



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 329
Tuesday, June 11, 2024

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 11, 2024

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

• (1005)
[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised on May 30, 2024, by the member for Edmonton—Wetaskiwin regarding unparliamentary language.

During question period that day, the Chair intervened after the member for Calgary Forest Lawn used the phrase “anti-Alberta minister”. In his point of order, the member for Edmonton—Wetaskiwin asked the Chair to clarify what constitutes unparliamentary language, because he asserted that the terms “anti-Alberta” and “anti-Quebec” had been used in the past with no objection from the Chair. The member expressed concern that the list of unparliamentary terms is getting longer and longer. When the point of order was raised, I promised to review the issue.

[*Translation*]

The Chair must take into account a whole range of factors before forming an opinion on what members perceive as inappropriate language.

I would refer members to page 623 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, and I quote: “[T]he use of offensive, provocative or threatening language in the House is strictly forbidden. Personal attacks, insults and obscenities are not in order.”

However, a little later, on page 624, that book states the following, and I quote: “In dealing with unparliamentary language, the Speaker takes into account the tone, manner and intention of the Member speaking, the person to whom the words at issue were directed, the degree of provocation, and most important, whether or not the remarks created disorder in the Chamber.”

[*English*]

In short, the Chair is required, often in the heat of the action, to assess the content of remarks, but also to take into account more subjective and contextual factors. As a result, a term found to be unparliamentary in one situation may not be considered unparliamentary in another.

This may occur not because the Chair is being inconsistent but rather because the tone, intention and reaction are different.

Language found to be acceptable when used in a general sense may be unacceptable when it targets a specific person. The Chair may be stricter to prevent a given situation from degenerating, while in other circumstances, the Chair would be inclined to let the comment pass or issue a warning rather than rule it unparliamentary. Each case must be considered in its specific context.

[*Translation*]

It is true that the term “anti-Alberta” has been used without being deemed unparliamentary. However, calling a member or a minister “anti-Alberta” could fall into either category. In the moment, out of an abundance of caution perhaps, the Chair directed the member for Calgary Forest Lawn to rephrase his question.

[*English*]

As for the second aspect of the member for Edmonton—Wetaskiwin's point of order, the Chair notes that no list of unparliamentary words exists. As indicated in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, at page 624, “language deemed unparliamentary one day may not necessarily be deemed unparliamentary on another day.”

As I just explained, it all depends on the context, tone, intention and reaction. The Chair therefore encourages members to choose their words with care so that we can have vigorous debates without lapsing into incivility.

I thank all members for their attention.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED BREACH OF DEPUTY SPEAKER'S IMPARTIALITY—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am also now ready to rule on the question of privilege raised on May 30, 2024, by the member for London—Fanshawe concerning an alleged breach of the Deputy Speaker's impartiality.

Routine Proceedings

In her intervention, the member indicated that she had just been made aware that a picture of the Deputy Speaker, wearing his robes, was used to advertise a political event held last October for a Conservative Party constituency association. She further noted that he was identified with his title of Deputy Speaker and not as the member for West Nova. She referenced other recent questions of privilege where the issue of inappropriate use of the Speaker's robes was also considered, which raised concerns over the use of House of Commons resources and about the impartiality of the Deputy Speaker.

[*Translation*]

In response, the member for Mégantic—L'Érable pointed out that the photo used in the ad was a publicly available image that could be found on the internet. He added that the ad contained no partisan criticism and that the event was not a fundraiser. Referring to a ruling made by Speaker Fraser on March 9, 1993, he also noted that expectations differed between the positions of Speaker and Deputy Speakers.

The Deputy Speaker, for his part, indicated that he had no knowledge of the ad. He said that, had he been shown a draft, he would have objected to it, and requested that it not be posted. He shared his regrets for the confusion that this may have caused to the House.

The member for London—Fanshawe intervened again on this matter on June 6, noting that she accepted the apology from the Deputy Speaker, but that the House was still owed an apology by those responsible for this mistake.

[*English*]

Let me first elaborate on the process used to bring forward the current matter. As I have indicated before, there is a mechanism to raise concerns about the conduct of a chair occupant. *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, at page 323, states, “The actions of the Speaker may not be criticized in debate or by any means except by way of a substantive motion.” This is in keeping with past precedents, which apply to deputy speakers as well, though occurrences are rare.

In addition to the 1993 ruling, referenced by the member for Mégantic—L'Érable, an interesting example can be found at pages 4365 to 4366 of the May 28, 1956, Debates. During what is known as the 1956 Pipeline Debate, the impartiality of the chairman of committee of the whole was questioned by the then leader of the opposition. Speaker Beaudoin determined that what has now become Standing Order 67(1)(p) should be used to call in question the conduct of chair occupants. He stated:

There is therefore no doubt in my mind that the proper course to be followed is for notice to be given of a substantive motion. Once the notice time has elapsed for the motion on the order paper, it is placed upon the routine proceedings, namely under “motions”. By virtue of [the Standing Orders] it is debatable and must be taken up when it comes up.

This is the approach also taken from March 16 to 19, 1964, regarding the then deputy speaker and, in March 2000, towards Speaker Parent. An alternative outcome was ultimately negotiated between the parties in that case.

• (1010)

[*Translation*]

Placing a substantive motion on notice, as was described by Speaker Beaudoin, therefore remains the usual course of action. As imperfect as this mechanism may seem to some, members unsatisfied with the conduct of one of the Chair occupants should take this very serious step. They should not be raising a question of privilege or commenting on their conduct in debate.

After having made this determination, deciding today whether the standard of impartiality expected of the Deputy Speaker was met or not, seems less relevant. That is a matter for the House to decide, not for the Speaker.

That said, interested members can refer to Speaker Fraser's ruling of March 9, 1993, where he stated at page 16685 of the Debates, that Deputy Speakers “remain members of their political party, may attend caucus if they choose and may even participate in debate.”

[*English*]

This makes clear that their degree of participation in political activities is an individual decision. Furthermore, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, at page 362, states that “the Deputy Speaker must be governed by ‘good taste and judgement’.”

As such, considering the practice of the House, the Chair does not find that this is a *prima facie* question of privilege.

Beyond the specifics of this question of privilege, and recent similar ones, this is a fundamental issue that once more has been put before the House with profound implications. Now, through this question of privilege, and in comments made here in the House, two of the Deputy Speakers have been subjected to criticism. I would caution the House against dragging the different chair occupants into debate. It has a corrosive effect on their ability to effectively preside over the proceedings of the House. I would beseech all members to think twice before using the chair occupants as a sort of political football to settle scores or to criticize their political opponents. I have full confidence in each of the Deputy Speakers, and the House should too.

I thank all members for their attention.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*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)(a), I have the honour to table, in both official languages the Government's responses to five petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

While I am on my feet, I move:

That the House do now proceed to orders of the day.

The Speaker: If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1055)

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

(*Division No. 807*)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garrison	Gerretsen
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada

Masse
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Miao
Morrice
Murray
Ng
O'Connell
O'Regan
Powlowski
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Singh
Sousa
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Trudeau
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Routine Proceedings

Mathysen
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Medicino
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
Oliphant
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 170

NAYS

Members

Aboultarif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
d'Entremont	Desbiens
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Fortin
Gallant	Garon
Gaudreau	Généreux
Genuis	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche

Government Orders

Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Martel
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Normandin	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Perron	Plamondon
Poilievre	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Therrien	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudel	Uppal
Van Popta	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vignola	Villemure
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer— 146

PAIRED

Members

Khera Vecchio— 2

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2024, NO. 1**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-69, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 16, 2024, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

[*English*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): There are 161 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-69. Motions Nos. 1 to 161 will be grouped for debate and voted upon according to the voting pattern available at the table.

[*Translation*]

I will now put Motions Nos. 1 to 161 to the House.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 81.

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 82.

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 83.

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 84.

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 85.

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 86.

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 87.

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 88.

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 89.

[*English*]

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 90.

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 91.

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 92.

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 93.

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 94.

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 95.

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 96.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 97.

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 98.

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 99.

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 100.

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 101.

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 102.

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 103.

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 104.

Motion No. 25

Government Orders

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 105.

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 106.

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 107.

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 28

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 108.

Motion No. 29

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 109.

Motion No. 30

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 110.

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 111.

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 147.

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 148.

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 150.

Motion No. 35

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 151.

Motion No. 36

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 152.

Motion No. 37

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 153.

Motion No. 38

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 154.

[Translation]

Mr. Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 39

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 173.

Motion No. 40

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 174.

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 175.

Motion No. 42

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 176.

Motion No. 43

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 177.

Motion No. 44

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 180.

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 181.

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 184.

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 185.

Motion No. 48

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 186.

• (1110)

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 49

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 198.

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 199.

Motion No. 51

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 200.

Motion No. 52

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 201.

Motion No. 53

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 202.

Motion No. 54

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 203.

Motion No. 55

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 204.

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 205.

Motion No. 57

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 206.

Motion No. 58

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 207.

Motion No. 59

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 208.

Motion No. 60

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 209.

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 210.

Motion No. 62

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 211.

Motion No. 63

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 212.

Motion No. 64

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 213.

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 214.

Motion No. 66

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 215.

Motion No. 67

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 216.

Motion No. 68

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 217.

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 218.

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 219.

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 220.

Motion No. 72

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 221.

Motion No. 73

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 222.

Motion No. 74

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 223.

Motion No. 75

Government Orders

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 225.

Motion No. 76

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 225.

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 226.

Motion No. 78

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 227.

[*English*]

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 269.

Motion No. 80

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 270.

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 271.

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 272.

Motion No. 83

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 273.

Motion No. 84

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 274.

Motion No. 85

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 275.

Motion No. 86

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 276.

Motion No. 87

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 277.

Motion No.88

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 278.

Motion No. 89

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 279.

Motion No. 90

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 280.

