close to my heart.

I know that in Newfoundland and Labrador, when I was the only patent agent there, it was very difficult for me. I had to travel to get the support I needed to maintain my professional credentials. I lacked the network of local folks to bounce ideas off of. It really is important to have a true bar.

The creation of an independent college would help grow the profession and result in more patent agents in small communities, like Newfoundland and Labrador, and the markets in New

Brunswick and Nova Scotia, so that they could have the proper coordinated, long-term professional development that would benefit their clients. There are plenty of innovative companies in Newfoundland and Labrador that seek professional services from Boston, California, Montreal or Alberta, depending on their industries.

The creation of a college would allow better local representation for these folks and growth of our industry.

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened intently to my colleague, and I appreciated his comments.

However, the member is defending a budget that is indefensible. Canadians did vote for a change in 2015. However, what the government promised and what it is delivering are very different. The government promised to balance the budget. Now the budget before us is not even close to being balanced.

Could the member tell us when the government will balance the budget?

Mr. Nick Whalen: Madam Speaker, that is really quite an ideological question, a “direction of the country” question that goes to what the appropriate fiscal anchors are that should guide our development, borrowing and spending practices.

As someone who has knocked on just over 10,000 doors and got to speak to just over 4,000 folks at the door, I know that my commitment to them was that we would focus on growing the economy for the middle class, and that if that meant deficit spending to do it, we would be guided by the principle that we would grow the economy more than the deficit, so that in the long term the deficit would shrink as a percentage of the economy. That is exactly what we have done.

The proof is in the pudding. Canada's growth has led the G7 for much of our mandate. I think we are now in second place. The debt-to-GDP ratio has fallen to the lowest among the G7. That allows us the economic resilience to put in place new programs to help the folks in Oshawa respond to crises, to create supercluster funds and to do things that will create the jobs of the future.

With respect to the portion of the bill that I am speaking to, I will say that it is cost-neutral for the government. The college will pay for itself through its fees to its members.

● (1135)

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Madam Speaker, when the member was knocking on those doors, did he mention that the government would pass on a debt to every man, woman and child in his riding of at least \$600 per year? If he even mentioned that to them, what sort of reaction might the member have gotten?

It is abysmal that the government keeps passing on this massive debt to future generations who will have to pay it back.

Government Orders

Mr. Nick Whalen: Madam Speaker, when I speak to people at the door about the complicated issue of the debt-to-GDP ratio, I say to them, “Listen, yes, you are going to have debt that will be \$600 more, but the growth in the economy will mean there will be closer to \$2,000 more on average in the pockets of working families.” They understand that.

We have to spend money to make money. Canadians think we are growing the economy, and they appreciate that.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Whitby, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to talk to Bill C-86. Since we came into government, we have really focused on the middle class and those working hard to join it. This legislation would help us to continue along that trajectory, continue to make Canada one of the fastest growing economies in the G7 and continue to help ensure that Canadian companies are able to create good middle-class jobs. In fact, they have been able to create over half a million jobs. Our government created the conditions with investments to ensure that these companies and Canadians would be able to grow and prosper. It has done so through our trade and other investments in education and skills training, and will continue along that path.

However, I want to focus my comments today on three specific points that I will ground within the sustainable development goals. Earlier this year, I was with the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development in New York to present our voluntary statement to the United Nations on the sustainable development goals. Canada has a role to play to ensure that we reach those 169 targets and 17 goals by 2030. We are well on track to do that. We have been doing it from day one.

I am going to focus on particular components of the sustainable development goals emphasized through this budget. The first is goal 5, one that is really important to my heart. It has to do with gender and ensuring that we have gender equality in our country. As we are in the midst of 16 days of activism against gender-based violence, I want to ensure that my actions matter. Speaking to this particular legislation, Bill C-86, allows me to do that.

What we have in front of us are a number of different initiatives that would help to ensure we have gender equality in Canada. Our government has legislated gender budgeting, made Status of Women a full department and enacted proactive pay equity legislation.

With regard to Status of Women becoming a full department, the future department of women and gender equality, it is nice to have the word “wage” included in the title when we are introducing proactive pay legislation. When we think about the fact that indigenous women, women of colour, women with disabilities, religious individuals, people with different sexual orientations and women who are too old or too young face disproportionate negative impacts and barriers in their workplaces and communities, it is important that we be sensitive. When we are enacting legislation, it is also important to look at how our legislation impacts individuals differently. By legislating gender budgeting and ensuring increased participation of women, especially the ones who are most vulnerable, we are working toward supporting women and girls and reducing the gender wage gap. We are making sure that our country is prosperous for everyone.

The current gap of around 20¢ per dollar of earnings between what men and women make grows proportionately bigger when we think about some of these vulnerable communities or look at intersectionality. When there are different intersecting identities, we see that the gap between men and women gets larger, so ensuring that our country is prosperous for everyone is really important.

As I mentioned, having a full department dedicated to the status of women, the women and gender equality department, is really important. It will have an expanded mandate for gender equality, including sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, and for the promotion of a greater understanding of gender diversity, often through what is known as a gender-based analysis plus.

We need to ensure that we have the capacity to leverage movements like #MeToo and Time’s Up and ensure that every woman in this country feels that she has a place and is valued and respected. The initiatives we have taken so far with regard to gender will ensure that this happens.

● (1140)

Continuing with my theme of the sustainable development goals, goal 8 speaks to decent work and economic growth; goal 9, industry, innovation and infrastructure; goal 10, reducing inequalities; goal 11, sustainable cities and communities; and goal 16, peace, justice and strong institutions. To tie up all of those goals is really the work that we are doing with stakeholders in the charitable sector.

I worked in research before I came into politics. I owned a research management company, but I worked with organizations like Neurological Health Charities Canada, the Alzheimer Society of Canada, Parkinson Canada, Epilepsy Durham and many organizations in my riding like Sunrise Youth Group in Whitby or the Charles H. Best Diabetes Centre, of which Kenadie, a sixth grade student, is a very strong champion. She came to see me in Ottawa last year.

These charitable organizations are the foundation on which our middle class rests. They are the ones that do a lot of hard work to ensure that we are able to continue to function as a society. For example, the Sunrise Youth Group supports adult individuals with developmental handicaps so that their parents can go to work. This is what our charitable sector does and it really is a strong part of our society.

In strengthening that role of our charitable sector, we are ensuring that charities are able to do the work they want to do on behalf of Canadians. We are removing the limits to their political activities, allowing charities to participate fully in policy development. They could provide feedback on legislation and legislative proposals. We are providing a permanent advisory committee on the charitable sector.

Government Orders

The charitable sector is one of the sectors that contribute to our economy. It can generate up to \$2 billion in economic activity and create as many as 100,000 jobs. The charitable sector is growing, is vital, and innovative. It does a lot with very little and we need to support it. Our government will be providing supports and resources of up to \$750 million over the next 10 years to support and establish a social finance fund. When we look to our charitable organizations to provide support for our families, we need to support them. That is what we are doing here in this budget implementation act.

The last things I want to speak to are goal 1, no poverty; goal 2, zero hunger; and goal 3, good health and well-being. When we look at reducing poverty and ensuring that people have the capacity to live a full life and contribute to our economy, we need to look holistically at the social determinants of health to ensure that we help create the conditions that allow Canadians to live their best lives possible. With our poverty reduction strategy, programs like the Canada child benefit, our national housing strategy, enhancing seniors benefits, the Canada workers benefit, we have lifted 650,000 Canadians out of poverty, including 300,000 children.

We are developing our first national poverty reduction strategy and establishing for the first time ever an official poverty alliance. We are looking holistically at ensuring that Canadians of all stripes will be able to have a good quality of life. Since October 2015, we have hit the ground running to ensure that this happens in a comprehensive, holistic way. Not only are we going to be able to achieve our sustainable development goals and the agenda 2030, but we are doing it here in Canada. We are taking leadership by ensuring that everyone has a fair chance to succeed.

• (1145)

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is disturbing to see how far the Liberals have led us into increasing debt, despite the fact that they promised in their election campaign that by now we would be coming back to balance. That is far from the truth. In fact, the cost of interest alone in 2017-18 was \$23.9 billion. By 2021-22, the cost will be \$39 billion. That is a \$15-billion increase in interest costs alone. That has nothing to do with paying down the debt. It will cost an extra \$15 billion to pay the interest on our debt, which is rising every year because of increased deficits as a result of the government's spending. This is in spite of the fact that it promised a very small deficit and promised to bring us back to balance by now.

My question is simple. Could that extra \$15 billion we are spending on interest not be put to better use to provide, for example, great palliative care for Canadians?

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Madam Speaker, we are keeping our debt-to-GDP ratio low. The investments we have made to date have ensured that we have created the conditions in this country that have allowed our small to medium-sized businesses to create over 500,000 jobs. We have invested in technology and skills training. We have invested in public transit in Durham region, the largest investment in public transit we have ever seen, which allows us to reduce our carbon footprint as well.

We have made investments to ensure that Canadians have a bit more in their pockets. Over the next year, an average family of four will have \$2,000 more in its pocket to spend on the things they find are necessary.

We are reducing poverty, we are investing in communities and we are helping to grow a strong Canada, and that is what Canadians find important.

Ms. Georgina Jolibois (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, NDP): Madam Speaker, before I ask my question, I want to clarify some points. One of the recent reports that came out in Canada about poverty indicated that the top two areas in Canada affected by child poverty are northern Saskatchewan and northern Manitoba. My experiences in northern Saskatchewan have shown that all levels of government, whether the federal Conservatives or Liberals or governments at the provincial level, are way out of touch. They ignore and neglect northern Saskatchewan and possibly northern Manitoba as well.

I am curious as to what this poverty reduction plan looks like. I want to believe that it is suitable for northern Saskatchewan and northern Manitoba. Can the government clearly explain? I do not want to hear about first nation involvement. I want to hear specifically about ridings like mine, Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, with a specific population of northerners that are first nations, Métis, farming communities and rural municipalities. Can the Liberal government clarify this point?

• (1150)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for focusing her concerns on areas in her riding. We have been taking a whole-of-government approach from the very beginning, which ensures that we are listening to stakeholders to ensure that when we introduce Canada's first national poverty reduction strategy, we do it in a way that would eliminate poverty. We are establishing an official poverty line for the first time ever in the history of this country.

We know the devastating effects of poverty. We want to reduce poverty and ensure that we are giving her constituents and constituents in my riding the best possible chance. I was at a school the other day for the breakfast program.

We want to ensure that we are listening to everyone. We want to make sure that our poverty reduction strategy has a real impact on Canadians across the country.

[Translation]

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Madam Speaker, the good news is that despite this “man cold”, as my wife calls it, my voice seems to be back. I hope it will stick around for the next 15 minutes so that I can speak to budget implementation act, 2018, No. 2. Before getting to what is in the bill or, more to the point, what is not, which might make up the bulk of my comments, I want to talk about the process.

Government Orders

After all, this is an omnibus bill, like the ones we saw so often under the previous government. The current government actually campaigned on a pledge to end the use of omnibus bills. The Liberals not only broke that promise, but they are constantly introducing omnibus bills. They use them not just for budgets, but also for other areas like public safety, transport and justice. We keep getting bills that are harder and harder for parliamentarians to study in any meaningful way.

I may be mistaken about the numbers, which we can check, but the mere fact that we can evoke this type of image says a lot. The Conservatives' first omnibus bill, Bill C-38, which was introduced in 2012 in the last Parliament, showed how abusive this practice had become. The bill was the nadir of this anti-democratic tendency, seeking to undermine the employment insurance program and eliminate the already inadequate environmental assessment process. The bill was hundreds of pages long.

If we were to combine the Conservatives' first omnibus bill from 2012 with the Liberals' first omnibus bill—not the one we are currently debating—we would have a bill the same size as the one before us, which is over 800 pages long.

That is completely ridiculous. I gather some of us are burning the midnight oil in our offices to read the bill. Some members say that they are sick of looking at the four walls of their offices, so they go read it at home. However, let us be honest. The idea that we have the time to consult our constituents, speak to stakeholders on the various files that critics are responsible for, read up on subjects of interest to MPs, and also read Bill C-86, including all the acts it amends, is simply unrealistic.

Some might say that this violates our parliamentary privileges. I am not looking to start a debate on privilege, but I do think it is important to point out how hard this makes it for us to do our jobs.

Even setting aside the size of the bill, the weight of it, and the rule against using props during debate in the House, I would advise my constituents not to print it out. It would be a waste of paper. The thing is massive.

On top of introducing a massive bill, the government has moved time allocation. Not only is it limiting debate in the wider sense by introducing a bill that is extremely difficult to study and therefore to debate, but it is also limiting the time for debate. In 10 or 20 minutes, the normal length of a speech in the House, it is impossible to address every issue. Plus, the government wants to limit the time for debate. This means that we, as the second opposition party, get to put up about eight speakers at most, out of about 40 or so MPs.

Some might say that the budget process, and therefore the budget implementation bill, are among the most important duties of the federal government. The fact that less than one-third of the members of a recognized opposition party get a chance to speak is a real problem.

Let us put the procedural issue aside, since we could talk for ages about this broken promise. I also want to talk about what is missing from this bill and, by extension, from the Liberals' budget. Unfortunately, the Liberals have neglected these elements too often over these past few years, since they came to power.

●(1155)

I would like to focus on a few aspects in particular. First, the government is still not charging web giants sales tax, even though that is a relatively simple matter. It is a matter of fairness and common sense.

When I was in my riding during the last parliamentary recess, I spoke with a constituent who told me that that is today's reality. We now get services via the Internet. That is how we download music, movies and television shows.

We are not asking the government to reinvent the wheel or to go against an existing trend. We are asking it to do two things. First, we are asking it to put all businesses on a level playing field. If Canadians order goods or services online, then they should have to pay sales tax the same way they would in a regular store. That may seem obvious to those watching at home, but the Liberal government has failed to do anything about this for far too long.

The Government of Quebec has led the way, and we hope that the other provinces and territories will follow its lead. However, with all due respect for our National Assembly colleagues, I have to say that it is not enough. The federal government has economic levers that it must use to level the playing field for businesses so that Canadians can benefit from the revenue generated under the law. That is what is lacking right now. However, it is not only the web giants, such as Netflix, Google, and Facebook, that must be required to charge sales tax. All the other digital platforms on which people can purchase goods must be, as well. The government is currently relying on the good faith of some stakeholders who have chosen to proactively charge sales tax.

Second, an agreement needs to be made regarding the future of our culture, specifically with regard to Netflix. I am not as familiar with this topic as my colleague from Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, who I am sure would have a lot to say about music platforms like Spotify and Apple Music. For now, I want focus on Netflix because I do not have much time.

I will not discuss the sales tax for now. I have no doubt the former heritage minister had a rough time in Quebec. Pretty much everyone unanimously agreed that her Netflix deal fell short, not only because of the percentage of francophone and Quebec content, which is nil, but also because the government asked so little of Netflix. The government is counting on the company to operate on the honour system and obey the law proactively.

Madam Speaker, I see your signal that I have just two minutes left. What better proof that it is impossible to study an omnibus bill in the time provided.

Government Orders

France and other countries offer examples of different ways to do this. We can also come up with our own model to acknowledge that this is the new normal without letting Internet giants rake in the profits while crushing our culture. We need to promote our cultural sector so that it can continue to make all of its unique offerings available to us with content that is our very own. This is about quality content and our duty to remember and share.

I will now move on to something else that is missing from the Liberals' budget.

The Minister of National Revenue keeps talking about a \$1-billion investment. The only thing that investment did was rub salt in the wound by uncovering the billions of dollars that are lost to tax evasion and tax avoidance. We see that cronyism is alive and well in the Liberal Party. The issue of the Panama papers and the paradise papers has not been resolved. Nothing has been done to recover those billions of dollars. Again, it is a matter of fairness.

In closing, I would say that the omnibus bill does very little to address the problems that the supposedly progressive Liberals promised to fix and this is their third attempt at it. That is three attempts and three failures.

• (1200)

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened closely to my colleague's comments. I really appreciated the parallel he drew at the beginning of his remarks between the current Liberal government and the previous Conservative government and their approach to doing things.

I wonder if he could expand on that because on reading Bill C-86, I am having a hard time differentiating between the Conservatives and the Liberals. Employment insurance has been overlooked, the fight against tax evasion and tax havens has been abandoned. The hon. member talked about Netflix and web giants. All these questions that we have been asking since our cohort was elected in 2011 have not been getting answered, not by the Conservatives or the Liberals.

Is it six of one and half a dozen of the other with these two parties?

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. He is right.

This government is even more frustrating than the previous one because it just talks and talks and talks, but does nothing. I want to go back to the example of Netflix. The minister kept telling us that Canada had entered the digital era. It was not just worth having for *Infoman*, it was the subject of *Infoman* a number of times because it was always being talked about. However, in the end, nothing was done.

My colleague mentioned EI and the issue of 15 weeks of benefits. People who are seriously ill are being ignored even though, as he said so well, people have been asking about it since before this government was elected. In 2015, I participated in a debate specifically on employment insurance that was held in my riding. Without me and my predecessor, who was running for the Bloc Québécois at the time, little would have been said about employment insurance. It seemed to be of no interest to the Liberal candidate.

What we can see is that the Liberals still are not very interested. It is unfortunate because the most vulnerable are the ones affected.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate some of the member's comments. There are a couple of thoughts that cross my mind with respect to the implementation of the budget. One is the fact that for the first time, we are looking at a pharmacare program. The Standing Committee on Health has been looking at this over the past few years. Now a special group is looking at it and will be coming forward to the Minister of Health with recommendations. This would be of great value to Canadians from all regions of the country.

Could my colleague provide his thoughts on the importance of moving forward on a national pharmacare program?

• (1205)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, yes, of course we want to move forward on that, and we do not understand why the Liberals are not doing so.

They have been promising a pharmacare program for decades. It would be the logical next step in a public health care system that was implemented in the 1960s. However, nothing has been done.

Now they want to study the issue some more. The member mentioned the work of the Standing Committee on Health, which tabled a unanimous report dealing with that issue in which it makes recommendations based on the advice of expert witnesses. I fail to understand why they insist on studying this issue over and over again without ever taking action. The member asked me whether we should move forward. Yes, we need to do so now, because vulnerable people are paying the price of inaction.

As a member from Quebec, I have to point out one last thing. As everyone knows, Quebec is way ahead when it comes to pharmacare. That said, the federal government could do its part by offering the right to opt out with no strings attached and with compensation. Ottawa has tremendous purchasing power that could help bring down the price of prescription drugs for the provinces.

Obviously, this will all depend on how the negotiations go. A lot of work remains to be done to implement this, so let us stop with the studies and let us actually do the work. People desperately need this.

[*English*]

Mr. Marwan Tabbara (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today in support of Bill C-86.

For people watching at home, some of what we are discussing today may sound familiar. That is because we heard about these programs earlier this year when the Minister of Finance presented the 2018 budget on February 27.

Budgets, by their nature, are aspirational, forward-looking documents. They are an expression of what we, as a government, are planning to do.

Government Orders

In order to achieve the objectives which we have set out for ourselves in the budget, we must make new laws or make changes to existing laws. To do that, we must pass legislation.

The aspirations in this year's budget took nearly 400 pages to express. If the budget took nearly 400 printed pages to express, the laws needed to implement the plan have to be written. That generally involves multiples of 400 pages and then those laws have to be presented and debated in the House of Commons, be examined by a committee or committees, be passed by the House, then sent to the Senate, debated and reviewed by a Senate committee, passed by the Senate and then sent to the Governor General for royal assent. All that takes a lot of time.

Therefore, we divide the budget plan into those items that need to get passed right away. Soon after the budget is presented, we deal with those items with a first piece of legislation. Then later we deal with the more forward-looking plans in the budget and we create a second piece of legislation to implement the remainder of the budget plan.

Today we are discussing that second piece of legislation to implement the 2018 budget. One of the aspirations expressed in budget 2018 was that we should address the gender wage gap by making progress toward equal pay for equal work. The issue arises because, as the budget said:

In Canada today, women earn 31 per cent less than men do...the median income for women is \$28,120, compared with \$40,890 for men...As the largest employer in the country, many have called on the federal government to lead by example—and that is what the Government will do.

The bill we are debating today introduces proactive pay equity legislation for workers in the federal government and in federally regulated sectors. Equal pay for work of equal value is the smart thing to do. We are very proud to be moving forward with proactive pay equity legislation. It is a key way in which our government is delivering on its commitment to gender equality.

Bill C-86 proposed to enact the pay equity act to establish a proactive process for the achievement of pay equity by the redressing of the systemic gender-based discrimination experienced by employees who occupy positions in predominantly female job classes. The new act would require federal public and private sector employers that would have 10 or more employees to establish and maintain a pay equity plan, with set time frames, to identify and correct differences in compensation between predominantly female and predominantly male job classes for which the work performed would be of equal value.

The new act would provide for the powers, duties and functions of a pay equity commissioner, which would include facilitating the resolution of disputes, conducting compliance audits and investigating disputes, objections and complaints, as well as making orders and imposing administrative monetary penalties for violations of that act. The new act would also require the pay equity commissioner to report annually to Parliament on the administration and enforcement of the new act.

Bill C-86 would also amend the Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act to provide for the application of the pay equity act to parliamentary employers. It would also make the Minister of

Labour responsible for the administration of the federal contractors program for pay equity.

• (1210)

On modernizing the federal labour standards, the amendments to the Canada Labour Code that Bill C-86 would make are:

(a) provide five days of paid leave for victims of family violence, a personal leave of five days with three paid days, an unpaid leave for court or jury duty and a fourth week of annual vacation with pay for employees who have completed at least 10 consecutive years of employment; (b) eliminate minimum length of service requirements for leaves and general holiday pay and reduce the length of service requirement for three weeks of vacation with pay; (c) prohibit differences in rate of wages based on the employment status of employees... (e) update group and individual termination provisions by increasing the minimum notice of termination.

Bill C-86 would also amend the Wage Earner Protection Program Act to:

...among other things, increase the maximum amount that may be paid to an individual under the act, increase the maximum amount that may be paid to an individual under the Act, expand the definition of eligible wages, expand the conditions under which a payment may be made under the Act.

It is interesting to note that while the Liberal federal government is enhancing labour standards for workers, the Conservative provincial government in Ontario is in the process of diminishing labour standards. We would think that the first rule of government would be like that of the medical profession: First do not harm.

I share the disappointment of some members of the House that we were not able to take a further step forward by protecting worker pensions in the event of insolvency of employers. Bill C-86 would make amendments to Canada's insolvency legislation and would improve the Wage Earner Protection Program Act. However, it does not address the issue, which is essentially of deferred wages remaining unpaid. The pension of workers need protection from employers' bankruptcy by giving pension funds priority in employer bankruptcies. I hope we can move forward to correct this problem in the not too distant future.

I also want to talk about our record of our government and what we have done for middle-class Canadians.

The investments made from our government in middle-class Canadians consist of \$40 billion in a national housing strategy. This is much-needed and will help Canadians have a decent home to live and raise their families. We have also increased the Canada child benefit, which will be indexed as of this year. An average family will receive \$2,000 more in its pocket to help with the high cost of raising its children. We have lifted hundreds of thousands of children out of poverty.

With respect to jobs, we have created over 500,000 new jobs since 2015. We have had the lowest unemployment rate in 40 years. The unemployment rate nationally is around 5.8% to 6%. In Waterloo Region, at the end of October, that unemployment rate was at 5.2%.

We have also announced federal funding for a high-tech company in my riding, North Inc., which is making high-tech Focals, eyeglasses. This has increased jobs in my region. It has added 230 good well-paying jobs in the high-tech sector.

Government Orders

As well, and not in terms of the budget, in my committee of citizenship and immigration, we brought in the global skills strategy to bring in high-tech workers to our region to ensure we closed the gaps in the high-tech sector.

In infrastructure spending, we have added historic spending of \$120 billion in infrastructure projects. In my region alone, I have announced \$97 million for a highway expansion, going from six lanes to 10 lanes, so we can get our products to market faster and can have faster commutes to and from the GTA from our region.

Also, we have lowered taxes for the middle class, from 22% down to 20.5%. We have also lowered taxes on businesses, from 11% to 9% in 2019.

These are some of the things our government has laid out and it is our record since we formed government. This is why I am supporting this budget.

• (1215)

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to my Liberal colleague sharing with this House and Canadians his perspective on how good the budget is. The theme is spend, spend, spend and spend some more. If any organization, business or family in Canada spent the way the government is spending, would it be sustainable? If a company was to hire more staff, pay higher salaries, provide additional benefits, and spend and spend all on borrowed money, how long can that go on? I believe it cannot go on, it is not sustainable, and a company would go out of business because it cannot live and prosper on borrowed money. Therefore, the question is this. Does he believe this is sustainable? Hopefully, he will say no. If so, when will the budget be balanced?

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are the opposition and, rightfully so, they have to ensure the government is investing in Canadians, that investment is recuperating and that investment is coming back to Canadians. Therefore, I will provide the House with the record.

Since we have taken office, we have invested in Canadians. We have seen an unemployment rate hovering around 7%, now down to 5.8% or around 6%. As I mentioned in my speech, in my region it is at 5.2%. When we put the investments in place for Canadians we see that record.

Also, we have lowered taxes on middle-class Canadians from 22% down to 20.5%. That has led to Canadians spending more in the economy and when there is more spending more businesses will be able to sell their products. We have seen that kind of a record. When we invest in Canadians, we see that record coming back.

Mr. Scott Duvall (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague mentioned the Bankruptcy Act. He was talking about pension protection on deferred wages. Did I hear him correctly? Did he say that he is for making sure that pensions are protected and that these are deferred wages and should have a higher priority with respect to a bankruptcy liquidation?

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, there have been companies in the past that have gone into insolvency or bankruptcy and a lot of the time pensioners were the last to get paid. We have seen it here with Nortel in Ottawa and I am sure the member has seen it in his region in Hamilton. Moving forward, we want to see that pensioners

are protected. A lot of the pensioners who are in unions have taken minimal wage increases throughout the years in order to protect their pensions and their benefits. Therefore, we want to ensure that pensions are protected. Personally, I want to see this going forward so that we can see pensioners being protected.

• (1220)

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his speech.

Everyone understands that it is never a good idea to limit debate on a bill, especially on such a large bill. This one here has nearly 900 pages.

We cannot forget that this political party made a promise during the last election campaign to not introduce massive omnibus bills. The Liberals also promised to limit the use of time allocation measures. They are renegeing on their commitments.

For us, the worst part is having to watch the government continue to run up deficits. We have no idea when the budget will be balanced again. A member was elected three years and a couple months ago on the promise that Canada would return to a balanced budget in 2019.

Why did the government and this member not keep their word?

[English]

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, we made a promise to invest in Canadians, and that is what we are doing. We are doing the best of the G7 countries. Canadian wages are among the best in the G7 countries. We will continue to invest in Canadians. We will see this record through. We will ensure that we are doing the best for Canadians by investing in them and opening up markets, which we have done with the TPP, CETA and the new USMCA. We will continue to deliver for Canadians.

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to speak to Bill C-86, the budget implementation act. I feel fortunate that I will get to speak on this bill, but because of time allocation on this bill and multiple others by the government, many of my colleagues are not going to have the opportunity to debate it. I feel fortunate that I at least get to debate the bill and question the government.

It has been pointed out many times that the government made numerous promises in its election campaign that it has no intention of upholding. When I make a promise, I vow to uphold it, but the government seems to have no respect for that whatsoever or for Canadian citizens, which I find simply abhorrent.

Government Orders

Liberals promised not to introduce omnibus bills and yet we have a budget implementation act of over 800 pages, almost 900 pages, in fact. Just the summary of this bill is over 12 pages long. It is a massive bill that deserves full debate in the House, but with time allocation being applied, we will not get that opportunity. I have spoken with my colleagues who wanted parts of this bill taken out and debated separately in committee, but those requests were denied by the Liberals at committee. It is a shame that we cannot properly debate a bill that is so important to every Canadian.

I will go back to the election promises that the government made back in 2015. Liberals claim to have been elected on a mandate of what they said they would do for the Canadian public and a big part of it was to keep the deficit below \$10 billion per year. That is a promise broken. Another part of the 2015 election campaign was that deficits would decrease annually as Liberals moved through their mandate. That is a promise broken. Liberals promised to reach a balanced budget by 2019. That is a promise broken. They promised to be open and transparent in their government. We have seen multiple times how that promise has been broken and we have another example of it again today with time allocation being applied to debate on this bill so that we cannot fully expose this bill for what it is to the Canadian public.

When I return to my riding of North Okanagan—Shuswap, increasingly people approach me and ask what we can do to stop this out-of-control spending by the government and the debt that it is passing on to future generations. That truly concerns me. There are a lot of young entrepreneurs in my riding looking to a brighter future, but we see what the government is doing with these continual deficits of nearly \$20 billion year after year. Most people cannot visualize what that \$20 billion would look like in a project in the town or community they live in or a project at home.

That \$20 billion does not translate easily to individuals, but it creates an approximate \$600 debt load per person. The government puts every man, woman, child, infant and senior in Canada further in debt by almost \$600 every year. In three years, that is \$1,800 for every man, woman and child. Imagine what it will cost a family of four people. It is unbelievable when people hear what this really means for families and individuals. When we work into that the percentage of Canadians who are full time in the workforce, it is probably about 25% of Canadians. Therefore, one in four Canadians is paying back the incredible debt that the government is building up.

• (1225)

In 2019, we are working towards electing a Conservative government, led by our leader. We are looking forward to bringing reality back to finances in Canada, so that we can provide hope and prosperity, and a future for those young Canadians.

The only way we are going to be able to do that is to try to keep them out of this incredible debt that the government keeps piling on. I cannot imagine. I have a daughter and son-in-law who have established themselves, but I cannot imagine having teenagers or young children right now and having to tell them that, with the government, they are going to be another \$500 or \$600 per year further in debt every time the government passes a budget. That is very troubling to me. I cannot imagine passing on that information on the doorstep.

That is what I am hearing from people when I am back home. They do not want that debt passed on to their children. Time and time again, people are asking, “How can we stop this?”

Another of the factors that have popped up in this bill and that have been pointed out is the increase in the debt servicing costs of government. It will not matter whether it is a Liberal, Conservative, coalition or minority government. It will not matter; the increased debt servicing costs could grow by up to 60% under the current government's plan. That is incomprehensible. It will mean that we could end up paying more in debt servicing per year than our current health care transfers to the provinces.

What it means is that what the government is creating in deficits and debt load to future governments is going to be taking away from something else that we should be able to pay for in the future. Whether that is housing, health care or business investment, all of those things are going to be impacted by the debt load that is currently being passed on by the government.

Getting back to some more of the promises that were made by the government and have now been broken, it promised to reduce business taxes. It has done that in some ways, but in other ways it has reached into the back pockets of business people and taken more out than it has actually put in. It did that earlier this year with the implementation of the deferred income taxes.

The government increased taxes on passive income investments. It will be up to 73% that individuals will have to pay on those passive investments. That is absolutely killing corporate investment in avenues other than their core business. Many people who had surplus income in their primary business decided to purchase rental properties, whether it was detached homes or small apartment buildings and so on. They would invest their extra income in purchasing those rental properties to create lower-income rental opportunities for individuals in the community who could not afford to purchase their own home.

I have had those individuals approach me time and time again over the summer and since, and they say they are no longer going to do that. There is no point in investing in a secondary business other than their primary investment. It is no longer feasible because of what the government is doing.

I know my time is running down, so I will try to wrap up. With over 800 pages in this bill, it is really difficult to fit in much detail about the individual pieces in a 10-minute presentation. Again, I want to stress the fact that the government has moved time allocation on the bill which, for most of our members, will remove the opportunity to speak on this bill. Again, it is deplorable that the government keeps doing this. I cannot comprehend how we are going to get past this.

We need to work together, as government and as opposition, on what is good for Canadians, but the government is making it almost impossible. I will wrap up with that statement.

Government Orders

• (1230)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the common issues constantly brought up by Conservative members, whether in speeches or when asking questions, is the deficit.

When I think of deficits, I think of the last 151 years of the Canadian Confederation. In that last 151 years, Conservatives have governed the country 38% of the time, and yet have accumulated almost 75% of our deficits. Nevertheless, when they are in opposition, they seem to be so focused on deficits. That seems to be at odds with their history. In government, the Conservatives do not really care about deficits, as the historical numbers clearly demonstrate, yet when they are in opposition they want to talk about deficits. Could my colleague explain why?

Mr. Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, the biggest reason we have had to deal with deficits is that we have taken over from Liberal governments that have spent the cupboards absolutely bare. We come back in when the economy has changed and business investment has left the country because of the tax situations that Liberal governments have created. We come in as Conservative governments and have to put the books back in order, and so we have to take on debt load to try to bring business investment back to Canada to turn around the negative situation the Liberal governments continually put Canada in.

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague's speech was thoughtful, highlighting that the government continues to fail, and its legacy of broken promises.

The government members have said they are investing in Canadians. Where is this money coming from that the Liberals are investing in Canadians? If they are spending, spending, spending, is it sustainable?

• (1235)

Mr. Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Langley—Aldergrove asked where the money is coming from. It is plain and simple where. It is coming from future Canadians, but they do not realize it yet, unfortunately. We cannot continue to wrack up deficit after deficit after deficit.

I came from a small business. If I ran my business that way, it would be bankrupt. If I ran my household that way, spending more every year than I was bringing in, either I would go bankrupt or I would pass on a huge debt load to my children and grandchildren.

However, that is what the current government seems to think it is okay to do. It boggles my mind how the Liberals think it is okay to pass on huge debt to future generations like they are doing.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that it was the Conservatives who accumulated most of Canada's debt, almost 75% of it. The response I got was that the Liberals made them do it, so it is the Liberals who forced the Conservatives to do it. That is just not true.

The Paul Martin budget was a multi-billion dollar surplus. The cupboards were not bare. It was a multi-billion dollar surplus that Stephen Harper inherited. Even before the recession kicked in, that

multi-billion dollar surplus was converted into a multi-billion dollar deficit.

I wonder if my colleague would change his mind, upon reflection, as opposed to trying to say that the Liberal Party made the Conservatives run deficits, and maybe take responsibility and allow for the fact that the Conservatives really do not know what they are talking about when it comes to deficits.

Mr. Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, deficits arose with the great global recession of 2007-09. We were forced into running deficits to keep Canadians working. In fact, when we were running those deficits, it was the Liberals who kept screaming, from this side of the House at that time. They wanted bigger and bigger deficits, and yet now they want to stand back and criticize us.

Now when times are good, when the economy seems to be relatively stable and there is some surplus income, that is when most prudent businesses and governments try to pay down their debts. They try to put it toward paying off those debts so that when the tough times come, they are not in such a drastic situation, trying to scramble and find out where they can save and cut money to pay back the debt they have built up.

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour to stand today to support the initiatives of our government that are expressed through the bill as we implement the budget promises we made last spring, and to deliver real hope, real change and real possibilities for growth in the country for some of Canada's most vulnerable populations.

The main focus of my comments will be on the poverty reduction strategy. It is Canada's first-ever poverty reduction strategy with real targets and real tools to measure not just poverty as it exists across the country, but also as it exists in specific regions, centres, and within specific populations.

The new strategy is critical, because one of the goals of the government—and we hear the phrase repeated often—is not just growing a stronger middle class, but the support that is required to help people join that middle class, to lift themselves out of poverty by giving them the tools they need, the support they require and the opportunities they desire to make sure their lives are transformed. This is critical for the success of our country, because as we build stronger families and healthier communities, we also build more resilient children. That gives us hope for the future that the next generation will have the capacity to provide much more support for all of us as we move forward together as a country.

To set the context, we need to understand that the poverty reduction strategy, while it is a new strategy enunciated in policy, is not something we just started to begin work on. The day we took office, we began making investments right across the country to make a transformational change in people's lives. In fact, well over 600,000 Canadians have been lifted out of poverty as a direct result of the steps taken by our government. That does not include the close to 500,000 new full-time jobs that have been created, which have also created a situation allowing people to avoid poverty. I say this because the prevention of poverty is just as important as its alleviation.