Motion No. 91

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 281.

Motion No. 92

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 282.

Motion No. 93

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 283.

Motion No. 94

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 284.

Motion No. 95

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 285.

Motion No. 96

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 286.

Motion No. 97

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 287.

Motion No. 98

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 288.

Motion No. 99

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 289.

Motion No. 100

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 290.

Motion No. 101

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 291.

Motion No. 102

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 292.

Motion No. 103

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 293.

Motion No. 104

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 294.

Motion No. 105

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 295.

Motion No. 106

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 296.

Motion No. 107

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 297.

Motion No. 108

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 298.

Motion No. 109

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 299.

Motion No. 110

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 300.

Motion No. 111

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 301.

Motion No. 112

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 302.

Motion No. 113

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 303.

Motion No. 114

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 304.

Motion No. 115

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 305.

Motion No. 116

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 306.

Motion No. 117

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 307.

Motion No. 118

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 308.

Motion No. 119

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 309.

Motion No. 120

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 310.

Motion No. 121

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 311.

Motion No. 122

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 312.

Motion No. 123

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 313.

Motion No. 124

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 314.

Motion No. 125

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 315.

Motion No. 126

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 316.

Motion No. 127

Government Orders

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 317.
Motion No. 128

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 318.
Motion No. 129

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 319.
Motion No. 130

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 322.
Motion No. 131

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 323.
Motion No. 132

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 324.
Motion No. 133

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 325.
Motion No. 134

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 326.
Motion No. 135

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 327.
Motion No. 136

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 328.
Motion No. 137

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 329.
Motion No. 138

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 330.
Motion No. 139

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 331.
Motion No. 140

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 332.
Motion No. 141

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 333.
Motion No. 142

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 336.
Motion No. 143

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 337.
Motion No. 144

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 338.
Motion No. 145

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 339.
Motion No. 146

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 442.
Motion No. 147

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 443.
Motion No. 148

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 445.
Motion No. 149

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 446.
Motion No. 150

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 447.
Motion No. 151

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 448.
Motion No. 152

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 449.
Motion No. 153

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 450.

Motion No. 154

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 461.

Motion No. 155

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 462.

Motion No. 156

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 463.

Motion No. 157

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 464.

Motion No. 158

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 465.

Motion No. 159

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 466.

Motion No. 160

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 467.

Motion No. 161

That Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 468.

• (1125)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Madam Speaker, once again I am privileged to rise in the House on behalf of the people I proudly represent in Lévis—Lotbinière. Right from the outset I would just say that back home, when it comes to the word “budget”, we do not have the same definition, nor do we have the same approach to budgeting as this Prime Minister, who does not even know what the words “balance” or “economy” mean.

Once again, in my 18th year here in the House, I was in attendance when the budget was delivered. Since 2015, it has been truly ridiculous to see the Finance Minister and this Prime Minister stand firm in their conviction that they are introducing a budget that is good for Canadians. We are witnessing a spendthrift government prove for the ninth year in a row that the Liberals are incompetent and irresponsible. This government's particular talent is keeping us in the financial hole we have fallen into, in spite of ourselves.

We are seeing sky-high interest rates on a debt we will never be free of for as long as we live. The Prime Minister is proud to wear the same rose-coloured glasses as the Finance Minister and the extended Liberal family. They are out of touch with our reality in this country, when the facts and statistics speak for themselves. We are far from being the envy of the G7, the way we once were. The unholy and catastrophic alliance between the Liberals, the NDP and the Bloc has plunged thousands of persons and families into misery and poverty.

Many of this Prime Minister's words ring false, starting with the words “budget” and “economy”. These investments on credit bring no value added to our GDP. We now have interest to pay down, in amounts that I cannot even visualize; I can only imagine stacks and stacks of cash in giant warehouses. Every one of my grandchildren born in the last seven years will bear this debt for as long as they live. They may never be able to buy a house. That is the case today for thousands of Canadians for whom home ownership is a distant dream.

Government Orders

As the ultimate spendthrift, our Prime Minister is a prime example of someone who never wanted for money as a child. He never had to earn a single dollar to put in his piggy bank or bank account. This same Prime Minister will be spending \$40 billion in new money on his new spending spree, with the unconditional support of the NDP and now the Bloc Québécois.

The former Liberal governor of the Bank of Canada, David Dodge, said that he thought this budget was the worst since 1982. This year, Canada will spend \$54.1 billion to service the debt, in other words, to pay the interest. That is more money than the government sends to the provinces for health care. It is a real scandal. The Bank of Canada and former Liberal finance minister John Manley both told the Prime Minister that he was increasing inflation with his spending, which was driving up interest rates. Obviously this spendthrift Prime Minister did not listen.

As a result, the Bank of Canada embarked upon the most aggressive campaign to raise interest rates in its history. Millions of Canadians are now realizing this more than ever as they renew their mortgages. This Prime Minister is not going to help them. The Liberal-NDP-Bloc coalition is undermining people's confidence in Canadian democracy and our institutions. Canadians did not vote for this kind of hypocrisy in the last election. It is not the first time in Canada's history that a party that will never rise to power resorts to scheming with the Liberals to achieve its goals.

How many people can no longer make ends meet, even when they tighten their belts, even when they get higher wages? The inflation rate continues to increase the cost of mortgages, the price of housing, the cost of groceries and all basic necessities. Before this Liberal government, it took only 39% of an average salary to cover the monthly payment on the average home. Today this figure has increased to 62%.

Just last weekend I took part in the Relay for Life in Lotbinière/Lévis, a walk to raise money for cancer. I was worried when people told me they no longer recognized the country we live in and no longer feel safe with the direction the country is headed in. Life is getting dire for millions of Canadians who have exhausted their savings and their credit. They are at the end of their financial resources. Many skip a meal a day, and more and more people have to rely on food banks every week. When is this going to end? It is just so sad.

Canada has the fewest housing units per 1,000 inhabitants of any G7 country. The number of housing units per 1,000 Canadians has been decreasing since 2016 because of the strong population growth.

• (1130)

We need more housing units to keep the ratio of housing units to population stable. According to the CMHC, we need 3.5 million more units than planned to restore accessibility. In 2024, this figure will climb to 5.8 million.

The Prime Minister has stated yet again that he will bring in foreign workers to address the labour shortage when we already have a hard time providing decent housing for the homeless, Canadian families and seniors. No one can tell us when the promised units will be built. Since the Liberals came to power, mortgage and hous-

ing costs have almost doubled. Stress and anxiety have become facts of life for millions of Canadians. They are worried parents, children and grandchildren who know opportunities are getting harder to come by in Canada. Not so long ago, many believed they would never find themselves in a precarious situation. They are caught in a nightmare from which they cannot wake. In nine years, the Liberals have brought us to a point from which there may be no return.

Legalization of marijuana has not helped. Written briefs to the House and the work of committees can attest to that. Countries that legalized marijuana saw an increase in crime. Not surprisingly, Canada is also now experiencing this, with an ever-increasing crime rate. They also reported an increase in mental health problems. We too are seeing an increase in the number of people who are facing mental health challenges. We are also seeing rising addiction and deaths from hard drugs, which the Liberals pushed to legalize at all costs. It is a disgrace. Our big cities now look like places where zombies come to die. There are even neighbourhoods where no one dares go anymore. What can we say about schools and day cares with injection sites as neighbours, keeping parents awake at night?

As they say in Quebec, you have to be tough to live in this reality. For many, that refers to the chaos and decline they are experiencing under this Prime Minister. Not so long ago, it could be said that any problem could be dealt with through policy. That was before the Liberal-NDP-Bloc Québécois coalition.

We are powerless to stop these irresponsible budgets, which are populist in the worst sense of the word. They do not correspond to the reality that all responsible, well trained economists recognize. No one in their right mind would deny that Canadians of every social class are paying far too much in taxes because this Liberal government is wasting too much money. Any right-minded individual suffering day after day is looking forward to the upcoming elections to get the country back on track and show this government the door.

The Liberals think they have a license to print money. Good times or bad, they never stop. Taxpayers pick up the tab in the form of a higher cost of living. They do not even benefit from higher-quality services. On the contrary, these services have greatly deteriorated since 2015.

The 2024 budget is a continuation of the Liberals' horrendous record. This is a government addicted to tax increases and inflationary deficits. That is why I will vote against this budget, in honour of those who work hard for their money and who know how to count.

I would like to reassure voters that there is hope. Only one year, at the very most, remains of this Liberal-NDP-Bloc Québécois nightmare. Common-sense Conservatives will axe the carbon tax and lower prices on the staples Canadians need. This is not the sort of budget Canadians need in these difficult times. What they need is elections as soon as possible to axe the taxes, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

Government Orders

• (1135)

[English]

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I always am amazed at the passion the member puts into his oration in the House. Daily in the House, the Conservatives cite food bank lineups as being an issue they care about. However, when it comes to supporting children, when it comes to feeding hungry children, and I note Breakfast Club of Canada is very popular in Quebec and does a great deal of work supporting breakfast programs in that province, could the member opposite speak to why the Conservatives have said they would vote against a budget that would feed 400,000 more kids per year and would commit to \$1 billion over five years to lift up kids and ensure they get a healthy start every day? Could he speak to why he would stand in the House and vote against that?

[Translation]

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Madam Speaker, look at what nine years of Liberal policies have brought us: We are at the point where we have to feed kids breakfast at school. Before 2015, when the Conservatives formed the government, we were helping third-world countries feed their children. Now we have to do the same thing in Canada. It is time for an election.

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): He is laying it on a bit thick, Madam Speaker. I do not have enough time to go over and correct my colleague's remarks. Everyone is to blame but them. Basically, he is promoting single-party rule, a return to totalitarianism. His conception of democracy is that Canada would be better off if all 338 seats went to the Conservatives.

I would like to know why my colleague always votes against the Bloc Québécois's proposals aimed at doing away with tax havens. He said that Canadians of every social class are paying too much in taxes. Canada's big banks have tax shelters and make billions in profits each quarter. Why does he vote against that?

Why does he vote in favour of oil companies continuing to receive tax subsidies despite making billions of dollars a year? Is that his vision of equity across social classes?

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Madam Speaker, I will address the first premise of the question posed by my colleague, whom I thank. Yes, the greater the number of Conservative members, the better off Canada will be.

I in turn have a question for my colleague: why did the Bloc Québécois vote in favour of \$500 billion in budget appropriations to prop up this government and its reckless spending over nine years?

The Bloc Québécois is part of the problem.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I do like my colleague, but we lived through the Harper regime. More Conservative members means more hardship for all Canadians.

We have seen the Conservatives block dental care, despite the fact that hundreds of people in Lévis-Lotbinière are already benefiting from the NDP program. The Conservatives also wanted to

block pharmacare. Today we have these foolish amendments moved by the Conservatives, who are blocking measures to ensure affordable housing, food for children, student loan forgiveness and the tax credit for volunteer firefighters.

I have a very simple question: Why are the Conservative members constantly blocking everything that could help Canadians?

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Madam Speaker, let me get back to the question posed by my colleague, who has my thanks. I will talk about real hardship, hardship in which the NDP is complicit because it is supporting the Liberals.

Thousands of Canadian families are struggling to put food on the table because their mortgage payments are too high. They are paying far too much for everything, including their mortgage, gas and food. We have come to this point because the NDP always supports the government.

I hope that the NDP will stop supporting this government as soon as possible so that Canadians can have a real choice, that being a new Conservative government.

• (1140)

[English]

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Madam Speaker, we know the results are in. After nine years of the Liberal government, it is clear that the Prime Minister is not worth the cost for any generation.

Food Banks Canada's recent report card said that nearly 50% of Canadians feel financially worse off compared to last year and that 25% of Canadians are currently facing food insecurity, a reality that should be unthinkable in a country like Canada, but, instead, is a growing problem.

The news from the Salvation Army is equally alarming. Nearly 75% of Canadians feel they are having difficulty managing their limited financial resources and 25% of Canadians continue to be extremely concerned about having enough income to cover their basic needs. That is the Prime Minister's record.

However, those are more than just figures. It is everyday Canadians who are working hard, doing everything they are supposed to be doing, stretching a dollar where they can and cutting costs where they can. They are struggling just to afford basic necessities. That is because groceries are at record highs and the costs are going up year after year. Families will be paying, on average, \$700 more on groceries just this year alone, and it keeps going. Rents have doubled, mortgages have doubled, fuel costs are up, home heating is up, taxes are up, everything is up.

Canadians who are already struggling to keep their heads above water cannot afford higher taxes and more inflationary spending that drives up the cost of everything and keeps interest rates high. Canadians are desperate for some relief, but the NDP-Liberal government is just not listening. Instead, what Canadians got in the budget was more of the same mismanagement and inflationary spending, which has resulted in this pain and misery that Canadians are feeling. It is a kick in the gut to Canadian families that are desperate for some relief.

Government Orders

This budget would add nearly \$40 billion in new inflationary spending, and it will cost the average Canadian family an extra \$3,687. More of the same of what got us into this mess does not help Canadians or address the affordability crisis. The Conservatives had clear demands in advance of this budget, one of which was to get spending under control, that for every new dollar spent, the government should find a dollar in savings. This is a simple, common-sense budgeting concept that Canadians apply to their own budgets on a daily basis.

Deficit spending is pouring fuel on this inflationary fire, driving up the cost of interest rates, and it is not just the Conservatives saying this. We know that the Governor of the Bank of Canada has been clear that the government's deficit spending is not helpful in bringing inflation down and lowering interest rates. We know that the Prime Minister has admitted that he does not like to think about monetary policy, but Canadians cannot ignore the repercussion of that negligence.

The Prime Minister's reckless spending and taxes forced the Bank of Canada to slam on the brakes, with the fastest increase in interest rates in Canadian history. Millions of Canadians renewing their mortgages are facing massive hikes in their mortgage payments to come. That is a very real repercussion to millions of Canadians.

Let us not forget that while the Prime Minister spends and spends, it is taxpayers who are footing the Prime Minister's bill. They are paying for it today, but they will also be paying it for years and years to come. This year alone, Canadian taxpayers will spend \$54.1 billion to service the Prime Minister's debt. That is more money than the federal government is sending to the provinces for health care. It is money that could be better spent, but Canadians are on the hook for it.

• (1145)

The NDP-Liberal government's tax-and-spend agenda is hitting Canadians from all sides. The carbon tax scheme is adding to the cost of food, fuel, shelter and just about everything they buy. The PBO has already proven that the vast majority of Canadians are worse off under this carbon tax scheme.

Certainly, in rural communities like mine, the negative impact of the carbon tax is even greater. Rural Canadians are punished for having to drive a couple of hours for a medical appointment, to get to work or even just to go the extra distance that is required for them to get groceries. There are no alternatives. However, the Liberals stand in this place, day after day, and try to spin a different narrative. They try to tell Canadians that they are better off. Canadians are just not buying what they are selling.

Now we know that the Liberals are knowingly promoting deceptive marketing practices. Their own economic analysis has proven that the carbon tax is hurting Canadians, but their solution is to hide the results. We know the PBO is under a gag order: "we've been told explicitly not to disclose it and reference it." Those are the words of the PBO at committee, when he was asked about the government's economic analysis. He was clear that his office had seen the Liberal government's own analysis, which confirms the report the PBO had already published. The results do not fit the NDP-Lib-

eral government's narrative, so instead of acknowledging the misery it has caused Canadians, it has simply hidden the results.

However, Canadians do not actually need to see the analysis; they know the results. They live the results every single day. They feel the carbon tax impact every time they pump fuel at the gas station, open up their energy bill or pick up groceries for dinner. The NDP coalition does not care. Even in the midst of growing poverty and food insecurity, it hiked the carbon tax anyway and is hell-bent on quadrupling it even further. It has proven time and again that it does not care if families are struggling to put food on the table.

Even though the Liberals have failed to meet every single environmental target they have set for themselves, they are obsessed with checking the carbon tax box. We see that activist-driven agenda with the obsession they have to punish our farmers. The Prime Minister is fighting tooth and nail to keep the carbon tax on farm operations. The carbon tax is increasing the cost of food production and is a huge hit to the bottom line of our farmers. Farmers are paying astronomical carbon tax bills, not to mention the GST that is charged on top of the tax: a tax on a tax. These bills are jeopardizing the viability of their farm operations and food security in our country and also abroad.

The carbon tax scheme also fails to recognize the valuable contributions that farmers already make to protect the environment. Environmental stewardship is the cornerstone of farming practices. Not only does the carbon tax scheme fail to recognize that, but it limits the ability of our farmers to innovate. Bigger and bigger hits to the bottom line of farm businesses means there is less and less money to reinvest in new technology. Filling up government coffers on the backs of our farmers does nothing to safeguard the environment. It is counterproductive, and it certainly does not help make food affordable. When food is taxed at every point in the supply chain, consumers will pay for it at the checkout, and they are. Only common-sense Conservatives will axe the carbon tax for everyone for good.

This budget proves that the NDP-Liberal coalition is not taking the affordability crisis in this country seriously. Every time the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance stands up in this place and tells Canadians how they are better off than they truly are demonstrates how out of touch they truly are with Canadians. Canadians are desperate for some relief. Only common-sense Conservatives will bring down interest rates for good by axing inflationary taxes and placing a cap on government spending.

Government Orders

• (1150)

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would note that there were many statements strung together in the member's speech that seem to be false. I am not sure who constructed that speech, but there are a lot of different things that I could take issue with. We know that Conservatives do not care about climate change. They voted hundreds of times in this House against any action on climate change whatsoever.

The member's party seems to be against investments in dental care, investments in pharmacare, investments in child care spaces, investments in health care and investments in mental health care. I do not know if members notice a trend here, but basically anything with the word "care" in it, the member's party seems to stand against.

Our government is investing in services and supports that Canadians need to lift them up, a stronger social safety net. Could the member opposite speak to why and how she can pretend to care about Canadians but not be willing to lift them up in their time of need?

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that the member suggests that the things I have spoken about are false. These are things that I have heard from the constituents I represent in a rural riding in Saskatchewan, where the government has been hell-bent on not respecting provincial jurisdiction and what the premier sees best for his province.

The member talks about investing. The government is great at increasing taxes; that is what the government does. The Liberals are increasing taxes for every single generation to fund their agenda of spend, spend, spend, under the guise of "We're helping Canadians. We're caring for Canadians", when the reality is that it goes to pay for high-priced consultants and to cover up their crime and corruption.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am always a little in awe when I hear the Conservatives speak. Aside from slogans, I do not hear any solutions or any plan. How would a Conservative government address our current problems?

My colleague spoke briefly about housing. According to the CIBC, all we have to do is build 5.8 million housing units in Canada by 2031. We have never gotten near that number. In fact, we would have to build three times more per year than we have ever built before.

Apart from chewing out the mayors of major Quebec cities like Montreal and Quebec City, what is the Conservatives' plan for building housing units and getting the country out of this housing crisis?

[*English*]

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, what we do know with the NDP-Liberal government is that photo ops and announcements do nothing. We know that. At the committee I am on, we have heard quite regularly how taxes on development—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): There is a phone near the mic, and the vibration was being picked up by the mic.

The honourable member for Battlefords—Lloydminster.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, we are hearing at the HUMA committee right now, in a study of housing, that the taxes and the regulatory red tape burden that developers are facing are in the way of getting housing built. At the end of the day, we know that after nine years, the Liberals, propped up by the NDP, have not gotten the job done.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, it was a reasonable question that came from my Bloc colleague. He just wanted to hear any ideas to come out of the Conservative bench on policy. However, in fact, the Conservative member did not provide any sort of possible solutions when it comes to housing.