Government Orders

The \$22 billion we invested includes about \$5.6 billion invested in housing. As soon as we introduced our first budget, we tripled the transfers to the provinces and doubled the investments in community organizations that are leading the fight against homelessness.

We also introduced the Canada child benefit and changed its profile. Not only is it a more generous benefit, but it is also now tax free and means-tested, which means that those with the greatest need will get the greatest support. Unlike the previous government, we do not send the cheques to millionaires and we do not tax the dollars after they have arrived in families' bank accounts. This has probably been the most profound change in social policy in this country in a generation, and probably the most important component of lifting those children I just referenced out of poverty.

Additionally, changes have been made to the CPP as we move forward to secure people's retirement funds. We have also boosted the GIS to make sure that single women, in particular, who are often alone at the end of their lives, get the boost they need to make sure that their incomes are better supported, giving them the capacity to maintain their living standards.

In addition, \$7.5 billion has been invested in early learning and child care. These transfers were delivered directly to the provinces, who since the collapse of the previous national day care strategy have evolved their programs and now have a more asymmetrical situation across the country. As we invest that \$7.5 billion over the next 10 years, it has already started to sustain existing spaces, provide new capital for expansion, and also provide that critical expansion of the child care system. In fact, in Ontario, 100,000 new spaces of subsidized, quality, affordable child care have been created as a direct result of the investments in partnership with the provinces.

For the first time ever, child care support has also been directed toward indigenous organizations to make sure that distinction-based programs, led, designed and delivered by indigenous communities for their children, are now part of the program. We have also made those investments, which are having an impact on families outside the mainstream programs that have existed for a generation in our country.

On top of child care, substantial investments have also been made in indigenous communities, both on and off reserve, both inside and outside of treaties, both in rural-remote regions and urban centres. These investments have led to cleaner drinking water, better housing, better education and, most importantly, better health programs being provided. In particular on Jordan's principle, in comparison with the approval and enrolment rates under the previous government, which in 10 years managed to get only one child served under Jordan's principle, we are talking about thousands and thousands being served every single year.

These are transformational changes, which have set the base for an even more aggressive push to eliminate even more of the poverty we see in our country, because we cannot sustain poverty in a country as rich as ours with a clean conscience.

As we set the new poverty standard and come across a standard way of measuring it so that we can have a common base to understand exactly whom we lifting out of poverty and how our programs are having that impact, we are often criticized for not

having announced new programs simultaneously to our establishing this poverty line.

• (1240)

Let me assure members that there are already programs and investments forecast into the future that have not been included in the 650,000 calculation we have already used to address the people we have lifted out of poverty. For example, we have the signing of bilateral agreements. I was just in the Northwest Territories doing exactly this, signing bilateral agreements on the Canada housing benefit.

The Canada housing benefit is a new way to subsidize people's living arrangements, giving agency and choice to low-income Canadians to choose the housing that best suits their needs. Those subsidies do not kick in until next year, but will have a dramatic impact on the quality of life and alleviation of poverty among those people who are in core housing need. In fact, when one includes all the other components of the national housing strategy, we seek to support well over 650,000 Canadians, and closer to 700,000. Then we get into repairs and some of the other programs that are part of the 10-year forecast.

Those dollars are locked in and are built on top of the \$5 billion we have already spent. We have also reprofiled those dollars to make them more flexible, in particular in the way in which they impact women and children, to make sure that those housing needs are addressed specifically through a national housing strategy. They were not in the previous iteration of the program. The new national housing strategy re-profiles that \$40 billion and projects it into those people's lives as yet another way to alleviate poverty.

This particular bill also addresses pay equity. I have heard the members opposite complain that the bill is too big. It covers seven distinct pieces of legislation, but the piece on pay equity covers the entire breadth of federally regulated and federally administered pay programs. It is a big, complex bill because pay equity touches virtually every corner of the government, as well as significant parts of the country's private sector. That is why the bill is 850 pages long.

The bill is a comprehensive all-of-government, all-of country approach to pay equity. We are very proud to push that forward, because pay equity, again, is one of the most important tools we can put together to ensure that we reduce poverty, in particular of women but also of families and Canadians right across the country. Pay equity, giving a fair chance to everybody, in particular women, benefits us all. As women's economic situations solidify and strengthen in this country, small and medium businesses and all our social dynamics strengthen as women become more powerful. That is one of the most important reasons to support pay equity. It is good for everyone, even those who are not women.

Government Orders

Additionally, we have also included an indexing formula in the Canada child benefit so that it will grow over time for families to ensure that inflation does not claw back the good, strong investments we have made to eradicate child poverty. Again, those dollars are not calculated as part of our poverty reduction plan, which was in place prior to the strategy, but will have an impact afterward.

Then of course there is the national housing strategy, the \$40-billion investment. I have heard some suggest that the way to do a housing program, which we have seen in the platforms of previous parties as they tried to get elected to Parliament, is to put the money upfront and just let the program drift off into the future. As someone who has done much of the consultation work with the minister and CMHC to put this strategy together, I can say that the reality is that the advice we were given by academics, housing providers, municipal partners and provincial agencies was that the best way to build a housing program was to invest heavily to start and then grow the investment as the system gets bigger over time.

In other words, if a riding were to receive a thousand units of public housing this year, a thousand next year and a thousand the year after that, its housing needs would go from 1,000 to 2,000 to 3,000. Repair needs grow with that, as do subsidy requirements, and if the program is not back-end loaded, one will not be able to build a successful system while building good, strong housing programs. That is why the program not only lasts 10 years, past two elections, but also grows over time to support a bigger, stronger, more robust capacity to house Canadians in need.

Put together, this constitutes our government's strategy for housing, poverty and improving the lives of indigenous people, women and many of the marginalized and racialized communities in this country. We have focused our programs based on data, the information we have received from stakeholders, and partnerships with indigenous, municipal, provincial and territorial governments. In total, the early investments, the project investments, the new tools to measure, study and drive data into the system to alleviate poverty are the reasons this bill is large, why are ambitions are just as big, and most importantly, why the achievements are so profound.

We are very, very proud of this particular piece of legislation. I hope that all of Canada can support it. I hope that everyone in Parliament can support it. This is delivering real change, real housing and real support to Canadians from coast to coast to coast, and I encourage all parliamentarians to support it as such.

• (1245)

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member tries to make the world look pretty rosy through his glasses. In fact, the simple question of when the budget will be balanced cannot be answered by anyone on that side of the House. They are embarrassed that it will be at least 27 years before that happens

We have heard a lot about the half-million jobs the Liberals say they have produced. I was only here for 23 months in the former Harper government, and we produced 1.2 million permanent jobs in Canada.

I would be in favour of a poverty reduction program as well. However, only the Liberal government, as we found out earlier this week, can spend half a million dollars on a slogan for a poverty

reduction program instead of putting half a million dollars toward poverty.

Out-of-control spending of \$4.5 billion for a pipeline no one wants to buy now and \$10.5 million for a convicted terrorist, Mr. Khadr, are examples of why Canadians are upset today with the government. Never mind the fact that the Liberal government has not been able to build pipelines to get our natural resources, which are an economic driver for our country, in place so it can do the kind of spending it would like to do.

I would like to ask my colleague if he can tell us how soon he believes the budget will be balanced, and more so, if that is actually important to him.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Mr. Speaker, making sure that Canada's fiscal house is in order is critically important. That is why we have made sure that we sustain the discipline so that our debt-to-GDP ratio continues to trend in the right direction and is in fact the lowest ratio in the G7. It is one of the things that has given us the capacity to stimulate the economy and grow those jobs.

The member opposite talks about jobs created. What he did not talk about was the jobs lost as not only a global recession hit this country but the Conservative austerity measures plunged this country into a second recession, the only G7 country that managed to achieve that. As a result, the net number of jobs that came to Canada were significantly reduced. It is why we have the lowest unemployment rate in 40 years right now, which is a good anti-poverty strategy.

As it relates to the deficit the party opposite talks about, there are lots of different deficits within a complex economy. For example, there is an infrastructure deficit. The previous government left us with a \$660-billion infrastructure deficit. That meant that expressways were falling down, bridges were not being built, transit was not being delivered, water was not clean, highways were broken, and housing was not being fixed or repaired. That deficit was real, because it impacted people's lives and the economy and productivity of this country. The Conservatives passed that on to this government and future generations.

The books need to be brought back into balance. However, it is not just the books as they relate to deficits and debt. It is also the social deficit, the environmental deficit and the infrastructure deficit of this country. One reason the Conservative Party was tossed out was that those other deficits were atrocious and required change. The change people are getting includes sustained and focused investments that are not only good for the people using the infrastructure and social pieces of government but are good for the country, because they grow—

Government Orders

• (1250)

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments. The hon. member for Jonquière.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this massive 850-page bill contains seven different pieces of legislation, and yet the Standing Committee on Finance held only three meetings to study it.

What is more, the 36 amendments proposed by the NDP in committee were all rejected. The Liberals did not even take the time to study or debate them. They rejected them all, including those recommended by the Ontario Equal Pay Coalition, the Canadian Labour Congress or CLC, the Canadian Union of Public Employees or CUPE, Teamsters Canada and the Public Service Alliance of Canada or PSAC. All of the witnesses from these unions agreed that amendments were needed so that the bill would remedy the shortcomings in the legislation, which requires women to go to court to get equal pay for equal work.

If the Liberals were serious about pay equity, why did they not create a stand-alone bill on this subject that we could have debated in the House? That way women would not have to wait three or four years for pay equity.

[*English*]

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Mr. Speaker, the NDP members often complain about two things: either we are consulting and are going too slow, or we have not consulted and are going too fast. I think we have hit the right balance here. We have put together comprehensive pay equity legislation after substantial consultation over the last three years with stakeholders, unions, private, public and governmental sources.

With regard to amendments, we have all been around committees in this place. We all see sort of a consensus emerge on how to fix a particular bill. The opposition presents one way to fix it, and the government produces a different way. The opposition's proposal might be defeated, but a very similar proposal will have the support of the government side. It is really a question of detail, sometimes, in those decisions.

As for pay equity, it is essential that we get it done in this term of Parliament. Women have waited too long. I was here in 2005 as a reporter when the NDP members rolled the dice and decided they could get a better deal under Stephen Harper than under Paul Martin. They not only collapsed the Kelowna accord, they not only collapsed an extra \$2 billion for housing, they not only collapsed a national child care strategy, they collapsed comprehensive pay equity legislation as well.

Members will say that they did not roll the dice and that Canadians changed the government. Sure, Canadians changed the government, but at some point, the NDP is going to have to take responsibility for what it does, not what it aspires to do. In this case, it collapsed those pieces of legislation, and it can live with that. That is its party record.

I would also remind the party members opposite of the zero dollars they wanted to spend on housing this year or the \$25 million they wanted to spend on indigenous infrastructure, a grand total of

\$375 million. If that is what they thought was the scope of the problem with indigenous communities across this country, they either did not care, did not know, or did not want to act.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today we are talking about the Liberals, who are proposing a hefty 850-page bill. It is an omnibus bill. It is the largest bill ever introduced in the House of Commons. The omnibus bills that the Conservatives used to introduce were 75 pages long. Today we are seeing an 800% or even 900% increase with this 851-page bill. The Liberals were elected on a promise to be more transparent and more accountable.

Furthermore, we are debating this unusually large bill under a gag order. This morning, the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour was boasting about how she has already given opposition members 15 hours of debate.

According to my calculations, 15 hours of debate divided by 851 pages equals one minute and five seconds per page. Is it responsible to allocate so little time to debate a bill? I use the phrase “debate a bill” loosely, because only eight NDP MPs and five Conservative MPs spoke to this bill before today, if memory serves.

The Liberals say that they are more democratic, more transparent and more accountable, but I have my doubts. I think that everyone has reason to doubt the goodwill and good faith of the Liberals.

As my colleague from Jonquière said, this bill amends seven acts. The Liberals have never been able to tell us how many clauses and subclauses are in this mammoth bill. They themselves do not even know. They do not even know all the things they put in this bill. It is ridiculous to have to debate it under time allocation.

I will focus on just a few points in my speech because, unfortunately, nobody in the House can cover all the measures introduced in the nearly 900-page bill in just 10 minutes.

Women have been waiting 42 years for the Liberals to keep their promises on pay equity. Unions have been fighting Canada Post in court over that for 30 years. The government is yet again telling women they will have to wait. Pay equity legislation will come into force not in a matter of weeks or months, but in four years.

Our party has been a tireless advocate for this important issue. We have even proposed changes in the past. As we heard from my colleague from Jonquière, the NDP proposed 36 amendments. The Conservatives proposed amendments. The other parties proposed amendments. How many amendments did the Liberals accept? Not one single amendment was accepted, despite the fact that they reflected the demands of unions and the demands of various women's groups. Not one amendment was accepted to improve the bill, to give women a stronger voice. The Liberals did not agree to any of our suggestions.

Government Orders

Canada is facing some major challenges that require a bolder approach than the one the Liberals are using. The first initiatives requiring employers to determine how many people must receive more pay are a step in the right direction. However, what could possibly justify how long it will take to implement this? Is it acceptable that women continue to be underpaid for another four years under this government?

In 2018, women earn on average \$12,700 less than men. If we multiply that by four, that means nearly \$51,000 less for women. The government says it is proud to have introduced pay equity legislation. However, women will still have \$51,000 less in their pockets, which is a lot.

If I had to summarize the government's action, I would have to say that it is nothing but half measures. The time it will take to implement pay equity is the biggest problem lurking behind the government's facade of good intentions, but it is not the only one. There is also the fact that budget implementation act, 2018, No. 2 does not require employers to apply pay equity to workers who were already under contract if changes are subsequently made to the contract following a call for tenders. Why? We do not know.

• (1255)

The bill also does not include any of the pay transparency measures that advocates have called for. Salaries cannot be compared when pay equity issues are being addressed. What is wrong with that picture? Will the pay equity commissioner have the resources needed to do his or her work properly? We do not know that either.

Speaking of half measures, why did the government not adopt the recommendations set out in the Bilson report, including the creation of a pay equity hearings tribunal? Lastly, the Liberals are once again professing to support equality while telling a segment of the population that is being treated unfairly to grin and bear it. I would like to remind the government that women represent 51% of the population.

The government made its choice. It chose not to make the investments needed to ensure that women receive equal pay, and chose instead to give big business, the richest people in the world, \$14 billion in tax cuts. This measure was introduced last week in the Minister of Finance's fall economic statement. Did the rich and these big corporations really need that \$14 billion this fall? I do not think so. They are getting help, yet many of them evade taxes or openly use tax havens to avoid paying taxes.

The same is true for web giants like Netflix, Apple and Facebook, which pay virtually nothing in taxes and then get tax breaks. However, they use our services and are quite happy to hire highly skilled workers from Quebec and Canada. The Liberals claim that our SMEs are important and that they want to support buying local, but they support the web giants that do not need to worry about all of the taxes imposed on our SMEs under Canadian law.

How much of this money will go to rural areas? We have no idea. The government is allocating billions of dollars for businesses to buy new equipment and innovate, but how can we innovate when our rural areas do not even have access to high-speed Internet or a 3G or LTE cellular network?

The Auditor General criticized the government for its lack of judgment in managing public money allocated to the connect to innovate program. Some municipalities in my riding are turned down for this program or CRTC funds for ridiculous reasons, such as the fact that there is already a home with high-speed Internet within a 25-kilometre radius. This is happening in Saint-Louis-de-Gonzague, and all the areas served by Coop CSUR in the Soulanges area are under the same restriction. Do we really want a double standard for our rural and urban areas?

On another subject, how will the poverty reduction strategy be funded? Apparently, it will be made up of existing programs without any additional money. I think the Liberals are just thumbing their noses at us. They have targets, but no plan. That seems to be a theme with this government, because it does not have a plan for the environment either. The Liberals got themselves elected in 2015 by saying, "We have a plan, we have a plan, we have a plan". Today, there is no plan, there is no plan, there is no plan. I think I will use that in an ad.

Are they going to help the most vulnerable citizens access health care services more easily? No. There is no plan for pharmacare either, even though we know that we could save \$3 billion a year according to conservative estimates. We could make a lot of investments in health care with that money.

What other measures does the bill include to drastically reduce our CO₂ and methane emissions starting this year? None. Is the government planning to help rural areas go green, develop public transit, make their homes more energy efficient, or use solar and wind power? No.

Is the government going to implement restrictions to help big corporations reduce their greenhouse gas emissions? No, of course there is no plan to do that. Will the federal government finally have a costed plan for reducing its own greenhouse gas emissions? No, it has no plan for that either.

It has been pointed out that many citizen movements have been launched. In Quebec, artists, scientists, economists and citizens have signed A Pact for the Transition. Millennials have been criticized for not being more involved in all kinds of things, but yesterday, young people who realized that the government is not doing anything for the environment took action, and a youth environmental group called ENvironnement JEUnesse brought suit against the federal government for failing to take action on the environment.

• (1300)

I have to stop now because I am out of time, but that shows just how important the environment is to people 35 and under and how absurd it was for the government to spend \$4.5 billion of taxpayers' money on a pipeline.

That move was not a plan or investment for keeping our planet healthy for current and future generations. It is shameful.

• (1305)

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to ask my colleague opposite a question.

Government Orders

The purpose of my question is simple.

[*English*]

The member opposite complained that there was not enough investment to back up the strategy or move forward some of these critical social issues in order to achieve them. I will take housing as an example, because I have often heard the opposite side say that it all comes after the next election.

The member opposite knows, because she complained that in the first budget the money was too little to solve the problem. I agree, we needed the full \$40 billion on top of the first investment. However, in our first budget, we tripled transfers to provinces and that money is building housing now, supporting housing now and renewing housing agreements now. We doubled the money that was going to homeless organizations that are fighting homelessness. We have now added an additional \$40 billion on top of that, and reprofiled the money to be a little more flexible so that it can, in particular, support women and children across the country. In other words, the national housing strategy is not a 10-year, \$40-billion program, but actually closer to \$55 billion over 14 years, if we take into account the dollars announced before we reprofiled the money.

Would the member not agree that, from the minute we took office and the first budget we passed right through to now, we have invested well beyond \$40 billion? Will the member also agree that those dollars are being spent as we speak?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Mr. Speaker, I hear my colleague from Hamilton Mountain shouting that it is 14 years. I am not the one saying so. Many social housing organizations across Canada are saying that 90% of the investments in social housing announced by the Liberals will not come until after the next election.

Way to go. The housing crisis is happening right now.

People are also talking about other crises. I do not know if the Liberals have their heads buried in the sand or what, but every week for the last four weeks, someone has had something to say about the environment. Global warming is the number one issue. Everyone says that urgent action is needed now.

What do the Liberals propose in these 851 pages? There is nothing for the environment, a big fat zero in terms of investment and a big fat zero in terms of plans. There is nothing for decarbonization, nothing for public transit, nothing for reviewing building codes to make them more energy efficient. There is also nothing to keep fossil fuels in the ground or to promote the development of green and renewable energy sources.

Where is the Liberals' vision for addressing climate change? I do not see it here. It is nowhere to be found.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech. I wholeheartedly agree with what she said about climate change.

What we need right now is not a plan to deal with a small issue because this is no longer about the environment. No, climate change has now become a critical and urgent issue. It is clearly no longer an environmental issue. It has become a threat to the security of our country and our planet.

I would like to ask the member if she has anything else to propose to effectively address this threat.

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Saanich—Gulf Islands. She is obviously very involved in this file and her involvement in and commitment to society in general are a good example of some of the things that can be done.

Many scientists, industry representatives, workers in the environmental field, and people around the world are carrying out initiatives in this regard. Thousands of initiatives are being carried out around the world. I am talking about initiatives pertaining to permaculture, local currency, buy local networks, geothermal energy, wind energy, the creation of construction standards for more energy efficient buildings, and awareness campaigns regarding the fight against plastic.

We are calling on the government to establish a plan for every department. Right now, only 5 out of 19 departments have a plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Environment Canada does not even have one. That makes no sense at all. I cannot believe it.

The government needs to have its own plan to adapt to climate change and apply it through public policies in every department and every sector, whether it be transport, food, housing construction and so on. There is an urgent need to act now.

Young people and the general public understand that. The only one who does not is the government.

● (1310)

Mr. David Lametti (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today in the House to speak to our economic update.

I did not get a chance to ask my colleague who just spoke a question. I think she was a bit unfair to the connect to innovate program. We invested \$500 million in Canada, and the CRTC will invest even more to create the backbone of the system.

True, there are some challenges with the maps, but the CRTC and the Minister of Innovation are always open to redrawing the maps to better connect Canadians.

We invested \$100 million in Quebec, and I was there for a number of the announcements. I assure the member and the House that we are working on getting people connected, since this has become a necessity in our country.

[*English*]

I would like to take a moment with the time that I have to speak about some of the intellectual property provisions in the economic update, with the backdrop being that the government had to address yet another deficit from the previous government, which was the innovation deficit.

The previous government, under Harper, had not invested for 10 years in either basic research or in innovation. We had fallen behind our neighbours and competitors in a variety of different ways. We had previously been good at this.

Government Orders

We have now brought that back, with massive, historic investments, in both fundamental curiosity-based research, as well as investing in both people and technology in order to make Canada a world leader in a variety of different digital areas, the new economy, artificial intelligence and training people, from kids all the way to the elderly, upscaling and retraining, in order that we be positioned to take advantage of that.

All of this is framed by an IP strategy that we announced earlier in 2018. It really pushes Canadians and Canadian inventors to think about intellectual property as part of the way in which they monetize their investments. I know the minister is fond of saying, and he is right, that companies that think about intellectual property tend to be more profitable and do better. We certainly are trying to buttress that with an array of policies in the IP strategy, as well as in the fall economic statement.

First, I want to speak a little about notice and notice regime and the improvements we have made to that. It is an interesting Canadian invention, the notice and notice regime. One of my old colleagues, Daniel Gervais, who was at the University of Ottawa at the time and is now at the University of Amsterdam, came up with this. The idea is that Internet service providers should not be liable for copyright infringement going on the Internet when they are acting only as a conduit. This accords with our traditional underlying principle of net neutrality.

What we do is we allow copyright holders, right holders to point out to an Internet service provider that there has been an alleged infringement of copyright through its architecture. Then we ask the Internet service provider to act in a certain way in order to maintain an immunity from liability.

In the United States, the Americans reacted with something called notice and take down, in which a copyright holder would tell the Internet service provider that there had been an infringement. In order for the Internet service provider to maintain its immunity, it would simply take down the work.

This system was widely criticized in the United States because it was being abused. People were alleging copyright infringement in all sorts of cases, when perhaps there was not even copyright infringement at all. It led to a silencing or had a chilling effect on free speech, among other things.

● (1315)

Our Canadian response was quite a good one. When such an allegation would be made, we would ask the Internet service provider to first freeze the information, archive it, and then give notice to the person who had put up the content that some sort of infringement had happened. This then would allow for both the information to be preserved and for the copyright holder to pursue it in our court system, if he or she wanted to do that, a court system in which we have a great deal of confidence, and get to the right result without the abuse that happened in the notice and take down system.

What began to happen in Canada, and I saw this myself a number of times in my teachings, was that American rights holders, through American law firms, would often allege content infringement in Canada. They would then send a letter to those people telling them that they had infringed copyright and that they would be sued unless

they paid x thousands of dollars by clicking on the link included. Sadly, a number of people did not realize this kind of claim was in contravention of Canadian law and they paid the money. This kind of trolling is what we are trying to prevent by standardizing the kinds of letters that are used in the notice and notice regime and by prohibiting any request for a monetary settlement in these letters.

We also heard from Internet service providers in Canada that it was difficult for them to maintain and archive all these various kinds of claims. Therefore, by standardizing the form, we also reduce the costs and increase the incentive for Canadian Internet service providers to comply with the system.

It is a good system. We are improving it by standardizing costs, making it more fair and preventing trolls from taking advantage of the system.

I am very proud of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and her team for having preserved the notice and notice regime in the renegotiation of the free trade agreement with Mexico and the United States. It is a strong Canadian addition to international copyright. I am pleased we have taken steps to improve it, based on the consultations we have had. These were widely shared among people and were widely agreed upon.

We are also making improvements to the patent regime, which again will help the innovative climate in Canada. We are allowing for experimentation on patents and not calling it patent infringement. It has been said that the patent system is a bargain whereby a person gets a monopoly for 20-odd years for an invention after having disclosed the secret of the invention publicly. Yes, it is true. We do not want people to infringe on the economic rights of the patent holder. However, it is not an infringement on the economic rights of the patent holder because it is not an absolute right for some other researcher to do experiments with the patent to develop another invention or improve an invention. We have recognized that in the statute.

Because licensing is such an important part of the patent regime, we have also protected licensees who licence a critical patent for their own processes and inventions, such that if the company falls into insolvency or bankruptcy or goes under creditor protection, the licensee will not lose the right to use that licence.

With respect to trademark, we are adding bad faith as a ground for opposition to trademarks. That too is something that accords overall with what we are trying to do.

I and other colleagues have spoken about a new college for patent and trademark agents to improve the quality of advice and service that is given. Again, this helps Canadian innovators.

Finally, we have brought in major improvements to the functioning of the Copyright Board, which plays such a critical role for both rights holders and users with respect to establishing rights and tariffs moving forward. If we can do that more quickly, more efficiently and in a substantively better way, it helps everyone.

Government Orders

● (1320)

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague has expounded on a number of programs that the Liberals think they are putting to good use in Canada. However, I have one problem. They are spending \$49.5 million more every day than they are taking in. They are adding that much to the debt, over \$2 million an hour.

Programs and projects could be put in place that would help them with the revenue side and sustain the jobs we already have rather than lose them, and one would be the building of pipelines in Canada. It would even reduce greenhouse gases around the world if we could get pipelines to both coasts. We would have a more efficient export program and help put people to work in other countries, as well as reduce greenhouse gases with oil they could use here rather than the products they presently use.

I wanted to point that out for my colleague across the way.

I heard the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour this morning refer to this as a fiscally sound management update for the fiscal accountability of the government. I would like to ask the member two things. When does he think the budget will ever be balanced? With \$49.5 million more being spent every day than the government is taking in, how is this sound fiscal management?

Mr. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I am a homeowner and I have a mortgage on my house. If the roof caves in or the plumbing breaks, I will have to spend money to fix it. My colleague next to me referred to that as an infrastructure deficit. There are simply times when in order to preserve the whole of the investment, we have to make other investments. That is precisely what we are doing.

We inherited a massive infrastructure deficit. In my home province, bridges are falling, infrastructure is deteriorating, water and environmental infrastructure. We had an innovation deficit. Now we are remedying that.

Yes, we have to spend money to do it, but, as has been pointed out a number of times, our debt-to-GDP ratio is going down and we have the best position in the G7 with respect to both overall debt and debt-to-GDP ratio. We are doing it prudently and saving the house.

Mr. Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have heard talk from the other side of the House about lifting people out of poverty. I hear that constantly. I am going to state some figures. My colleague on this side of the House was getting into some of them.

The first figure is \$2,066,210, the second figure is \$17,948 and the third figure is \$49,589,041. I could do a quiz, but maybe the folks on the other side of the House realize that the first figure is the amount the debt is going up per hour. The second figure is the amount that every Canadian owes, \$17,948. The third figure, \$49,589,041, is the amount the debt grows every day.

When Liberals talk about lifting people out of poverty, what does my colleague tell Canadian youth who are faced with a debt of \$663 billion right now? How is that lifting them out of poverty?

● (1325)

Mr. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his proficiency in math. The answers are quite obvious.

First, the major part of Canada's overall debt was loaded by Conservative governments, first Mulroney and then Harper, in a massive way. It was only Liberal governments, such as Mr. Martin's government and this one, that managed to reduce the overall debt load.

Our overall debt load is going down as a function of our GDP. Precisely the answer for young people is that we are investing in the kind of economy that is going to give them great jobs when they finish school. It is going to subsidize the education they are getting to get those great jobs. As the economy grows, the overall percentage and importance of the debt actually goes down. I would put it to young people that they would like more challenging and better-paying jobs, knowing the debt has been managed moving forward.

The Deputy Speaker: I see the hon. member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame. We are out of time for this particular five-minute period, but I can promise him that we will get him the next time around.

Resuming debate, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Ms. Pamela Goldsmith-Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Consular Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this budget builds upon previous budgets by protecting the environment and strengthening the economy, and the results quite clearly speak for themselves. At 3%, Canada has the strongest economic growth of the G7 countries. In the last three years, Canadians have created 550,000 new jobs and have pushed unemployment to a record 40-year low. More Canadians are working, wages are growing and business confidence is strong. Budget 2018 is the next step in our plan to ensure that every Canadian has a real and fair chance at success.

In British Columbia, we understand the importance of measures that protect our oceans and ensure a strong and biodiverse ecosystem. Canada relies on safe and healthy coasts and waters for trade, economic growth and quality of life, and we recognize that the ocean holds a special place in the traditions and cultures of Canadians, and in particular, of indigenous peoples.

It gives me great pleasure to focus on the oceans protection plan legislative amendments that would enhance marine environmental protection and strengthen marine safety to support safe and environmentally responsible shipping.

Passage of these amendments would strengthen safeguards to better protect marine environments from the impacts of shipping, including protecting endangered whale populations. They would enable a more proactive, rapid and effective response to oil spills in Canada's waters. They would modernize Canada's ship-source oil pollution fund, including unlimited compensation for victims and responders in the event of an oil spill from a ship, and they would support research and innovation to enhance marine safety and environmental protection.

Government Orders

Our government is entirely committed to the sustainability of wild Pacific salmon and recognizes that this commitment requires ongoing action to succeed. Recognizing the importance of fisheries to Canada's economy as a whole, and commensurate with the Atlantic fisheries fund, this budget would create a British Columbia salmon restoration and innovation fund, which would include a contribution to the Pacific salmon endowment fund of \$5 million in 2018-19. As well, our government is committed to the sustainability of wild stocks and would invest \$107 million to support stock assessment and rebuilding efforts from coast to coast.

Canadians are deeply concerned about threatened whale populations. We would commit \$61 million to help whales recover, building on the approximately \$800 million in investments to date under the oceans protection plan and the \$167 million in budget 2018 dedicated to protecting endangered whales. The additional measures announced today would focus on increasing the food supply for whales, reducing the disturbance caused by vessel noise and addressing ocean contaminants to strengthen our overall effort. Our government is making a real long-term and sustained effort to help whales recover.

Plastics in the ocean are a threat to whales and to many other species. In my riding, the Pacific Science Enterprise Centre, on the West Vancouver waterfront, was the staging ground for Vortex, an art display by internationally renowned artist Douglas Coupland that was commissioned by the Vancouver Aquarium to draw attention to the magnitude of the ocean plastics global challenge. Coupland collected plastic waste from the shores of Haida Gwaii, which most people think of as pristine. Over the course of a few months, he assembled a display that is at the aquarium today.

The Pacific Science Enterprise Centre is partnered with the Coastal Ocean Research Institute at the aquarium, resulting in collaborative laboratory research on microplastic distribution and its effects on the marine environment. This is really important, because under the previous government, the long-term viability of this DFO lab on the West Vancouver waterfront was under severe threat. Today we are expanding science research and partnerships to address ocean health.

We know that pollution is not free. We pay for the cost of storms, floods, droughts, wildfires and extreme heat, which is why we are ensuring a price across Canada on what we do not want, which is pollution, so that we can get what we do want, which are lower emissions, cleaner air and new business opportunities.

British Columbia has been a leader in pricing pollution since 2008. We were successful in British Columbia, and we know why. That success is about to be Canada's success.

I would like to share the outcomes from a report I was involved with in 2015 about why B.C. was successful. First, we found that pricing pollution and a thriving economy can co-exist. Second is that strong political leadership is needed. Third is to keep it simple by creating broad coverage. Fourth is to start with a low price. Fifth is to commit from day one to a schedule of price increases and to stick with it. Sixth is that revenue neutrality will make pricing pollution durable. Seventh is that a price on pollution cannot be everything. It needs to be part of a suite of climate policies. Eighth is to prepare for a vocal and not fact-based opposition. Finally, expect a cleaner

environment, an enhanced reputation and a thriving clean-tech sector. That is where the budget would bring this country.

● (1330)

We would also support the transition to a cleaner economy by providing an accelerated capital cost allowance for clean energy equipment. To increase investment in the clean-tech sector, the government proposes that specified clean energy equipment be eligible for immediate expensing. With this change, the cost of clean energy equipment would be eligible for a full tax writeoff the year it was put into use in the business. This change would encourage investment to create jobs for the middle class and would help Canada achieve its climate goals.

The fall economic statement proposed two further important changes to Canada's tax system to enhance business confidence. First, allowing businesses to immediately write off the cost of the machinery and equipment used for manufacturing and the processing of goods would fuel new investments and support the adoption of advanced technologies and processes. Second, introducing the accelerated investment incentive and accelerated capital cost allowance for businesses of all sizes across all sectors of the economy that are making capital investments would help encourage investment in Canada, providing a timely boost to investor confidence.

Coupled with these new incentives is our government's strengthening of free trade agreements, which is something I have been very honoured to be part of. Canada has a unique place in the world. It is located next to the world's largest economy to the south and has close business, economic and historic ties to Europe to the east and deep connections to the fast-growing Asia-Pacific nations to the west.

With the successful conclusion of the United States-Mexico-Canada agreement, the Canada-European Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, and the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, Canada is the only G7 country to have free trade agreements with all other G7 nations. These countries represent two-thirds of the world's total GDP taken together. The government's ongoing commitment to free trade with economies around the world, including those in vibrant emerging markets, will help further strengthen and grow the middle class and deliver long-term economic growth to benefit all Canadians.

Government Orders

Equal pay for work of equal value is smart and just. We are very proud to be moving forward with proactive pay equity legislation. It is a key way our government would deliver on its commitment to gender equality. Work is under way, and consultations on key design elements of the proactive pay equity system with stakeholders, including employers and organized labour, as well as other experts, have concluded. Our government will introduce proactive pay equity legislation for workers in federally regulated sectors in 2018.

As we work hard to protect the environment and to build a robust, resilient economy, it is important to remember the difference we have made for families at home. In the 2017-18 fiscal year, 9,650 families in my riding received the Canada child benefit; 16,060 children benefited from just over \$57 million of investments through the Canada child benefit payments. Since introducing this legislation in 2016, the policy has lifted more than half a million people, including 300,000 children, out of poverty. We believe in supporting Canada's middle class, and that is why we created the Canada child benefit. This summer, we increased the CCB to keep up with the cost of living two years in advance of our initial plan so that families can keep up.

This budget would put this government on the right path. We take into account the environment and the economy. We take into account the importance of a strong middle class and we take into account what is required for the 21st century for each and every Canadian.

• (1335)

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member opposite, a fellow British Columbian. It is always wonderful to hear B.C. voices here in this chamber.

The member talked about the need to support the clean-tech environment. General Motors announced in many different press releases that it wants to build more high-tech autonomous cars and that these cars of the future also need to be electric, yet the Oshawa plant is not part of this. The member is part of a government that says a lot of things about innovation and investment rules, but it appears that Oshawa, and perhaps other parts of Ontario's economy, are not going to be part of that future. How does she square the two?

Ms. Pamela Goldsmith-Jones: Mr. Speaker, I would first like to express my empathy for the employees who are facing such a devastating decision.

Ours is a government that is standing up for a 21st century economy, where the fundamentals must include putting a price on pollution. The opposition party continues to live in the past and continues to advocate for a future that is very bleak for our children and grandchildren.

I am very proud of the fact that we are focused on growing the clean-tech sector and are admitting the challenges we face so that Canadians can thrive in the future.

Mr. Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, I understand that when in government, they have to make tough decisions and have to decide where technology is going and listen and whatnot. I think the government probably has the resources it needs. However, the member did not even try to address the question. She just pointed her finger at the Conservatives and said that somehow it is our fault that they are not succeeding in attracting investments in clean tech for the

next generation of automobiles in places like Oshawa. Could she give some concrete examples as to why someone on the streets of Oshawa right now should believe the rhetoric of the government?

Ms. Pamela Goldsmith-Jones: Mr. Speaker, I am choosing not to exercise selective thinking. I think we are all well aware of the GE plant that opened in Welland and created 250 jobs.

The point is what the future of Canada's economy looks like and the fundamentals of that future. I am quite surprised, because the member opposite is also from British Columbia and is well aware of the success of putting a price on pollution in British Columbia and how the economy of British Columbia has thrived, if not led the country, in the context of being properly rooted in what our future is telling us we simply must do.

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite was looking for an example of a targeted investment supported by the federal government that is driving new work in Oshawa related to the auto industry. Is the parliamentary secretary aware that as part of our \$5.6 billion investment in the auto sector, GM selected Oshawa for the site of its new electronic vehicle research centre? Close to 1,000 engineers have been hired in southern Ontario. The member for Milton says that engineers do not matter and are not part of the ecosystem of the auto sector. She dismissed them as good jobs and as a remedy for some of the unemployment challenges in the country. Is the parliamentary secretary aware that these investments are being made in Oshawa today and set the stage for retooling the plant that was closed yesterday?

• (1340)

Ms. Pamela Goldsmith-Jones: Mr. Speaker, yes, of course we are. I would like to further stress the importance of the free trade agreements we have worked so hard on in the space of three years to improve upon what went before and to finalize agreements around the world to benefit Canadian workers and their families.

Mr. Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the member saying I should know British Columbia's experience with the carbon tax. Actually, I do. I was on a task force with the B.C. Chamber of Commerce to evaluate it. There are two very different sides to this. If by innovation she means the results of the carbon tax, in the last year that was referenced, 2016-17, we actually saw an increase in overall carbon emissions. We have also seen a decrease in the amount the local cement industry has in its own marketplace.

Government Orders

Washington State has decided not to go ahead with a carbon tax. It has actually voted it down twice. If she is saying that the only innovation to come out of that is to have higher gas prices and at the same time higher subsidies, she is kidding herself. They may say it is a price on carbon, but they are also subsidizing a number of different industries. If they look at B.C., greenhouse growers and the cement industry have seen—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Ms. Pamela Goldsmith-Jones: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to focus on the fact that putting a price on pollution puts Canada in a global leadership position. It brings together business, academics and research, and most importantly, it offers hope for the future for our children and grandchildren.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT FOR SAINT-LÉONARD—SAINT-MICHEL

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in response to the question of privilege raised on Monday, November 26, by the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley. The member contended that the absence of the member for Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel constituted a breach of privilege.

Page 145 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* reads as follows:

The matter of privilege to be raised in the House must have recently occurred and must call for the immediate action of the House. Therefore, the Member must satisfy the Speaker that he or she is bringing the matter to the attention of the House as soon as practicable after becoming aware of the situation.

Speaker Sauvé's ruling from May 26, 1981, states:

There has to be a balance in relation to a question of privilege. If an hon. member has a question of privilege, then it has to be dealt with very rapidly. If we defer questions of privilege for several days and they are serious, then I wonder what the meaning of...a question of privilege is. If it is urgent, it is urgent and therefore has to be heard immediately.

Clearly, the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley did not raise the issue at the first opportunity. Media reports from November 20 quote from a November 8 letter from the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley and the member for Timmins—James Bay to the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, where they ask the commissioner to examine the facts surrounding the member for Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel.

Media stories also state that the Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner has confirmed that his office has begun a preliminary inquiry into the conduct of the member for Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel under the Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons.

Furthermore, the rights of the House to maintain the attendance and service of its members have also not been denied, as the Board of Internal Economy, which is the governing body of the House of Commons, has legal authority to act on all financial and administrative matters respecting the House of Commons, its premises, its services, its staff and members of the House of Commons.

The Parliament of Canada Act, which gives the Board of Internal Economy its powers and authority, outlines the process to be followed for non-attendance by members.

Furthermore, Section 59 allows the House of Commons to go even further, stating, "The Senate or the House of Commons may make regulations by rule or by order, rendering more stringent on its own members the provisions of this Act that relate to the attendance of members or to the deductions to be made from sessional allowances."

For all of the reasons cited, I do not believe that this issue constitutes a breach of privilege of a member or of the House.

● (1345)

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary for these additional comments on the matter. They will be taken under advisement and commented upon at a later time.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Langley—Aldergrove.

* * *

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 2

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-86, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a real honour to be able to represent my beautiful community of Langley—Aldergrove and share with the House a perspective of what I am hearing from the community on the growing debt that we are hearing about from the government.

The government is defending the fact that the debt is growing and growing. The last Liberal speaker highlighted that the B.C. carbon tax is going to be providing hope for the next generation. However, this is not what I am hearing from British Columbia residents. The question has come out about the \$35 a tonne, and what percentage it is. I was asked by a constituent if I realized what we were paying in the form of a tax. Is it 5%, 10%, 15%, 20%? What is the percentage that we are paying on the energy, on the carbon, on the natural gas in British Columbia? Most Canadians, in fact, everyone I have asked after meeting with that constituent said that they had no idea.

Therefore, we asked Canadians to check on their bills. In British Columbia, natural gas is provided by FortisBC, which has it listed on the bottom of the bill. I would ask anybody in the House, or any Canadian watching, what they think the government is endorsing as its model, its plan, for taxation on carbon. We are told that it is \$35 a tonne. Last year, it was \$30 a tonne, but \$35 this year, and every year it goes up another \$5 a tonne. What does that mean in a tax? People do not understand, and we do not know. I did not know. However, when we checked the bill, it is 112%. Last year, at \$30 a tonne, it was \$72%. Can members think of this in any other country in the world?

Government Orders

The Liberal government is bragging saying that it is providing great leadership, and the great leadership is being provided by a 72% tax on carbon last year. This is what the Liberals are saying is going to provide hope to the next generation. This year, on April 1, the carbon tax on energy, on natural gas, in British Columbia is 112%. On April 1, just a few months from now, it will go up to \$40 a tonne. It will be over 155% that the government will be charging on energy. That is what \$40 a tonne means to British Columbians, and that is what the government is saying is the hope for the next generation. It will be putting debt upon debt with a growing interest rate and uncertainty in the economy. That is not hope.

However, this is what the government does. It says one thing and does something else. The Liberals promise one thing and do something else. When we actually dig down, open the curtains and look at the Wizard of Oz who is pulling the rods, this is what we get with the government. It says one thing and does another, and it is hurting Canadians. It is hurting this generation. It is hurting the economy. It is hurting confidence in the economy. We are seeing this now come out.

The Liberals have been in government for three years, and in three years they have broken promises and made a growing mess. I am hearing from the young, middle-aged and middle-income. I am hearing from a full spectrum of the economy, from my constituents and even the youth who are getting fed up with the government. They do not trust the government. There is an uncertainty with the government. Canadians are getting more and more desperate and looking for a change in government, because the pathway that we are on is not sustainable.

Before I was elected federally, I was a bureaucrat for a few years. Before that, I was an entrepreneur, a business person. Therefore, I know what it means to take a risk. I was a business person for 25 years, and it is hard to make a buck. People who work hard and take a risk and hire people are needed. They are the economic engine of this country. That is what the government has said and the Liberals know that to be true.

● (1350)

We need to create an environment in this country where people are willing to invest and take that risk, where there is a possibility of a profit, where they do not have a government calling them tax cheats and where Canadians are willing to be fair and pay their fair share of tax.

I have just shared with my colleagues the shocking news of what the Liberal carbon tax actually equates to in the form of tax, that being 112% tax on energy. I encourage people watching to go and check their bills. People do not realize that natural gas right now is not that expensive. It is a very clean energy source. However, who in the world, in good conscience, could charge Canadians 112% tax? That is what the Liberals are saying is leadership, world leadership. It amounts to tax, tax, tax.

I have been in this House since 2004. What a great honour to be here. In those years, I have heard over and over again that the Liberals love taxes. They will say whatever Canadians want them to say to get elected. However, it is a great honour to be here, to represent our communities. Everyone of us, I am sure, realizes that great honour but we have a responsibility along with that honour, to

represent well and make sure that we make this country better, stronger, with a better future for this generation and generations to come.

Not keeping our promises and putting growing debt on this country is not leaving the country in better shape than when we came. It has been three years of a four-year term of this Parliament. This Parliament began in 2015 and will end in 2019. Less than a year from now, Canadians will be going to the polls to vote.

Canadians are realizing what promises were made by the government, such as having a balanced budget. There was going to be a temporary phase with a maximum \$10 billion spent that one year. Within three years, it would be balanced. Why did the Liberals make that promise? Canadians realized that it is not sustainable to continue to go into deficit budgets. A business cannot operate like that. If a business year after year after year had deficit spending, was spending more money than what was coming in, the business would go bankrupt. We see that. It is a proven fact. Again, a family cannot spend more than what is brought in.

It is the same thing in our country. The government knows that and that is why, leading up to the 2015 election, the Liberals promised that they would balance the budget. Have they kept that promise? No, they have not. Have they promised to be a world leader in putting a price on pollution? They have said they are going to do that. They put a price on pollution of 112%. Next year it will be going up to 155%. I cannot imagine any country in the world that would brag to say it is providing world leadership while we have the highest rate of taxation on any country on this earth on energy, 112%, and next year going up to 155%.

That is not what the government promised. The government promised change, but not this kind of change. We will be approaching, in less than a year now, an election where Canadians are going to be faced with a decision. The expression says, "Fool me once, shame on you." Canadians are not going to say, "Fool me twice, shame on me."

I have listened to the youth. I have a youth advisory board I listen to. They are not happy with the government. They are not happy with what the government has done to their future in saying no to pipelines, to the point where we are not getting world prices for our natural resources. That is their future being squandered. It is our youths' future that is being squandered by the government borrowing against them. They did not give their credit card to the government, but the government has taken their credit card and is mounting debt on their credit card. They are fed up.

● (1355)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Whitby, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague spoke about leaving the country in better shape than it was when we came to government.

I would remind him that ours is one of the fastest-growing economies in the G7. We have put policies in place to ensure that we are lifting 650,000 people out of poverty, 300,000 of whom are children. Next year, a family of four will receive \$2,000 more in its pocket than it is currently receiving. There have been 500,000 new jobs created by Canadian small and medium-sized businesses. In Bill C-86, we have introduced a social finance fund to help charitable organizations. We have introduced a poverty reduction strategy.

Statements by Members

What would the member say to his constituents who are benefiting from the policies we have put in place?

Mr. Mark Warawa: Mr. Speaker, I trust the member balances her budget every month. She is asking this House what Canadians say regarding spending more money than they are taking in.

Let us say a company is spending money, increasing the wages of its employees at the employees' cost, and saying, "Yes, I'm paying you more, but you are actually paying for all that extra pay and all that extra economic activity. It makes us look good as a company." Is that sustainable? The answer is no. It can only go on for so long.

Where does the money come from? It comes from Canadians. There is only one taxpayer. The government needs to realize that. The taxpayer is getting fed up. It needs to stop.

The Speaker: The hon. member will have three minutes and 15 seconds remaining in questions and comments following the hon. member's speech when the House resumes after question period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Canada is jeopardizing the lives of all of the Haitians it is sending back to Haiti in the coming days, weeks and months. It is as simple as that.

The country is essentially embroiled in a civil war and the federal government refuses to commit to not deporting anyone to Haiti until the situation is resolved. It must institute a moratorium. It needs to show some humanity and some compassion. It needs to be responsible.

I am urging the Minister of Public Safety and his colleague, the Minister of Immigration, not to play around with the lives of Haitians. Those who are here are in need of refuge. Haiti is not safe. We should not wait for someone who was deported to end up a victim of the ongoing violence in that country. We must not wait until it is too late.

* * *

[*English*]

DORSET PARK COMMUNITY HUB

Mrs. Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Dorset Park Community Hub provides outstanding services to Scarborough. Founded by the Agincourt Community Services Association in 2011 to serve one of Toronto's priority neighbourhoods, the hub is a shared community space offering valuable programs and services.

It is the largest food bank in Scarborough. It has given out more than 100,000 baskets already this year, going into the busy Christmas season. It provides services for newcomers, such as settlement counselling, workshops on housing and employment, and help learning English. It also runs programs to support seniors and youth, as well as programs just for women, which are greatly appreciated by the community.

I have attended many events there, but I will always remember the Christmas party in 2016, when many Syrian families experienced their first Canadian Christmas. I would like to thank executive director Lee Soda for her outstanding leadership, and all the staff and volunteers for their service to Scarborough.

* * *

● (1400)

AVALON RETIREMENT LODGE

Mr. David Tilson (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Avalon Retirement Lodge in Orangeville on its 35th anniversary of serving our community. Both my parents are graduates of Avalon, so this wonderful facility has a special place in my heart.

Established in 1983, Avalon has become a vibrant and vital part of the community, serving seniors in a family-oriented, warm and inviting atmosphere. Its commitment to the care and comfort of its residents is well known in the community, and its reputation is top-notch.

Avalon Retirement Lodge and Avalon Care Centre have a combined staff of 212 and are located in the beautiful town of Orangeville. Residents have the opportunity to partake in a variety of interactive events and experiences, develop friendships, take advantage of in-home services and connect with the wider local community.

It is my pleasure to congratulate Avalon staff on 35 years of service to Orangeville and district, and to wish them many more.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MATHIEU OSTIGUY

Mr. Pierre Breton (Shefford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the riding of Shefford, we have passionate young athletes who put a lot of effort into taking their performance to the next level.

That is certainly true of Mathieu Ostiguy from Saint-Angèle-de-Monnoir. Mathieu started participating in figure skating competitions at an early age. His focus and hard work have set him on a rewarding path.

Mathieu Ostiguy and his partner Chloe Choinard, from Ontario, were recently crowned junior pairs champions at the Quebec division figure skating championship held in Gatineau. That performance qualified them for the upcoming Skate Canada Challenge in Edmonton. We wish them the best of luck.

We are very proud to have such a talented skater in our riding. Thank you, Mathieu, for putting our region on the map with your spectacular performances.

*Statements by Members***HERITAGE BUILDING**

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I was and still am deeply disappointed and saddened by the demolition of Maison Boileau in Chambly. This is a reminder that elected officials at all levels of government still have a lot of work to do to prevent this type of situation from happening ever again. Cost and sustainability are challenges we must contend with.

Built in 1820 by René Boileau, member of Parliament and patriot, this house represented another reminder of our rich local history in Quebec.

One thing is certain: the reaction in Quebec is reassuring. People know that we need to demand more and better when it comes to protecting our built heritage.

I am committed to working with my counterparts at the National Assembly and with all elected officials to live up to our collective responsibility and duty to preserve our memory. I invite my colleagues to do the same.

Je me souviens.

* * *

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mrs. Eva Nassif (Vimy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again this year, from November 25 to December 10, there will be 16 days of activism against gender-based violence. It is an opportunity for each one of us to reaffirm our commitment to preventing and eliminating the violence experienced by almost half of all young women and girls across the country.

These 16 days are vital because we highlight the work that has already been done to tackle gender-based violence and also reiterate the importance of our actions in this struggle.

I know that my actions count, and I am committed to helping, listening, believing, condemning, stepping in and taking action. I undertake to be present. I invite all my colleagues to do the same not just for these 16 days, but for the entire year.

Together, we can make a difference.

* * *

[*English*]

FORT MCMURRAY HOUSING REBUILD

Mr. David Yurdiga (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, during the 2016 fires in Fort McMurray, over 80,000 people were forced to evacuate. Sadly, thousands lost their homes.

I regret to report that many of these people are still without their homes. Many homeowners have been scammed by home builders who have taken deposits, never to be seen again. Members of the Hillview community are particularly struggling, with condo fees having escalated from \$300 to over \$800 per month, in addition to special assessments that have added over \$50,000 per unit. The condos are still under construction.

These families pay for their home mortgages and temporary housing, and these are all unforeseen costs. Some have lost their homes, and many are at risk of losing their homes. Many have

received assistance, but many, through no fault of their own, have not. These families simply fell through the cracks in the system.

I request that the government investigate this travesty and work with the Red Cross to ensure that everyone who needs assistance gets assistance.

* * *

● (1405)

SPORTS-RELATED CONCUSSIONS

Mr. Doug Eyolfson (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, we held our first formal meeting of the Subcommittee on Sports-Related Concussions in Canada, where the legendary Ken Dryden, winner of six Stanley Cups with the Montreal Canadiens and goaltender for Team Canada in the 1972 summit series, appeared before the committee to share his insights on this important issue impacting far too many Canadians.

With a majority of child and youth visits to the emergency room being sports-related injuries and a majority of those being concussions, and knowing the serious long-term impact that can result from these injuries, the Standing Committee on Health created this all-party subcommittee to have conversations with Canadians on further actions the government can take to address this important issue.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and providing recommendations to the government that will help keep children and youth in sport safe.

* * *

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ARCHAEOLOGY MUSEUM

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant (La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was extremely proud to attend last Friday's opening of the new season of the Musée d'archéologie de Roussillon, which is located in my riding of La Prairie. I was even more proud to attend as the museum is celebrating its fifth anniversary this year.

The Musée d'archéologie de Roussillon opened on September 10, 2013, and is much more than just a place to conserve and showcase our heritage. It is first and foremost a place for research and education.

The museum's collection has more than 200,000 artifacts, with many of national interest. It is an incredible treasure that is the envy of several museums not just in Quebec, but across Canada.

To mark this important anniversary, the museum will be free for the entire month of December. I invite all my colleagues to visit the Musée d'archéologie de Roussillon and to discover the richness of Canada's heritage. They will not want to miss it.

Statements by Members

[English]

FRAUD AGAINST SENIORS

Hon. Alice Wong (Richmond Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, because they are especially vulnerable, Canadian seniors are being targeted for scams and fraud more than ever.

We have all heard of the Canada Revenue Agency fraud threatening arrest over the phone, or immigration scams that threaten deportation, especially in my riding of Richmond Centre, where it is delivered in a non-official language. We also have financial scams, where seniors are being asked to sign away their pensions and life insurance benefits to people who are not working in the best interests of the senior.

Motion No. 203 regarding fraud against seniors will have the government recognize that it can do more to tackle fraud against seniors. I look forward to all-party support on this very important motion.

* * *

BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB

Mr. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the largest provider of out-of-school programs in Canada, the Boys and Girls Club plays an integral role in our communities. In my riding of Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, I know first-hand how families and youth benefit from the incredible programming the Boys and Girls Club provides. Its programs are comprehensive, integrative and include physical activity, homework and academic support, healthy eating, arts and culture, civic engagement, leadership, and the list goes on.

Its clubs are primarily located in low-income areas, where it uses its program funding to meet the needs of children, youth and families, while delivering programs that challenge, support and inspire vulnerable children to succeed.

I encourage my colleagues to support the efforts of the Boys and Girls Club and to commend it for its hard work in helping young Canadians be productive and successful members of our communities.

* * *

[Translation]

LA FRANCOPHONIE

Mr. Fayçal El-Khoury (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Franco-Ontarians and other francophones from across Canada will not be discouraged by the cuts announced by the Ontario government. Despite these cuts, francophones in Ontario and across the country will not be afraid to defend their rights in court if they have to. In order to do that, they can make use of the court challenges program, which our government restored.

Francophones will continue to be proud to speak French and to defend their language. They will keep doing whatever it takes to help French flourish across the country and around the world. The fact that we speak French enhances the prestige of our Canadian identity. Mr. Ford sought to sow division. Instead, he brought together francophones from across Canada. We stand in solidarity—

● (1410)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Durham.

* * *

[English]

SEA KING HELICOPTER

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week marks a milestone in Canadian military aviation history, the final flight of the Sea King helicopter. After 55 years of operational flight, the Sea King is the longest-serving aircraft in Royal Canadian Air Force history. That is a testament to our maintenance crew, our air crew, and our Royal Canadian Navy partners.

We have been innovators. We were the first navy in the world to land a large helicopter on a small naval ship using the beartrap landing system. That has let us sail in all three of our oceans and around the world for Canada. With its 465,000 hours in operational flight, it is as if we have had a Sea King flying 24-7 for 53 years straight.

Today I want to thank the military families in the Sea King community: 406 Squadron, 443 Squadron on the west coast, and my squadron, 423 Squadron.

We used to say that we were flying yesterday's aircraft tomorrow. Tomorrow is Saturday, the final flight of the Sea King. We salute the Sea King community.

* * *

ORDER OF MILITARY MERIT RECIPIENT

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise in the House today to recognize Major Trevor Jain, a doctor from Charlottetown. Major Jain is one of five members of the Canadian army recently awarded the officer level of the Order of Military Merit, the second-highest honour awarded by our Governor General to recognize outstanding military service.

A surgeon with the Armed Forces, Major Jain serves in the 36th Brigade of the army reserves for Prince Edward Island, and was nominated by his fellow soldiers. His most recent deployment was to Iraq, where he served as a trauma team leader.

When he is not serving his country as a reservist, Dr. Jain is an emergency physician at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in Charlottetown, the program director of the bachelor of science in paramedicine program at the University of Prince Edward Island, and the medical director of the paramedicine program at Holland College.

I ask the House to join me in congratulating Major Trevor Jain for his recent award, and to thank him for his dedicated service to our country.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the fight against climate change is everyone's responsibility. Every country has to pitch in. According to the IPCC, we have less than 12 years to change course. Every sector of the economy needs to reduce its emissions to limit global warming to 1.5°C. To do that, we need to drastically change our consumption practices, our habits and our transportation.

That is why I will be holding a town hall on Sunday, December 2, at Raphaël-Barrette hall in Salaberry-de-Valleyfield. Our guest speakers will include Patrick Bonin from Greenpeace, Julia Posca from IRIS, and Lorraine Simard from Vaudreuil-Soulanges's Comité 21. Excerpts from the documentary *Tomorrow* will also be shown. While political leaders are gathering at COP24 in Poland, the people of Salaberry—Suroît will have an opportunity to talk about citizen initiatives urging government action, such as the Pact for the Transition and ENvironnement JEUnesse's class action suit, and to discuss the need for clear public policies at the federal level. Everyone in the world understands that we need to start looking at solutions.

I hope to see many people on Sunday at 1 p.m. in Salaberry-de-Valleyfield.

* * *

[English]

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, manufacturing industries, and auto manufacturing in particular, are economic pillars of our economy in Perth—Wellington and across Ontario. Our community is home to many manufacturing jobs and thousands of people who are employed in the parts-manufacturing field. Our communities rely on these jobs. That makes yesterday's news out of Oshawa all the more concerning. The abrupt announcement that General Motors would cease operations at its Oshawa plant affects not just the people in Oshawa and Durham, but the people of Ontario and Canada. The ripple effect across the entire supply chain is already being felt.

We must ensure that we have the economic conditions in place to enhance competitiveness and encourage investment. In my riding, I hear from employers at small and medium-sized businesses who are feeling the impacts of not only the steel and aluminum tariffs but the retaliatory tariffs as well, the effects of which are making it harder and harder for our businesses to compete.

Last week's Liberal economic update failed to address the brutal economic realities of these tariffs. Now is the time for the Liberals to act. Ontario workers deserve nothing less.

* * *

● (1415)

SITE UNSEEN ART INSTALLATION

Ms. Pamela Goldsmith-Jones (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is the national launch of Site Unseen, an art installation from British

Columbia directed by West Vancouver Secondary School teacher Jackie Wong, and Hartley Bay School principal Cam Hill.

With the guidance of artist Cori Creed and students from the Gitga'at Nation and West Vancouver, coastal communities in northern and southern British Columbia embarked on a journey of revelation to build personal and community awareness of their diverse culture through art, stories and life. Having shown Site Unseen at the West Vancouver Art Museum and Harmony Arts Festival and the Museum of Northern British Columbia in Prince Rupert, the students and Site Unseen are now in Ottawa.

I thank Olivia, Hailey, Brianne and Mackenzie from Hartley Bay, and Steve, Carmen and Megan from West Vancouver, and their fellow students for courageously walking in each other's footsteps toward truth and reconciliation.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the opportunity to meet with workers at the GM plant in Oshawa who will soon be out of a job. I heard firsthand the anxiety and the fear that the families are now going through because of yesterday's announcements.

Now we can all agree that government support should be there for workers in times like these. However, the government's ability to provide that support is severely hampered because it is already running massive deficits.

Can the minister confirm if any of the support programs being contemplated for GM workers were factored into the fall economic statement, or can we expect the deficit to be even higher?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it was devastating news for Oshawa. This is a very difficult time for the workers and their families.

That is why we, as a government, have been very clear. We will stand there with the auto workers. We will stand and support the automotive sector. We will never give up on our workers, because we believe in the work they do. They provide a high-quality service when it comes to the automotive sector. We have also been very clear about our support when it comes to the automotive sector, with the additional support through the strategic innovation fund in the fall economic statement.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to protecting the jobs of workers, one thing the government could do is to pull back on its plan for the carbon tax.

We know that the carbon tax will make it harder to create and protect jobs in Canada, because the government has admitted that. It has admitted that the carbon tax will threaten jobs, so much so that it has granted a huge exemption to large industrial emitters.

Oral Questions

Can the minister confirm whether or not that same exemption will now be granted to the auto sector to protect those Canadian jobs?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, companies invest in Canada because we have the best workforce on the globe. We have the best skilled employees around the world. We have topnotch quality in our automotive sector.

The Oshawa plant received numerous J.D. Power awards for quality and production. We are proud of our workers. That is why, as a government, we are going to defend our workers, invest in our workers, and support our workers. We are going to continue to support our automotive sector and those hard-working middle-class workers who support and work in Oshawa.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government is not supporting them. The government is making Canada a more difficult place to invest in, if we are to keep those jobs here.

Liberal policies have been making it difficult to keep jobs in Canada for some time. Liberal policies in Ontario have driven up the cost of energy to the point where an auto plant in Oshawa pays almost double the energy costs that the same plant would pay in Texas.

Will the minister give Canadian auto workers a fighting chance to save their jobs, and cancel the carbon tax?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been defending auto workers since day one, since we formed government in 2015.

As a result of our programming and policies, we have seen record investment of \$5.6 billion in the automotive sector. We introduced the automotive innovation fund and changed its terms, and also provided additional support through the strategic innovation fund.

These programs brought in additional investments, and through the fall economic update as well, and a statement by the Minister of Finance, we have provided additional measures for companies to make more investments in Canada.

More growth, more investments, more jobs. That is our plan.

• (1420)

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that may be their plan, but it does not match reality at all.

Canada is still in shock after GM's announcement yesterday that 2,500 workers, 2,500 breadwinners, are going to lose their jobs in the coming year. Suppliers will also be affected. Thousands of Canadians woke up to this sad reality this morning. The government's role is to help the workers.

What is the government's plan to help Canadian workers who are dealing with this crisis?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our automotive sector remains strong. It is well placed to build the clean, connected cars of today and tomorrow.

We will always stand with our automotive sector and our workers. We will continue to work with the automotive sector, and we will continue to defend and protect our workers.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the results are not exactly stellar.

This week it is 2,500 workers at GM. A few weeks ago, it was 3,000 workers at Bombardier. Over the past three years, 19,000 workers in Alberta's oil and gas industry have been affected the government's bad policies.

The government is supposed to help companies invest, not leave. What is the government's plan to keep Canada's economy strong?

[English]

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the numbers because they tell a compelling story: 3% GDP growth last year in the Canadian economy; the fastest growth rate among the G7 countries; a record unemployment rate of 40 years; 500,000 full-time jobs have been created since 2015.

Yes, we understand the unique challenges faced in different regions and different sectors, but we have a plan. Our economy is growing and we are focused on Canadians. We are focused on making sure they have the ability to succeed and they have the ability to find meaningful employment. That is our plan. We are going to continue to invest in Canadians.

[Translation]

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if there is something that the Liberals and the Conservatives have in common, it is the lack of transparency when they bail out major corporations.

The announced closure of GM's Oshawa plant is a tragedy for the 2,500 workers and their families. It is also a tragedy for the community.

What is frustrating is that GM is not showing any gratitude for the country that pulled it back from the brink of bankruptcy. In fact, the Conservatives lent GM over \$7 billion in 2009.

GM still owes Export Development Canada \$1 billion on a loan it took out in 2009.

If the Liberals have no plan to save these jobs, will they at least ask that the money be repaid?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed with GM's decision. My thoughts are with the employees, their families and their communities.

I understand that this decision is part of an overall plan. This is terrible news for the employees affected and their families.

We will continue to defend our workers and our auto sector.

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, he did not say how.

Oral Questions

Back in the 1980s, the GM plant in Oshawa employed over 23,000 people. It was once one of the biggest auto plants in the world. That was before NAFTA and the end of the Auto Pact, when Liberal and Conservative governments decided to stop trying to keep jobs here as they had done in the past. They told us not to worry and said the free market would take care of everything.

In times of crisis, governments lend or give public money with few strings attached. We have all seen how well that works.

[*English*]

However, one billion dollars are still owed by GM to Export Development Canada. Will the Liberals ask for a refund if GM cannot maintain the jobs?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our number one priority is the automotive workers. We have been clear that this news presented by GM is very devastating for the Oshawa community. That is why we met with Unifor today. That is why we met with its leadership to talk about next steps and how we could help workers going forward. We have also connected and are working with the provincial government, with Premier Ford, to see what we can do to help the workers going forward. I also called and met with the mayor of Oshawa.

All hands are on deck. All options are being examined. We are going to continue to make sure we never give up on our workers.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this plant closure is devastating to thousands of families and to all of southern Ontario. We have to remember that billions of dollars came from Canadians to support General Motors in the past three years. It was given with no obligation to maintain jobs.

It is clear that the Prime Minister is failing the people of Oshawa. He has no auto strategy and has shown no clean energy leadership. Why is the government giving up on Oshawa? Why is the Prime Minister not fighting for these Canadian auto worker jobs?

• (1425)

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the member opposite. We never have and never will give up on the workers in Oshawa.

We have been very clear. We have our plan. Our plan is investing in people. Because of our policies and programs, we have seen a record investment of \$5.6 billion in the automotive sector since 2015, and \$4.1 billion is directly attributed to the programs that we put forward to build partnerships, to see investments in our plants to make sure they could compete going forward and to make sure that they could get product mandates. We will continue to defend and support our auto workers.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that minister should be fighting for Canadian jobs, not handing out billions of dollars, with no obligation. That is exactly what the government did again last week: another \$14 billion in money for corporate luxuries like plush jets and stretch limousines, no obligations to workers or to communities.

Every time there are handouts given to corporate executives, why are there no obligations to Canadian workers or communities? Why

does the Prime Minister always give a blank cheque when he should be standing up for Canadian workers?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is where we fundamentally disagree with the NDP. We believe in investments because investments lead to growth and growth means more jobs. This is our plan.

We have been investing in Canadians. We have been investing in our companies. We have been investing in our regions. We have been investing in the automotive sector. That is why we have seen record investments of \$5.6 billion in the automotive sector. That is why Toyota has invested over one billion dollars, Honda \$500 million and Linamar \$750 million. These are clear examples that our policies and programs are working.

We are going to continue to make sure we defend the workers in Oshawa.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was in Oshawa when we got the devastating news that our award winning plant would have no new product after 2019. This morning, our leader and Conservative MPs were at the gates of GM Oshawa, offering support to the workers affected by this decision. It is about the workers.

The news that 2,500 people are losing their jobs and the ripple effect that this decision will cause is devastating. Will the Prime Minister join us in the fight to save these jobs in Oshawa?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand how difficult this is for the member, because he represents the community. Members on this side of the House also share his concerns about the devastating impact this is having on the workers and the community. That is why we have engaged with the local municipal leadership there. That is why we have engaged with the province as well. We just met with Unifor as well and the workers to move forward on a path to see what we can do to assist the community and to make sure we protect these good quality middle-class jobs.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I grew up in Cape Breton, where we lost our industry, we lost our jobs, we lost our economy and at the end of the day, we lost our people. The fact of the matter is that there are certain things that are worth fighting for and there are certain times to fight. This is one of those times when we need a government to fight.

Oral Questions

The minister went to Davos three years ago and bragged about the fact that he was an activist government in deepening the relationship with GM and showing how competitive Canada was, and he failed. I would implore that now is definitely not the time to give up. Will the government fight with this party to ensure we keep these jobs?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will never give up on our workers. We will always defend our auto workers and we will always defend the auto sector.

We have actually demonstrated that through meaningful action, putting forward policies and programs, unlike the previous government, which introduced the automotive innovation fund, but it was never used, because the terms and conditions were such that the automotive sector could never benefit from that program.

Once we formed government in 2015, we changed those terms and conditions. That helped bring in more investment, which meant more jobs in the automotive sector. That is the plan, that is what we have done and that is what we will continue to do.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after a century of auto manufacturing, GM determined that Ontario was no longer competitive because of tariffs, taxes and trade uncertainty. If there is any chance of saving these jobs in Oshawa, we need a plan. We need more than words and sympathy. We need a plan to address tariffs, taxes and trade. Where is the plan?

• (1430)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was rather surprised yesterday to hear the member for Durham criticize Canada's retaliatory measures in response to the illegal and unjustified U.S. 232 tariffs. He called our response "dumb". Our response was perfectly reciprocal, a dollar-for-dollar response. It was essential to defend our industry and our workers.

The Conservatives supported this at the time. Now they are losing their nerve. However, I guess that is no surprise from the party that urged us to capitulate on NAFTA.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if Canada's taxes are hurting Canadian manufacturers more than the American targets, they are dumb and they should be removed. I would invite the minister to go and meet small and medium-sized manufacturers across Ontario.

However, the industry minister is the most lobbied minister in Canada. In fact, GM is the most frequent meeting. I want the minister to tell us this. Did GM mention tariffs? Did GM mention payroll taxes or NAFTA? What was GM asking the minister about before it decided to close up shop in Oshawa?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like the Conservatives and the leader of the Conservative Party to be very clear. Is it the Conservative position now that Canada should unilaterally drop our retaliatory tariffs, because I want to tell—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Durham and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs will come to order, along with a lot of others I hope. The member for Yellowhead cannot hear.

We all need to hear both the questions and the answers. We will have some order.

The hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs has the floor.

Hon. Chrystia Freeland: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Conservatives to come clean on what their policy is on Canada's just and correct retaliation, because here is what the Canadian Steel Producers Association said today, "Canada's retaliatory tariffs are vital in protecting the jobs of 23,000 steelworkers." We stand with them, do you?

The Speaker: Order, please. I remind the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs to direct her comments to the Chair. I do not think she was asking me a question.

I am getting heckled from all sides all of a sudden.

The hon. member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that the government capitulated time and time again when it did the negotiations.

Over two and half thousand people are out of work in Oshawa and the government's plan appears to be to do nothing. The Prime Minister is admitting defeat, throwing in the towel before the fight even starts. On this side of the House, we are not going to give up on those workers and those jobs.

What is the government's plan to fight for manufacturing jobs in places like Oshawa? What is its plan?

The Speaker: Order, please. I remind hon. members, including the Minister of Foreign Affairs and others, although I did not hear a particular member on that side, that while I appreciate their assistance, I would rather have quiet. I remind members that the time to speak is when they have the floor and not otherwise.

The hon. Minister of Innovation.

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, read my lips. We will never ever give up on our workers, because we support the automotive sector. We support the automotive industry. We have been very clear that this sector is absolutely critical to the Canadian economy.

When it comes to Oshawa, we understand how difficult this is for the workers and the communities. That is why we are working with local community officials, that is why we are working with the province and that is why we are working with the unions to make sure we look at all options and move forward on a path to help our auto workers.