We know that the Conservatives are trying to block everything: block support for a school lunch program, dental care and pharmacare. Another thing they are blocking is a tax credit for firefighters and search and rescue volunteers, which is absolutely critical for the retention of those volunteers in our country. Maybe my colleague can explain to those volunteer firefighters and search and rescue volunteers why the Conservatives are using every single tool in the tool box to delay help to Canadians.

• (1155)

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, it has been proven, after nine years, that the Liberal policies are doing nothing but creating more red tape.

I put forward a PMB, Bill C-318. Where is it? The Liberals stole it.

If the Liberals are so great with policies, maybe they should put some policies forward that do not create red tape, do not tax the taxpayer to death and actually have homes built. They are failing to do all of the above.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am glad I caught your eye, and I am glad you also caught the fact that I had mistakenly put my phone a little bit too close to the microphones. It is now far away.

I want to start by thanking the residents and constituents of my riding for again allowing me the opportunity to represent them in the House. We are now several years into this particular Parliament, but we all know that it is a great honour to be sent here to represent them. We speak on their behalf. We do not just speak for ourselves.

In preparation for speaking today, I did go through the many emails and phone notes I have written to myself from calls with constituents, people who have told me about the misery they are suffering through with the NDP-Liberal government's policies and Bill C-69 specifically, which is basically an encapsulation of many years of policy-making by the government that has led to the doubling of mortgage down payments and the doubling of rent.

Government Orders

I speak as a renter. My rent has gone up significantly, and I do not fault my landlord. He has no choice, because interest rates have much more than doubled. When an interest rate goes from 25 basis points or 50 basis points to 4.75%, that is a multifold increase. That is not a doubling; it is not a 4.5% increase. We are talking about a manyfold increase, like an 800% increase in some cases, on the interest people are paying on the total amount of their loan. I do not fault them.

We have seen the price of homes double since the Liberal government took over. We have seen the price of many goods go up significantly. It is the number one issue in my riding, the cost of living. It hits people in the grocery stores when they see it. It hits them at the pump when they go to refill their trucks or vehicles that they use to get their families around my riding. My riding is one of the bigger ones in Canada. Thankfully, the electoral boundaries commission is drastically shrinking it, by 40%. That will make it much easier for me to get back to everybody on time, those who make phone calls and send emails and those few who still send letters.

I often get asked the question, “What would Conservatives do?” I have taken the time to summarize a few things that, for me, are the highlights of what Conservatives would do. We have our main points that we make, and all parties do this. I often hear the NDP-Liberals accuse Conservatives throughout Canada of sloganeering. We are just making it simple for people to understand. There are vast amounts of information online, on YouTube, on social media. I trust Canadians to go through those things. If they are interested and curious about what Conservatives are proposing, there is an entire docuseries that, for example, the member for Carleton, the leader of His Majesty’s opposition, has made, “Debtonation.” I highly recommend it. Those who are interested should go check it out.

I will start with “pay as you go”. It is a very simple idea. It has been time-tested. It has worked. In the U.S. Congress, between 1998 and 2002, when it was introduced, it basically said that for every new dollar of government spending, the current government had to find a dollar of cuts in current government programs or propose one dollar of new taxation to cover this cost. In the span of those four years, they were able to balance the budget of the United States government. That is a government that runs trillion-dollar deficits at this point.

Our national debt is in the trillions, but we do not run trillion-dollar deficits yet. I do not want to suggest anything. I am sure the Liberal government, if given half the opportunity, would reach that level. After all, as I remember it, there was a certain Prime Minister who promised to run small deficits, less than \$10 billion for three years, and that never happened. The Prime Minister has run multi-billion dollar deficits ever since he was elected to office, and it has never stopped. In fact, none of the budgets that the Liberals have tabled since then have shown a balanced budget.

“Pay as you go” is a proposal from the Conservatives to adopt that would ensure that we could fix the federal budget. Fixing the federal budget would lead to lower interest rates. Lower interest rates would lead to lower housing costs and lower rents and, at the very minimum, stop this massive inflationary increase in the costs of everything.

It would make it easier for small businesses, like those of fishermen, giving them an opportunity to actually be able to afford new equipment. It would give them an opportunity to plan for their retirement and have the certainty that the equipment, goods, boats and everything else they use to run their business would have the same value at the end of the day, so they could retire with dignity.

The second thing is the building homes not bureaucracy act, which this House voted on. I find it interesting that one of the NDP members who spoke was trying to give a hard time to one of our members, the member for Battlefords—Lloydminster, saying that we had not proposed anything on housing. We proposed legislation on housing, legislation that they voted against, in fact. The NDP members voted with their coalition partners in the Liberal Party.

● (1200)

There is a proposal, the building homes not bureaucracy act. It went very specifically to the heart of what is going on in our country, which is that we have people at the very local level, in the planning departments of different cities, who are making it more difficult to increase density and, as is in my community, to build more greenfield housing of single-family detached housing and low-rises. Calgary has generally done a really good job of building housing that is necessary, but so has the city of Edmonton.

As Calgarians, we do not often praise the city of Edmonton, but I used to live in Edmonton, and if I look at its housing costs over the last nine years, it probably has the smallest increases of any major metropolitan region. That is because, locally, they have decided to prioritize pricing and make sure that pricing stays low and affordable, so people can afford the homes that they want to live in, and there are different types of housing for different people to make sure they have the choices they need at different stages in their lives.

However, the building homes not bureaucracy act had provisions in it to ensure that we divested ourselves from federal government properties that are no longer necessary, to ensure that we can pass them over to developers to encourage them to build more housing and more development around TUCs, and also to cut CMHC’s bonuses. This is the housing agency that is supposed to ensure we build sufficient amounts of housing. I have long been a critic of the CMHC. It does not matter which CEO has been there. It has completely failed in its mandate, so at minimum we should be cutting these bonuses, the performance base or whatever euphemism we want to use for the bonuses and the extra pay they are giving themselves when they are failing. We should not reward failure.

Government Orders

The government needs to cancel the carbon tax. It is very simple: Axe the tax. The carbon tax is adding on to the misery of all Canadians. We can see it in our grocery stores with the prices, but if we tax the farmer who makes the food, and we tax the shipper who takes the food to the producer who adds second-level value, and then they take it to the grocery store, all of those costs are being passed on through the entire system, and we have higher costs at the end of the day. That is simply how math works, and axing the tax is the solution.

What would we do to replace the tax? We are Conservatives. Generally, we do not like taxes. We would not replace it with any other tax. There are a lot of technological changes that we could do. There are a lot of things that we could do on the grid side in Canada to make sure we have a national grid, or something closer to a national grid, where there would be a better flow of electrical power between the provinces. We can do that through encouragement. We do not need to mandate things.

I watched the Minister of Environment mandate things, such as forcing Calgary Co-op, the grocery store of my choice, with 400,000 members in Calgary, almost a third of the city, to abandon its completely compostable bags. They are completely compostable in the city-owned compostable system, and the government is saying that they have single-use plastic in them. It is a compostable bag. Not even the ink is made of plastic. It is also compostable, but an insistence that Ottawa knows best is why we see so much division in this country and so few Liberal provincial governments left. There are so few of them left in existence.

I know many members wait for this, but I always have a Yiddish proverb. I have a great love for that language, and when a wise man and a fool are debating or arguing, there are two fools debating. That is what I feel while watching the Liberal cabinet when it has these disagreements about whose fault it is that there is a massive increase in mortgages and massive increase in housing prices and rentals. They seem to always point their fingers at somebody else. It is never their fault when things go wrong. It is always someone else's. It is as if they've not been in power for nine years.

The government members often, during question period especially, say that they will find the person who is responsible for this. They love labelling small business owners as too rich, with too much for their retirements, while the Liberals basically have gold-plated defined benefit plans that are afforded to them by the taxpayer. They should stop accusing those who create richness in our country and who contribute to the hiring in all of our communities. It is often that the government members are always looking for someone else to blame. It is the cabinet. It is just that person. I have not found a wise man among them yet, but I have found those fools who continuously blame Canadians for every single one of their mistakes.

As such, of course, I am going to be voting against Bill C-69. I have moved several amendments to it as well. It is also a matter of confidence, so I will also remind my constituents back home that on these types of matters, I have zero confidence in the NDP-Liberal government and this coalition, and we must vote this legislation down.

We have to have a carbon tax election, so let us axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

• (1205)

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I note that, when asked for solutions, the member offered a couple of gimmicky slogans. I cannot think of any term for them other than “slogan”. “Pay as you go”, was what the member said. It is interesting that this concept is a way of looking at our fiscal environment and saying that it is what the government needs to do, but the member opposite has not ever pronounced, as is the same for all of his party members, whether the Conservatives are going to support our government's plan to increase the capital gains inclusion rate for people making over \$250,000 in capital gains.

I would note that, when the Governor of the Bank of Canada came to the finance committee, only a couple of weeks ago, he said that our government is sticking to the fiscal guardrails and that this is helpful in fighting inflation. The only way that is possible is that, on the one hand, we have the investments we are making and, on the other hand, we have some additional revenue from the capital gains. The Governor of the Bank of Canada says that is helpful. What is the member opposite's position on the capital gains issue?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I have sad news for the member. If he carefully reads the piece of legislation, Bill C-69, he will see that the capital gains tax is not in it. In fact, the Minister of Finance said that she would table a separate piece of legislation. It is as if the Liberals were completely unprepared to table a single piece of budgetary legislation that included all of their taxing schemes because they were either too incompetent, too foolish or did not know what they were doing, or this is just a political ploy and a political game, just as so many pundits are now attacking the Liberals over. They even have the Canadian Medical Association disagreeing with them.

Capital gains tax is not in the legislation. I invite the member to read it.

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member talked about the Conservatives' so-called housing plan. The Conservatives' plan is to sell off public land to rich developers. They want to make their corporate landlord donors even wealthier. When the Leader of the Opposition was housing minister, he built all of six homes. He let half of the country go, with zero dollars to build more rentals. He lost 800,000 units of affordable housing. He sold them off to corporate landlords. This is the Conservatives' plan: cut and privatize. Canadians are worse off.

Does the member not think that we should use public land and public money to build more non-market housing, more co-operative housing and more social housing, which would be more housing for people that people can actually afford?

Government Orders

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, we were carefully listening, the group of us here, to the member's comments on what I had said and proposed, including the fact that we have legislation that we had proposed before the House. That member voted it down. The NDP-Liberal coalition voted down a piece of legislation that would have addressed the housing crisis created by the massive spending by the Liberal-NDP government. We really spent our way to prosperity, have we not? The massive spending by the government has led to higher interest rates and higher inflation. This has been tried before, and it has failed every single time.

My message to residents back home in Calgary and in Calgary Shepard, my corner of the city, is to remind residents and ask them if they are better off today than they were nine years ago. That is a very simple thing. Every single one of my residents, I am convinced, will say, no, they are worse off because of the NDP-Liberal government and MPs' decisions on spending.

• (1210)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I know that the Conservatives are against the budget. However, in this budget, the Liberals are giving tens of billions of dollars to oil companies and the fossil fuel industry in Canada.

I know that the Conservative Party finds it difficult to acknowledge the existence of climate change and that it is always extolling the virtues of Canada's oil industry. I would think they would be happy to see that in the budget.

Why are they then voting against it?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, tens of thousands of families in my riding depend on jobs in these energy companies. These are companies that were founded in Alberta. Many of them started as small businesses.

Thanks to the Government of Alberta, and thanks to the quality of the workers in my riding, we have built companies and wealth worth billions of dollars. The jobs they create pay for the houses, vacations and education of every family in my riding.

I am proud of these big Albertan companies.

[*English*]

Mr. Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to participate in the debate on the budget implementation act, also known as Bill C-69. I will declare from the outset that I will oppose the reckless and incompetent Liberal government and its disastrous economic policy, which is contained in this legislation.

When the budget was introduced, the Liberal government told Canadians that it was adding another \$57 billion in new inflationary spending, but guess what? The Parliamentary Budget Officer later confirmed that that enormous number was even higher, to the tune of \$61.2 billion. That is a miscalculation of over \$4 billion. This new inflationary spending only adds more financial fuel to the flames of inflation. Sadly for Canadians, as long as the NDP-Liberal government stays in power, it is only going to get worse. Already, it is costing Canadians more. In fact, the new spending in this budget would cost the average Canadian family an ex-

tra \$3,687. I would ask the Canadians watching at home to pause and think about that for a moment. What could their family do if they had an extra \$3,687 in their bank account?

As the shadow minister for tourism and the proud member of Parliament for the Niagara Falls riding, which includes the city of Niagara Falls and the towns of Niagara-on-the-Lake and Fort Erie, may I be the first to suggest a vacation in Niagara Falls, Canada's top leisure tourism destination? When common-sense Conservatives proposed to rescind the carbon tax and federal taxes for fuel for the summer to allow Canadians an opportunity to enjoy a vacation, the Liberal government instead criticized those same Canadians and then voted down our motion.

Really, that extra money could go toward anything, especially things that would help improve the quality of life for them and their children. Instead, the Liberal Prime Minister will continue to take their hard-earned money and then immediately throw it at the shocking interest charges that his enormous debt has racked up after nine years. This is simply unsustainable. This is not how we get to a balanced budget either, as the finance minister said she would during her fall fiscal update in 2022.

According to the Fraser Institute, last year the Liberal government was spending more on paying off its debt than it was spending on child care benefits and employment insurance benefits, but it gets worse. This year, the NDP-Liberal government will spend more taxpayer money on servicing its debt than on health care. I will let that sink in for a moment.

After nine years of the Liberal Prime Minister, it feels like we are back in the dying days of the Dalton McGuinty and Kathleen Wynne Liberal government at Queen's Park, where rampant, wasteful and reckless Liberal spending on green energy programs made Ontario's debt the highest of any sub-sovereign state in the world. What is both troubling and astounding is the fact that some members on the Liberal side are from the very same cast and government of that Ontario period. Have they learned nothing?

After nine years of the Liberal government, Canadians know prices are up, rent is up, debt is up, taxes are up, and they are fed up. Rent has doubled. Mortgage payments are 150% higher than they were before the current Prime Minister took power. Tent cities exist in almost every major city. Over 50% of Canadians are \$200 or less away from going broke. The Liberal government's tax-and-spend inflation is non-discriminatory. It costs Canadians their hard-earned money and savings, and it impacts Canadians of all walks of life, of every demographic and in every region of our great country. Young Canadians have had to put their dreams of buying a home on hold, while hard-working Canadians are working overtime, or two or more jobs, just to get by. Retirees, who have worked hard their whole lives to build our country, are now struggling to hold on to their savings as high inflation and new Liberal taxes drain their bank accounts.

Government Orders

Demand at local food banks is at an all-time high. In Niagara Falls, Project Share's food bank served more than 13,000 people last year, a total of one in seven residents. Across Ontario, a report from Feed Ontario revealed that more than 800,000 Ontarians used a food bank between April 2022 and March 2023, an increase of 38% province-wide.

These miserable results are the legacy of nine years of the Liberals' rule, and their disastrous spending and budgetary plans, which have failed at every turn. If Canadians were not already enduring enough financial pain and suffering caused by their federal government, they will take no solace in knowing that the Liberal government is committed to quadrupling the carbon tax, driving up the cost on everything from food, to groceries, to shelter and energy to heat and cool their homes.

● (1215)

The government's most recent tax increase was a 23% hike on the carbon tax on April 1, but there is hope. There is a solution. In the next federal election, which will be a carbon tax election, Canadians can elect a common-sense Conservative government. Only common-sense Conservatives will axe the tax to bring lower prices for Canadians. We will build the homes Canadians need. We will fix the budgetary finances of this country and we will address the issues of crime, which the government policies have made only worse, not better, in Canada.

The carbon tax is just one of a series of new tax measures being schemed up by the tax-hungry Liberal government that needs to continuously feed and fund its spending addiction. In the first quarter of this year alone, businesses across Canada saw taxes go up in areas such as CPP and EI premiums, as well as the added burden of the carbon tax. Some also had an alcohol escalator tax hike to worry about, such as the wineries and craft breweries in my riding, and every business is concerned about general costs continuing to go up.

Canadians in need of a home, desiring to rent or trying to save to buy their first home face stiff headwinds. After nine years of the Liberal government, housing costs have doubled and mortgage costs have doubled. Required down payments have doubled and rent has also doubled. More houses were built in 1972 than were built in Canada in 2022. Because of the government's habitual overspending ways, Canadians are struggling with increased mortgages and interest rates, which threatens their very future.

Just this morning, Global News reported on an Ipsos poll indicating 63% of respondents would continue to remain on the sidelines of the housing market due to higher interest rates. The poll was conducted between June 7 and June 10. Some 45% of respondents maintained that they would not be able to afford a home no matter how much interest rates declined, and, sadly, six in 10 respondents said they had given up on ever owning a home.

After nine years of the Liberal government, Canadians are poor while Liberal insiders and friends of the Liberal cabinet get rich. The government has screwed up the housing file so badly that in the 2023 fall economic statement, it trumpeted the creation of a new Canadian mortgage charter to save Canadians from the problems the NDP-Liberal government had created itself. The government should be ashamed.

Only common-sense Conservatives will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime so Canadians can focus on getting ahead in their daily life. After nine years, it is clearer than ever that the Liberal Prime Minister is not worth the cost, and budget 2024 would make life worse across the country for Canadians. Prices are up and rent is up. Debt is up; taxes are up, and Canadians are fed up. The Liberal government's time is up.

I encourage members of all opposition parties to take a stand with Conservatives, vote against the reckless, inflationary federal budget and vote non-confidence in the disastrous Liberal government.

● (1220)

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have to give the Conservatives some credit finally. I know it is taken me a long time to reach this conclusion, but they are exceptional at stringing together misleading and false statements into speeches.

The member opposite talked about quality of life. He used that phrase in his speech. Our government's budget and the BIA invest in helping Canadians be able to save or to buy their first home; in ensuring that families can save for their children's education more easily; in ensuring that over 400,000 more kids can get food in school; in life-saving medication, which obviously would cost families if it were not offered through a national pharmacare program; in student loan forgiveness; in research funding to ensure that students and researchers can do their work at a competitive rate; in helping seniors get their teeth fixed; and in more child care spaces. The list goes on.

Does the member opposite oppose every single one of those investments designed to improve the quality of life of countless Canadians?

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: Mr. Speaker, the member talked about investments. It is spending. The government is spending enormous amounts, billions of dollars in fact, to fix the problems it in fact has created itself. These programs would not have been needed had the government taken actions earlier on to fix the problems that we now face.

On the housing file, the government has spent \$89 billion on its national housing strategy. Never has so much been spent to accomplish so little. I mentioned in my speech that the government, in 2022, built fewer homes than the former government did in 1972. That is a failure on the part of the current government.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let me reassure my colleague that the Bloc Québécois will be voting against this budget.

One of the reasons we will be voting against this budget has to do with the government's commitments toward the oil and gas industry. The budget commits up to \$83 billion by 2035 to an industry that is raking in record-breaking profits while contributing to global warming.

I would simply like to know if this is one of the reasons my colleague will be voting no too: the fact that this government is handing billions of dollars to an industry that does not need the money and that is helping exacerbate climate change.