• (1435)

The Speaker: I appreciate members addressing the Chair, and only speaking when they have the floor.

Oral Questions

The hon. member for Carleton.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, well, “read my lips” is exactly what George H. Walker Bush said before promising not to raise taxes, which is exactly what he turned around and did. It is exactly what the current minister is doing. He is promising something, the opposite of which he is delivering.

He has a new carbon tax that makes it more expensive for factories to heat themselves, to operate machinery and to move goods from A to B. That is precisely what it means to give up on our workers.

Will he stand with our workers and cancel this carbon tax to save our jobs?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course we will stand and defend our workers. Of course we understand how difficult this is for the workers in Oshawa and the impact it is having on their families and communities.

What the member opposite should also understand is that when \$5.6 billion worth of investments are made, it is because we have the right conditions. We have a world-class workforce; we have free trade agreements that give market access in North America, Europe and Asia; and we have the right incentives in place to make sure that we have the ability to build the best vehicles in the world. This is a plan that is working. It is because of the strategic innovation fund.

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Liberal, Tory, same old story. The GM plant closure in Oshawa is just like the one in Windsor, shattering families. The Liberals learned nothing. The government never even bothered to put in a national auto strategy. The Liberals knew this was coming and they did nothing.

These families deserve a government that puts families first, not a Liberal government that gives billions of dollars to rich corporations like GM, without a guarantee that jobs are going to remain in our communities. What more than expressing disappointment are the Liberals actually doing for these families?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a bit rich for the NDP to talk about our government's plan. When the Prime Minister was in Windsor and announced a \$1.2 billion investment in the Windsor engine plant, members from the NDP were in the audience clapping.

Make no mistake, we have a plan and that plan is working. We are investing in the automotive sector and that is creating tens of thousands of jobs. We will continue to defend this sector.

* * *

[*Translation*]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, workers have suffered enough. After massive layoffs at Bombardier and the closure of the GM plant in Oshawa, now our workers might not see a penny of the contract to build VIA Rail's new fleet.

The United States requires 65% domestic content, and China requires between 70% and 90%.

Why is it so hard for the Liberals to protect Canadian jobs, integrate Canadian technology and develop homegrown expertise?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would be totally inappropriate for anyone to comment on VIA Rail's procurement process to replace its Quebec City-Windsor fleet. I can assure the House that the process was open and transparent, and I would suggest that my colleague opposite wait for the results.

* * *

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, an internal Canada Revenue Agency report just revealed that the data of 10,000 Canadians were searched, without their knowledge, by employees.

This is on top of the Liberal government's decision to allow Statistics Canada to continue to access Canadians' personal information. The government must take immediate action to protect Canadians' confidential information.

Can the government confirm that action has been taken against the CRA employees who used Canadians' personal data?

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, each case of misconduct is unacceptable and in no way reflects the professionalism of the tens of thousands of CRA employees who do good work every day.

The CRA has some of the strictest employee conduct rules in the Government of Canada, and we continue to improve on them.

I can confirm that the individual in question is no longer employed at the CRA. He worked there when the Conservatives were in power, I should point out.

Since this case is currently before the courts, I cannot give—

• (1440)

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska.

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary report reveals that over 2,000 privacy incidents occurred between September 2016 and June 2018, while this government was supposed to be leading the country.

The minister tells us that she did not think she needed to inform the Privacy Commissioner of this situation. If we want the Privacy Commissioner to be able to do his job, the minister must notify him of any irregularities in her department.

I repeat my question. Were the individuals—yes, I said “individuals”, not “individual”—who had access to those documents given any sort of formal notice or measures—

Oral Questions

The Speaker: Order. The hon. Minister of National Revenue.

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, each case of misconduct is unacceptable and in no way reflects the professionalism of the tens of thousands of CRA employees.

Our government has strengthened CRA surveillance technology by investing \$10 million to implement solutions for business management errors.

Our investments are paying off. The increase in the number of privacy breaches that have been reported is directly tied to the CRA's ability to detect unauthorized access. All allegations of misconduct are taken seriously and systematically investigated.

[English]

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the CBC has reported that the “files of at least 10,000 Canadians were compromised” at the Canada Revenue Agency, including cases where employees kept files on neighbours, family members and even fellow employees.

The report also said that data snooping is getting worse under the Liberal government, and yet the Liberals cannot understand why the majority of Canadians oppose being required to give their bank statements to Statistics Canada.

When will the Liberal government end its unauthorized surveillance of Canadians?

[Translation]

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every case of misconduct is unacceptable and in no way reflects the professionalism of the tens of thousands of employees at the Canada Revenue Agency.

I am very pleased that our government has invested more than \$10 million, something the Conservatives across the way did not do when they were in government. Imagine all the cases that went undetected under their government.

We are taking this information very seriously. Protecting Canadians' privacy is a priority of the Canada Revenue Agency.

[English]

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the problem is getting worse under the current government. She has been the minister for three years. It is time for her to take responsibility for her own track record. This week's report that says unauthorized snooping is on the rise does nothing to give Canadians confidence in the government.

Given the thousands of compromised files at the Canada Revenue Agency, will the government finally tell Statistics Canada that it cannot have Canadians' financial information without their consent?

[Translation]

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, for my colleague's information, the government has invested \$10 million for the public's protection and safety. We will not be like the government of the people across the way who kept their heads in the sand for 10 years.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, ENvironnement JEUnesse maintains that the Canadian government has violated the fundamental rights of young people and wants to bring a class action suit on behalf of Quebeckers 35 and under. According to this organization, the federal government has shown gross negligence on climate action. It is buying pipelines with Canadians' money and will once again fail to meet its greenhouse gas reduction targets because it has absolutely no plan.

Are the Liberals prepared to listen to these claims and this heartfelt plea from young Quebeckers, or would they rather keep listening to their buddies in the oil industry?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of young people. Young people want climate action. For 10 years, the former Conservative government did nothing. We have a plan and we are working hard every day. We are putting a price on pollution across the country; we are phasing out coal; we are making historic investments in public transportation and renewable energy; and we are investing in clean technologies. We will stay the course. I will be attending COP24, and I will push for progress on the Paris Agreement. We must do this for our children and grandchildren.

* * *

• (1445)

[English]

HOUSING

Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, more than a third of one-bedroom units in the Toronto area are overcrowded. Imagine a one-bedroom apartment for a family of six. This is a snapshot of Canada's housing crisis. Renters and families are among the hardest hit, and still the Liberal government refuses to make housing a right, as it promised. Yesterday, housing providers and advocates presented the government with a way forward.

What do Canadians have to do to make the Liberal government ensure that housing is a right in this country now, not later, and certainly not after the next election?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to answer that question. Providing a safe and affordable home for all Canadians is a key objective of our government. That is why we have helped a million families since 2016 to have access to a safe and affordable place to call home. It is why only a week ago we celebrated the first anniversary of our historic first-ever national housing strategy, a 10-year plan to invest \$40 billion in the housing needs of Canadians. That is why a right to housing will be a key pillar of that long-term plan.

*Oral Questions***INFRASTRUCTURE**

Mr. Colin Fraser (West Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, having energy-efficient buildings is critically important to our government's efforts to reduce GHGs and to make our communities more sustainable. In my riding of West Nova, residents know that ensuring that our buildings are in a good state of repair now and for years to come is essential to our well-being.

Can the Minister of Infrastructure and Communities explain what steps our government is taking to ensure this is the case?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for West Nova for his great work on behalf of his constituents. Our government was proud to recently invest \$3.4 million to improve green infrastructure in the municipality of Argyle. This investment in Argyle is to build a new, fully accessible and net-zero energy municipal administrative building to better serve the region. We are proud to improve the people's quality of life in Argyle and across Canada.

* * *

ETHICS

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, major ethical lapses are a hallmark of the Liberal government. Today, we learned that Raj Grewal, the former member for Brampton East, has been under RCMP investigation for months in connection with millions of dollars in gambling activity using suspect funds, this at the same time the Ethics Commissioner has been investigating the MP's extra-parliamentary employment and for greasing the way for that employer to attend a prime ministerial event in India.

Again, I will ask a question that has been asked so many times in the last three years: When did the Prime Minister become aware of this RCMP investigation?

The Speaker: I remind members that we cannot use the personal name of a member.

The hon. government House leader.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I stated yesterday, it was last week that the member told us he is addressing certain challenges and receiving treatment from a health professional. Based on these circumstances, it was agreed that his decision to resign as member was the right one. We hope that he receives the support he needs.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister himself misled the House when he said that the member for Brampton East had resigned. The member is still in the House and is still active.

The RCMP is currently conducting an investigation. At the same time, the Ethics Commissioner is investigating because the member for Brampton East accompanied his boss, the Prime Minister, on his trip to India.

Last week, we were told that he resigned, but he is still working.

When did the Prime Minister learn that the RCMP was conducting an investigation?

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said last week, the member told us that he had certain challenges and that he is receiving treatment from a health professional. We hope that he receives the support that he needs.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, three years into the Liberal mandate, veterans are still waiting for them to keep their promise. Over 3,000 veterans have been waiting for answers for over a year. That is discouraging. Veterans would like to know why they have to go through another medical exam when they have already been examined by National Defence doctors.

Will the government help our valiant veterans by fixing this situation and respecting diagnoses made by National Defence doctors?

• (1450)

[*English*]

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to delivering timely services to veterans and we know that on this, we need to do a lot better.

The members opposite should also remember that the Auditor General said that it was the Harper government that was not doing enough to facilitate veterans' timely access to mental health services and benefits. We have invested \$10 billion. We have hired 470 new front-line staff. We are getting it done.

Mr. Phil McColeman (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here are the facts: dysfunction, mismanagement and incompetence. Twenty-nine thousand veterans are in a backlog waiting for a decision. Of those, 3,000 have waited for over a year. There has been \$42 billion spent by the minister and nothing has improved.

When is the minister going to stop wasting time and money and help veterans directly?

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since the member was part of the Harper government, I will take him at his word that he knows something about dysfunction.

What did he think would happen when they closed nine offices? What did he think would happen when they cut the budget of the department? What did he think would happen when they cut 1,000 members of the staff at the Department of Veterans Affairs? In what world do they live to think that doing that would cut wait times?

We will continue to clean up the mess they made.

*Oral Questions***INFRASTRUCTURE**

Ms. Georgina Jolibois (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, communities across northern Saskatchewan have become inaccessible because of broken and unfinished roads, lack of rail access and no safe public transportation. The conditions are worse now that winter has settled in. The Liberals keep neglecting the calls from the local leadership, like Mayor Bruce Fidler in Creighton, to invest in safe and reliable infrastructure. Northerners deserve better.

Why does the Liberal government not care about infrastructure in northern communities?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are acting. We have a historic investment of \$180 billion over the next 10 years in infrastructure that will see communities across Canada, northern communities, rural communities, urban communities, see better infrastructure, because we know that what Canadians want is infrastructure of the 21st century that is modern, resilient and great. That is what we are going to deliver to Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

* * *

[Translation]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have no strategy to bridge the digital divide, none. Those are not my words; they are the Auditor General's. He says that the Liberals' failure to plan for rural and remote regions is depriving people in those regions of the high-speed Internet access they so desperately need. In my riding, 16 of the 25 municipalities have connectivity problems. We need a strategy that will help young people, families and small businesses.

When will the government invest to get everyone connected?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand the importance of high-speed Internet. That is why we announced the connect to innovate program, which will make things better for many rural communities across Canada.

[English]

A few weeks ago I had the opportunity, along with my provincial and territorial counterparts, to put forward a framework on the first national broadband high-speed strategy for rural and remote communities. We will continue to work on this very important issue.

* * *

[Translation]

ETHICS

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 23, we learned that the President of the Treasury Board provided contradictory information. He told the House that he had been involved in the ship procurement contracts, but he told the RCMP that it was not Treasury Board's role to interfere in that file. Canadians have a right to know what role the Treasury Board president played in this unclear process.

To whom did he tell the truth?

• (1455)

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman has a specific accusation to make, he should draw that accusation to the attention of the appropriate police authorities or perhaps he would care to say that outside.

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board has told two different stories with respect to the political interference with the naval supply ship contract. In October, he told this House that it was his job to examine the details. In 2016, he told the RCMP that it was not his job. He cannot have it both ways.

Will the President of the Treasury Board stand in the House today and tell us which version of the truth is accurate?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when legal matters are to be investigated, they are investigated independently by the RCMP and any decision with respect to charges is made independently by the Director of Public Prosecutions. The creation of that office, in the first place, was done back in 2005 by the previous government.

Indeed, the prime minister of the day, Mr. Harper said that they would ensure that decisions about criminal prosecutions are independent of politicians and independent of politics. That is our system.

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is not about a court case. This is about the integrity and honesty of the President of the Treasury Board. He has told two different stories that contradict each other. This is a serious issue with respect to political interference in a major contract. Where is the transparency and accountability? Why will the President of the Treasury Board not come clean and tell us which version of his story is true?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the details of any legal case are to be determined independently by our court system. That is how the process works. The distinguished defence counsel, acting now for Admiral Norman, proclaimed that our legal system should never be denigrated for political gain. She said, "we have one of the greatest legal systems in the world". Let it do its work.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has a long history of resettling the world's most vulnerable refugees through the private sponsorship program, thanks to Canadians coming together to help resettle the most vulnerable.

The residents of Brampton South have raised the plight of Sikh and Hindu refugees from Afghanistan who have faced violence and persecution. The Bhullar foundation has answered the call to help resettle this religious minority population through the private sponsorship program.

Oral Questions

Can the Minister please update the House on the progress to resettle these privately sponsored refugees?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Brampton South for her strong advocacy on this issue.

As members know, we have quadrupled the number of spaces available in the private sponsorship of refugees program as compared to the Conservatives. This has allowed us to reduce processing times, to reduce backlogs and to work closely with community sponsors, like the Bhullar foundation, to resettle even more religious minorities.

That is why I am so happy to update this House that on the third-year anniversary of the passing of the late hon. Manmeet Bhullar, the approved families for resettlement will be arriving in Canada early in the new year.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Tides Canada has led the coordinated campaign against the construction of new pipelines and the Alberta energy sector.

We know foreign money flows into Tides to help fund that campaign. However, this morning we found out that the Liberal government has decided to flow money to Tides to support the campaign as well. No one believes the Prime Minister supports Alberta's struggling energy sector while he funds the greatest opponents to it.

Can the Minister of Natural Resources explain why the government is funding the Tides campaign against Alberta jobs in the energy sector?

• (1500)

Mr. Paul Lefebvre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we understand that, right now, in the oil fields of Alberta, people are frustrated by the price differential. We know that the solution is to build pipeline capacity and expand the oil to new markets. That is why we are working hard to do that, and making sure we do that in the right way.

Currently in Alberta, there is no consensus within the industry on short-term solutions. However, we welcome workable solutions to work with Alberta to make sure that we move forward in the right way.

* * *

CANADA POST CORPORATION

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are blocking equal pay and safer workplaces at Canada Post.

A postal worker in my riding said, "Social assistance cheques were held back [by Canada Post]. We were instructed that we could not deliver these cheques even though they were in our Nanaimo facility."

Workers want to deliver assistance cheques. They also want to be treated fairly, but Canada Post and the Liberals are painting posties

as the enemy. Why are Liberals using the most vulnerable people to undermine workers' rights?

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement and Accessibility, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government expects all employers to provide safe workplaces. As Canada Post works to reduce the backlog, the health and safety of its employees will continue to take the highest priority.

However, the labour dispute has taken its toll on Canadians, including workers, charities, organizations and businesses of all sizes. Canada Post will be doing everything it can to get up to full operations as quickly as possible.

* * *

[Translation]

HEALTH

Mr. Ramez Ayoub (Thérèse-De Blainville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week is National Addictions Awareness Week. The entire country is facing a crisis, the opioid crisis, so this is an important moment to think about the complexities of addictions, the people who suffer from them and the ways we can help them.

I would like to thank all the healthcare workers who save lives, reduce stigma and encourage our friends and families to lend each other a helping hand when needed.

Could the Minister of Health tell the House about the measures the government has taken to address addictions?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Thérèse-De Blainville for his important question and for the excellent work that he does on the Standing Committee on Health.

This week is an opportunity to think about how anyone can be affected by issues related to drug use, whether it be a family member, a loved one or even a co-worker.

I am proud of the compassionate approach our government is taking, and we will continue on that path. We will continue to help those who need it and keep Canadians informed through awareness and education campaigns. That will help us to ensure that all Canadians get the help they need.

* * *

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every day steel and aluminum tariffs remain in place, Canadian jobs are at risk. The new NAFTA with the United States and Mexico is a deal with many concessions.

The Liberals gained nothing and lost a lot. Why did the Prime Minister give up so much without ensuring that steel and aluminum tariffs would be lifted?

Points of Order

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is absolutely clear on the steel and aluminum tariffs imposed illegally and unjustly by the United States. Our view is that we have to fight these tariffs. We fight them with a strong retaliatory response, we fight them at the WTO and we fight them at NAFTA where we have preserved the chapter 19 tribunals.

What is unclear is the position of the Conservative Party, which seems, today, to be arguing that we should capitulate, just as it did on NAFTA.

* * *

[Translation]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport is sending the message that the free trade agreement with Europe is going to be honoured on the backs of Quebec's workers.

VIA Rail, a Crown corporation, where the Crown is the government, is going to have its trains made in Europe rather than Quebec. We have people in Saint-Bruno and La Pocatière who have the necessary expertise, but once again, Quebec gets tossed by the wayside.

Why is the Minister of Transport allowing VIA Rail to turn its back on Quebec's workers?

[English]

Mr. Omar Alhabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to opening markets for Canadian workers and businesses. We are the only country in the G7 that has a free trade agreement with all other G7 nations. We are committed to helping our businesses grow. That is why in the fall economic statement, the Minister of Finance announced our trade diversification strategy to help businesses in Quebec and across Canada. We want to bring more investment to Canada, we want to create more jobs for Canadians and we want to raise the quality of living for all Canadians.

• (1505)

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we knew that Ottawa had hung our dairy producers out to dry in the free trade agreement with Europe. What we did not know, however, was that it would do the same to our rail industry.

A government-owned company is awarding a \$1-billion contract to one of Quebec's competitors.

How can it explain that? I suppose the free trade agreement was poorly negotiated.

Will the minister speak with officials at the Crown corporation to ensure that our workers are not the victims of their inability to negotiate for our people?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, it would be totally inappropriate for anyone to comment on VIA Rail's procurement process, which is currently under way, to replace its Quebec City-Windsor fleet.

I would remind my colleague that VIA Rail is an independent Crown corporation and is responsible for this procurement process. I can assure the member that it is open, transparent and thorough, and that it has been conducted in accordance with all trade rules.

* * *

[English]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Maxime Bernier (Beauce, PPC): Mr. Speaker, since 2014, the energy industry in western Canada has suffered proportionately a far greater crisis than the automobile industry, and yet not only is the government not helping, it would make energy projects even more difficult with Bill C-69. Can the minister give us assurance that she will finally listen to the concerns of the industry, and pull out this bill?

[Translation]

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise. We know that we need to ensure that Canadians trust us when it comes to the assessment process for major projects.

[English]

We need to get it right when it comes to major projects. That is the only way our resources will get to market.

There was a failed system under the previous government, so we were not able to do that. We did not bring indigenous peoples together, we did not take seriously environmental concerns, we did not have a timely process, nor did we work with provinces to ensure one project, one review. That is exactly what we are doing.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the 2018 Governor General's Literary Award winners: Paul Gagné, Lori Saint-Martin, Marianne Dubuc, Mario Brassard, Frédérick Lavoie, Anne-Marie Olivier, Michaël Trahan, Karoline Georges, Howard Scott, Phyllis Aronoff, Jillian Tamaki, Jonathan Auxier, Darrel J. McLeod, Jordan Tannahill, Cecily Nicholson, Sarah Henstra.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

The Speaker: I would also like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Honourable Issaka Sidibé, President of the National Assembly of Mali.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[English]

POINTS OF ORDER

MEMBER FOR BRAMPTON EAST

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am rising on the issue of the question from the member for Thornhill. I am hoping you can provide some clarification.

Speaker's Ruling

On Thursday, November 22, CTV News reported that the member for Brampton East informed the chief government whip that he intended to leave, which, according to the Canadian press, was effective immediately.

On Friday, November 23, in the Toronto Star, the Prime Minister's Office is quoted as saying, "Based on these circumstances, we agreed that his decision to resign as Member of Parliament for Brampton East was the right one."

As far as we have been told, this member has resigned from Parliament. Could you inform the House what the procedure is to inform this chamber about a member resigning and whether we would be made aware of that from your office as soon as possible or whether we should continue to rely on inaccurate media reports that say he is a former member of Parliament?

● (1510)

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this question and response left me with some concern and confusion as well. My understanding is that any member of Parliament who seeks to resign has to notify one person in one office in writing, and that is your office, Mr. Speaker, to officially resign that seat.

We have a Liberal member from Montreal who has had some problems doing that since the spring. We had this recent case just last week. The member for Brampton East indicated it through the Prime Minister's official site and I believe also through the government House leader's comments here today that "it was agreed that his decision to resign...was the right one."

Mr. Speaker, first, could you clarify for us if you have received notice from the member for Brampton East that he in fact has resigned that seat, and if he has not resigned that seat, could you call upon the government House leader to clarify the record from the beginning of this very concerning affair that now involves an Ethics Commissioner investigation and a RCMP investigation?

The government has had difficulty being consistent and truthful to Canadians about this very worrisome affair. Continuing to contribute to that confusion does not help anyone, and it certainly does not help us get closer to the truth in this matter.

I call upon you, Mr. Speaker, to clarify the reality for all Canadians.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. members for Chilliwack—Hope and Skeena—Bulkley Valley for raising this point of order. Of course, a member may resign by standing in the House and resigning. However, let me refer members to page 252 of the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, which says:

A Member may also resign his or her seat by delivering to the Speaker a written declaration of intention to resign signed before two witnesses. On receiving the declaration, the Speaker addresses a warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer for the issue of a writ for the election of a Member to fill the vacancy.

First, I have not received such a letter. Second, when the Speaker receives the letter, the Speaker then informs the House that the Speaker has informed Elections Canada of the vacancy.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much, first, for clarifying. As far as we in this chamber know, the member for Brampton East continues to hold his seat in Parliament.

The second part of the question was whether the government House leader had left the House in error in reporting that he had resigned in her replies to the comments and questions we have been consistently asking about the situation of the member for Brampton East. She has several times indicated that she agreed with his sentiment to resign. If that is not, in fact, true, and she does not have any extra knowledge of that fact, she should simply clarify the record for all Canadians.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, you will be able to check *Hansard*, I am sure, which is the official record, in which my response would have been that we have accepted his decision to resign.

The Speaker: I thank hon. members for their comments on this.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

ACCESS TO INFORMATION—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the question of privilege raised on October 30, 2018, by the member for Milton regarding the government's response to written Question No. 1316, tabled in the House on January 29, 2018.

[*Translation*]

I want to thank the member for Milton for having raised the question, as well as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House for his response.

[*English*]

The member for Milton explained that she had submitted a written question asking the Minister of Environment and Climate Change for the titles of the individuals who had approved a particular tweet from November 7, 2017. In response, she received what she described as a non-answer, as it lacked the specific information requested. She explained further that the information she was looking for was recently provided to the CBC by the government through an access to information request. This she characterized as a deliberate attempt by the government to deny information to her and the House, and thus, a contempt of the House.

● (1515)

[*Translation*]

In response, the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader argued that it is not the role of the Speaker to judge the quality of answers provided to Order Paper questions and that the answer was in fact duly tabled as per the rules of the House. He was also of the view that, through the two different processes—that is, written questions and access to information requests—different questions were asked and, thus, different answers provided.

[*English*]

The right of members to obtain timely and accurate information from the government, through whatever means, is essential to the proper functioning of our parliamentary system.

My predecessor made this point clearly on May 26, 2015, when he said, at page 14137 of *Debates*, and I quote:

Government Orders

Members place great importance on obtaining full and accurate information through answers to their written questions, a procedure that exists in part to allow members to fulfill their obligations as parliamentarians.

[Translation]

Despite this, the fact remains that under current practices the Speaker's authority is limited in this respect. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* mentions at page 529:

There are no provisions in the rules for the Speaker to review government responses to questions.

In a ruling dated February 8, 2005, which can be found at page 3234 of Debates, Speaker Milliken further explained:

Any dispute regarding the accuracy or appropriateness of this response is a matter of debate. It is not something upon which the Speaker is permitted to pass judgment.

[English]

While I cannot conclude that there is a *prima facie* question of privilege, all members must have easy access to precise, relevant and complete information. Commensurate with this obligation is the government's responsibility to provide that information to members in support of their work as parliamentarians.

I thank members for their attention.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 2

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-86, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise to talk about important pieces of legislation that come before the House. However, there are very few budgetary measures as important as what we are debating today in the budget implementation bill. There are so many things one could talk about, it is hard focus on one.

However, one I have highlighted in the past a great deal is the Canada child benefit. That is one of the jewels in the budget. We have saw it virtually from day one when this Prime Minister made a commitment to Canada's middle class. One of the centrepieces of that commitment was the Canada child benefit. For the constituents of Winnipeg North, it has had a profoundly positive impact. To give members a sense of that, imagine approximately \$9 million-plus coming into the community of Winnipeg North every month as a direct result of the Canada child benefit program.

When we think about the economy, we think of what moves an economy forward. Often it is when we have consumers who are spending. Therefore, if we think about that \$9 million-plus a month that Ottawa sends to Winnipeg North for those residents, they use the money to support their children in their community. That is one of the reasons in the bigger picture, the macro picture, that we have seen over the last number of years an economy that has grown to the tune of creating over 500,000 new full-time jobs in a relatively short

period of time. Contrast that with when Stephen Harper was the prime minister. It took him approximately 10 years to generate one million jobs. Here we have 500,000 full-time jobs and tens of thousands of part-time jobs. It is because of the very progressive measures this government has taken to support Canada's middle class. When we talk about the Canada child benefit program, we also have to take into consideration that this budget implementation bill recognizes the need to have annual increases to support our families.

We not only think of our young people but also of our seniors. Again, Winnipeg North has benefited from a direct enhancement by this government of our social programs. Here I am referring specifically to the guaranteed income supplement. Once again, literally hundreds of seniors in Winnipeg North are benefiting directly from a positive decision by the government to enhance the guaranteed income supplement. That means that some of the poorest seniors in our country in Winnipeg North are receiving an annual increase of more than \$900 a year. Again, that goes a long way in assisting our seniors.

I have had the opportunity, through knocking on doors and attending many different types of events, to talk with seniors, and one of the common things that comes up for seniors, and even those receiving the guaranteed income supplement, is the cost of medication. The reason I bring up the cost of medication is that not only is it an important issue for the residents of Winnipeg North, but also an important issue for all Canadians.

• (1520)

That said, I would argue that there is one social program that most, if not all, Canadians get a sense of pride from. Whenever we talk about the great things about being a Canadian, one is the fact that we have a fantastic health care system. It is a system that is envied around the world. If we talk to immigrants who come to Canada from other countries, they often say how wonderful the health care system is in Canada.

At times we need to recognize the need for change, and change is in the wind. We have a Prime Minister and a Minister of Health, now the our second Minister of Health, who have looked at how Ottawa can assist in continuing positive change on the health care front.

For many years, I thought that the cost of prescribed medicines ways fairly prohibitive for people at the low-income threshold. The cost can even be prohibitive for the middle class and those doing exceptionally well financially, given the portion of their monthly salaries going toward paying for their medications.

For the first time, we have a government that is committed to looking at pharmacare. The Standing Committee on Health that brought the issue forward. The first health minister worked with provinces to try to get better prices of pharmaceuticals for provinces, and I believe the next step is a pharmacare program. I have had the opportunity to introduce numerous petitions in the House on this issue. Many of my constituents have taken the time to sign petitions saying that they want a pharmacare plan. As a longtime Liberal, I believe this is an important social issue, and it is so rewarding to see a government that is finally prepared to bring that to a reality.

Government Orders

I realize there is a lot to be done on it, because health care is not just a federal responsibility but a shared responsibility between Ottawa and the provinces and territories. I would go even further to say there is a moral, if not a legal, obligation to take indigenous people into consideration. Through this budget implementation bill, we are once again moving forward on a possible pharmacare program for all of Canada. I hope that some day we will see that, but at least we are moving forward. I look forward to hearing from the Minister of Health in the coming months, and possibly the Minister of Finance who may be able to give a better indication of whether this is doable.

I have talked about how some of these decisions have had a positive impact on Winnipeg North. If we look at the bigger picture, I often talk about taxation and some of the positive tax measures this government has put in place from day one. I often talk about the tax cut for the middle class and the special tax on Canada's wealthiest. Moreover, many business incentives have been put in place. We have reduced taxes for small businesses, the backbone of our economy, by about two percentage points, reducing the small business tax rate to 9%. At the same time, we are investing in infrastructure, recognizing the importance of supporting our communities. All regions of our country have seen many benefits.

It was not that long ago I was talking about everything from splash pads to community facilities, to roads and infrastructure. All of those things are really important. This government believes in investing in Canadians and infrastructure. At the end of the day, the Prime Minister is committed to delivering on the commitments we made in the last election campaign on things such as a healthier middle class—

• (1525)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Unfortunately, the time is up. I am sure the member will be able to add more during questions and comments.

The hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, I once read to the House an excerpt from a Liberal platform in 1997, I believe, where the Liberals identified the problem of Canadians who do not have access to necessary and essential medicines. They told Canadians that they were going to immediately bring in pharmacare to fix that gap. Here we are over 20 years later, and we have a Liberal government that is prepared to act, but of course prepared to act not by bringing in pharmacare but by convening a committee and having another study, which is going to be reported maybe by June.

Is my hon. colleague going to stand in the House and tell his constituents and the people of Canada that his government is going to bring in universal public, single-payer pharmacare in the next year? Will he do that, or not?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, whether in the Manitoba legislature or the House of Commons here in Ottawa, I like to believe I have been consistent on the importance of the pharmacare issue. My daughter, who happens to be an MLA in the province of Manitoba, has also been advocating for provinces to do it alone if Ottawa does not move forward.

It is a program that I would like to see further advanced. I believe there are a good number of members in the House who would like to see it advance. For the first time in generations, virtually since medicare was established, we are seeing some movement forward on this particular file. I am encouraged by it, and we will have to wait and see. However, at the end of the day, as I indicated, we are very fortunate to have the type of health care we do in Canada.

• (1530)

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Madam Speaker, the previous speaker commented about how the economy is doing so well. My question, then, is why is the Bank of Canada warning us about the decline in investments in Canada? Over the last three years, Canadian investment in the U.S. has increased by 65.8%, and yet in that same time span, investment in Canada has decreased by 5%. Where is the confidence that my colleague has about the economy, and what can we look forward to?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I am confident because if we compare Canada and the G8 countries, we find that Canada is performing exceptionally well. We are leading the pack. The member can cite specific stats and then call them into question, but in most part, Canadians will realize that as a whole the government has been moving this country forward. Working with Canadians, what we have seen over the last couple of years is amazing growth. We would have to go back 50 years, 60 years or 70 years before we would see the type of growth in terms of the number of real, tangible numbers of jobs generated. Over 600,000 have been created, and more than 500,000 of them are full-time jobs. That is real, tangible proof that the economy is moving forward in a healthy way.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Madam Speaker, I wonder if my colleague across the way finds it inappropriate of the current government to once again introduce a mega-bill with a tremendous amount of pages and details. Everyone is having a tough time deciphering all these details.

I am vice-chair of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. The committee has to review the Copyright Act. No one knows where this is going and we learn in this bill that this is how the Copyright Board of Canada will be reviewed.

Can the hon. member understand how someone like me, who is committed to understanding the issues, may find it unacceptable that the Copyright Board of Canada is being reviewed in an omnibus bill when it is such an important issue right now?

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I suggest to the member that from virtually day one, we have seen a very ambitious government on a number of different files. We have seen substantial good changes. I remember not too long ago a constituent come to me saying that this government had done more in two years than the previous government did in 10 years. I believe that individual was talking about things in a very positive way. The results are very tangible, and I do not make any apologies for a government that wants to work hard. I look forward to 2019.

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Madam Speaker, I too look forward to October 2019.

Government Orders

While I am glad to rise today and lend my voice and the voice of my constituents to this debate, I would be remiss if I did not also register my frustration that the majority of my colleagues in the House will not be able to give any input on this piece of legislation. The government has again moved time allocation, effectively ending debate.

Here we go again with more broken promises. Over and over during the campaign, the Liberals railed against time allocation and they railed against omnibus bills, yet all the promises they made are out the window. This is an 800-page omnibus bill. It would take Canadians more time to read this legislation than we have been given to debate it. It is outrageous and it is undemocratic, but it is made even worse because of the campaign promise of the Liberals not to use omnibus bills.

I will be focusing most of my time today on the lack of action taken by the Liberal government in order to improve Canada's competitiveness on the world stage. The imposition of a carbon tax, the spending spree and the debt spiral the government is plunging Canada into are all part of the abysmal track record of the Liberals on keeping their promises to Canadians.

Remember those promises? They were a maximum \$10-billion deficit, and a balanced budget in 2019. Again, we have more broken promises.

The Business Council of Canada, which represents the largest companies operating in Canada, made the following submission to the finance committee during pre-budget consultations:

[W]e ask the government to introduce a comprehensive strategy to improve competitiveness, diversify trade and attract private sector investment. According to a recent survey of our members, only one in seven CEOs expressed confidence in the competitiveness of Canada's business climate. According to that survey, the tax and regulatory burden combined with concerns around the availability of talent were the most important factors affecting company investment plans in Canada.

Among other recommendations, we've called on the government to undertake a comprehensive review of Canada's tax system with the goal of strengthening the incentives for investment and growth. We believe the need for this review has only been intensified by the implementation of the U.S. Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

It went on to say:

Effective January 1, 2018, the U.S. reduced its federal corporate income tax rate from 35% to 21% and allowed for full expensing of investments in machinery and equipment. This tax reform package also introduced new international tax rules. They encouraged multinationals to shift capital back into the U.S.

These changes have given the United States a significant tax advantage over many advanced economies but in particular Canada, given our very close proximity and dependence on that market. According to a...study that we commissioned by PwC Canada on the implications of U.S. reform, failing to respond to these changes threatens 635,000 jobs and \$85 billion in GDP.

In their last budget and their most recent fall economic update, the Liberals have done absolutely nothing to address the concerns outlined by the Business Council of Canada on Canada's lack of competitiveness on the world stage. The Liberals are just out of touch with Canada's business community.

Our Conservative team has been on the ground from coast to coast to coast, talking with business owners, investors, and employees. Personally, I have visited Sault Ste Marie, Belleville, Guelph and all throughout the Waterloo region. I was proud to host a round table with local business several months ago, with the shadow minister for international trade, the member for Niagara West. While the round

table focused on the trade negotiations between Canada and the United States and the retaliatory tariffs, we also heard how the Liberal government is not creating a healthy environment to enable small and medium-sized businesses to grow.

One business from southwestern Ontario that participated in our round table shared that in 2009, during the global economic recession, it lost 800 employees. However, because of the policies of our Conservative government at the time, it was able to recoup its losses in just eight months.

Contrast that with today. The same business is looking at job losses of over 1,000 employees as a result of slow economic growth. It is worried that the Liberal government is spending the cupboards bare, so that when a recession hits, it will not be able to recoup like it did previously.

● (1535)

We also heard that, just as the Business Council of Canada outlined in its submission to the finance committee, the competitive climate is causing many companies to move south of the border. Even worse, it is discouraging entrepreneurs from starting businesses here in Canada at all.

For those already in operation, any foreseeable plans to expand have been put on hold. Companies that once felt they were supported and encouraged by the policies of the federal government just do not feel that same level of support anymore. That the government is raising taxes and has no plan to balance the budget is making this climate of worry and concern much worse.

Speaking of debt, in the first three years of the current government, the Prime Minister added \$60 billion to the national debt. Deficits are even higher than expected and higher than what was promised in the 2015 election campaign. The Parliamentary Budget Officer projects deficits of \$22.2 billion in 2018-19 and \$21.4 billion in 2019-20, which is \$4 billion higher than the government showed in budget 2018.

Last year, Canada's net debt reached an all-time high of \$670 billion, or \$47,612 for every Canadian family. According to the finance committee, the budget will not return to balance until 2045, by then racking up an additional \$450 billion of debt.

When the economy is strong and growing at 3%, a responsible government would pay down debt, so that we have more fiscal room in case of a downturn. However, we see the current government doing the exact opposite.

In 2009, the Conservative government was able to take decisive action to support the Canadian economy, yet it returned to balance and a surplus by 2015. However, with no plan or commitment to balance, the Liberals have budgeted the cupboard bare. The next time Canada is faced with a crisis, there will be nothing there.

The cost of interest alone on our debt will increase from \$23.9 billion in 2017-18, almost doubling to \$39 billion in 2021-2022. That is \$39.1 billion, which is more than the \$36.1 billion we spend on federal health care through the Canada health transfer.

Government Orders

Let us think of what that money could do if we were to provide our veterans with the help they desperately need. We could properly invest in mental health care throughout Canada. We could provide palliative care to every community from coast to coast. Instead, it is going toward paying for the government's out-of-control spending.

My last point is on the carbon tax. Following the Liberals' announcement of their forced carbon tax on Canadians, the president of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce said that although he is a climate change believer, the senseless response by governments all over the world is, simply put, ridiculous. He said there should never be a cost to using less, that it makes no sense. If less use is required, he described punitive measures as the lazy man's way of reducing carbon emissions. As he said, it is completely counterproductive to take money out of circulation, hang on to it for a period of time, then give 90% of it back. That was a promise he had heard from the Prime Minister on a report by 570 News, which he felt was insulting to the intelligence of every taxpayer, like we need to be babysat.

The chamber of commerce president said he was reminded of an old saying: A tax is a fine for doing something good, and a fine is a tax for doing something wrong. He said the carbon tax is a fine everyone will have to accept, and that is just wrong. He said that today, when business is burdened in every manner by government, it's time that it be recognized by all politicians that without business there is nothing for anyone. Businesses, he said, need a path that clearly demonstrates our economy is first and foremost, so it can provide all the money government needs to save the world.

It is clear that the government is far more interested in imposing its ideology on Canadians than it is in listening to and working with Canadian business.

• (1540)

I am going to finish with this. According to a website that tracks the success of the Liberal government, after 1,119 days in office, the Liberals have broken or completely ignored as many promises they made in the 2015 election campaign as they have kept. That gives Canadians much reason to worry, because a government that campaigns on one thing and does exactly the opposite only increases Canadians' mistrust in our democratic institutions.

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member was all over the place with a lot of different points. Unfortunately, I will not have time to address issues like the carbon tax supported by pinko commie Preston Manning and other Conservatives. I will not get into that. I will not get into his misleading Canadians on raising taxes. We only did that to the wealthiest one per cent. I will not address that either.

I would like to ask, though, about his love of U.S. tax changes down south and the massive deficits they have caused. While the U.S. debt-to-GDP ratio is increasing, ours is decreasing. The hon. member is in love with that deficit and the Conservative deficits run by the Harper administration. Why is he against ours?

• (1545)

Mr. Harold Albrecht: Madam Speaker, I know my colleague was not here in 2008, 2009 and 2010, those years when we were facing not just a Canadian downturn in the economy but a global recession. My Conservative colleagues are on the opposition side now, but when we were in government in 2008 and 2009, we had a minority

government and we were suggesting stimulus funding. The Liberal Party then actually said that we were not spending enough to stimulate it. They wanted us to go deeper and deeper into deficit.

Former prime minister Harper had the wisdom to know that there was a limit to how much the government could spend and how much it could go into deficit. The Conservative government at the time also had an incredible plan to bring us back out of deficit spending within a three- to four-year period, which we accomplished.

There is a big difference between going into deficit financing to stimulate a lagging economy that is in recession and comparing that to today, when we are in an economic growth period and still spending way more than we are taking in. It is a recipe for disaster.

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, the hon. member talked a lot about balancing the budget. I am just wondering if he would comment on how much easier it would be to balance the budget if the government did not forgo \$10 billion or more per year in taxes by not closing down overseas tax havens. I have often stood in this place and brought up an example of one Canadian company that, for the price of a post office box in Luxembourg I think it was, has evaded \$690 million in taxes. That is one company alone. It does not have any employees in Luxembourg. It just made the big investment of getting a post office box.

I am just wondering if he would like to comment on why the government, in this budget or any other budget it has put forward, has not brought forward measures to close those tax havens instead of opening new ones.

Mr. Harold Albrecht: Madam Speaker, it is just a clear indication of the misplaced priorities of the government. We saw the same thing a year and a half ago when the government started attacking our farmers and our small businesses, trying to go after them and calling them tax cheats, yet at the same time ignoring their multi-billion dollar corporations. This is just another example of that.

I agree with my colleague. We should be going after those who are cheating our tax system and evading taxes. It is a clear indication that those are areas we need to shore up. However, the Liberals are going after small-business people, who are the backbone of our economy and provide thousands of jobs for Canadians. Not only do we need to leave those people alone, but we need to have policies in place that encourage them to maintain those businesses and expand them as they are able.

Government Orders

Mr. Ali Ehsassi (Willowdale, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to rise in the House today to discuss Bill C-86, a second act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures.

Bill C-86 represents our government's commitment to do more for Canadians. The bill acts as a framework to implement key measures proposed in budget 2018 that will ensure Canadian businesses remain competitive and successful, globally as well as domestically.

In 2018, our government is placing people first, by creating a competitive, sustainable and fair Canada. Throughout my speech, I will provide several examples as to how Bill C-86 would accomplish such objectives.

Last week, on November 21, the Minister of Finance addressed members of the House to unveil the 2018 fall economic statement. His statement reiterated the commitment of our government to continue investing in the middle class to ensure that our economy would remain robust and would continue to flourish for years to come. We are experiencing a strong and growing economy from coast to coast to coast.

We, on this side of the House, have always believed that investment leads to growth and growth leads to more jobs. That is why we can all be proud as we witness new jobs being created, which in turn provide new opportunities for many Canadians to succeed.

In 2017, Canada experienced the strongest economic growth among all G7 countries, accumulating 3% GDP growth. Due to the hard work of Canadians, the results continue to speak for themselves.

We are also experiencing a healthy wage growth. In fact, we are now experiencing the fastest rate of wage growth in the last eight years. With more jobs and the lowest unemployment rates reported in 40 years, consumer confidence remains strong. Our plan is to put more money in the pockets of Canadian families next year, whereby a typical Canadian family of four will be \$2,000 better off.

Allow me start off with examples by citing the significance of Bill C-86 to legislating gender budgeting.

We have placed gender equity at the forefront of decision-making by introducing gender budgeting legislation. The future of Canada's economic and social prosperity depends on supporting women of all ages, reducing the gender wage gap and increasing the participation of women in the workforce.

This comes after the failure of the Harper government to recognize women as a driving force in the economy. We, on the other hand, are ensuring every Canadian has an equal and fair chance to succeed. This is not just the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do. In fact, there are now more women employed than ever before in our long history.

Another example is the significance of Bill C-86 to the issue of pay equity. To further complement legislating GBA+ budgeting, our government aims to provide pay equity to all Canadians by implementing measures to create a more inclusive work environ-

ment. For this reason, work has already begun with key stakeholders to introduce proactive pay equity legislation.

To deliver on our commitment to gender equality, we are proud to offer equal pay for equal value of work. This has been long overdue, and we hope to set a precedent for the global community as leaders and champions of equality.

The next thing I would like to cite is the significance of Bill C-86 insofar as the new employment insurance benefits for second parents. As I have already touched on the significance of gender equality in the workplace, allow me to now emphasize our government's interest in introducing legislation to ensure that there is similarly gender equality at home. The new parental sharing benefits will provide all parents, including adoptive and same-sex parents, an opportunity to focus on sharing the responsibilities of raising their children as they see fit.

● (1550)

The new employment insurance benefit for second parents provides more flexibility for parents to set aside time and ensure greater success at shared parenting. Encouraging equality is the right thing to do for all Canadians.

Finally, allow me to talk about how crucial Bill C-86 is to the establishment of the department of the status of women.

Unlike the previous Conservative government, this government keenly understands that gender equality is a key factor in stimulating economic growth. Bill C-86 proposes to create the department of women and gender equality. This new department will solely focus on the status of women in Canada and strengthen our capacity to advance gender equality and stimulate the middle class through innovative policies and programs.

By preserving the department's place as a centre of gender expertise, we hope to prevent gender-based violence as well as expand the mandate for gender equality. This is inclusive of sexual orientation, gender identity and expression by promoting greater understanding.

We have come a long way by appointing the first gender-balanced federal cabinet and the first federal minister fully devoted to gender issues. We hope, and I think it would be fair to say, that we have seen that Canada is serving as an example on the world stage.

Bill C-86 signifies our government's commitment to next steps in advancing our economy by focusing on the growth of the middle class and those who are working hard to join it.

Through Bill C-86, we are taking significant action to invest in this plan. Canada's future prosperity depends on offering equal and fair chances at success.

● (1555)

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Madam Speaker, I enjoy working with my colleague on the scrutiny of regulations committee. I find him to be a very collegial colleague.

Government Orders

He commented frequently in his remarks about supporting families and children, with which we certainly agree. If that is true, why then did his colleagues oppose Motion No. 110 the other day, which sought to give additional support to families after they had the unfortunate situation of losing a child. It seems to me that this is a common sense motion and the House should get behind it. However, when it went to committee, the Liberal members on that committee put roadblocks in the way and would not allow the amendment to go through.

Could my colleague comment on how he squares the circle of support for families with children, but for those who have actually experienced the loss of a child, which is one of the most devastating experiences a family can endure, his government seemed rather uncaring in that situation?

Mr. Ali Ehsassi: Madam Speaker, it is a great honour to serve on the scrutiny of regulations committee with my colleague. I might as well add that he does an admirable job of chairing that committee.

As he rightly pointed out, we are into common sense economics. I do not think for a second that any Canadian would doubt our commitment to Canadian families and to Canadian children. For the past three years, every decision we have made has been to put families and children at the centre of economic planning, and the results speak for themselves.

If we look at GDP growth, if we look at the rate at which Canadians are experiencing wage growth, we can all be very proud that Canadian families are doing admirably and we are all seeing the positive results of focusing on families.

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, there are so many questions I could ask for my colleague across the way. I could ask about why we are getting these huge budget implementation bills of 850-something pages with only a couple of days to assess it before we begin debate and then only a few hours of debate in the House and a few hours in committee.

I want to go back to the big picture. One of the things we really should be concentrating on in Parliament is to reduce the gap between the wealthiest of Canadians and the rest of us, the 1% and the 99%. That gap has been growing since the 1980s and 1990s. One way to do it is to ensure everybody pays his or her fair share in taxes.

The Liberals had an opportunity to close tax loopholes for CEOs and to close offshore tax havens where the wealthy hide their money. Instead they go after the little fish and it is very little return for a lot of work. Why are the Liberals just missing the boat on fixing this problem that will help us get back to a fair society in Canada?

•(1600)

Mr. Ali Ehsassi: Madam Speaker, my hon. friend has alluded to the fact that the budget bill is a lengthy one, and I could not agree with him more, the reason being that we are doing quite well and we are leading the G7 in terms of economic growth, but our work is not done. It is absolutely imperative that we continue to tackle various issues.

This budget, as the member is fully aware, is all about ensuring that we have a competitive, sustainable and fair system. Therefore, every single one of the various issues that are addressed in this

budget focus on addressing the issue of ensuring that we have more inclusive economic growth and that all Canadians can share in the new prosperity.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to rise in the House to speak to Bill C-86, budget implementation act, 2018, no. 2, more specifically to modernizing federal labour standards as well as the wage earner protection program.

The Government of Canada has a mandate to modernize labour standards and adapt them to today's reality. Bill C-86 is the first step in making this modernization a reality.

I want to begin by providing a bit of context. Part III of the Canada Labour Code establishes basic working conditions in the federally-regulated private sector, such as working hours, minimum wage, statutory leave, annual leave, and various other types of leave.

[*English*]

They would also create a level playing field for employers by requiring all of them to meet these minimum entitlements. Many employers already go above and beyond what is in the code, but for some workers, these standards are the only protections they have.

[*Translation*]

Unfortunately, these things have remained largely unchanged since the 1960s when most Canadians had steady jobs with regular nine to five hours.

[*English*]

Today, many Canadians are struggling to support their families in part-time, temporary and low-wage jobs. They may work several jobs to make ends meet, face unpredictable hours and lack benefits and access to certain entitlements.

[*Translation*]

The government understands that the nature of work is changing. That is why we held extensive consultations that highlighted the need for updated federal labour standards. That is what we are doing with budget implementation act no. 2.

[*English*]

Our consultations made it clear that there were a number of complex issues related to federal labour standards and the changing nature of work that required more in-depth review and discussions. A modern set of federal labour standards would better protect our workers and help set the stage for good-quality jobs.

[*Translation*]

A group of experts, soon to be announced, will be looking at these issues.

[*English*]

Let us talk about some of the changes being introduced through Bill C-86:

Government Orders

Subdivision A of Division 15 of Part 4 amends the Canada Labour Code to, among other things,

- (a) provide five days of paid leave for victims of family violence, a personal leave of five days with three paid days, an unpaid leave for court or jury duty and a fourth week of annual vacation with pay for employees who have completed at least 10 consecutive years of employment;
- (b) eliminate minimum length of service requirements for leaves and general holiday pay and reduce the length of service requirement for three weeks of vacation with pay;
- (c) prohibit differences in rate of wages based on the employment status of employees;

● (1605)

[*Translation*]

Many Canadians are victims of domestic violence. It takes so much courage and determination to make that decision to leave a violent situation. These individuals experience extreme stress and vulnerability. Sometimes, they just cannot go to work for a number of days, and the trouble is, they do not know what type of leave they can use to justify their absence.

This five-day period of leave will help more Canadians get out of violent situations without the risk of losing their job.

[*English*]

By introducing equal treatment protections, these amendments would also ensure that employees in precarious work are paid and treated fairly, and have access to the same entitlements as their full-time counterparts. As well, they would ensure that employees receive sufficient notice and compensation when their jobs are terminated, to help protect their financial security. However, change of this magnitude does not happen overnight.

That is why up to approximately \$51 million over five years starting in 2019-20, and up to about \$12 million ongoing will be allocated to support the implementation and enforcement of the labour standards amendments, including education and awareness, training and increased resources for proactive enforcement and timely resolution of complaints.

In addition to these changes to the code, we are also enhancing the wage earner protection program to provide more support for Canadians during difficult times when their employer is insolvent and they are owed wages. The wage earner protection program is a Government of Canada program that provides financial support for workers who are owed eligible wages when their employer files for bankruptcy or becomes subject to receivership. In short, the WEPP is there to help workers when they need it the most.

Budget 2018 announced that the government would propose legislative amendments to increase the maximum payments under the WEPP and make eligibility more equitable. As such, our government is proposing to increase the maximum payment under the WEPP from an amount equal to four weeks of maximum insurable employment insurance earnings to an amount equal to seven weeks. For 2018, this would amount to an increase of up to \$3,000.

I think the members of the House would agree that this increased support is a welcome change for Canadian workers, and I am glad to say that the increase in the maximum payment would come into

force on royal assent and would apply in respect of bankruptcies or receiverships that occurred on or after February 27, 2018.

Changes would also be made to program eligibility more equitable so that workers who are owed wages, vacation, severance, or termination pay when their employer files for bankruptcy or enters receivership are better supported during a difficult time.

The changes proposed today are part of our plan to modernize federal labour standards as part of Bill C-86. We are also introducing historic proactive pay equity legislation. This legislation would ensure that women and men in federally regulated industries receive equal pay for work of equal value.

We have already introduced in the Canada Labour Code the right to request flexible work arrangements, new leaves and new protections for unpaid interns. More recently, we passed Bill C-65, which addresses workplace harassment and violence. We are bringing in change that Canadians have been asking for.

We spent nearly a year consulting with Canadians, stakeholders and experts to get their perspectives on what a robust and modern set of federal labour standards should look now. Now we are taking action. We are ushering in modern and robust standards that will benefit both workers and employers.

With modern labour standards that support good-quality jobs, employees can thrive and achieve a better balance between the demands of their personal lives and the operational requirements of their jobs, which can lead to a greater sense of well-being. By the same token, they can help employers recruit and retain employees, which can lead to an increase in productivity. Employees who come to work feeling supported by their employers are able to do their best work and to innovate, which can create a better working environment and lead to long-term gains for employers.

It is a win-win for everyone.

● (1610)

[*Translation*]

I request the support of the House to get rid of these 1960s-era provisions that are well past their best before date. We must update our labour standards to reflect the equality and quality of Canadian jobs across the country.

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

Many people in Canada who are aware of problems in the cultural sector and the media might be asking themselves this question. As my colleague said, our economic performance was among the best in the G7. However, yesterday in committee, Facebook representatives told us they had decided to set up their sales offices in Canada and would begin collecting GST on their ads sometime in mid-2019. How can that be?

How can it be that our government does not have the backbone to tell companies that sell ad services to Canadians to collect GST? That failure to act is inexplicable and has probably cost us billions in uncollected revenue at a time when we really need it.

Government Orders

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. In 2015, Canadians spoke out loud and clear, choosing our government's plan to invest in Canadians and create good jobs, valuable opportunities and positive growth for everyone.

We are serving Canadians and meeting their needs along the way.

[*English*]

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Madam Speaker, in 2015 Canadians had their voices heard, but in 2015 Canadians also heard significant promises by the current government that the deficit would be \$10 billion maximum and that there would be a balanced budget by 2019. Now the Liberals go on and say they are just investing in the economy and that it is making our economy stronger, but the record is clear.

Budget 2016 promised that spending would raise the GDP by 0.5% in 2016 and by 1% in 2017 and 2018. However, the Parliamentary Budget Officer has estimated the infrastructure spending only contributed a tiny 0.1% to the GDP growth in both years, or not even 10% of what was promised. How can the Liberals continue to go down this path of spending more money, increasing our deficits and increasing our debt payments \$15 billion more over a four-year period? That is \$15 billion more in payments just for interest.

How can the government continue to support investments like that, requiring more interest payments by this generation and, more importantly, downloading them onto our children and grandchildren?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague opposite for his question. I repeat once again that, in 2015, Canadians spoke out loud and clear, choosing our government's plan. I would also add that we have decided to invest in an economy that works for everyone, and I will give a few examples of what we have achieved since 2015: over 500,000 jobs created; the lowest unemployment rate in nearly a decade; the Canada child benefit, which is helping many families in my riding; opportunities created for young people thanks to the Canada summer jobs initiative; support for our seniors as part of the new horizons for seniors program; significant investments in infrastructure across the country; and the list goes on.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, there is almost no way for me to exaggerate the crisis in housing being experienced across this country, and particularly in the Lower Mainland. In my constituency of Vancouver Kingsway, we have renters who cannot find affordable places and a dream of home ownership by young people that has been crushed. People are leaving the communities they grew up in.

Members of the current government claim they are interested in housing, and while the Liberals say they have allocated \$40 billion for housing, it is actually \$20 billion because \$20 billion of that is coming from the provinces. The \$20 billion is tied to provincial contributions and it is over 10 years, most of which would flow after 2019.

Does my hon. colleague really understand that there is a housing crisis in this country? If that is the case, why are the Liberals putting

so little money into housing, and why are Canadians having to wait so long for any of that federal money to actually flow?

• (1615)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleague that there is an affordable housing crisis. To answer his question, I want to tell him what is happening in my riding, specifically in Laval. People have been particularly happy with our government since last year because we are taking action and introducing something that is going to help people who really need it.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am going to start where the Liberals just left off. The Liberals said, unbelievably, that somehow Canadians who are in the immense turmoil that exists currently with the housing crisis in so many parts of this country are happy with the government. I can say first-hand, from living in New Westminster—Burnaby, which is, in a sense, in the epicentre of the housing crisis, that tonight there are women, men and families wondering whether they can keep a roof over their heads. As rents rise, and they have limited pensions or are working at minimum wage, they do not believe they can keep up. There are women, men and families worried about whether they will ever have housing again. That is why so many shelters are filled to the brim. It is a national tragedy, yet what we have heard today from the Liberals is that everything is just fine. It clearly is not.

We need a federal government that understands the principle of a roof over every single Canadian's head and that will make the required investments so that housing becomes a priority again in this country. That is certainly something Jagmeet Singh has been speaking to right across this country as he talks with Canadians. There is no doubt in his mind that the housing crisis is critical and that we have to respond with the kind of effort we did after the Second World War.

I have mentioned this before in the House. We built 300,000 housing units in the space of 30 months. Governments at that time understood that the men and women in service overseas were coming back to Canada and deserved to have a roof over their heads. That is why in places like New Westminster, like 109 Glover, which is my address, those houses were built in 1947, 1948 and 1949. We built hundreds of thousands of units. Today the government pretends that it has done something. It has manufactured, in a bizarre way, some cooked-up figures, as if it is actually addressing the housing crisis. It is a tragedy that the government does not understand the importance of this. There is nothing in this budget implementation bill that addresses the housing crisis.

Government Orders

There is nothing in the budget implementation bill that addresses the crisis in pharmacare, either. The lack of pharmacare is something so many Canadians feel acutely. One in every five Canadians, as my colleague, the member for Vancouver Kingsway, has mentioned numerous times in the House, has no access to medications. They simply cannot afford to pay for them. Businesses have to pay billions of dollars a year for drug plans. The good businesses, of course, provide drug plans to their employees. Businesses that care less choose not to do that, but then those employees become part of the one in every five Canadians who cannot afford medications.

These are the big, glaring errors in this budget implementation bill. When the government could have chosen to take action, it chose, instead, to do nothing. It aggravated it, appallingly to me and to so many Canadians, with a massive \$14-billion corporate tax writeoff scheme. That is \$14 billion of taxpayers' money. Stunningly, when I talked to the finance officials and asked if it was true what I was reading on page 58 that plush corporate jets and stretch limousines were included as part of these massive corporate tax writeoffs that could go to Bay Street companies, they said yes, it was very true; stretch limousines, absolutely; plush private jets, absolutely.

The government is not prioritizing the needs of Canadians by putting in place single-payer universal pharmacare, putting in place housing in this country at a time when it is in crisis or responding to the needs of indigenous children. They are profoundly underfunded and disadvantaged for life because of the up to \$10,000 funding gap per pupil per year in indigenous schools because of the chronic underfunding by the federal government.

Instead of responding to all of this, we have what is before us. What is before us had some good intentions. Pay equity was a very good intention. The federal government slapped itself on the back and said it did a good job. It was then referred to committee, which heard from witnesses. It heard from the Coalition for Pay Equity, CUPE, the Public Service Alliance of Canada and the Canadian Labour Congress. It heard from a wide variety of activists who have been fighting for pay equity and making sure that women are paid equally for work of equal value for years. Each one of them said that there were major flaws and that this bill had holes that must be addressed.

• (1620)

The pay equity coalition was particularly eloquent in this regard. It said that unless these flaws were fixed, women would have to go back to court so they could actually get equal pay for work of equal value. That is a compelling argument. Parliamentarians from the Liberal Party were at the committee and heard from the Coalition for Pay Equity, the teamsters, CUPE, PSAC and of course, the CLC, all of them saying the same thing, to fix the flaws. Every single one of them said that if these flaws were not fixed, women would have to return to court. Therefore, the Liberals cannot brag about bringing pay equity. All they can brag about is bringing a flawed bill to the floor of the House of Commons.

The NDP, because we are the worker bees in this House, went to work. We worked night and day. We came up with dozens of amendments to fix all the flaws. The Liberals put forward a flawed bill. However, our job, as parliamentarians, is to fix the flaws. When

I went to committee last week, my full expectation, despite the fact that the Liberals were bulldozing the bill through committee, was that the Liberals would accept the amendments and fix the flaws in the bill, even though we did all the work. Unbelievably, the Liberal MPs who sat at committee and heard about the massive flaws that would lead to women having to go back to court to achieve pay equity refused to entertain any amendments whatsoever.

Now we are left at report stage with a deeply flawed piece of legislation. Not a single Liberal can get up and say that the government has fixed pay equity, because it has not. The Liberals had a chance. We did the work for them. We were willing to let them take the credit, because the only thing that seems to concern them is who gets credit. We do not care. We just want this fixed. We want pay equity to be a reality. We do not want women to have to go back to court. The Liberals said no. Therefore, we are left with a bill with all the massive flaws identified by witness after witness. Not a single Liberal MP was willing to stand up for pay equity at committee. Not a single MP was willing to fix the flaws.

That is just one issue in a very sad narrative. I only have 10 minutes. I could speak for hours on this, because there are flaws identified in other parts of this massive omnibus piece of legislation. It is the biggest in our history, at 850 pages. It was thrown at the House of Commons with all kinds of flaws and mistakes written in, yet the Liberals were unwilling, even when other parties did the work for them, to entertain any fixes to the flaws.

Unfortunately, what that means is that this will be exactly like what we saw with the Harper government. Half a dozen times, a court threw out the legislation, because the Conservatives steamrolled it through the House of Commons rather than listening to elected representatives and experts so they could fix the flaws. Tragically, we are going to see women being forced to go back to court to throw out a piece of legislation on pay equity that could have been fixed. We did the work for them.

The most frustrating thing is that the current Liberal government does not have the character to understand that it is not who gets the credit; it is that the work is done right. We have always believed that the work needs to be done right. That is our role in Parliament, as Canadians chose in the last election. Up until the next election, we will continue to do that work.

• (1625)

[*Translation*]

I must oppose the bill at report stage. There are huge errors in this bill, and the Liberals rejected dozens of amendments that we proposed. They refused to improve the bill, and this is why I will vote against it.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am going to focus my question on the member's housing analysis for a very simple reason. Not one single fact was presented in the argument he made to the House.

The NDP will complain that if we spend money this year, we should have spent it last year. If we spent money last year, why are we not spending it this year? If we spend it over 10 years, why are we not spending it all right now? If we are spending it all right now, what are we going to do for the next 10 years? It has an argument against any action any government takes ever.

When we take a look at what the NDP promised, if it had been elected to government this time, it would have spent zero dollars on affordable housing in the year we are currently in. It is in the platform. Actually, it would have been three years in a row of zero dollars on affordable housing, not a single penny on new housing.

On homelessness, the issue the member spoke to specifically, which he thinks is suddenly a crisis, quite clearly, the drafting of the platform last time did not see it that way, because there was \$10 million a year. Liberals are spending \$10 million in Vancouver and Toronto alone in new dollars and \$100 million across the country. We doubled those funds. The only thing worse than the argument just presented was the NDP platform presented to Canadian people in the last election.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, the member needs to understand that despite the influence of Donald Trump and Trumpism, repeating something that is false over and over again does not make it true. That is very simple and very straightforward.

Heather has a daughter and a mother. The three of them live together in a one-bedroom apartment, and the fact is that she is wondering whether next month she will still have a roof over her head, because she works for minimum wage.

The fact is that when John's pension could not keep up, he ended up sleeping on the sofa of a friend, and eventually, a senior who had worked all his life, on the Liberals' watch, ended up at a parkade in downtown Westminster sleeping in his last possession, which was a car.

The fact is that Ed tries every night to find an affordable apartment, because he wants to move out of the shelter. However, he finds that within minutes of anything going online, it is already impossible to get that particular apartment, because it is taken so quickly.

Those are the facts. I wish Liberals would listen to real Canadians for a change.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, this kind of debate is devastating for me. There are parts of what the Liberal government is saying that are quite correct. There is much I agree with from the New Democrats. We could just have a conversation saying that we need pay equity, we need universal child care and we need housing and ask how we get there from here because we know it is not in this budget. More than anything, we need a climate program that actually ensures that we have a world

that will allow human beings to live on it. We need a habitable planet. We do not have that from the government. We have promises of it from many of the parties in this place.

I would just ask my friend from New Westminster—Burnaby if there is any way we can see a way out of this constant hyperpartisan wrangling. If we can put our political stripes aside and find ways to agree with each other on some things, we can move to agree with each other on the big things.

● (1630)

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I would like to start off by congratulating the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands on her engagement. She will be married very soon, and I think all members of the House join in congratulating her and wishing her and her husband-to-be the very best in the years to come.

Second, the reason we worked night and day to get those amendments in to fix the pay equity bill was that we do not care who gets the credit. What we do care about is that pay equity becomes a reality in this country and that women are not forced to go back to court to obtain the rights they had to go to court to acquire in the first place. That is the starting point.

The member for Saanich—Gulf Islands raises an important point. We have to make sure that we are getting the work done. It is not a series of talking points that makes difference. It is developing and producing results. That is why we worked so hard at report stage at committee to fix all the flaws identified in the bill by witnesses. We listened to witnesses and provided those amendments. I share her incredible disappointment that the Liberals did not accept a single opposition amendment. They became partisan. If they had accepted the amendments, we would have a much better piece of legislation.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, International Development; the hon. member for North Island—Powell River, Housing; and the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, Employment Insurance.

[English]

Mr. Andy Fillmore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a great privilege to speak to this House about Bill C-86, which represents our government's next steps to advance the mandate given to us by Canadians.

In 2015, Canadians sent us to Ottawa on a promise to grow the economy, support Canada's middle class and most vulnerable, and build a more inclusive and prosperous nation for all Canadians. Over the last three years, our government has made great progress on this promise.

Government Orders

Across the country, a strong and growing middle class is driving economic growth, and creating new jobs and more opportunities for people to succeed. While there is still more work to be done to ensure that every Canadian has a fair chance at success, real progress has been made. More Canadians are working, wages are growing, and Canadians and business are confident in their future.

The Canada child benefit, CCB, is helping families with the high cost of raising children by putting more money in the pockets of nine out of 10 families, helping to lift 521,000 people, including nearly 300,000 children, out of poverty. It is a measure that is making a real difference in Halifax.

This summer, I was at Mulgrave Park in our city's north end. It is a vibrant public housing community where many families benefit from the CCB. In a conversation with the executive director of Mulgrave Park Caring and Learning Centre, Crystal John, I asked her what she had been hearing from families about how the CCB is helping them. She told me that one important way to help is by giving families the funds to purchase nutritious meals for children. We know that food is expensive and that healthy food is even more expensive. Therefore, ensuring children are well fed, receiving the nutrients they need from healthy food, with fresh fruits and vegetables, is critically important. This is the positive impact of the CCB on the ground in Halifax and across the country.

Of course, more than nine million Canadians are also benefiting from the government's middle-class tax cut. By this time next year, a typical middle-class family of four will receive on average \$2,000 more each year as a result of these two measures to help with the cost of raising their children and saving for their future. This will help grow the economy for the benefit of everyone. We have also enhanced the Canada pension plan, which will provide more Canadians with a secure retirement.

We have made historic investments in infrastructure, including the national housing strategy, which is helping Canadians with a secure, safe and affordable place to call home. I will say that, as a former city planner, this is a point of great pride for me. Secure and affordable housing is fundamental to a citizen's well-being. We have taken important steps to create a strategy that is smart, focused on the vulnerable and rights-based. Now, Canada's strong fiscal position, which includes the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, allows the government to continue investing in the middle class and to lay a solid foundation for future generations.

In November, the Minister of Finance presented the federal government's 2018 fall economic statement, and here are some of the measures that it included.

First, the government is taking action to help Canadian businesses to compete, succeed and create good, well-paying jobs. We are introducing new tax incentives that will support business investment in Canada, including allowing businesses to immediately write off the full cost of machinery and equipment used for the manufacturing or processing of goods. We are also cutting red tape to make it easier to do business in Canada while protecting Canadians' health, safety and the environment.

The fall economic statement also makes important investments in a new social finance fund. The government recognizes that

innovative approaches are needed to tackle persistent and complex social challenges that make it difficult for some Canadians to succeed and reach their full potential. To encourage and realize innovative ideas, the Government of Canada is creating a new social finance fund to allow potential investors to partner with charities, non-profit and social purpose organizations to work together to solve our country's biggest social challenges. We are also providing support to social purpose organizations to improve their ability to successfully participate in the social finance market. All told, the social finance fund is expected to help create thousands of jobs, foster economic growth and help us build a more equal and fair Canada.

In Halifax, we are so lucky to have a vibrant community of passionate people working in the social innovation field. Just last week, I had the opportunity to invite the Minister of Innovation to Halifax for a reception at Common Good Solutions, an incubator and consulting agency that helps social enterprises start and grow. Its fearless leader, David Upton, has been a strong voice for government support for social enterprises, and I have been proud to stand along with him. In speaking with him since last week, he is thrilled with what the new social finance fund will mean for this growing industry.

• (1635)

One more important update in the fall economic statement is support for Canadian journalism. A strong and independent news media is crucial to a well-functioning democracy. The government recognizes the vital role that journalism plays in communities across Canada and is making key investments to ensure that Canadians in underserved communities continue to have access to informed and reliable news coverage.

New measures include allowing non-profit news organizations to receive charitable donations and issue official donation receipts; introducing a new refundable tax credit that supports original news content creation, including local news; and introducing a new temporary, non-refundable tax credit for subscriptions to Canadian digital news media.

There is still more work to do but the progress we have made to date is extraordinary and we are not slowing down. We will continue to fight for Canada's middle class and vulnerable Canadians. The budget elements included in Bill C-86 will go a long way to help us realize this goal. I encourage all members to support it.

I am going to share a few more excellent points about the budget bill and I am sure that everyone in the House will be interested in hearing them.

Government Orders

Members have heard me say before that Nova Scotia is home to some of the brightest scientists and researchers in the world at leading research institutions like Dalhousie University, St. Mary's University, the Bedford Institution of Oceanography and the IWK, the Izaak Walton Killam Children's Hospital and more. For the last year, they have rallied around the recommendations of the Fundamental Science Review, also known as the Naylor report, which was commissioned by this government under the leadership of our Minister of Science and Sport. This report called for significant investment in investigator-led research.

Our government agreed with those calls for action, because research expands our understanding of how the world works, allowing us to address existing and emerging challenges in our region in new and effective ways.

Equally important, basic research also serves as the foundation for the knowledge-based economy. That is why budget 2018 includes the single largest investment in investigator-led fundamental research ever. That is \$4 billion for fundamental science and research infrastructure and it includes a 25% increase to funding of the tri-council of NSERC, CIHR and SSHRC.

We have said it before, science is back, but more than that, with budget 2018 it is unstoppable.

The final measure I want to highlight is conservation, and this is a topic that many of my constituents in Halifax care deeply about. A whopping \$1.3 billion to protect Canada's landscapes and biodiversity, including species at risk, is included in the budget. It also includes funding to protect endangered marine life such as the right whale.

These measures are joined by several others that are geared toward protecting our environment for generations to come, including funding for the implementation of Canada's pricing of pollution system.

There is \$56 million to expand an existing home energy retrofit partnership with efficiency in Nova Scotia.

One of my favourite measures is making entry to Canada's national parks free for kids forever.

These are the kinds of investments that will keep Canada on a path to prosperity along with others that I mentioned in my speech today and countless additional initiatives from budget 2018 that I did not have time to address.

I hope that my colleagues from all corners of this place will agree that this plan is working for Canadians and that they will vote for this budget implementation measure to keep this spectacular momentum going.

• (1640)

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoulu, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a bit unfortunate to notice that the parliamentary secretary cannot spontaneously speak without any notes about their supposedly great budget engagement.

I went out for a few seconds and I am sure I missed the point where the member said when his government would balance the

budget. I am sure I missed that. The Liberals seem to want to be a responsible government, so I am sure I missed that point.