[English]

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: Mr. Speaker, again, we are voting against the government, and the budget in particular, because of the government's failures over nine years of being in power. Its actions have caused the affordability crisis we are facing today.

Our hope is that a non-confidence vote will be held in our favour and that a carbon tax election will be held so a common-sense Conservative is elected to try to fix the problems the government has created.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one thing the member and I can agree on is that the Liberals have failed to ensure that Canadians across the country have housing. However, I have not heard a single concrete, sound solution being put forward by the Conservatives.

One such thing that is vital, which we are talking about today, is the rental protection fund. We know that for every one house built, 11 affordable homes are being lost, yet the Conservatives continue to prop up the same corporations that are swooping in and buying up affordable homes, leaving people unable to access the homes they need. Housing is a basic human right.

Why does the member continue to participate in delay tactics that are keeping Canadians from being able to access the affordable housing they need and deserve?

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: Mr. Speaker, why did the opposition party that works in tandem with the government vote against our building homes and not bureaucracy act? We put forward a piece of legislation that would address the housing crisis in Canada, and the New Democrats voted to support their Liberal friends.

• (1225)

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-69 is an omnibus budget implementation bill that creates or amends 67 different acts. It enacts the consumer-driven banking act, which makes the federal government exclusively responsible for regulating this sector, with the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada serving as the regulator.

Today we are calling on the government to take this division out and fix its flaws over the summer. We want the government to come back in the fall with a framework that does not give Bay

Street an undue advantage over other financial institutions, that respects Quebec's and the provinces' jurisdiction and that delegates the administration of the framework to an appropriate agency.

Since financial technology or fintech companies are not federally regulated, Ottawa has opted to regulate them indirectly by controlling the manner in which the banks can transact with them. Specifically, Bill C-69 provides that banks and other federally regulated financial institutions will be covered by the new act. They will be required to co-operate with fintech companies, but they may do so only in accordance with federal rules and standards.

As for institutions that are not federally regulated, they are ignored. They can opt in voluntarily if they get the approval of their province, which would then have to waive the right to apply its own laws to the portion of their activities that comes under the open banking system. For now, Bill C-69 does not affect insurers, due to the sensitive nature of the medical data they hold, or to intermediaries like brokers, but the framework is likely to expand to cover them in the future.

The specific rules and standards that will apply to the sector, particularly in terms of consumer protection and financial liability, will be set out in another bill that is due out in the fall, but the decision to make it exclusively federal is being made now, in Bill C-69. We urge the government to take out this division, improve it over the summer and present us with a better law this fall. Taking out this division will not delay the bill's coming into force.

In practical terms, under this section of Bill C-69, the Quebec Consumer Protection Act and the Quebec Act Respecting the Protection of Personal Information could cease to apply to financial institutions for any activities related to open financial services. The impact of an exclusively federal open banking system on the prudential obligations of Quebec financial institutions, as set out by the Autorité des marchés financiers, is unclear at this point.

In addition to forcing Quebec to transfer legislative power to Ottawa, Bill C-69 puts Quebec's institutions at a disadvantage with respect to federal institutions. While banks will have only one set of regulations to follow, an institution like Desjardins would be caught between two governments: the Government of Quebec, for its general operations, and the federal government, for its technological interactions with customers.

Being subject to two uncoordinated regulatory bodies could be downright dysfunctional and give banks an egregious advantage over co-ops and trust companies. Bill C-69 gives Bay Street an advantage over other institutions like co-ops and credit unions. As a result—

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Lac-Saint-Jean is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, there are people talking. If people want to talk, they should do so in the lobbies.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: That is a good suggestion. Anyone who wants to have a conversation should take it out into the lobbies. That is what they are there for.

The hon. member for Joliette.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I also thank my colleague from Lac-Saint-Jean.

Bill C-69 places Quebec in a dilemma in which there are no good options.

If we refuse to join the federal framework, our institutions will stay trapped in the 20th century while their federal competitors step into the technological 21st century. Maybe we could let our financial institutions opt in to the federal framework, but then Quebec would have to waive the right to apply its own laws to their activities that come under the open banking system.

Then there is the worst-case scenario. In order to survive against its federal competitors, an institution like Desjardins could choose to stop being a Quebec institution within the meaning of Quebec's Cooperatives Act and become a federal institution under Canadian co-operative bank legislation. Trust companies would face the same choice. Since the open banking system could eventually be expanded to cover insurance, all of our insurance companies could switch over to federal regulation.

If this worst-case scenario comes to pass, the entire financial sector and all of its activities will be completely outside Quebec's jurisdiction. That is a serious threat to Montreal's status as a financial hub. In short, by using its power over banks to regulate all companies that interact with them, Ottawa is trying to force Quebec and the provinces out of the financial sector, which it failed to do when it was trying to regulate securities.

Rather than taking the unilateral, centralist route, Ottawa should have chosen co-operation. It could have called a federal-provincial finance ministers' working meeting on open banking. It could have encouraged them to release a joint statement at the end of this meeting in which the governments announce their intention of developing a common regulatory approach with a clear deadline, such as 2025, and possibly setting up a federal-provincial office.

It could have sent a clear message to all financial institutions, not just banks, telling them to agree on a common technology, such as a secure data transfer protocol, because open banking is coming. Lastly, it could have worked on common technical regulations on accreditation rules for fintech companies, security standards, clarification of financial liability, consumer and data protection, and other such matters.

This is what we are asking the government to do today. We are asking it to take out the division on open banking that centralizes the sector exclusively at the federal level. We are asking it to take a few months to coordinate with the various players and the provinces and then to come back in the fall with a framework that respects jurisdictions and does not put provincially regulated institutions at a disadvantage.

The government could have chosen another model for the open banking system. There is the Interac approach based on self-regulation, as well as the securities approach. Securities fall mainly under

provincial jurisdiction, but Ottawa has laws governing federally incorporated companies. The Supreme Court has also recognized federal jurisdiction over systemic risk in the financial sector. In Quebec, the Autorité des marchés financiers is the regulator.

To ensure that businesses could raise capital across Canada and that registrations in one province would be recognized everywhere, governments decided to coordinate. That is why Quebec's Business Corporations Act is very similar to the Canada Business Corporations Act and to the corporation laws of all the other provinces. The same is true for all legislation governing the various aspects of securities.

Quebec retains its legislative powers. The Quebec act may be stricter in some respects. For example, Quebec is the only province that requires a French version for all corporations registered with the Autorité des marchés financiers. However, this version must comply with the common standard adopted by all governments. This is the approach I prefer. This is the approach preferred by the Bloc Québécois.

There is another concern. In Bill C-69, the government delegates the administration of the framework to the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada, an agency that mainly promotes financial literacy and that does not have any of the required expertise. In committee, FCAC representatives acknowledged that they did not have expertise in sharing financial data in a way that minimizes the obvious cybersecurity risks. They also told us they do not currently have a plan for developing the expertise needed to oversee the security aspect of open banking.

We also asked several questions that the FCAC representatives said they were unable to answer. For example, since fintech companies are not banks, they are not federally regulated. We asked if the government had obtained the consent of the provinces, particularly Quebec, which has its own civil laws, before tabling this bill. They were unable to answer. The answer is no.

● (1230)

During the briefing on the notice of ways and means preceding Bill C-69, it was my understanding that provincially regulated financial institutions could join the federal framework if they so chose, provided that the province consents and declines to regulate on its own those activities involving the open banking system. Is this in fact the case? I am unable to get an answer.

Which provincial laws will have to take a back seat to the federal laws? There is no answer.

Who will be tasked with certifying the technology companies, Ottawa or the Autorité des marchés financiers? I am unable to get an answer.

Will Quebec's Consumer Protection Act apply to the activities of the open banking system? There is no answer.

Government Orders

In the case of fraud or damages, will it be possible to launch a class action suit under the Civil Code or the Consumer Protection Act against a fintech company? Again, I am unable to get an answer.

Will the sharing of financial responsibilities between the financial institution and the technology company necessitate changes to the financial institutions' prudential standards? Will the Autorité des marchés financiers need to change its rules to comply with the federal framework? Here again, I cannot get an answer.

None of this is surprising. The Financial Consumer Agency of Canada is not well positioned to manage this framework. It learned it would be receiving this role just before the budget was tabled. This is ridiculous.

To avoid a disaster or some risky back-peddaling, let us act today. Let us take this division out of Bill C-69, do our job better and come back with a good bill this fall.

• (1235)

[*English*]

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his work at the finance committee. I have enjoyed working with him. I understand that there are interjurisdictional issues that the member has rightfully pointed out in the debate today in relation to the consumer-driven banking framework. He and I have had some good discussions about that, and I look forward to more.

There are a lot of other things in the budget implementation act. I understand that the Bloc will not be supporting the BIA for the reasons that members on that side have given, but could the member speak to the merits of the BIA in relation to, for example, the Canada carbon rebate for small businesses, the investment tax credits for clean-tech manufacturing and clean hydrogen, the new research infrastructure funding, funding for grads and postgrads, or a national school food program? I believe that the Bloc is in support of all of those things.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary for his remarks. I really like working with him too.

Bill C-69 seeks to amend 67 different statutes. It contains some good things and some that are not so good.

For example, it contains the global minimum tax aimed at countering tax havens, and that is good. My colleague was talking about credits for what the government calls “clean” hydrogen. In fact, this is an \$11-billion subsidy for the oil companies and the hydrocarbon industry to help gas companies with that. We do not support this. However, we do support the measure that earmarks \$1 billion for the school food program. This was one of our asks.

And so it goes. There are things we support and things we do not support. Overall, the cons outweigh the pros, so we will not be voting for this bill.

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to my colleague's remarks.

I want to pick up on what he said at the end of his speech, when he called this budget ridiculous. Can my colleague elaborate on the ridiculousness of the current government?