Could the member just repeat to me in which year the government will balance the budget?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for creating a wonderful opportunity to talk about the importance of the economy in Canada and how well it is doing.

The member would know that Canada has the lowest GDP-to-debt ratio in the G7. We have the lowest rate of unemployment in 40 years. In fact, in Canada right now we have a labour shortage, not an unemployment problem. We have the highest productivity in the G7. This is an economy that is doing extremely well.

Someone who works in the finance world in Ontario told me that he does not right now see any room for expansion in the economy the way that it is right now. Everything is working at full capacity and it is a remarkable thing to behold. This has been made possible by key budget measures that this government has made, which have allowed Canadians to expand their companies and to create new employment opportunities.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Madam Speaker, I know that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage is not the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance. However, if he is following this file within his own department, he knows full well that failing to require that companies like Netflix or Google collect GST on their services is an injustice to all competitors that are Canadian and hire Canadians.

I am not even talking about corporate taxes, because I know that the Minister of Finance will say that it is complicated. The Liberals do not have much initiative, but I can understand that corporate taxes are complicated. That said, applying a transaction tax on transactions made in Canada is pretty basic.

Are the minister's rose-coloured finance glasses so big that he does not even see a need to collect taxes from service providers? Pathetic. Does my colleague have nothing to say on this? He knows very well that the cultural sector is unanimous on this issue.

Our service providers and creators at least want local broadcasters and over-the-top television services, which are comparable to Netflix, to be on an equal footing with the others.

[English]

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Madam Speaker, right now, the industry committee and the heritage committee are undergoing parallel studies that in the end will have the result of proposing measures to the House that we can all debate and vote on, that will help to level the playing field in this point of transition from an analog to a digital economy.

I think the member would be very happy to realize that in fact Netflix has announced the production of its first Quebec-based film, which is going to be very wonderful in Canada. This is an evolving media landscape, and we are, all together, going to be finding solutions to address the realities of a new world of media.

Government Orders

•(1645)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, this is the problem as I see it. I watched the budget cuts in 2012. Environment Canada and Parks Canada lost 10% of their budgets. That money has not been replaced. Yes, it is wonderful to see investments in new protected areas, but as the Auditor General's report pointed out, our heritage buildings are not even being properly tracked. They are under Parks Canada's jurisdiction. Our lighthouses are not being protected. Meanwhile, on the species at risk side, the Canadian Wildlife Service does not have the people to prepare the recovery strategies. That is why it took 14 years to get a recovery strategy for southern resident killer whales, and it is still not being enacted.

I am frustrated. I see the nice words, and I know there are a lot of iconic measures in press releases, but we are not seeing restoration of Environment Canada to what it was before the cuts.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Madam Speaker, I would like to add my voice of congratulations to the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for her wonderful news. We are all elated. It is a beautiful bit of news for all of us to hear at this time.

Like many federal departments, Parks Canada had to labour under terrible and debilitating budget cuts for nearly a decade under the previous Conservative government. It is now working valiantly to come out from under those dark days and produce work plans, business plans and strategic plans to restore the system of Canada's parks and the environment it administers back to what they have been and should be. Unfortunately, we never have enough resources. We are going to continue to work hard to give them what they need to succeed.

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to respond to something the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands said. She said the government always has iconic and historical engagement announcements. I have come to think that it is all the government is about. It is always historical, amazing, so great, but we have never in Canadian history seen a government spend so much money to do so little.

[*Translation*]

I am very happy to speak today in the House of Commons on behalf of the citizens of Beauport—Limoilou.

Centre Block will soon be closing for complete renovations for 10 or 15 years. I wanted to mention that. There is no cause for concern, however, because we will be moving to West Block. I will therefore be able to continue to speak on behalf of my constituents.

Today I am discussing Bill C-86, a second act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures.

I will focus on the fact that the members of the Conservative Party are extremely disappointed with the bill. We have witnessed a string of broken promises over the past three years. It is a little ironic that the hon. member for Papineau, the current head of the Liberal government, said during the election campaign that he wanted to do something to make people less cynical of politics, to help them have more confidence in politicians, in the ability of the executive branch, the legislative branch and members of Parliament to do things that

are good for Canadians and especially to respect the major promises formally made during the campaign.

A group of researchers at Laval University have created what they call the Vote Compass. It shows the number of promises kept and broken by the provincial and federal governments.

I remember that, to their chagrin, a few months before the 2015 election, the research institute had to acknowledge that 97% of all promises made by Mr. Harper during the 2011 election campaign had been kept.

The Liberal government elected in 2015 broke three major promises and is continuing to break them in the 2018 budget. These were not trifling promises. They were major promises that were to set the guidelines for how the government was to behave and for the results Canadians would see.

The Canadians we talk to are familiar with the three major promises, since I often repeat them. I have to, because this is serious.

The Liberals promised to limit themselves to minor \$10-billion deficits in the first two years and a \$6-billion deficit in the third year.

What did they do? The first year, they posted a deficit of \$30 billion. The second year, they posted a deficit of \$20 billion. This year, the deficit is \$18 billion, or three times what was announced.

That is the first broken promise, and it was not just some promise that was jotted down on the back of a napkin. In any case, I hope not. In fact, I remember quite well that the promise was made from a crane in the midst of the election campaign. The member for Papineau was in Toronto, standing on a crane when he said that he would run deficits to pay for infrastructure. That is the second broken promise. He said that the \$10 billion a year in deficits would be used to inject more money into infrastructure. However, of the \$60 billion in deficits this government has racked up to date, only \$9 billion has gone to infrastructure. That is another problem, another broken promise.

That is why I was saying earlier that we have rarely seen, in the history of Canada, a government spend so much money for so few results. This is probably the first time we have seen this sort of thing.

I will give an example. He said that he would invest \$10 billion in infrastructure in 2017, but he invested only \$3 billion and yet racked up a deficit of \$20 billion. Where did the other \$17 billion go? It was used for all sorts of different things in order to satisfy very specific interest groups who take great pleasure in and boast ad nauseam about the Liberal ideology.

The third broken promise is an extremely important and strategic one. In fact, it was so obvious that we did not even really think of it as a promise before.

Government Orders

•(1650)

All Canadian governments, in a totally responsible manner and without questioning it, traditionally endorsed this practice. If there was a deficit, the document would indicate the date by which the budget would be balanced. There was a repayment date, just as there is for anyone in Canada. When the families of Beauport—Limoilou, many of whom are watching today, want to buy a car or appliance, such as a washer or dryer, not only does the seller ask them to get a bank loan, but he also asks them to sign a paper that indicates when the debt will be repaid in full.

Thus, it is quite normal to indicate when the budget will be balanced. We have been asking that question for three years, but what is even more interesting is that the Liberals had promised that the budget would be balanced in 2019, and now there are 45 days remaining in 2018. Telling us when the budget will be balanced is the least the Liberals could do.

There are consequences to running up large deficits, however. The Liberal government has been accumulating gigantic deficits at a time when the global economy is doing rather well, although forecasts indicate that we will enter a recession in the next 12 months. Although times are tough in Alberta and Ontario, where General Motors just closed a plant, the situation is positive. There are regions in Canada that are suffering tremendously, but the global economic context is nevertheless healthy. Knock on wood, which is everywhere in the House of Commons.

The first serious mistake is to run up deficits when times are good. When the global economy is doing well and our financial institutions are making money, we have to put money aside for an emergency fund and an assistance fund, especially for the employees of General Motors who lost their jobs and for all families in the riding of my Alberta colleague who have lost their jobs in the oil sector.

We have to have an emergency fund for the next economic crisis because that is how our capitalist system works. There are ups and downs. That is human nature. It is random. Agreements are signed, things are done, progress is made, and there are ups and downs. The current positive situation has been going on for five or six years now, so we need to be prepared. That is why growing the deficit during good economic times can have very serious consequences.

I would like to talk about another serious consequence, and I am sure this will strike a chord with the people of Beauport—Limoilou who are listening to us now. Does anyone know how many billions of dollars the government spends on federal health transfers? It is \$33 billion per year. To service the debt, to pay back people around the world who lend us money, we spent \$37 billion last year. We spent \$4 billion more on servicing our debt than on health transfers.

An hon. member: That is shameful.

Mr. Alupa Clarke: Yes, Madam Speaker, it is shameful. It sure looks like bad management of public affairs. It makes no sense, and I am sure Canadians agree. I am sure they are sick and tired of hearing us talk about \$10-billion, \$20-billion, \$30-billion deficits and so on.

Canada's total debt is now \$670 billion. My fellow Canadians, that means that, at this point in time, your family owes \$47,000. That is a debt you will have to pay.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage was very proud to announce that the government was giving nearly \$6,000 a year per child, through the Canada child benefit, to people earning less than \$45,000 a year. They are not giving money away, however; they are buying votes, which is unfortunate, since the very children this money is helping will end up having to pay it back. This is completely unacceptable on the part of the government.

•(1655)

I am proud to be part of a former Conservative government that was responsible, that granted benefits without running deficits and that also managed to balance the budget.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sure that the hon. member will be able to elaborate during questions and comments.

[*English*]

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I know the member from Quebec has a lot more to say so I am going to let him say it because my comment has nothing to do with his speech. Therefore, he can finish his speech when I finish.

I do have to put something on the record, which has come up a lot in this debate, about omnibus bills. Some people do not understand how it works. Since 1888, there have been omnibus bills and they have not been able to be split, except politically, maybe, with the great bell ringing in 1982.

There are two types of omnibus bills. One is on regular bill time, when a bill is on more than one topic. The other is with the budget. There was a problem that the use of omnibus bills was being abused, especially the example of the budget with a whole bunch about the environment that was not in the budget. Therefore, we promised to change that, and we did.

In section 69.1 of the Standing Orders, we changed that and it had those two categories of bills. Therefore, that promise was kept. That section has been used three times. It was used on October 31, 2017, on a corrections bill, which turned out not to be split; on June 11, 2018, on the national security bill, which was actually split, showing that it worked; and then on November 3, 2017, on a budget bill that was split five ways. Not only did we put in a mechanism, but it works.

Mr. Alupa Clarke: Madam Speaker, I will respond to that, because the Conservatives do not hide and we are not afraid of the truth.

The fact is that the MP for Papineau, the Liberals' leader, the Prime Minister presently, said during the last campaign that never in the world would he present an omnibus bill. There was no nuance. It was, "no omnibus bill, ever". The fact is that it is the biggest omnibus bill we have ever seen in this Parliament. It is bigger than an elephant. Seriously, it is huge. It is over 800 pages.

Government Orders

The blunt fact is that we were not ashamed of putting forward omnibus bills, because Canadians wanted the House to be efficient. Canadians wanted the House to go forward to make changes when necessary. Sometimes, when we had to debate every article, it did not go fast enough for the quickly changing pace of the world and all the needs of the Canadian people.

Right now the member is trying to engage with people to try to hide the fact that the Liberals are doing omnibus bills. They are ashamed of it.

• (1700)

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Madam Speaker, I heard my hon. colleague's speech. I am very intrigued by some of the aspects that he believes are a disgrace.

Just on that, I want to talk a bit about some of the amendments in this budget implementation bill that are about bankruptcies and about commercial licence holders in corporations being protected from bankruptcy. However, we do not have any amendments that allude to workers' pension protection in bankruptcy. This is a moral failure of this budget implementation act. I wonder what the hon. member thinks about protecting pensions when we are talking about bankruptcy legislation.

Mr. Alupa Clarke: Madam Speaker, I personally believe we should ensure that workers pensions are protected when a company files for bankruptcy.

[*Translation*]

As a society, we cannot tell workers who have worked for 30 or 40 years and who were counting on a pension that, all of a sudden, for purely capitalist reasons, their pension will be slashed.

There are people in my riding who suffered a great deal when White Birch Paper almost went under. There were unbelievable cuts to employees' pensions. The only comfort I could find when I met with the people on the board of White Birch Paper, which employed 400 people, was when they told me that their pensions had been cut as well.

The NDP is working hard on this. Good for them, because it is an important issue.

* * *

[*English*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bills, to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-243, An Act to amend the Canada Revenue Agency Act (reporting on unpaid income tax) and Bill S-248, An Act respecting National Physicians' Day.

* * *

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 2

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-86, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism (Multiculturalism), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very glad to speak on Bill C-86, a second act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures.

At the outset, I will take stock of where we are as a country today. Economically, this is one of the best economic times we have had in our history, with a 40-year low in our unemployment rate. Our growth in GDP is one of the top in the G7. We have an unprecedented amount of growth taking place in various sectors, particularly the high-tech sector. A complaint I often hear from employers is their inability to hire people. There is a labour shortage, as we have heard in the House a number of times, in different parts of the country, but also in the area I represent in the greater Toronto area.

Middle-class Canadians are seeing first-hand that this plan is working. They are getting \$2,000 more a year compared with what they got before. Budget 2018 is a step in that plan, supporting our government's people-centred approach to ensuring that every Canadian has a real and fair chance at success.

This has been a difficult week for some of us, especially those close to the GM plant in Oshawa, and our hearts go out to all of the hard-working men and women and their families in the Oshawa region. I have constituents in my riding who depend on the plant, and all of us across all parties hurt along with the families in Durham and the general region.

The fall economic statement presented by the Minister of Finance set out some very specific targets that allow more competitiveness in the Canadian economy. This past Saturday, all of us got back to our ridings very late in the morning, but I had the pleasure of opening a new company in my riding. It is located on Thornmount Drive in Scarborough—Rouge Park. It is called Sakara Wood Inc. It manufactures wood panels. It invested in very expensive manufacturing equipment and did not know about the accelerated deduction. I was able to inform the owner of the deduction that is available. This individual, who has worked for a very long time, is going to be hiring people. I am very proud that he chose to establish his business in my riding. When these types of businesses are opening, it shows the confidence that people have in the economy right now.

It is fair to say that since we took office three years ago, we have worked on a number of important initiatives, but particularly to ensure there is gender equality in this country. That has been a cornerstone of our Prime Minister and of the mandates of many ministers. Our budgetary process goes through a gender-based lens, which oftentimes was not the case in the past. This allows the full participation of all women in the economy, which will help grow our economy in the long term.

Government Orders

I want to highlight some of the specific things that budget 2018 offers in this respect. Something I have heard throughout my adult life over and over again is pay equity and the challenges and failures of successive governments to fully implement it. The statistics are startling. Men and women do not make the same amount of money for work of equal value. Over time that has really limited many women from progressing in the workforce and being able to attain the same level of economic security that men have been able to attain. It affects pensions and a whole host of benefits, because oftentimes our benefits are based on earnings.

• (1705)

I believe that the pay equity component of this budget essentially sets us on the right path. It does recognize equal pay for work of equal value. It is a very smart thing to do. We are also very proud to move forward with this proactive legislation. It is a key way in which our government is delivering on its commitment to gender equality.

Our government will introduce proactive pay equity legislation for workers in federally regulated sectors in 2018. This is on top of a number of other initiatives, most notably the establishment of a full status of women department. This is long overdue. I recall that a number of very progressive initiatives have been undertaken by the current minister to challenge many of the barriers to women's full participation and to ensure there is a safe and secure place for women and girls, as well as for boys, as equality takes shape in the years to come.

We recognize that it does require a lot of work. The stand-alone department speaks to the importance that our government assigns this issue. This bill will allow for additional resources for the department. It will give additional funding opportunities and resources, so that the minister will be able to target very specific issues and gaps within Status of Women currently.

As I go across the country, undertaking anti-racism engagements in several cities, the issue of racialization has come up, as well as discrimination against women and intersectionalities. This points to the fact that we are going in the right direction. Certainly, there is a lot more to do, and as a government we will do it.

Another important aspect is the poverty reduction strategy. It is part of an overall strategy to allow many Canadians to get out of poverty. Poverty in 2018 should not be a reality for Canadians. As we look at different parts of the world that are impoverished and have limited economic resources and opportunities, it is a shame that in a country like Canada, which has one of the highest GDPs and best economies in the world, we have people living in poverty. However, we do.

As a government, we were successful in lifting 650,000 Canadians out of poverty, including 300,000 children. That is a very significant improvement, but, again, this is an ongoing process. It includes support for infrastructure and support for housing. As members know, for the first time in a generation, we have a national housing strategy. That, too, will assist people living under the poverty line to be able to get out of poverty altogether.

Poverty limits individual success, limits the ability of young people to attain their maximum potential, whether at school, in the

workforce, or other areas of life. It is very important that as a government we are doing this, and I am very proud of it.

Once again, time appears to be running out. I look forward to questions.

* * *

• (1710)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Filomena Tassi (Minister of Seniors, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 66(2), I would like to designate Wednesday, November 28, 2018, for the conclusion of the debate on the 18th report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 2

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-86, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his speech. I do not doubt his sincerity, but I really did not get an answer to the question I asked earlier. It was a very simple question.

My colleague attends many of our committee meetings and he knows very well that the Quebec cultural sector sees as an injustice the fact that regular buyers of their content will be at a disadvantage compared with Netflix, for example, when it comes time to offer content on the web using their on-demand platforms.

He knows full well that the entire cultural sector would at least like to make sure that buyers are not at a disadvantage on the web, since the government is not requiring that Netflix collect GST on acquisitions and services in Canada, just as it does not require that Google collect tax on ad sales.

I am asking the question. I hope that my colleague will not give excuses and that he will answer my question. It is baffling that, despite the fact that Canada is a G7 nation and that it is performing better in certain areas—although it is also less savvy—we are not asking that federal and provincial taxes be collected on these subscriptions.

I hope to get an answer or at least an admission that he does not know.

[*English*]

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree: Madam Speaker, I certainly do not doubt the sincerity of my friend on the other side with respect to this issue. He has been a very strong advocate for culture in Quebec and Canada.

Government Orders

The nature of production is changing. Our government has made it very clear that high-tech companies are not getting a free ride in Canada. If they participate in the system, we expect them to pay into the system. That is why we will be undertaking consultations on this issue.

With respect to the overall strength of the economy, I can speak to the greater Toronto area. Virtually, every weekend if I go downtown, I am seeing dozens of vehicles stopping traffic because of productions taking place. There are many production houses in the greater Toronto area, Montreal and Vancouver. I think this speaks well of our overall cultural sector.

• (1715)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert on a point of order.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: Madam Speaker, I do not know whether this is a translation problem, but I was expecting a very simple answer. It took two minutes and I did not hear the words “I do not know”.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I think that is a matter for debate. If the hon. member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert has a question, he may stand.

Resuming questions and comments, the hon. member for Beauport—Limoilou.

[*English*]

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am sure that the member must have skipped one of the paragraphs in his speech where he was intending to announce when the government would balance the budget. That has always been the case in Canada's history. Maybe he could check his speech once more. All of my constituents are calling non-stop every single day about when the budget will be balanced.

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree: Madam Speaker, I am surprised the member has time to be in the House when he is answering so many questions from his constituents.

The paragraph I want to refer to is one that deals with the strength of the economy. Canada has one of the lowest debt-to-GDP ratios of any G7 country. We are on a sound economic footing.

I would love to talk about deficits. We can talk about the social deficits resulting from 10 years of neglect by the previous Conservative government. If one looks at the infrastructure deficit in Toronto community housing, where walls are falling apart and have not been painted for over a decade, one can see a serious deficit. We can talk about a number of issues, but when we talk about deficits it is also important to understand the effects that our infrastructure deficit has had on our country.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, as their federal member of Parliament, I thank the good people of my riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke for giving me the privilege to represent their interests. Together, we inform all Canadians about the deteriorating state of the nation's finances, as demonstrated by the economic update that was delivered by the government less than a week ago. It is even less relevant today than on the day it was delivered.

The Conservatives believe in clean air, low taxes and a healthy economy. A clean environment and well-paying jobs are only possible when taxpayers are treated with respect. This is in marked contrast to the Liberal governments, which stifle competitiveness and investment with their out-of-control deficit policies.

In Ontario, we have suffered rising small business and personal taxes. A higher minimum wage was introduced with no thought of its negative impacts, like job losses and soaring electricity rates. However, the additional environmental laws and regulations brought on by the federal Liberal government are driven by ideology rather than common sense, including the new carbon tax that will do nothing to help the environment and will make Canada a bad place to invest. Of course, entrepreneurs already figured this out years ago when they moved their capital out of Canada after the last election.

Carbon taxes raise the cost of doing business, a cost that will be shouldered on the backs of ordinary Canadians.

Thoughtful Canadians who follow my speeches in Parliament will recall when I first sounded the alarm, shortly after the 2015 election, on where the finances of our nation were headed.

Since the 2015 election, there has been an unprecedented flight of capital from Canada. After October 19, 2015, over \$122 billion fled the country. For the first time, according to Statistics Canada, total Canadian investment in the United States exceeded that of the United States holdings in Canada. Scared investors fled the country. Capital that should have been available for the private sector to create jobs in Canada instead was used to create jobs in Trump's America.

Make no doubt about it, the government has been getting a free ride on the American recovery. As demonstrated by the announcement of more job losses in the automotive manufacturing sector, the free ride is over. Between Canadian investment dollars and cheap oil, the Prime Minister has been Donald Trump's best friend, to the harm of working Canadians.

In the first five months of office, the Liberals spent the Conservative budget surplus and burned through billions more. Then they proceeded to fake news their way through their bad spending and changing accounting methods to try to cover up the Conservative budget surplus. Ontario taxpayers have seen this cover-up before, when the disgraced former Ontario premier Kathleen Wynne tried to cover up how much the Toronto Liberal Party had driven Ontario into debt with her bad spending and making election bribes and promises that taxpayers could not afford.

This economic statement is costly and dogmatic, with no plan to balance the budget and the finances of Canada anytime in the future. Only a Liberal government would brag about taxes fattening coffers.

Government Orders

What did the finance minister do with the tax windfall the government collected from average, working, middle-class Canadians? He spent it. Rather than slowing the growth of the federal deficit in a budget that will never be balanced, as long as the member for Toronto Centre is the finance minister, he spent the additional tax revenues and more on bad spending.

The government wasted taxpayer dollars on things like a \$500,000 logo and \$40,000 on propaganda and Facebook ads aimed at telling children how to use a stove. Let us not forget the \$65 million dollars that was spent on big greenhouse gas producing SUVs to impress G7 members as part of the Prime Minister's vanity project to buy a seat on the UN Security Council.

The Liberals broke their election promise in raising taxes on small business. By selectively raiding the employment insurance account, payroll taxes are set to rise along with the changes to CPP the government has legislated to start next year.

These additional costs are layered on top of the rise in minimum wage.

• (1720)

Our party left government with a \$3.2 billion surplus and had the best job creation record among the G7 countries. As a result, we were able to keep taxes low for Canadian families and businesses. We reduced taxes to their lowest point in 50 years, with a typical family of four saving almost \$7,000 a year.

Energy poverty is now a fact of life in my riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke. This economic statement does nothing to help people in need. Luckily, smart voters elected Doug Ford to put a stop to corrupt electricity practices of the previous provincial party. The good he is trying to do is being undermined by the deficit-obsessed Liberal Party. The economic statement makes energy poverty worse for all Canadians, with more money for industrial wind turbines. Unlike before in only Ontario, now every time one is put up, everyone's taxes increase.

In Ontario, the price of electricity to consumers rose to the highest level in North America. This federal government action just picks a different taxpayer's pocket with the same failed policies that resulted in Ontario being the most indebted subnational government in the world.

What is the policy of the government that is driving the deficit so high and costing more job losses in the automotive manufacturing sector? The policy of the Liberal government is to intentionally wind down Canada's fossil fuel industry and with the most recent announcement from General Motors, the products which use the fuel as well.

The Prime Minister clearly stated in January of 2017, "We need to manage the transition off our dependence on fossil fuels."

The Calgary Herald wrote:

That's what the Liberals have been doing since being elected in 2015.

They're managing down Alberta's industry by imposing new regulations, killing pipeline options, withdrawing tax incentives and passing energy-hostile bills such as C-48 and C-69...

The crash in prices for Alberta oil and bitumen is a direct result of Liberal hostility to both the Northern Gateway and the Energy East pipelines....The damage to federal finances...will be huge...but it seems slow to sink in.

[Maybe that's because] for many [government] MPs and ministers, the energy crisis may even look like a kind of victory.

Now, the Liberal Party can claim another victory with the announcement that thousands will lose their jobs at the General Motors factory in Ontario. While the policy to kill the Alberta economy is working, maybe a bit too well, it remains to be seen how the federal government will react as this policy to shut down the fossil fuel industry is felt across the country, with more job losses, particularly in the automotive manufacturing sector which is centred in central Canada.

The policy to shut down the oil and gas industry can only be followed by shutting down the industries that need fossil fuel to operate. I am waiting for proper main stream media reporting on this story.

As the rising deficit and more of the government's disastrous policies work their way into Canada's economy, the only response by the government can only be labelled as a threat to democracy in Canada.

Rather than changing direction, the response by principal secretary Gerald Butts and the rest of the Prime Minister's handlers is to double down with a propaganda campaign and an audacious plan to bribe the Canadian media in how facts are either reported or selectively omitted.

When a Conservative MP utters the words "fake news", it launches headlines in the Globe and Mail, Global News and the Ottawa Citizen. When the member for Ottawa Centre calls a columnist she does not like "fake news", or attacks a climate scientist or another member of Parliament, the response by too many members of the captive media is silence or some form of fake news. How many more independent voices in the media will be silenced with this bribe that is being offered? As well, how about the timing, in an election year?

Democracy depends on an independent media. The so-called "arm's-length panel" that will act like a government censor board to determine who gets direct funding is a model ripe for abuse. Censor boards will censor. That is what they are intended to do. The Liberals have stolen the media's power to set the federal election debates. Now they are turning the media into a political wedge issue on what gets reported.

The voters in my riding know a bribe when they see it and they know when a political party is trying to stack the deck in its own favour. All of this bad spending is being done with borrowed money.

Government Orders

• (1725)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the problem with asking a question is because there is so much inaccurate information, where does one begin. Every year, over 200,000 people die in Canada. I am surprised she did not blame that on the Government of Canada.

To focus the member on a specific question, could she explain to the House why the Conservatives, who have been in power for 38% of the time in Canada's 151 years, have accumulated 75% of the debt. They are very good at debt accumulation. When I asked the previous Conservative member this, he said "blame the Liberals".

In case she is thinking of blaming the Liberals, let me just remind her that Stephen Harper inherited a multi-billion dollar surplus and before the recession even got under way, he converted it into a multi-billion dollar deficit. I wonder if she could explain to Canadians why they should believe the Conservatives know anything about deficit management.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank my most loyal fan across the way for asking the first question today.

I want to remind everyone of the Flaherty principle, which really does work. Flaherty's principle is that as we reduce taxes, overall revenues increase. That is why when we were government, we were able to lower taxes and grow jobs and the economy at the same time. In fact, we saved the average family of four \$7,000, the lowest tax rate in over 50 years.

Let us not forget what has happened just this week. It is not just the oil sands the government is shutting down. Now, and we are seeing it at GM, it is beginning to shut down the industries that are related to and use fossil fuels. This is only going to compound the problem. The debt it is racking up is going to cost even more.

• (1730)

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I think all parliamentarians were quite shocked when the retirees and employees of Sears, after it shut down, lost significant amounts of their pensions. I know one of the deficiencies in the bill before the House, and something on which the government chose not to act, was to amend the Bankruptcy Act and other similar legislation that would ensure that workers' pensions would be protected upon bankruptcy.

Does my hon. colleague agree that workers who defer their salaries and wages and put them into company pension plans should have their money protected from creditors in the event of a bankruptcy or is she content with the status quo?

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, like the member who just spoke, we in our community have many people who were already retired and were collecting pensions from Sears. We also endured many people who suffered as a consequence of Nortel.

With Sears specifically, and with the different automotive companies that have huge debts, this has come from the provincial holiday given these companies. Therefore, the most important measure to be taken first is for the non federally-regulated pensions to be required to ensure there is always more than enough funding in the pension pool.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I heard my hon. colleague mention several times through her address that reducing fossil fuels was put forward as a bad thing. I wonder if her view is that we should increase production of fossil fuels or eliminate them so we have some chance of survival on this planet.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, as the fossil fuel industry in Canada winds down and more fossil fuels are taken out of the ground in countries outside of Canada, in places where they do not have the environmental laws we do, the emissions are actually increasing. As a total result of shutting down our oil sands, we are getting more emissions overall in other countries, because they do not sequester the carbon, let alone pay attention to the overall emission rules.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Eva Nassif (Vimy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on the topic of Bill C-86.

As the member for Vimy and a member of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, I am proud of our government's accomplishments and their impact on the lives of middle-class Canadians in my riding and across the country.

We continue to implement policies to benefit the middle class and all those who are working hard to join it. We believe in the importance of investing in all Canadians. Our economy is strong and in full expansion, and middle-class Canadians are enjoying the direct and concrete benefits of our plan's effectiveness.

The number of employed Canadians is on the rise; the unemployment rate has reached its lowest level in 40 years; we have seen the strongest economic growth of all the G7 nations; salaries are increasing; consumer and business confidence is on the rise; and businesses are investing because they believe in our plan, which promotes sustainable growth.

A year from now in 2019, a typical middle-class family of four will be taking home \$2,000 more. Thanks to the Canada child benefit, 300,000 children will be lifted out of poverty. Nine out of 10 families receive this benefit, which, in my riding alone, has helped more than 19,000 children.

Thanks to programs such as the Canada child benefit and the national housing strategy, we have improved Canadians' living conditions. Last week marked the strategy's first anniversary. Since we took power, we have also improved seniors' benefits by bringing the eligibility for old age security back down to age 65 and by enhancing the guaranteed income supplement. We have done all this by reducing taxes for the less fortunate and increasing them for the wealthy.

We have also invested in sustainable infrastructures and created numerous jobs. I am pleased to inform the House that, in the past 12 months alone, more than \$55 million was invested in the electrification of public transit in my riding of Vimy. I am proud that the City of Laval is showing leadership in the area of sustainable infrastructure.

Moreover, to address the affordable housing crisis across Canada, we invested to help our most vulnerable families. In my riding, we invested in the first stage of the Val-Martin affordable housing project, and people are thrilled. There is still a long waiting list as 1,000 people still await affordable housing. This is a first step, and we are moving in the right direction.

Our constituents are happy because they are seeing the positive impact of our investments on their lives. Yes, we have a lot of debt, but we are investing in Canadians' lives. Affordable housing is an issue of interest to all Canadians. There is still a lot to be done, but we are happy to continue to work to solve this problem that has been around for decades.

As a woman and a member of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, I would like to point out that, like each year, the 16 days of activism against gender-based violence will take place from November 25 to December 10. This is an opportunity for every one of us to reaffirm our commitment to preventing and eliminating the violence suffered by almost half of all girls and young women in Canada.

• (1735)

These 16 days are essential because we honour the work done in the past to fight gender-based violence. We also see the importance of contributing to the fight so that we can make a difference by working together.

Our government has also advanced the cause of pay equity, since ensuring equal pay for equal work is the smart thing to do. It is a key initiative our government has taken to honour its commitment to ensuring gender equality.

We have passed legislation according to the results of gender-based analysis to make sure that every Canadian has a fair and equal change to succeed. It is not simply the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do. Canada's future prosperity depends on it. Our government placed gender equality at the heart of its decision-making process in order to support women, reduce the gender wage gap, promote the participation of women in the workplace, and continue to build a country and an economy that works for everyone.

We have created a whole new department: the department of women and gender equality. Our government understands that gender equality is key to economic growth. The new Status of Women department will improve our ability to advance the cause of gender equality, and grow the middle class through policies, programs and the funding of community organizations dedicated to ensuring equality.

Thanks to these laws and policies, the government will be better able to capitalize on the momentum of international movements such as #MeToo, Time's Up and women's marches to make major changes for the benefit of Canadians of all gender identities. Our government launched the women entrepreneurship strategy and gave it \$2 billion in funding.

We also opened the country up to foreign markets and new clientele. This is the spirit in which our government negotiated the trade agreements that will give Canadians privileged access to 1.5 billion new overseas customers.

Government Orders

We have made a lot of progress in three years, but there is still a lot to do. I am proud to be part of this government. I am still very proud of representing the people of Vimy, and I promise them that I will do my best, with our government, to help all of the poor and grow the economy in my riding and across the country.

• (1740)

[*English*]

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague listed a number of accomplishments that the current government has achieved, but she did not list the great increase in the deficit and the increase in interest costs. At one point, she said that investor confidence is growing.

It certainly is not growing in my area. I can tell her of a number of small and medium-sized enterprises that are losing confidence. Not only are they unable to expand like they had hoped to do, they are laying off people. This is going on across the country.

The Bank of Canada actually confirms this because the new Canadian investments into the U.S. have gone up by two-thirds, by 66%, over the last three years. U.S. investment into Canada decreased by 52%.

I would like it if my colleague could give us some actual concrete evidence for her comments that investor confidence is growing, because that is not my experience.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Eva Nassif: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague opposite for his question. Yes, in fact, we do have a lot of debt but we have invested in economic growth and infrastructure and we have created over 600,000 jobs. I can assure my colleague opposite that a lot of jobs have been created in my riding of Vimy. We have also boosted investor confidence. Investor confidence has increased since we were elected. We are leading the G7. We are working hard to continue on this positive course.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this has been a question asked regularly and I wonder if the member has any thoughts on it. Since we have limited time, I will state it simply. When will the budget balance itself?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Eva Nassif: Mr. Speaker, that is not what is most important right now. We inherited a lot of debt from the Conservative government, which never managed to achieve good economic growth.

I just told the member's colleague that we are sure that we are on the right track. In the current economic situation, investing is the right thing to do. The numbers speak for themselves. We are leading the G7. We have a good economy that works. We have a lot of jobs. That is the proof. We will balance the budget, but we are proud of what we have accomplished and of the fact that Canada is leading the G7 at this time of global uncertainty.

Government Orders

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

• (1745)

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 6. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 7, 8, 10 and 11. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. This recorded division also applies to Motions Nos. 7, 8, 10 and 11.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 12. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 13 to 22.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 13 to 22.

The next question is on Motion No. 23. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Government Orders

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 the motion stands deferred.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of the bill. Call in the members.

• (1825)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 952)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Alleslev
Anderson	Arnold
Benzen	Bergen
Bezan	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Brassard	Calkins
Carrie	Clarke
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Finley
Gallant	Genius
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kmiec
Kusie	Lake
Liepert	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
McCaulley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	Obhrai
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Poillievre	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shipley	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tilson
Trost	Van Kesteren
Vecchio	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Bennett	Benson

Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Bossio
Boudrias	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brisson	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Cannings
Caron	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Donnelly
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Duvall	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Freeland	Fuhr
Garneau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolibois
Joly	Jordan
Jowhari	Julian
Kang	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)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Marcil	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saarnich—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinity
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mihychuk	Moore
Morrissey	Murray
Nantel	Nassif
Nault	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Pauzé	Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Plamondon
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Rankin
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Ruimy	Rusnak
Saganash	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Sanson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Tabbara

Government Orders

Tan
Thériault
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

Tassi
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Yip
Zahid— 200

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 3.

[*English*]

Hon. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you would find agreement to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting against.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply and the Conservative members will be voting yes.

• (1830)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will be voting no.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the CCF agrees to apply and will vote no.

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will vote no.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 953)

YEAS

Members

Aboultouf
Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bezan
Block
Brassard
Carrie
Cooper
Diotte
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Gallant
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kusie
Liepert

Albas
Alleslev
Arnold
Bergen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Calkins
Clarke
Deltell
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kmiec
Lake
Lobb

Lukiwski
Maguire
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Nuttall
O'Toole
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Shiple
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga— 79

MacKenzie
Martel
McColeman
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vierson
Warawa
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias
Bratina
Brisson
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Kang
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Fortin
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Julian
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig

Government Orders

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the CCF is pleased to confirm that there is unanimous consent to apply and will be voting no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 954)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Alleslev
Anderson	Arnold
Benzen	Bergen
Bezan	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Brassard	Calkins
Carrie	Clarke
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Dreeschen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Finley
Gallant	Genius
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kmiec
Kusie	Lake
Liepert	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	Obhrai
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Poillievre	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shipley	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tilson
Trost	Van Kesteren
Vecchio	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong
Yurdiga — 79	

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Bossio
Boudrias	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brisson	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Cannings
Caron	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Donnelly
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)

MacAulay (Cardigan)
Malcolmson
Marcil
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouелlette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Saganash
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Stetski
Tan
Thériault
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinity
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Moore
Murray
Nassif
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rusnak
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Yip
Zahid— 200

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 4.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to the current vote, with Liberal members voting no.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, with the Conservative Party voting yes.

[*English*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply this vote and will vote no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to the application of the vote and votes no.

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I completely agree to apply and will vote no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will vote no.

Government Orders

Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Duvall	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Freeland	Fuhr
Garneau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolibois
Joly	Jordan
Jowhari	Julian
Kang	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)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Marcil	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saenich—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mihychuk	Moore
Morrissey	Murray
Nantel	Nassif
Nault	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Paupé	Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Plamondon
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Rankin
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Ruimy	Rusnak
Saganash	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Thériault	Tootoo
Trudeau	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Weir	Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Zahid— 200

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 6. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 7, 8, 10 and 11.

[*English*]

Hon. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you would find consent to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting against.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply, with the Conservative members voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and votes no.

[*English*]

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to apply and will vote no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will vote no.

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the CCF agrees to apply and will vote no.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 6, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 955*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allelev
Anderson	Arnold
Benzen	Bergen
Bezan	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Brassard	Calkins
Carrie	Clarke
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Dreessen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Finley
Gallant	Genius
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kmiec
Kusie	Lake
Liepert	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
McCaughey (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	Obhrai
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shipley	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Strahl	Stubbs

Sweet
Trost
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 79

Tilson
Van Kesteren
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Kang
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Malcolmson
Marcil
Mathysen
May (Saaneich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouелlette

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Fortin
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Jordan
Julian
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Moore
Murray
Nassif
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis

Government Orders

Paucé
Petipas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Saganash
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Stetski
Tan
Thériault
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wrzesnewskyj
Young
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rusnak
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Yip
Zahid — 200

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 6 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 7, 8, 10 and 11 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 12. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 13-22.

The chief government whip.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the result of the previous vote to the next vote, with Liberal members voting no.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, and Conservative members will be voting yes.

[*English*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply this vote and will vote against it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting no.

● (1835)

[*English*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply and votes no.

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the CCF agrees to apply and will vote no.

Government Orders

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 956)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Alleslev
Anderson	Arnold
Benzen	Bergen
Bezan	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Brassard	Calkins
Carrie	Clarke
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battledowns—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Finley
Gallant	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kmiec
Kusie	Lake
Liepert	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	Obhrai
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Poillievre	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shipley	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tilson
Trost	Van Kesteren
Vecchio	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong
Yurdiga — 79	

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Bossio
Boudrias	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brisson	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Cannings
Caron	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Donnelly
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault

Duvall	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Freeland	Fuhr
Gameau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Houffner
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolibois
Joly	Jordan
Jowhari	Julian
Kang	Khalid
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauson (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Marcil	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saarich—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mihychuk	Moore
Morrissey	Murray
Nantel	Nassif
Nault	Olipphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Paupé	Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Plamondon
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Rankin
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Ruimy	Rusnak
Saganash	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Schieffe
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Thériault	Tootoo
Trudeau	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Weir	Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Zahid — 200

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 12 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 13 to 22 defeated.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 23.

The hon. chief government whip.

Hon. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, I believe again if you seek it you bill find consent to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting against.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply with Conservative members voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will vote no.

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply and will be voting against the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply and vote no.

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the CCF agrees to apply and will vote no.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 23, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 957*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Alleslev
Anderson	Arnold
Benzen	Bergen
Bezan	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Brassard	Calkins
Carrie	Clarke
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Finley
Gallant	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kmiec
Kusie	Lake
Liepert	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
McCaughey (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	Obhrai
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Poillievre	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shipley	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tilson
Trost	Van Kesteren
Vecchio	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong
Yurdiga — 79	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Bossio
Boudrias	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brisson	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Cannings
Caron	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Donnelly
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Duvall	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Freeland	Fuhr
Gameau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolibois
Joly	Jordan
Jowhari	Julian
Kang	Khalid
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauson (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Marcil	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mihychuk	Moore
Morrissey	Murray
Nantel	Nassif
Nault	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Pauzé	Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Plamondon
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Rankin
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado

Government Orders

Ruimy
Saganash
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Stetski
Tan
Thériault
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

Rusnak
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Yip
Zahid— 200

Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jordan
Kang
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Morrissey
Nassif
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly
Jowhari
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Miychuk
Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Yip
Zahid— 156

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 23 defeated.

[*English*]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

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

• (1845)

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

(Division No. 958)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Aubin
Beaulieu
Benzen
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Block
Boudrias
Brassard
Calkins
Caron
Choquette
Cooper
Davies
Diotte

NAYS

Members

Albas
Alleslev
Arnold
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Bergen
Blaikie
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Boutin-Sweet
Brousseau
Cannings
Carrie
Clarke
Cullen
Deltell
Donnelly

Government Orders

Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Gallant
Genius
Godin
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Julian
Kent
Kusie
Lake
Liepert
Lukiwski
Maguire
Marcil
Mathysen
McColeman
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Quach
Rayes
Rempel
Saganash
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stetski
Stubbs
Thériault
Trost
Van Kesteren
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga— 123

Dubé
Dusseau
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Fortin
Garrison
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kelly
Kmiec
Kwan
Laverdière
Lobb
MacKenzie
Malcolmson
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nater
Nuttall
O'Toole
Pauzé
Poilievre
Rankin
Reid
Richards
Sansoucy
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Trudel
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong

Anderson
Aubin
Benzen
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Block
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Carrie
Clarke
Cullen
Deltell
Donnelly
Dubé
Dusseau
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Gallant
Genius
Godin
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Julian
Kent
Kusie
Lake
Liepert
Lukiwski
Maguire
Martel
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McColeman
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Quach
Rayes
Rempel
Saganash
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Kesteren
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga— 115

Arnold
Benson
Bergen
Blakie
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Brassard
Calkins
Caron
Choquette
Cooper
Davies
Diotte
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Garrison
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kelly
Kmiec
Kwan
Laverdière
Lobb
MacKenzie
Malcolmson
Mathysen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nater
Nuttall
O'Toole
Poilievre
Rankin
Reid
Richards
Sansoucy
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Stetski
Stubbs
Tilson
Trudel
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN ACCESSIBILITY ACT

The House resumed from November 22 consideration of the motion that Bill C-81, An Act to ensure a barrier-free Canada, be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made Friday, November 23, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment of the member for Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte to the motion for third reading of Bill C-81.

The question is on the amendment.

● (1850)

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

(Division No. 959)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif
Albrecht

Albas
Alleslev

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bibeau
Blair
Bratina
Brisson
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Dabrusin
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fergus

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Bittle
Bossio
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fillmore

Government Orders

Finnigan	Fisher
Fortin	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Fuhr	Gameau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jordan
Jowhari	Kang
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
Marcil	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mihychuk	Morrissey
Murray	Nassif
Nault	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Pauzé	Peschisolido
Petipas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Plamondon
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Ruimy	Rusnak
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Thériault
Tootoo	Trudeau
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young
Zahid — 163	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

[*English*]

Pursuant to order made on Friday, November 23, 2018, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-81.

The hon. chief government whip.

Hon. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it you will find consent to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting for.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply, with Conservative members voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the result of the previous vote and will vote yes.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the result of the previous vote and will vote yes.

[*English*]

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

• (1855)

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, CCF is in favour of applying and of the motion itself.

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

(*Division No. 960*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alghabra	Alleslev
Amos	Anandasangaree
Anderson	Arnold
Arseneault	Arya
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Bennett	Benson
Benzen	Bergen
Bezan	Bibeau
Bittle	Blakie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Bossio	Boucher
Boutin-Sweet	Brassard
Bratina	Bretton
Brisson	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Calkins
Cannings	Caron
Carrie	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Clarke
Cooper	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCoursey	Deltell
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diotte	Donnelly
Dreeshen	Drouin
Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseault	Duvall
Easter	Eglinski
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Eyking
Eyolfson	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fergus
Fillmore	Finley
Finnigan	Fisher
Fortin	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Fuhr	Gallant
Gameau	Garrison
Genuis	Gerretsen

Gladu
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Harcastle
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Johns
Joly
Jowhari
Kang
Kent
Khera
Kusie
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Liepert
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Nault
Nuttall
Oliphant
O'Regan
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Reid
Richards
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Saganash
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Schieffe
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Spengemann
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Thériault
Tootoo
Trudeau
Van Kesteren
Vandenbeld
Vecchio

Godin
Goodale
Gourde
Hajdu
Harder
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Jordan
Julian
Kelly
Khalid
Kmiec
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lightbound
Lockhart
Longfield
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Maguire
Maloney
Martel

May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McColeman
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Moore
Motz
Nantel
Nater
Nicholson
Obhrai
Oliver
O'Toole
Paradis
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poilievre
Quach
Rankin
Rayes
Rempel
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rusnak
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Saroya
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sopuck
Sorenson
Stanton
Stetski
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Tilson
Trost
Trudel
Vandal
Vaughan
Viersen

Private Members' Business

Virani
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga

Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young
Zahid — 278

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

The Speaker: It being 6:55 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC) moved that Bill C-417, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (disclosure of information by jurors), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise to speak to my private member's bill, Bill C-417.

Bill C-417 seeks to amend section 649 of the Criminal Code, which is the jury secrecy rule. The jury secrecy rule prohibits a juror from talking about his or her experiences during jury deliberations for life. My bill would carve out a minor exception to the jury secrecy rule to better help jurors who are suffering from mental health challenges arising from their jury service to get the help they need.

Before I discuss the particulars of the exception proposed in my bill, it would be helpful to provide some context and some background to how I arrived at introducing this bill.

The bill arises from a study at the justice committee, of which I am a member, on juror supports. Indeed, it is the first parliamentary study on juror supports. In that regard, I would like to commend the member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford for his leadership in taking the initiative to bring about this study. It proved to be a valuable study that resulted in a unanimous committee report, with many important recommendations.

During the study, we heard from many former jurors who went through difficult trials and who were exposed to horrific evidence. We heard about the stress and anxiety that it caused them. We heard about how it impacted their relationships with others, including friends and family. We heard about the challenges they faced upon trying to return to work, upon trying to return to the life that they knew prior to jury service. We heard about the stress and anxiety, and even PTSD, they had suffered as a result of their jury service.

Private Members' Business

The testimony of these former jurors was extremely powerful. I would like to read into the record some of the testimony of the former jurors.

Mark Farrant, who served as a jury foreman in a particularly gruesome murder trial, said this of his experience:

Images would haunt me day after day, an unrelenting bombardment of horror. My daughter's red finger painting would hurtle me back to the scene of the crime and I would stare transfixed, seemingly out of space and time. Sometimes I would just start to cry for no reason at all. Intimacy with my spouse was impossible, and I found myself either sleeping downstairs on some kind of vigil, or sleeping in my children's rooms at the foot of their doors, if I even slept at all.

I began to see everything as a potential threat, and even began arming myself with knives "just in case", I would say to myself, as I would take my children to the park to play. My daughter asked me one day why I was putting a knife in my jacket and I struggled to understand, even myself, why I was doing it, let alone to explain it to a three-year-old. I knew something was horribly wrong with me.

Indeed, something was horribly wrong. Mark Farrant was diagnosed with PTSD as a result of his jury service.

Tina Daenzer, who more than two decades ago served on the Paul Bernardo jury, said:

At that moment I had no way to fully comprehend how bad it would be. Imagine watching young girls being raped and tortured over and over again. You couldn't close your eyes and you couldn't look away because your duty was to watch the evidence.

● (1900)

Many days I would go home in a fog, as if heavily medicated. I counted on my husband to care for our children and to assume most household responsibilities as I often had difficulty focusing on tasks after a day in court. Most nights the videos would play in my head over and over again. I had difficulty sleeping. Intimacy with my husband became nonexistent for a long time, even after the trial ended. I became afraid to go outside after dark, and to this day that still affects me. I have extreme distrust of strangers.

Then there is Scott Glew, who sat on a jury in a murder trial that involved the murder of a two-and-a-half-year-old boy. He said this:

To this day, I worry all the time that something will happen to my kids, that someone in their life will hurt them the way the victim was hurt. I am super vigilant and accused of being way too overprotective, but knowing what I know, I cannot be too careful with who looks after my kids.

That is just a part of what was a lot of testimony, very powerful testimony, of jurors who quite courageously shared their stories, shared their experiences, shared about how their jury service changed their lives forever.

We heard at the justice committee that one of the biggest impediments for jurors to get the help that they needed was the jury secrecy rule.

The jury deliberation process is one of the most stressful aspects of jury service. After all, it is a time when jurors are sequestered with 11 other strangers, sometimes for hours, days or weeks, where they have to go through the evidence methodically, sometimes very disturbing and gruesome evidence, and ultimately decide the fate of an individual. In the most serious of cases that fate may be to put someone away for the rest of his or her life.

In that regard, Tina Daenzer, who served on the Bernardo jury, described this of the jury deliberation process. She stated:

After the Bernardo trial ended, I was only sequestered for one evening, and basically I got the question, "What took you so long?" You can't answer that. You can't discuss what the other people in the room would like to do or not like to do.

Again, you've seen the evidence and you've decided that the person is guilty, but... you are still sending that person to federal prison for the rest of their life. You shouldn't feel guilty, but somewhere deep down you still do. Talking through those things could be quite helpful.

Dr. Sonia Chopra, a psychologist who appeared before the justice committee, has undertaken a fairly extensive study around former jurors. She identified, as a result of her interviewing many former jurors, that seven out of the top 10 stressors for jurors occurred at the time of the verdict and the jury deliberation process leading up to that. In her study, she included some of the comments from jurors about the deliberation process.

One juror said, "The deliberation room, that's where the stress began. The trial was fun."

Another juror said, "I was just appalled with the jury. If there's a weak link, that's where it was."

Another said, "Stress wasn't because of the trial; it was because of the other jurors."

Another said, "Infighting with the jury was my only source of stress."

Another former juror said, "Deliberations were stressful for me and I'd been holding it in."

Another said, "After the verdict, I was crying."

Taken together, it is clear that for it to be a Criminal Code offence to talk about those experiences to a mental health professional is a serious impediment toward jurors getting the help that they need.

● (1905)

That is where this bill comes in. It seeks to make a minor exception to the jury secrecy rule, namely that a juror, in the course of getting mental health treatment arising from their jury service, could share his or her experiences with a mental health professional who is bound to confidentiality post-trial. This is consistent with an important recommendation of our unanimous report.

I want to stress that this minor carve-out is in no way inconsistent with the rationale underlying the jury secrecy rule, including ensuring the finality of a verdict and protecting the sanctity of the jury deliberation process because, again, this exception would only apply post-trial to a mental health professional who is bound by confidentiality.

Therefore, it may come as no surprise that at the committee this received very widespread support from the witnesses, including from former jurors, mental health professionals and lawyers, including William Trudell, the president of the Canadian Council of Criminal Defence Lawyers. This is a non-partisan issue. It is a common-sense issue. It is about doing the right thing to help jurors get the help they need, by making a minor amendment to the Criminal Code.

Private Members' Business

In the non-partisan spirit of this bill, I am honoured that the member for Victoria, the NDP justice critic, who I have the honour to serve on the justice committee with, is the seconder of my bill. I am very pleased that the member for Mount Royal, who ably serves as the chair of the justice committee and played an important role in the study as chair, is supportive. I see my friend, the member for Oakville North—Burlington, who is a co-seconder, as well as other MPs on all sides of the House.

I am also very honoured that Mark Farrant, who is one of the leading advocates in Canada for juror supports, stood with me here in Ottawa when I announced this bill. Mark Farrant often says that jury service is the last mandatory form of service since the abolition of military conscription. In that regard, it is completely unacceptable that jurors are unable to get the help they need for doing nothing more than their civic duty. That needs to change. Bill C-417 would help change that, and on that basis, I urge the speedy passage of this bill.

• (1910)

Mr. Arif Virani (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contributions of the member for St. Albert—Edmonton at the committee, but also today in this House in presenting his private member's bill. It is prior to my tenure as parliamentary secretary, but in terms of those committee deliberations, could he advise this House about some of the practices taking place in different provinces around the country? I know some of them have put in place counselling and psychological supports for jurors. Also, in the course of applying those supports and that treatment, has the issue of section 649 of the code ever resulted in prosecutions of jurors in different parts of the country, as a result of the treatment they received?

Mr. Michael Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice for his work as a member of the justice committee and in his capacity as parliamentary secretary. The hon. member raises the issue of juror supports across Canada. There is a patchwork from province to province, with some provinces having better juror supports, some having less and some having none at all. It was a key recommendation of our committee to call on the federal minister to work with her provincial and territorial counterparts to see a better consistency of supports across Canada, and also to provide one-time funding to help make those supports available and accessible right across Canada.

Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member could share with the House the other jurisdictions that have brought in this type of legislation and the impact that legislation may have had on drafting his private member's bill.

Mr. Michael Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for Oakville North—Burlington for her support of this bill.

There is similar legislation in place in the state of Victoria in Australia. The evidence before the justice committee was that since that law was passed, it has worked quite well. There were no issues that arose from it. That makes sense. Again, we are talking about post-trial, totally confidential, in the context of meeting with a mental health professional.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for introducing this bill and for serving this House with his encyclopaedic knowledge of statutory law and of our legal system.

The member spoke very eloquently about the importance of providing mental health support to people who go through the traumatizing process of serving as jury members during trials on allegations of violent crimes. Can he also discuss how the existence of such mental health support may actually lead to higher-quality deliberations? Will members of a jury, for example, be able to deliberate more freely and more confidently, knowing that they will have support in the aftermath, than they are capable of doing right now?

• (1915)

Mr. Michael Cooper: Mr. Speaker, the member for Carleton raises a very important point. It was one that was raised by a number of former jurors and others who appeared before the committee. Knowing that following the conclusion of a trial they could go to a mental health professional and talk about all aspects of their jury service would go a long way to comforting jurors and would also encourage Canadians to step up to the plate.

Far too often, people who are called to serve on juries do not want to be on juries. Part of the reason is the very difficult circumstances former jurors have found themselves in post trial. This is an important step in that regard.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties, and if you seek it, I think you will find unanimous consent for the following motion: That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House: (a) any recorded division requested in relation to the third reading stage of Bill C-75, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Youth Criminal Justice Act and other Acts and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, or the third reading stage of Bill C-86, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, be deferred until Monday, December 3, 2018, at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment; and (b) at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions on Thursday, November 29, 2018, the House revert back to the rubric "Motions" for the purpose of considering a motion to concur in the 66th Report of the Standing Order Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

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

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Mount Royal.

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise, and I want to thank my colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton for the private member's bill he put before us. It is consistent with the report by the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, which had unanimous approval.

I also want to salute my colleague from Cowichan—Malahat—Langford who, along with the member for Victoria and the member for Niagara Falls and all of the other members of our committee, have worked so diligently in bringing this issue to the fore.

Private Members' Business

Jurors throughout Canada have a serious issue. As the member for St. Albert—Edmonton reminded us when he quoted Mark Farrant, jury service is essentially the only compulsory service left in this country. It is the only time that members of the public often find themselves in contact with the justice system.

While the bill before us deals with a very important component of the issue, the study we did showed many flaws in the way we treat jurors in Canada. For example, it showed us that in some provinces, the rate that we pay a juror has not increased since the early 1970s and that there is a great divergence among provinces, with some provinces paying up to \$163 a day and other provinces paying nothing for the first few days of jury services, leading to many people being unable to afford to be on a jury. We want juries to be representative of the public at large, and not simply one small group that can afford to do jury service.

We found that in some provinces, there have been excellent services provided post-trial to jurors in recent years, and some provinces have started real legal support programs. Other provinces have absolutely no legal support programs. As my colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton said, one of our important recommendations was to ask the federal Minister of Justice to work with her provincial counterparts to ensure that all provinces are able to provide post-trial support for jurors.

We heard the quotes that were read by my hon. colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton. We heard compelling testimony before our committee that showed how deeply people were affected by their jury service. We heard that people have come out of a trial unable to take care of their children, unable to have relationships with their partner, unable to fend for themselves in the world, but dropping out of the world and secluding themselves. That is not an acceptable result in Canada today from a compulsory service that we ask of our citizens.

I would only hope that in addition to this very well-timed bill, there is more that can be done through the provincial and federal governments working together to improve the lives of jurors across Canada. The last thing we want is people disinclined to perform jury service.

As to the bill put forward by my hon. colleague, it lies purely within federal jurisdiction. This is an issue that is in the Criminal Code. It is an issue that results from the fact that in Canada, we have determined that it is generally inappropriate for jurors to discuss the matters that have arise during deliberations, except if they are somehow raised in open court or are the subject of a criminal proceeding. However, that is not the case in every jurisdiction in the world. In the United States, for example, jurors are able to speak freely about their experience in deliberation, which has led to many books. All of us can remember the O.J. Simpson trial and how many books came out of the Simpson jury.

Now, that is not the approach our committee is proposing. We are not proposing, and neither did any of the jurors who came before at committee propose, that jurors be allowed to enrich themselves by talking about juror deliberations in titillating or sensational trials. That is not the approach we are proposing. We took the time to listen to expert testimony from different jurisdictions in the United States, Europe and Australia. As my hon. colleague mentioned that we are

proposing the model used in the Australian State of Victoria, which, by the way, has a coordinator for juries, a person whose entire job is to be responsible for making sure that the juror experience in that state is appropriate and that jurors are well taken care of.

We in Canada would be well advised, at the provincial and territorial level, to create the position of jury coordinator so there is someone who has overall responsibility. It would not just be for the purposes of one trial or one case, but overall in talking about the juror experience and making it better.

● (1920)

We have bailiffs, judges and others who, with appropriate training, can do excellent jobs, but that does not mean the experience should stop there.

We heard testimony of jurors being confined to small rooms and small spaces. We heard testimony of jurors being told to park next to the accused or next to family members of the accused, of walking into court next to people who were testifying at trial. All of this could be avoided if we had someone who had an overall responsibility of walking through our courthouses, determining how best to allow jurors to have a decent experience.

In this case, Victoria, whose jury coordinator, by the way, came from Canada, told us that it had an exception to the secrecy rule, which we have in section 649 in our Criminal Code. When it came to speaking to mental health professionals, jurors were allowed to do so and it was an exception to its general criminal principle that jurors could not talk about deliberations. This is exactly what my colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton is proposing in this legislation.

In our report, we recommended using Victoria as an example, and that is exactly what the member has done. He has carved out a very small exception to allow those jurors who were or could be deeply affected by the deliberations to speak to mental health professionals. We heard about the most stressful parts of juror service. Jurors could have conflict with their fellow jurors in deliberation. They could be hearing about gruesome, horrific testimony. They could, for example, be even at a point where they would be in an altercation with fellow jurors because they were the only ones who believed the defendant should either be acquitted or found guilty.

Coming out of their service, while jurors can talk to a mental health professional about the other things that have impacted them during their service, in Canada we do not allow jurors or someone providing support to jurors, for example if the juror is hearing impaired, to talk to a mental health professional or other medical professionals about the stress they experienced in deliberations, which could be the major source of their stress.

Therefore, while it is well and good and excellent that we are pushing for provinces and territories to each have a mental health support program for former jurors, it still does not work as effectively if this exception is not created in the Criminal Code to also allow them to talk about their experience in deliberations.

Private Members' Business

My colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton has taken a recommendation, which was unanimously supported by all of the members of the committee, has taken a concrete example that exists in a different Commonwealth jurisdiction in Australia to show it can be done and he has put this into legislation. I dearly hope we can unanimously support this in the House and move it quickly toward the other place, so we can move forward down a path of helping jurors in an area of federal jurisdiction to be treated better when it comes to mental health services.

• (1925)

[*Translation*]

I think this is a very important piece of legislation. I thank my colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton and all the members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights for their work. I hope this bill will be adopted very quickly.

[*English*]

I appreciate the opportunity to speak in favour of the legislation. Let us get it through.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been discussions among the parties and if you seek it, I think you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House: (a) any recorded division requested in relation to the third reading stage of Bill C-75, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Youth Criminal Justice Act and other acts and to make consequential amendments to other acts, or the third reading stage of Bill C-86, a second act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, be deferred until Monday, December 3, 2018, at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment; and (b) at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions on Thursday, November 29, 2018, the House revert back to the rubric "Motions" for the purpose of considering a motion to concur in the 66th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-417, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (disclosure of information by jurors), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I had the honour, on October 29, to second Bill C-417 introduced by my friend and colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton. As he indicated, we worked together, along with the member who spoke earlier, the

hon. member for Mount Royal, the chair of the justice and human rights committee. I enjoy working with him there and note that today he spoke with his typical eloquence.

I get many letters from my constituents urging me, when it serves Canadians, to work across party lines to do what Canadians ask us to, which is to make laws that are going to make their lives better. If ever there were an example of that, it is tonight. I am delighted to support this initiative. It is a non-partisan issue. It is what I would call a no-brainer. It is really hard for me to understand how people could resist such an obviously right thing to do.

What would this bill do? It would make it possible for someone to seek mental health assistance if a person has served on a jury and is one of very few people deeply affected or traumatized by that experience. Who could possibly oppose such a measure? Perhaps there are ways the law could be improved through drafting, which is the role of committees to delve into it further, but, in principle, how could one possibly oppose this measure?

Along with my other colleagues, I want to salute the work of my colleague from Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, who pushed us to do this and produced, as my friend from Niagara Falls pointed out, a unanimous report, which everybody joined hands around. I commend him for doing so. The member for Mount Royal described some of the recommendations that are part of that report, but as he pointed out, many of them are in provincial jurisdiction. The beauty of this very simple and clean amendment to the bill is that it is entirely in federal jurisdiction. It is an amendment to section 649 of the Criminal Code that very narrowly addresses the problem he has described today.

I grew up in a place called St. Catharines, Ontario. That community was traumatized by the Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka trial. To his eternal credit, Mr. Justice Patrick LeSage did something for which he had really no authority: he provided counselling for jurors who were affected by that horrific testimony, videotapes and so forth that changed people's lives. I know that to be true because I know people who were affected by that horrible experience.

The committee heard other people, including Mark Farrant, who both of my colleagues have spoken of, who has become a leader in this initiative. He stood with the hon. member for St. Albert—Edmonton and me at a press conference to tell his story. He is not afraid to tell the story of what happened to him by doing his civic duty.

Both of my colleagues have stressed that one of the few remaining things, if not the only remaining thing, that Canadians can be compelled to do is do their duty on a jury. We depend on them. Our system of criminal justice depends on them and they put their lives, once in a while, in real jeopardy by doing what is required of them.

Private Members' Business

The thing that also needs to be said is in that criminal courtroom the Crown counsel will, no doubt, have access to effective medical assistance. The judge will as well, because judges have that kind of support. Probably the defence lawyer would as well through the Canadian Bar Association insurance program or the like. People who choose to sit in the courtroom do so voluntarily, but who does not have any support? It is jurors. They get nothing, but they put themselves sometimes at great risk. That is wrong. I will provide some examples of the poignant testimony heard at the justice committee to prove that point. The state of Victoria figured out that it was the right thing to do and fixed it, and Canada should as well.

One juror named Tina Daenzer said, “What I had to watch—those girls being raped and tortured—wasn’t just watching evidence; it was sitting in a box where I felt I couldn’t do anything to save them. It was excruciating for me.”

• (1930)

She goes on to say:

It's been over 22 years. I still have residual effects. If your 85-year-old granny is standing on the side of the road waving me down to help her with her broken-down car, I ain't stopping. I'm not stopping for anybody. I'm distrustful of most strangers. My family life is back to regular, but as a societal person, I'm highly distrustful of people.

That is what jury service did to that Canadian citizen.

Sonia Chopra, a former juror, said this:

I experienced nightmares, recurrent thoughts, loss of sleep, loss of balance, weight loss. Grinding of teeth at night escalated to clenching of teeth during the day, which led to headaches. I had a general feeling of anger all the time, and the feeling of helplessness.

I could go on.

Psychologist Vivien Lee said to our committee that because of stigma, jurors “often do not recognize or seek help until much later, when their difficulties have impacted many aspects of their work and personal lives.”

The point of this legislation is to say that it is okay to go to a health professional, seek counselling and obviously take the steps necessary at a time when it is perhaps easier to make the changes that would make their lives better.

According to the World Health Organization, every dollar we invest in mental health results in about \$4 in savings to the Canadian and world community. I think that is applicable in this situation as well.

I want to commend the member for St. Albert—Edmonton for his leadership. I am proud to have served with the people who have spoken and others in this chamber tonight who are on the justice committee, effectively led, as I wish to confirm, by the member for Mount Royal.

I urge all members to support what the member for St. Albert—Edmonton properly called a common sense bill.

• (1935)

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my colleague, the member for St. Albert—Edmonton, for introducing this bill and giving me, as well as so many of my other colleagues, the honour of seconding the bill.

I remember my first time in Parliament, back in 1984, when my colleague Pauline Browes asked if I would second her motion to erect a statue to John Diefenbaker here on Parliament Hill. Needless to say, I was very proud to have that honour, and I am very proud to have this honour. I thank my colleague for that.

This is the first time we have introduced legislation to Parliament to address this critical oversight with respect to jurors in our justice system. I appreciate that my colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton and all those we have heard here are addressing this situation, which up to now has been basically ignored. I was justice minister for six and a half years. I do not remember any reports or memos with respect to the health and well-being of jurors. I am so pleased that we are taking steps, as my colleague, the member for Victoria, just pointed out, on something that makes common sense.

What we can get out of Bill C-417 is the protection members of a jury need. The member has proactively taken this issue that has been ignored for too long. The legislation effectively speaks to section 649 of the Criminal Code, which prohibits jurors from disclosing jury deliberations to anyone, other than in relation to obstruction of justice under subsection 139(2) of the Criminal Code. This new legislation would allow jurors, for the first time in Canada, to seek the help of licensed practitioners, such as psychiatrists and psychologists. I am so pleased to hear of the support.

When we were on the justice committee and heard some of the testimony and evidence, everyone was affected in some way or another. My colleague, the member for St. Catharines, still remembers, as we all do who live in the Niagara Peninsula, the gruesome details of the Bernardo trial. I remember that trial. Indeed, my colleague is correct when he says that the wounds from that trial have not healed. All I can say is thank God that man was not released on parole just recently. As a matter of fact, there are people who are still suffering and are still impacted by that trial. I heard from a constituent who was a friend of Kristen French. She reiterated that the nightmares from that trial live on in her family, friends and jurors.

We had compelling testimony at the justice committee from Mr. Mark Farrant and Mr. Patrick Fleming. Mr. Farrant has been an advocate for jurors and is one of those who has suffered PTSD, in addition to anxiety, depression and nervous shock, due to the distressing and disturbing evidence presented at the trial in which he served as jury foreman. The 2014 trial was that of Farshad Badakhshan, who was convicted of second degree murder in the death of his girlfriend, Carina Petrache. She was stabbed multiple times before her body was burned in a fire. Mr. Farrant was subjected to viewing gruesome evidence over and over again. It should be no surprise to anyone that jurors are traumatized by being obliged to sit and watch graphic horrors repeatedly.

Private Members' Business

Tina Daenzer was another witness we heard from. She was the first one to be selected for the Bernardo trial. She had to listen and see all the terrible evidence introduced at that trial. She wanted to close her eyes and look away, but she could not, because she knew it was her duty to watch the evidence. At one point during the trial, Judge LeSage had to call a recess on her behalf, as she was having severe heart palpitations due to stress. She was referred to counselling. In his 29 years as a judge, Justice LeSage had ordered or recommended counselling for a juror on only two occasions, and the Bernardo trial was one of them. It should be noted as well that he himself sought counselling after that trial ended.

● (1940)

Ms. Daenzer ended her testimony by saying that counselling had helped her manage the trauma and anxiety and to get back to living her life. This speaks to the reason why Bill C-417 is critical to protect our jurors. If we want to continue to have jurors serve and to value their service, we need to ensure that they are provided avenues to reduce their stress, including the opportunity to talk about it and debrief afterward.

Many provinces do have juror support programs such as providing free counselling to former jurors. The bill would increase the effectiveness of those sessions, as it would allow jurors to further discuss the reasons why they had become significantly stressed. Many of our health care professionals who testified at committee supported this change, as they felt it would improve the health of former jurors without compromising the sanctity of our jury system, which medical professionals are bound to by confidentiality requirements.

I thank all the members who have been involved with this, the member for Mount Royal, the member for Victoria and, of course, the member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, for encouraging and moving forward with this at the justice committee. Because of that report, we are seeing Bill C-417 here today.

It is not without precedent. As members have heard, there are other jurisdictions that are having a look at this issue. In Australia in the State of Victoria they have had similar secrecy rules to Canada's, but its Juries Act 2000 now allows jurors to discuss juror deliberation in the course of their mental health treatment undertaken as a result of their jury service. As justice minister it was always very helpful to see what our colleagues in Australia did. They face many of the same issues we do in Canada. Both countries adhere to the Westminster model of Parliament and are in fact similar in many ways. I always remember when the Prime Minister of Australia was here about 10 years ago and addressing Parliament. He mentioned that Canada and Australia were like identical twins separated at birth. Indeed, having a look at what they do in other countries such as Australia is very helpful for us here in Canada.

One of the things I want to touch on, which I was pleased that my colleague from Mount Royal raised as well, is the lack of remuneration for members of the jury. To ask someone to sit on a jury for two weeks and then not pay them or to pay them \$50 a day contributes to the stress these individuals suffer from. As my colleague pointed out, some provinces have not raised this amount since the 1970s. That is absolutely wrong. These people are an essential part of our justice system and they should not have that

added stress of not being able to look after their homes. Even employers are stressed because they are losing their employees for perhaps long periods of time. I am hoping that in our discussions with our provincial counterparts to say that time has moved on, that will be one of the areas where we do get these people the kind of financial support they need.

The bill is within the complete jurisdiction of Parliament, and I am so pleased and honoured to be a part of this. Again, I thank all of my colleagues here for all of their wonderful support for this important bill.

Mr. Arif Virani (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-417, an act to amend the Criminal Code (disclosure of information by jurors), initiated by the member for St. Albert—Edmonton.

As is readily apparent this evening, the bill proposes to amend the Criminal Code to provide that the prohibition against the disclosure of information relating to jury proceedings does not, in certain circumstances, apply in respect of disclosure by jurors to health care professionals.

Our government indeed recognizes the crucial role in dedicated service of jurors in the Canadian justice system, as stated by a former juror, Mark Farrant, who was indeed quoted by the moving member, the member for St. Albert—Edmonton. Mr. Farrant said in his testimony before the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights that, “Jurors are an important pillar of the justice system.”

Members heard reference to Mr. Farrant, repeatedly, this evening.

Before November 22 of last year and February 8 of this year, that justice committee undertook a study that culminated in their report, “Improving support for jurors in Canada”, which was rendered in May of this year. The committee held eight meetings in Ottawa to hear evidence from witnesses, including former jurors, Canadian and foreign government representatives who work directly with jurors or in justice departments, Canadian and international lawyers, and other experts interested in the stresses that are associated with jury duty.

Again, those committee deliberations and that committee report have been referred to extensively in the speeches we have heard thus far tonight.