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for his question and for all his interventions in the House.

In my speech, I focused on division 16, the open banking system. Clearly, the government did not consult Quebec, the other provinces or any market players. The sector, in other words the business community, has been asking the government to legislate since about 2016. The government finally presented a rough sketch of a bill, but there are major problems with what it is proposing. It really seems like the government does not listen and is slow to act. It does not do much. When it finally does do something, it creates serious problems, as it did in this case. Everything will be decided next fall in a future bill. What is being decided here in this bill is that the federal government is taking control of all jurisdictions that should normally be shared.

I therefore urge my colleague to talk to his Conservative Party colleagues about voting with us to have this division taken out of the bill.

[*English*]

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of the items brought up by my colleague is a national school food program, and I want to touch on that.

We all know of and see the great programs that Quebec put into place for child care and school food programs. I am wondering if the member could speak to the difference those programs have made in the lives of children and students and how important it is that children across Canada have access to school food programs, in contrast to what we are seeing right now, which is the Conservatives blocking, delaying and voting against essential programs that Canadians across the country rely on.

• (1240)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her thoughtful comment.

I would say to her that, after the Quiet Revolution, Quebec started developing a social model, Quebec's social-democratic model. This model continued to develop while the governments of Jean Chrétien and Paul Martin slashed transfers to the provinces, particularly for social services, in order to balance their budgets.

Government Orders

We saw poverty shoot up and the wealth gap widen significantly in the other provinces. Meanwhile, Quebec used the means at hand to implement various measures with the help of community and social groups, people who believe in the redistribution of wealth and equal opportunity for all. Everyone tightened their belts to implement these measures. That is when the family policy, including child care centres, was rolled out, allowing more women to join the workforce. That is also when we adopted a pharmacare plan that covers people without prior coverage. That is all very limited, but while the federal government was slashing transfers by 40%, we put this in place to preserve the social fabric.

As expert studies show, at that time, the level of inequality in the other provinces began to look similar to that of the United States, while the conditions in Quebec began to look more like what is found in Scandinavian countries. There are a great many elements, and we always get community groups involved.

[*English*]

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are poor, a theme that is all too common after nine years under the Liberal-NDP government. Canadians know that they could do all the right things: They could go to school, have a part-time job while they are going to school, make ends meet, get a job, and work and put in as much as they can to save up. However, at the end of the day, the government will do everything in its power to work against all that hard work.

The Canadian experience, or the Canadian dream, that we used to have in this country used to include things that would seem very basic for any country. If people put in hard work, they could own a home, own a business and send their kids to a good playground or a school where they would not find such things as needles and crack pipes. They would be able to just walk down the street without fear of being mugged or fear of going through tent cities such as those we are seeing across this country. However, after nine years of the Liberal-NDP government, that experience is gone. Nine out of 10 young people say that they have lost the dream of home ownership. They see a Liberal-NDP government with a carbon tax scam, which has been increased once again. Because of this, single moms have to make decisions about skipping meals now.

There is a woke, ideologically extremist government that will do everything in its power to make sure Canadians will never be successful. This is because we have an out-of-touch Prime Minister who has probably never had to fill his own car with gas or go grocery shopping on his own. I am not even sure if he knows how to open doors anymore. He probably needs to be retrained after next year, when he is not going to be prime minister anymore. The sad part is that the incoming Liberal leader is no different. It is Mark “carbon tax” Carney who is going to be crowned. The pain that the Liberal-NDP government is inflicting on Canadians does nothing to these trust-fund babies or these elitists, but it does everything to harm the middle class and workers.

We do not have to look very far to see the pain the government has caused after nine years, with nothing but blind support from the NDP. On top of the tent cities, there are food banks with larger and larger lineups at them and with different demographics than there were nine years ago. In fact, people can have a well-paying job and

still have to line up at a food bank. They could be a teacher or a nurse but still end up sleeping in their car because, after nine years, the Liberal-NDP government has doubled housing costs. The government spent \$89 billion on housing. Rents and mortgages have doubled; in fact, rents are at the highest rate they have ever been in Canadian history.

However, this is no surprise, because we have an out-of-touch Liberal-NDP government that has no clue. According to them, Canadians have never had it so good. However, none of the Liberal or NDP MPs or the Prime Minister actually talk to Canadians. They would rather rub elbows, as Mark “carbon tax” Carney does, with the elites of the world. They would rather do that than sit at a dinner table with everyday Canadians and workers, such as the ones who cannot afford groceries anymore, who are deciding whether they should get that extra grocery item or who are thinking about whether they can actually afford heat or rent this month. Kids are starving because of the cost of food. That is nine years of the Liberal-NDP government.

The problem is that productivity in this country has declined once again, for the seventh consecutive quarter. GDP per capita tells us how productive the country is. I spoke on Bill C-69 just weeks ago; at that time, GDP per capita was at the lowest rate since 2016. The week before that, GDP per capita was at the worst rate since 2017. Today GDP per capita is worse than it was in 2014.

● (1245)

Canadians have been hit with 40-year highs in inflation because of the Liberal-NDP government's out-of-control spending. They got the most rapid interest rate hikes seen in Canadian history. They got slammed by a carbon tax scam that only went up, did nothing for the environment and only made the cost of gas, groceries and home heating even more expensive. Not only did the government do that, but it also made sure that investment in this country fled. More than \$200 billion of investment has already fled since 2016. That is the record of the current government; however, again, Canadians have never had it so good according to the Liberals.

In fact, Canadians have had it so good that they want to leave. More Canadians are leaving each year now because of the high cost of living. The Canadian dream that everyone thought of or came here for, just as my family did, is gone, and the proof is in the numbers: the food bank usage, the people fleeing from here or thinking about leaving here, the number of bankruptcies and the insolvencies.

I will give an example of a small business owner. Small business owners are the ones the government considers to be tax cheats. I have a friend in the GTA, who left everything back at home and took the big risk of coming to this country. He came at a good time, when taxes were low and rent was half of what it is today. That was under a Stephen Harper government. It was a time when people knew that they could put in hard work and get something back.

Government Orders

He started his first job as a janitor in this country; now he is a very successful transport owner. What happened in that time, and what has happened to him now? He was able to save up. He was able to send his kids to a good school, and now they are a part of that business as well.

Now he is being taxed more than ever before by the ideology-driven government. In this country, after nine years, success is vilified. If people make money, the Liberals are going to take it. Now my friend has been hit with higher carbon tax costs; he cannot find workers, because the government has broken the immigration system; and, on top of all that, extortion has happened to him. After nine years of the Liberal-NDP government, he is getting hit with every single bad policy: He is paying higher taxes, he is not getting the labour he needs so he can grow his business, and his success is not only vilified by the government, but now extortion is happening to him because the soft-on-crime policies of the current government have done that to him and his business.

Now, this person's family lives in fear every single day. The family members live in separate hotel rooms. They have bulletproof windows on their house and cars. On top of that, they are now thinking about leaving. This is a story that is all too common in this country after nine years of the Liberal-NDP government. By every measure, productivity has gone down; that always affects the most vulnerable people and the middle class, the ones whom the Liberal-NDP government is supposedly always standing up for.

However, hope is on the horizon; it cannot come soon enough. Under a common-sense Conservative government, we would turn this country around. That Canadian dream would be revered once again around the world.

Under the leadership of the member for Carleton, we would axe the tax. We would get rid of the carbon tax for all and bring down the cost of gas, groceries and home heating. We would make sure business owners can keep that money, so they could invest more in themselves and in workers.

We would fix the budget. We would bring in a dollar-for-dollar law, so that a dollar spent needs to have a dollar of savings somewhere, and this would help lower inflation and interest rates. The current government does not understand this, because the Liberals think that budgets balance themselves.

We would build the homes, not more of the bureaucracy that we have seen under the government, which has doubled the cost of housing in all respects.

We would stop the crime by bringing back mandatory minimum sentences so that we can have safe streets and safe communities once again.

Under a common-sense Conservative government led by the member for Carleton, we would bring home that Canadian dream once again. This is something that, after nine years, the out-of-touch Liberal-NDP government has destroyed.

• (1250)

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the mem-

ber's speech was a bunch of slogans strung together with a lot of falsehoods scattered throughout.

The main one I would take issue with right now is that the member blames the federal government for global inflation. Members in the Conservative Party do this on a daily basis. This is interesting because every country in the world, postpandemic, has been dealing with an inflationary environment. The member opposite does not acknowledge that and is trying to pin that on the federal government.

In relation to this, though, we have the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio, the lowest deficit and the strongest projected GDP growth in the G7. We are rated number one for budget balance by the International Monetary Fund. We have 141% postpandemic job recovery, which is higher than that of the United States, and we have maintained our AAA credit rating. We are the first country in the G7 to have experienced a rate cut by our central bank. How does that square with the member opposite's claims?

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, it is a little rich, coming from the specific member, to be talking about falsehoods.

If the Liberals want to talk about falsehoods, they should remember how they sold the carbon tax scam. They said it would be revenue-neutral. Well, that was false. They said it would somehow fix the forest fires and the environment. That was false. In fact, their own environmental department says they do not even track how much this carbon tax scam brings down emissions, and emissions went up. The Liberals know it is just like the Prime Minister: not worth the cost.

On top of that, the member wants to talk about inflation. The carbon tax scam added to inflation. It is a big chunk of today's overall CPI number that we see. In fact, if the Liberals were to take away the carbon tax scam, as Conservatives would do, it would dramatically bring down inflation, which means we could bring down interest rates.

This carbon tax scam is nothing but a Ponzi scheme under the Liberal government, supported by the NDP, because all they want to do is protect their leaders' pensions.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we heard my colleague talk about small business. As the former small business critic for the federal NDP, I know that the Conservatives were literally invisible during COVID-19.