First of all, I want to indicate our thanks to the committee for their thorough study and their important report on this important issue. What I would like to do now is take a moment to explain the jury process in Canada, because understanding the roles that jurors are asked to play is necessary to finding solutions to assist them with the difficulties that can result from their very important public service.

For criminal cases, section 11(f) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms is a trigger. What that does is it grants any person charged with an offence the right:

...to the benefit of trial by jury where the maximum punishment for the offence is imprisonment for five years or a more severe punishment.

As provided in section 471 of the Criminal Code:

Except where otherwise expressly provided by law, every accused who is charged with an indictable offence shall be tried by a court composed of a judge and jury.

Private Members' Business

When a person is charged with a crime listed in section 469 of the Criminal Code, the trial will automatically take place before a judge and jury, unless the person charged with the offence and the Attorney General agree to a trial without a jury.

In all of these types of criminal cases, the jury is called upon to reach a unanimous verdict, determining whether the accused is guilty beyond a standard of what is called “a reasonable doubt” based on the evidence presented by the prosecution.

In the context of civil cases, juries also have a role to play. While most civil cases are heard by a judge alone, a defendant may also have the right to a trial by judge and jury, depending on the nature of the case and the court. Civil juries must decide, on a balance of probabilities, whether the plaintiff proved that the defendant violated civil law. There are six jurors in a civil case and at least five of them are asked to agree upon a civil verdict.

Finally, there is also an aspect of coroners' inquests that is triggered when we discuss jurors. Coroners' inquests, which aim to inform the public of the circumstances of a death, require jurors as well. Jurors must respond to questions about the circumstances of a death and may make non-binding recommendations. Unlike civil or criminal cases, jurors in coroners' inquests are not required to render a verdict on anyone's legal responsibility.

Serving as a juror in any of these capacities that I have just outlined can involve significant stress. We have heard a lot of testimony and a lot of submissions today in this chamber about the stresses the jurors face. Those stresses have the potential to seriously affect a juror's life. What causes stress varies from one person to another, evidently. Several examples were raised by witnesses at committee. I would like to discuss some of these.

For many Canadians, being summoned for jury duty is the first and maybe the only experience they will have with the justice system. As a result, few prospective jurors are knowledgeable about what jury duty entails, and that unfamiliarity with the process itself often generates anxiety. Many individuals may therefore feel overwhelmed and stressed when they are summoned for jury duty.

As expressed by Professor Jane Goodman-Delahunty, “...jurors are moving into an environment that is very unfamiliar to them. This can be very intimidating, and that alone can be somewhat stressful.”

● (1945)

Being exposed to disturbing information is also a fundamental aspect of what jurors are faced with. Again, we heard extensively about this this evening.

It goes without saying that some legal proceedings deal with truly horrific and horrible crimes and involve traumatic and explicit evidence and testimony, which can include disturbing audio and video. This can be extremely stressful for jurors who are exposed to it.

We heard this quote earlier, but it bears repeating. Mark Farrant explained:

Images would haunt me day after day, an unrelenting bombardment of horror. My daughter's red finger painting would hurtle me back to the scene of the crime and I would stare transfixed, seemingly out of space and time.

With respect to deliberations, some jurors explained that they were uncomfortable with challenging group dynamics and the confrontations that sometimes occurred between jurors. Therefore, the deliberation process itself can be stress-inducing.

Other individuals spoke about their significant fear of making the wrong decision or rendering a verdict that would have a life-altering impact, fuelling the gravity of the task that was before them.

Former juror Michaela Swan told the Standing Committee on Justice:

...the most difficult process in serving as a juror was that of deliberations and the resulting post-trial discharge...It's confusing and highly complicated, but there is an immense drive to do the right thing.

There is also an abruptness of the end of the trial. Generally, after a verdict is rendered, the duty of jurors comes to an end. The committee heard repeatedly that for a number of jurors, particularly the ones serving on extensive and gruesome trials or inquests, the transition back to normal life was indeed challenging.

Former juror Patrick Fleming explained:

We need assistance getting back to our “normal” life. We are civilians who did not choose this path for ourselves nor are we trained to deal with this type of situation. Being a juror is a monumental job that has had a major impact on my life.

Many of the former jurors who participated in the committee's study described the difficulties they experienced once the jury task concluded.

Michaela Swan, who I mentioned earlier, stated:

Within 20 minutes of delivering a verdict, and after four days of being sequestered, I walked through an open parking lot with 11 other strangers and returned to normal life. I had Sunday to reconnect with my family and was back to work Monday.

As Patrick Fleming explained:

At the end of the trial, it was so abrupt. One minute I was reading a guilty verdict to five individuals, putting them away for 25 years plus another 25, and then the very next minute the court doors opened, and I was going home. Think about that.

With respect to section 649 of the Criminal Code, some jurors described feelings of isolation. Currently, in Canada, jurors cannot discuss the case with anyone as per section 649 of the Criminal Code itself. They are cut off from their family, friends and usual support networks with whom they would normally share troubling information and receive advice or encouragement. This also can be an added stress.

As Patrick Fleming explained:

I felt isolated from my family and friends. I would distance myself, and I could not share what I was going through...I felt guilty for not being present for my family emotionally and physically.

The important work undertaken by the committee clearly shows that it is possible to prevent or reduce the stress on the juror's experience, particularly by improving the preparation process and the conditions under which jurors fulfill their duties throughout the legal proceedings, as well as by providing jurors with psychological support as needed.

As was also mentioned earlier, it is a worthwhile investment. According to the WHO, every dollar invested in mental health results in about \$4 worth of savings.

It is important that we continue to work with the provinces and territories to find solutions that support jurors and their mental health, including an examination of section 649 of the Criminal Code.

●(1950)

Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while my time might be short, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this legislation.

I want to thank the member for St. Albert—Edmonton for choosing this issue to address in his private member's bill. It is an extremely important issue, and as he has heard tonight and knows himself, it is a nonpartisan issue.

I am a member of public safety committee. The first report that we did was also on PTSD and operational stress injuries. It too was a unanimous report, just like the justice committee report.

Mental health is an issue that crosses party lines. It is an issue that all of us need to work on together. When people serve their country, we need to make sure that we look after them.

I was quite surprised when I heard that jurors are not able to seek support from medical professionals when they have finished a trial. I first learned about this during a public safety study. Both nurses and jurors reached out to my office to ask if our study could incorporate the mental injuries they had suffered. That was of course outside the scope of our study.

We probably first became aware of mental injuries from our veterans. For me personally, that was the first time I learned that people could suffer mental injuries because of what they saw or heard.

We have come a long way with our veterans and are starting to make strides with our first responders and public safety officers. With both of those groups, we have a long way to go, but with jurors this is something that just has not come up before.

I am so happy to be able to speak to this issue and that the justice committee took the time to study it broadly with jurors. Much of it falls under provincial jurisdiction. Right now, four provinces provide some kind of services to jurors, but this really is something that should be provided across the country.

I quite liked the suggestion by the member for Mount Royal that there should be someone who looks after jurors. Would that not be a lovely way to support jurors?

From the testimony that members heard and I read in the report, after jurors have gone through a trial they have intrusive thoughts, nightmares, trouble sleeping, and develop phobias and anger, and lose their appetite and have a sense of isolation, and are hypervigilant, depressed, anxious, and suffer from substance abuse problems.

It is critically important that all parties support this legislation. We have limited time left to see it get through the House and then hopefully through the Senate to become law.

I am very pleased to offer my support to the member. I will be supporting the bill and will certainly be advocating within my own

Adjournment Proceedings

caucus to ensure that we get this important piece of legislation passed.

●(1955)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Oakville North—Burlington will have six and a half minutes remaining in her time when the House next gets back to debate on the question that is before the House.

[*Translation*]

The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to speak tonight about Canada's engagement with UNRWA and generally with the Palestinian territories.

In response to an earlier question I asked, the Minister of International Development spoke of the time she spent in the West Bank visiting UNRWA facilities, which I have also done. Earlier this year, as part of a trip with the Canada-Palestine Parliamentary Friendship Group, I also had the opportunity to visit the West Bank and an UNRWA school and to speak with students there. It left me with some striking impressions.

I believe deeply that Canada must continue to support a two-state solution, recognizing that both Israelis and Palestinians have a legitimate historical connection to the territory covered by both Israel and the Palestinian territories, recognizing as well that what is required is an appreciation and understanding of each other's histories and each other's connections, and constructive dialogue that recognizes the legitimacy of each other's situation and the challenges presented by this conflict.

At the UNRWA school I saw many of the challengers that others have reported, including that the students were not being given any opportunity to interact with their Israeli neighbours. When we spoke to students, they spoke of not even having a desire to have those interactions, as a result of the situation they were in. The teachers in the room nodded along with that.

UNRWA is well known and well documented to be an organization that is far too tolerant of intolerance and accepting of curricular materials that do not recognize the essential connection between both peoples. In this particular case, the materials do not recognize the connection between the Jewish people and that territory and the need for that kind of understanding and appreciation of both positions.

Adjournment Proceedings

Therefore, the question for Canada is that when we are sending money to support development of state Palestinian education, are we becoming subject to that soft bigotry of low expectations that says that even though there is intolerance in the curriculum, that is good enough? Or, are we insisting that when Canadian tax dollars are spent, those be reflective of Canadian values, so that we set the highest possible standards and look for an alternative to the current situation that we see with an organization like UNRWA, where dollars are not being spent in a way that reflects our values?

What was striking when I posed this question to the minister was that we had previously heard, on the one hand, that she had allegedly raised issues about the problematic material, but on the other hand that she had said that spending that money was totally fine. In other words, they are trying to say on the one hand that there are not problems, but on the other hand the minister is speaking about and raising problems that exist within UNRWA. It seems to me that we cannot have it both ways. Either there are not problems, and therefore it is acceptable to be spending this money, or there are problems. If the minister is raising the problems, then why is this money being spent?

Our Parliament should be deeply concerned about the welfare of the Palestinian people. That is why we should not be giving money to UNRWA, but instead should be looking to deliver support in ways that set the highest standard of pluralism, neutrality, and encouraging peace and peaceful coexistence. That is our position.

Will the government come on side with that, stop funding UNRWA, and instead look for more effective ways that are more reflective of Canadian values to deliver support to the Palestinian people?

• (2000)

Ms. Kamal Khera (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to providing humanitarian assistance and responding to the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable around the world.

Having travelled to the region recently, I am sure my hon. colleague opposite would acknowledge that Palestinian refugees endure high levels of poverty, unemployment and food insecurity. By helping to support their humanitarian needs, Canada is also contributing to stability in the region.

On October 12 of this year, the Minister of International Development announced \$50 million over two years to support millions of vulnerable Palestinian refugees who lived in the West Bank, Gaza, Syria, Jordan and Lebanon. This funding is the same that has been provided over the past two years. It will help support education, health and social services, as well as urgent humanitarian assistance for those affected by the Syrian crisis.

Canada is also providing up to \$12.5 million in support to Right to Play International, which will collaborate with UNRWA to help create a more inclusive environment for Palestinian refugee children and to also respond to existing educational gaps and needs in the West Bank and Gaza.

As the only UN agency mandated to provide assistance to Palestinian refugees, UNRWA delivers basic education, health and social services and humanitarian assistance to millions of people

whose needs would otherwise be unmet. As it has been for years, Canadian support for UNRWA is also linked to Canada's commitment to the goal of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East negotiated by both parties, which includes the creation of a Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security with Israel.

As we do with all our contributions in the region, Canada is monitoring and working with UNRWA very closely. Our re-engagement with the agency allows us to do so. It also allows us to raise allegations of violations when they come to light and to find solutions.

I am sure my colleague opposite knows that UNRWA is required to use textbooks of the jurisdiction in which their schools operate. This allows students to sit for local exams.

UNRWA has in place a formal framework to review all textbooks and, where needed, provides additional training for teachers to address any problematic issues related to neutrality, bias, gender equality or age appropriateness.

Canada will continue to take all allegations of neutrality violations extremely seriously. Our government will continue to support the provision of assistance to the most vulnerable on behalf of Canadians and in a way that reflects Canadian values.

• (2005)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member that Palestinian refugees are in need of our engagement and support. However, I do not accept that the recognition of that vulnerability justifies giving money to just any organization that is involved in providing social programs to them. It behooves us to assess the nature of the information and the education provided by that organization in the process.

The member acknowledges that the textbooks used are dependent on the jurisdiction in which they take place, and this creates significant problems in being able to ensure our values are reflected, that universal human ideas of human rights, pluralism and human dignity are reflected in those institutions.

All of the problems are evident in what the member is saying. Instead of simply accepting that this is as good as it gets, let us insist on doing better with respect to the issues of neutrality and pluralism.

I want to ask the member if the programming provided through the Right to Play organization will include programs that encourage different communities to be involved in sporting activities together. For instance, will these dollars be used so Israeli and Palestinian children are playing in programs together or will that play, which is facilitated through that program, be happening exclusively in each community separately?

Ms. Kamal Khera: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, Canada and other donors expect UNRWA to uphold UN standards for neutrality. This also includes the educational materials of the jurisdictions in which UNRWA operates and which UNRWA is required to use.

Adjournment Proceedings

Along with other donor governments, Canada will continue to closely monitor these issues, if and when they arise. It gives us an opportunity to find solutions if we are at the table.

Thanks to UNRWA's work, more than three million people have access to primary health care and over half a million Palestinian refugee girls and boys benefit from the quality education provided to them in UN schools.

HOUSING

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am here today because I asked a question of the minister about a woman in my riding named Pat.

Pat is now 80 and was desperately ill. In fact, her family was not certain how long she would be with us. The good news is that Pat got better. The bad news is that during her time of having a hard health issue, she did not have a home any more.

The reality for Pat is that she was told by the hospital that she would have to leave. She had nowhere to go and ended up spending months in a hotel where the rent was \$500 a week, which was much more than the pension she had.

When we look at the reality of seniors across Canada who are facing the same challenges that Pat is, we want to make sure that they have a safe place to go, that seniors are not homeless and put in this situation.

It is important to recognize that in our communities, including the communities that I represent in North Island—Powell River, that there are a lot of organizations working hard every day to address issues of homelessness and the high risk of homelessness that is happening in so many communities across Canada. I would like to name just a few in my riding: the Campbell River and District Coalition to End Homelessness; Grassroots Kind Hearts Society, which feeds people in Campbell River every day; the Salvation Army Lighthouse Resource Centre in Port Hardy, which provides lunch five times a week; Port Hardy Seniors, of which I am a member, that feeds seniors lunch every Tuesday and provides many opportunities for activities in the community; Homelessness Partnering Strategy funded in Port Hardy through the Sacred Wolf Friendship Centre; Comox Valley Coalition to End Homelessness; Dawn to Dawn in Comox Valley, which does so much to support those who are at high risk and homeless; Community Resource Center of Powell River, which recently received 20 beds to provide emergency shelter; Powell River committee against homelessness; and the Salvation Army, which has shelters in several of the communities I represent.

These are just a few of the organizations that work hard every day with people across our communities who are facing significant challenges with housing.

It is so important that we recognize that in rural and remote parts of Canada, housing is a significant crisis. The organizations I mentioned before do everything they can, but they need a more active partner in the federal government.

In B.C., we are actually seeing what an active partner looks like. Recently, the housing minister of B.C. made a significant announcement in investments for housing. What I really appreciate

is that rather than leaving the majority of the resources at the back end, like the federal government currently is with 90% not even beginning to move until the next election, the housing minister is making sure that it is in the front, as the housing minister said in an announcement about the housing crisis in B.C.

She said, “We’re frontloading because it’s so desperate...It breaks my heart every time I hear a story, and I heard another one today, of a community, an Indigenous community that is reeling from two suicide deaths of young people.” This is from an article in *The Tyee*.

I want to be really clear. This provincial B.C. government is dedicating funding for 1,100 units of indigenous housing both on and off reserve. Provinces do not usually fund housing on reserve. Usually, they step out of that and see it as a federal responsibility, but as the article said, on-reserve housing has been a federal responsibility since 1867 and has been chronically underfunded.

When we look at stories like Pat's, we know that there is a significant issue for seniors across this country, and we need to make sure that they do not fall through the cracks. I want to make sure that today in the House that people understand that seniors simply cannot wait.

● (2010)

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member opposite for bringing that human story not just to Parliament but to all of Canada through Parliament. The challenges facing communities across this country, as they relate to homelessness, are profound. Housing and homelessness are partnered in this challenge.

We have done several things to support governments like the B.C. government and others, to try and turn the situation around with a historic investment in housing, which is not just the \$40 billion over the next 10 years, but also includes the \$5.8 billion put in our first budget, which are the dollars that are being spent by the provincial government in B.C. so effectively. However, more has to be done.

Part of what also has to be done is that we have to understand that the story that was just told to us comes from rural Canada. Rural Canada has housing and homeless challenges as well. When the previous government identified 61 designated communities, it kind of forgot rural Canada and imposed the same rules on rural Canada that were imposed on urban Canada. In other words, the definition of what constituted chronic homelessness was exactly the same as what was designated in major cities like Vancouver or Toronto.

The challenge here is that rural communities, especially northern rural communities, experience homelessness differently, women experience homelessness differently, women in rural communities experience homelessness differently, and seniors who are women in rural Canada experience homelessness differently. The notion that the woman who was just described would have to spend six months living on the street before a federal program would even contemplate supporting this individual, is obscene. It is wrong.

Adjournment Proceedings

The changes that we have made to the program allow for the HPS, the homelessness partnership money which is now renamed as “reaching home” to work in preventative strategies. One of the things we are trying to get to, as shown in a good study coming out of London, Ontario, is the role that hospitals play in projecting people into homelessness. The right to housing is going to be realized when governmental organizations that provide provisional housing do not simply swing the door open to say, “Good luck. I hope you find housing out there” but actually have a responsibility before discharge to make sure that people have a place to call home, that their rent is secured and they are attached to housing systems that can realize their housing needs and, thus, respect their human rights.

This is the change to “reaching home”. As I said at the beginning, it is intertwined with an approach to housing that also is building new housing now. We have built 14,000 units of housing since we took office. We have repaired 156,000 units of housing and our support has reached into more than a million homes across the country.

Even though we have put these large numbers in play and even though we invested before the \$40 billion and have reprofiled the money in that \$40 billion investment, when we hear stories like this, we know we have to work harder and deliver more because no senior, no woman, no person in rural Canada, no person anywhere in Canada should be in a situation where they find themselves paying the sorts of rents that were described and not having supports of meals, social services and community. That is just unacceptable.

The national housing strategy is a bold new beginning on the housing front. More needs to be done and we have to make sure that when we act, we act in recognition of the complexity of this issue right across Canada.

As for the issue of indigenous housing, the government is currently engaged with national indigenous organizations, the Métis, the Inuit and first nations. We are also in the groundbreaking moments of a national urban housing strategy to fulfill the last chapter of the national housing strategy to make sure that all Canadians get the home they deserve.

My thanks to the member for the story she told. I assure her that help is on the way because help has already arrived in places like B. C. in a strong partnership between our government and the provincial government in Victoria.

● (2015)

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do hope that help is on the way because so many people are falling through terrible cracks. I sat with Pat in her not very warm and friendly hotel and she talked about how the community around her was doing everything they could to support her and how grateful she was. I thought to myself that she had a lot more grace than I would have in that circumstance.

However, it is also about working with women who are in their eighties who are calling my office because they did not get their taxes done on time because of health issues, so they have lost their GIS and are now facing eviction. One woman in particular was 86 and she did not know what she was going to do if she was homeless at that age.

Seniors from small communities being sent to large communities to access health care are struggling to find housing. At the same time, seniors in the larger communities are being sent to the smaller communities because they cannot afford to live in bigger communities. Based on the vital signs of my community, we know that we have a lot of seniors, up to 26% plus, in our communities. Over 40% of renters are spending 30% or more of their income, in some cases, 50% on rent, and the vacancy is very low.

Therefore, I look for action. Right now I just have to say that Canadians are waiting and waiting and they simply cannot wait when they are in these vulnerable circumstances.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report that for many Canadians, the wait is over. The 14,000 new housing units are a start. I agree, we need to do much more. The national housing strategy, with the co-investment fund and other investments, is poised to do just that.

The challenge we have is that it took us 25 years to build the crisis. Our party was part of the problem, in the early nineties, when we made significant cuts to the housing program.

People like Claudette Bradshaw invested her time and energy in changing course and delivering the homelessness partnering strategy program from this side of Parliament. There were people like John Godfrey, who resuscitated and reinitiated federal investments in housing, and Bill Graham, who refused to let the operating agreements expire in cities like Toronto, in particular for co-ops. All these Liberal members also helped start to rebuild the system. Quite clearly, by the time I stood for the by-election, the work was not nearly as complete as it should have been.

This government took office and invested \$5.8 billion immediately. Those dollars are the dollars producing houses in places like B. C. now. We have now reprofiled the dollars to make them more effective, over the next 10 years, with a \$40-billion investment and good, strong bilaterals. I am proud to say that British Columbia was one of the first provinces to sign a bilateral, and that means 10 years of runway for housing to be constructed in that province, and that will turn things around, hopefully. If not, we have—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot.

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, once again the government is not keeping its promises regarding EI sickness benefits, which are currently limited to 15 weeks.

Adjournment Proceedings

The Prime Minister himself told Houda El Kherchi in the presence of Patrice Roy on *Téléjournal* that he was working on this file. That was almost two years ago in December 2016. Why has nothing been done about this yet? Why are the Liberals refusing to allow experts to come and talk to parliamentarians? Why are the Liberals allowing sick people to suffer and live in precarious circumstances? Could the Prime Minister have made another false promise? What are the Liberals afraid of?

We cannot sit back and do nothing when over a million Canadians are calling on us for help. I want the government to take action. That is our role as parliamentarians and that is the responsibility of the government.

The employment insurance system as it now stands is truly unfair. People do not choose to become ill. Can we accept the fact that we are letting some Canadians live in precarious circumstances because they are ill? Statistics show that one in two Canadians is at risk for cancer. How can this government be insensitive to the fate of half the population?

On Tuesday, January 15, I will be hosting a talk entitled “15 weeks to heal is not enough!” together with Solidarité Populaire Richelieu-Yamaska. The law only provides for 15 weeks of sick benefits, which is just not enough for people to heal and survive financially. More than one-third of recipients currently need a lot more than the program's 15 weeks of benefits. The Employment Insurance Act needs to be revamped.

Setting aside partisanship and political posturing, there are seriously ill people who need our help. On January 15, I will join Mélanie Pelletier, a presenter from Saint-Hyacinthe, Marie-Hélène Dubé, who started the national petition “15 weeks to heal is not enough!”, Yvan Bousquet, from Mouvement Action Chômage, and many organizations and unions in the riding in an attempt to change this unfair law.

Mélanie Pelletier, Marie-Hélène and I need the support of the citizens of Saint-Hyacinthe and Acton, and I hope that many will answer our call.

It is important that we take the time to listen to these people who are sick. I am now getting calls from physicians in my riding who are telling me that patients are having to return to work when they are sick. I sincerely hope that the parliamentary secretary will have good news for us and that there will soon be changes to the 15-week period.

● (2020)

[*English*]

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister has said and others have repeated, it is hard to hear stories about Canadians suffering.

[*Translation*]

I am aware of the financial difficulties faced by Canadians suffering from a long-term illness or injury and their families. There are support measures available to them.

[*English*]

Of course, there are employment insurance programs that can provide support through sickness benefits. When eligible Canadians are unable to work, they can turn to these sickness benefits for support. These benefits also allow them to take time to rest and restore their health, so that they can return to work in better condition without having to worry about their financial situation. Sickness benefits are designed as a short-term income replacement measure for temporary work absences. They provide 15 weeks of income replacement for Canadians who leave work due to short-term illness or injury.

That said, I know that some sickness benefits claimants exhaust their 15 weeks of benefits before they are able to get better and return to work. We are sensitive to their plight. I want to remind the House that EI sickness benefits are actually a complement to the range of other supports that are also available for longer-term illness and disability. That support includes the Canada pension plan disability benefit, as well as benefits offered through private and employer insurance, and supports provided by the provinces and territories.

Improving the EI program is one of our government's priorities. Last year, we announced the creation of an EI benefit for family caregivers of adults for a maximum of 15 weeks. It also allows eligible family caregivers to provide care or support for an adult family member who is seriously ill or injured. We also announced that immediate and extended family members of children who are critically ill will have, for the first time, access to a new benefit previously only available to parents. Additionally, medical doctors and nurse practitioners are now able to sign EI caregiving medical certificates.

[*Translation*]

This change will simplify the administrative process while allowing Canadians to focus on what really matters: being with their loved ones.

● (2025)

[*English*]

Lastly, budget 2018 announced that the government would extend working while on claim provisions. This again blends in with our sickness and maternity benefits to support Canadians when they need help. This provision came into force in August 2018 and allows Canadians recovering from an illness or injury to have greater flexibility to manage their return to work and to keep more of their EI benefits.

These are just a few of the real differences we are making in the lives of Canadians. Our government is firmly committed to modernizing the EI system to better reflect the needs of hard-working middle-class Canadians. Our work is not done, but we are changing the system to be more accommodating, more sensitive and, hopefully, more supportive for Canadians in need.

Adjournment Proceedings

[*Translation*]

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy: Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about one of my constituents. She is going through the same thing that thousands of our constituents across the country, in our 338 ridings, are going through. I commend her on her courage and determination to change this unfair legislation.

Mélanie Pelletier, a woman from Saint-Hyacinthe, exhausted her 15 weeks of EI sickness benefits. Mélanie told me how hard it is. She said that it is no longer about living, it is about surviving. Mélanie, and many people like her, live with stress, anxiety and pain and do not feel like the government is supporting them or listening to them.

I cannot turn a blind eye to people like Houda, Marie-Hélène, and Mélanie. I want to see concrete measures and results. I am calling on the government to show some compassion. I want the government to keep its promises and enhance EI sickness benefits.

Extending the benefit period to 50 weeks would give our constituents the opportunity to heal.

Will the government finally keep its promises and live up to its responsibilities or will it keep turning its back on the most fragile among us?

[*English*]

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Mr. Speaker, of course our government takes this responsibility seriously. That is why we have introduced so

many reforms to strengthen and broaden EI support for vulnerable Canadians as they deal with illness, in particular. We empathize with the particular situation my colleague has raised and are doing whatever we can to enhance employment insurance to better reflect these sorts of specific needs of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

The reality is that families and workplaces are changing, which means that employment insurance must also change.

[*English*]

That is why we have been working very hard over the past two years to make a number of these benefits more flexible and more inclusive. My colleague can rest assured that we are doing everything we can to deal with these realities and to help Canadians at every stage of their lives. As I said, more change is coming. We understand the need to support Canadians and EI is an important tool to do just that.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 8:28 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux..... 24035

Committees of the House

Public Accounts

Mr. Sorenson..... 24035

Business of the House

Mr. Strahl..... 24035

Motion..... 24035

(Motion agreed to)..... 24035

Petitions

Firearms

Mrs. Gallant..... 24035

Pharmacare

Ms. Mihychuk..... 24035

Health

Ms. Mihychuk..... 24035

Infrastructure

Ms. Mihychuk..... 24035

Visitors Visas

Ms. Mihychuk..... 24036

Labelling of Genetically Modified Foods

Ms. Boutin-Sweet..... 24036

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Lamoureux..... 24036

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 2

Bill C-86—Time Allocation Motion

Ms. Chagger..... 24036

Motion..... 24036

Mr. Poilievre..... 24036

Ms. Hajdu..... 24036

Ms. Quach..... 24037

Mr. McColeman..... 24037

Ms. Kwan..... 24037

Mr. Deltell..... 24038

Ms. Dabrusin..... 24038

Ms. Malcolmson..... 24038

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)..... 24039

Mr. Lake..... 24039

Mr. Ouellette..... 24039

Ms. Jolibois..... 24040

Mr. Arnold..... 24040

Ms. Kwan..... 24040

Mr. Nater..... 24041

Motion agreed to..... 24042

Report stage

Bill C-86. Report stage..... 24042

Mr. Whalen..... 24042

Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes..... 24044

Mr. Warawa..... 24044

Mr. Arnold..... 24044

Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes..... 24045

Mr. Albrecht..... 24046

Ms. Jolibois..... 24046

Mr. Dubé..... 24046

Mr. Aubin..... 24048

Mr. Lamoureux..... 24048

Mr. Tabbara..... 24048

Mr. Warawa..... 24050

Mr. Duvall..... 24050

Mr. Deltell..... 24050

Mr. Arnold..... 24050

Mr. Lamoureux..... 24052

Mr. Warawa..... 24052

Mr. Vaughan..... 24052

Mr. Maguire..... 24054

Ms. Trudel..... 24055

Ms. Quach..... 24055

Mr. Vaughan..... 24056

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)..... 24057

Mr. Lametti..... 24057

Mr. Maguire..... 24059

Mr. Diotte..... 24059

Ms. Goldsmith-Jones..... 24059

Mr. Albas..... 24061

Mr. Vaughan..... 24061

Privilege

Member of Parliament for Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel

Mr. Lamoureux..... 24062

Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 2

Bill C-86. Report stage..... 24062

Mr. Warawa..... 24062

Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes..... 24063

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Mr. Beaulieu..... 24064

Dorset Park Community Hub

Mrs. Zahid..... 24064

Avalon Retirement Lodge

Mr. Tilson..... 24064

Mathieu Ostiguy

Mr. Breton..... 24064

Heritage Building

Mr. Dubé..... 24065

Violence Against Women

Mrs. Nassif..... 24065

Fort McMurray Housing Rebuild	
Mr. Yurdiga	24065
Sports-Related Concussions	
Mr. Eyolfson	24065
Regional Archaeology Museum	
Mr. Poissant	24065
Fraud Against Seniors	
Mrs. Wong	24066
Boys and Girls Club	
Mr. Fisher	24066
La Francophonie	
Mr. El-Khoury	24066
Sea King Helicopter	
Mr. O'Toole	24066
Order of Military Merit Recipient	
Mr. Casey (Charlottetown)	24066
Climate Change	
Ms. Quach	24067
Manufacturing Industry	
Mr. Nater	24067
Site Unseen Art Installation	
Ms. Goldsmith-Jones	24067

ORAL QUESTIONS

Automotive Industry	
Mr. Scheer	24067
Mr. Bains	24067
Mr. Scheer	24067
Mr. Bains	24068
Mr. Scheer	24068
Mr. Bains	24068
Mr. Deltell	24068
Mr. Bains	24068
Mr. Deltell	24068
Mr. Bains	24068
Mr. Caron	24068
Mr. Bains	24068
Mr. Caron	24068
Mr. Bains	24069
Mr. Julian	24069
Mr. Bains	24069
Mr. Julian	24069
Mr. Bains	24069
Mr. Carrie	24069
Mr. Bains	24069
Ms. Raitt	24069
Mr. Bains	24070
Mr. O'Toole	24070
Ms. Freeland	24070
Mr. O'Toole	24070
Ms. Freeland	24070
Mr. Albas	24070
Mr. Bains	24070

Mr. Poilievre	24071
Mr. Bains	24071
Ms. Hardcastle	24071
Mr. Bains	24071
Rail Transportation	
Mr. Aubin	24071
Mr. Garneau	24071
Canada Revenue Agency	
Mr. Rayes	24071
Mrs. Lebouthillier	24071
Mr. Rayes	24071
Mrs. Lebouthillier	24072
Mr. Kelly	24072
Mrs. Lebouthillier	24072
Mr. Kelly	24072
Mrs. Lebouthillier	24072
The Environment	
Ms. Quach	24072
Ms. McKenna	24072
Housing	
Ms. Benson	24072
Mr. Duclos	24072
Infrastructure	
Mr. Fraser (West Nova)	24073
Mr. Champagne	24073
Ethics	
Mr. Kent	24073
Ms. Chagger	24073
Mr. Paul-Hus	24073
Ms. Chagger	24073
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Martel	24073
Mr. O'Regan	24073
Mr. McColeman	24073
Mr. O'Regan	24073
Infrastructure	
Ms. Jolibois	24074
Mr. Champagne	24074
Telecommunications	
Ms. Sansoucy	24074
Mr. Bains	24074
Ethics	
Mr. Gourde	24074
Mr. Goodale	24074
Ms. Alleslev	24074
Mr. Goodale	24074
Ms. Alleslev	24074
Mr. Goodale	24074
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Ms. Sidhu (Brampton South)	24074
Mr. Hussen	24075
Natural Resources	
Mr. Sorenson	24075

Mr. Lefebvre	24075	Mr. Bagnell	24091
Canada Post Corporation		Ms. Hardcastle	24092
Ms. Malcolmson	24075	Message from the Senate	
Ms. Qualtrough	24075	The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes)	24092
Health		Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 2	
Mr. Ayoub	24075	Bill C-86. Report Stage	24092
Ms. Petitpas Taylor	24075	Mr. Anandasangaree	24092
International Trade		Business of the House	
Mr. Allison	24075	Ms. Tassi	24093
Ms. Freeland	24076	Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 2	
Rail Transportation		Bill C-86. Report stage	24093
Mr. Ste-Marie	24076	Mr. Nantel	24093
Mr. Alghabra	24076	Mr. Clarke	24094
Mr. Plamondon	24076	Mrs. Gallant	24094
Mr. Garneau	24076	Mr. Lamoureux	24096
Natural Resources		Mr. Davies	24096
Mr. Bernier	24076	Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	24096
Ms. McKenna	24076	Mrs. Nassif	24096
Presence in Gallery		Mr. Albrecht	24097
The Speaker	24076	Mr. Genuis	24097
Points of Order		Division on Motion No. 2 deferred	24098
Member for Brampton East		Division on Motion No. 3 deferred	24098
Mr. Strahl	24076	Division on Motion No. 4 deferred	24098
Mr. Cullen	24077	Division on Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 deferred	24098
Ms. Chagger	24077	Division on Motions Nos. 12 to 22 deferred	24098
Privilege		Division on Motion No. 23 deferred	24099
Access to Information—Speaker's Ruling		Motion No. 2 negatived	24100
The Speaker	24077	Motion No. 3 negatived	24101
		Motion No. 4 negatived	24102
		Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 negatived	24103
		Motions Nos. 12 to 22 negatived	24104
		Motion No. 23 negatived	24106
		Ms. Hajdu (for the Minister of Finance)	24106
		Motion for concurrence	24106
		Motion agreed to	24107
		Canadian Accessibility Act	
		Bill C-81. Third reading	24107
		Amendment negatived	24108
		Motion agreed to	24109
		(Bill read the third time and passed)	24109
		PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS	
		Criminal Code	
		Mr. Cooper	24109
		Bill C-417. Second reading	24109
		Mr. Virani	24111
		Ms. Damoff	24111
		Mr. Poilievre	24111
		Mr. Housefather	24111
		Business of the House	
		Ms. Chagger	24113
		Motion	24113
		(Motion agreed to)	24113

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 2

Bill C-86. Report Stage	24078
Mr. Lamoureux	24078
Mr. Davies	24079
Mr. Albrecht	24079
Mr. Nantel	24079
Mr. Albrecht	24079
Mr. Bittle	24081
Mr. Cannings	24081
Mr. Ehsassi	24082
Mr. Albrecht	24082
Mr. Cannings	24083
Mr. Iacono	24083
Mr. Nantel	24084
Mr. Albrecht	24085
Mr. Davies	24085
Mr. Julian	24085
Mr. Vaughan	24087
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	24087
Mr. Fillmore	24087
Mr. Clarke	24089
Mr. Nantel	24089
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	24090
Mr. Clarke	24090

Criminal Code

Bill C-417. Second reading	24113
Mr. Rankin	24113
Mr. Nicholson	24114
Mr. Virani	24115
Ms. Damoff	24117

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

International Development

Mr. Genuis	24117
------------------	-------

Ms. Khera	24118
-----------------	-------

Housing

Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River).....	24119
Mr. Vaughan	24119

Employment Insurance

Ms. Sansoucy.....	24120
Mr. Vaughan	24121

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>