Government Orders

They did not bring any new ideas to help protect workers or to help small businesses survive. The NDP brought ideas to work with the government and to make sure that we protected jobs. In addition, when it came to credit card merchant fees, we saw the big credit card companies raking over small businesses, but the Conservatives sat silent. It took years of the federal NDP putting pressure on the Liberal government to actually cap merchant fees so that we were in line with Australia and the European Union.

We are bringing forward ideas to deal with the labour market crisis, such as child care, dental care and pharmacare. We heard from small business that child care is critical to unlocking workers that need to participate in the workforce.

Why are the Conservatives blocking supports, such as child care, dental care and pharmacare, for small businesses?

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if he had been an effective small business critic, he would still be in that role.

I will tell Canadians why he is not. It is because the NDP has propped up this corrupt, inept, incompetent government. In fact, the member talks about small businesses, but it is because of them that more small businesses are going insolvent and that there are more bankruptcies. The NDP helped jack up the carbon tax scam. That is not just for businesses; it is the workers of those small businesses—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1255)

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I know the hon. House leader for the NDP is way down at the end, but I am having trouble hearing the member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

The hon. member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that they might be a little farther away after the next election, but that is okay. They can heckle me all they want.

Canadians know that workers were hurt the most by the Liberal-NDP government's woke, extremist, ideological thinking, which drove them into food banks more than ever before. However, they take pride in saying that they are somehow the saviours of this country. In fact, we just have to look at their record. Ever since the NDP has been propping the Liberals up, there has been more food bank usage, more bankruptcies and more insolvencies. Moreover, the workers they supposedly stand up for are impacted the most by their failed policies.

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere pleasure to stand before the House in support of the budget implementation act, 2024, No. 1, which would implement many of our government's key priorities in budget 2024, entitled "Fairness For Every Generation."

All children deserve a fair start in life, and I think we can all agree on that, yet nearly one in four kids in Canada lives in a household with too little income to buy enough to eat, impacting their health and their opportunities to learn and grow. That is just not right. Therefore, in budget 2024, we proposed a new national school food program that would help ensure children across Canada

get the food they need to thrive, regardless of their family background.

The children of today are tomorrow's doctors, nurses, electricians, teachers, scientists and small business owners. By supporting them, we lay the groundwork for a brighter tomorrow. Therefore, I urge my hon. colleagues to pass Bill C-69 swiftly so we can get this program up and running and do right by Canada's kids.

We are proposing to invest \$1 billion over five years into the national school food program, which will provide 400,000 more kids across the country every year with food in school. That is 400,000 more kids beyond those currently served by the patchwork of provincial, local and charitable programs that currently exist across Canada. By working together with provincial, territorial and indigenous partners, we will expand access to school food programs across the country as early as the 2024-25 school year, which is incredible.

For kids, this investment will mean not being hungry at school or missing crucial nutrients from their diet. That is important because studies show that students who consistently consumed a nutritious breakfast and lunch achieved higher grades in reading, math and science compared to their peers.

Meanwhile, for moms and dads, and caregivers across Canada, this investment will mean peace of mind knowing that their kids are eating healthy meals and are well looked after in school. Healthy and nutritious food for all our kids is an investment into the future. Parents will no longer have to decide on whether they purchase healthy and often more expensive alternatives or pay their rent on time.

Even with inflation easing significantly over the last year, specifically over the last four months, which has led to Canada to be the first country in the G7 to have its central bank cut rates, affordability pressures are still causing many more Canadian families to face food insecurity, which, frankly, should worry all of us. After all, food insecurity is strongly linked to poorer health outcomes, including higher rates of type 2 diabetes, heart disease and high blood pressure, but also higher rates of mental health issues like depression and anxiety. All of this puts a large burden on our already stressed health care system.

Government Orders

The national school food program will be a safety net for the parents who need this support the most, including first nations, Inuit and Métis families, many of which have some of the highest historic rates of food insecurity in Canada. Once up and running, it will save an average participating family with two children as much as \$800 per year in grocery costs. That is extra money families can direct toward clothing, toys and books for their kids, as well as groceries and other essential goods.

Further to that point, evidence shows us that school meal programs do not just reduce health inequities for kids. They also promote sustainable food systems and practices, and create more jobs in both the food service and agriculture sectors, especially for women. This is feminist social policy in action, and it is smart economic policy too.

Speaking of that, something that should always be mentioned when we are talking about vulnerable kids and youth is that we have done a lot. That is why we have made generational investments into the Canada child benefit, which has helped lift hundreds of thousands of children out of poverty since its launch in 2016. About \$91 million comes into my riding of Whitby on a yearly basis to support 14,000 families just in my riding alone.

• (1300)

This program provides families with up to nearly \$8,000 per child per year to provide the essentials that kids need. That is why we are continuing to deliver an early learning and child care system across all provinces and territories, which has already cut fees for regulated child care to an average of \$10 a day or less in eight provinces and territories, and by 50% or more in all others.

We are also improving access to dental health care for children under the age of 12 through the Canada dental benefit, and soon for children under 18 with the Canadian dental care plan, so that parents do not have to choose between taking care of their kids' teeth and putting food on the table.

To help younger Canadians get the mental health and addiction support right when and where they need it most, we are also launching a new \$500-million youth mental health fund. My youth council was a group of young people who identified this issue a number of years ago and has advocated for more supports for youth mental health. Therefore, it is great to see this in the budget. This new fund will help community mental health organizations across the country provide more access to mental health care for younger Canadians right in their communities, so we can help more kids and youth live healthy, happy, supported and fulfilled lives. Canada's success depends on the success of younger generations.

The national school food program is at the top of our list. It is a generational investment to help families and make life more affordable across the country. Thanks to this crucial investment, we will be helping families by ensuring that kids do not spend the day at school hungry, and at the same time bringing peace of mind and relief to parents and caregivers. However, we cannot do it alone.

I hope my honourable colleagues will support Bill C-69 and join us in our vision of a Canada where every child and youth has enough food to eat to focus in school and reach their full potential.

Mr. Eric Melillo (Kenora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member across the way spoke about a lot of the government's programs and the big spending announcements that it has brought forward over the last few years, including in this budget. Unfortunately, it is the government's policies, its spending and programs that have led to the cost-of-living crisis we are seeing after nine years. Instead, could the member speak to when his party will finally listen to common-sense Conservatives and Canadians who are struggling, and listen to our plan to axe the tax and stop inflationary spending so we can help address this cost-of-living crisis that Canadian households are facing right across the country?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that the Conservatives have only slogans. They produce no solutions or offer any solutions of any kind for any of the issues that Canadians are facing today. Our government is busy putting forward solutions and implementation plans and making investments in Canadians. We know that we have to invest in people to create the kind of prosperity and country that we want.

Obviously, our country is going through the same inflationary crisis that the entire globe has been going through postpandemic, but we have fared much better than many other countries, and that is clear based on the statistics. We are the first country whose central bank has cut interest rates. We should all be very proud of that.

We can invest in Canadians and make life more affordable at the same time.

• (1305)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are accusing the Conservatives of not having a plan, but the Liberals' plan is to spend money in jurisdictions that are not its own, that they are not responsible for and that are the sole purview of Quebec and the provinces, by imposing conditions. Quebec has established social programs, child care, dental care, health insurance and housing solutions. The federal government is investing billions of dollars in our areas of jurisdiction. At the same time, it is not spending money on strengthening its own social programs, such as old age security, employment insurance and its immigration policies.

Does my colleague not think that his government's priority should be to invest in its own areas of jurisdiction?

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Bloc Québécois regularly brings up interjurisdictional issues when it comes to the federal government making key investments to support Canadians. Whether they live in Quebec or any other province, all Canadians deserve investments in the kinds of supports they need to solve the affordable housing crisis, to create a stronger social safety net, to increase research and productivity and innovation in our economy. Why would Quebec not want to benefit from those key investments?

We, as a federal government, would not be carrying out our duties if we were not trying to work with Quebec and ensuring it gets the investments it needs as well.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are all hearing from constituents across Canada about the tremendous toll that the cost of living is taking as it continues to skyrocket.

One group, in particular, I am hearing from in my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith are those living with disabilities. It is not enough for people living with disabilities to receive \$200 a month. There was a glimmer of hope that people living with disabilities would finally be lifted out of poverty, that they would be consulted by the government in the way they deserve to be.

When will the Liberals finally consult with those living with disabilities? When will they ensure that people living with disabilities are no longer legislated into poverty?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: Mr. Speaker, since being elected in 2019, I have been an advocate for individuals with disabilities and have advocated for the Canada disability benefit from day one. I have been in touch with my constituents living with disabilities and I feel strongly about the \$200 more per month, notwithstanding that provinces and territories have neglected to provide the supports necessary to individuals living with a disability. It is within their jurisdiction to do so, but, we, as a federal government, are stepping up yet again to supplement where provinces and territories happen to be failing Canadians. We are making the investments.

I do agree with the member that \$200 is not going to lift all people living with disabilities out of poverty, but it is certainly a good start and it will bring provinces to the table, when we can tell them that they should not be cutting back on any of the supports for individuals with disabilities, so in the future we can raise that amount and ensure we lift all people living with a disability out of poverty.

Mr. Michael Coteau (Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the Conservatives do not believe it is a good idea to invest in children. We are talking about a budget that would help feed young people who need food, fix teeth, invest in mental health and the most very basic form of child care, which is essential for strong families.

Why does the parliamentary secretary believe that investing in children is one of the best things this government can do?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: Mr. Speaker, children are our future. I have young children. All of us with children certainly understand that they are the future of our country. We could make no better invest-

ment in the future generation than investing in children, whether it be food, dental care, pharmacare, child care, all the things that our government is doing to support families, so they can achieve and have a fair chance at success.

• (1310)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in talking about the last 18 years, it has been the best of times and the worst of times. It is the best of times, as one is well aware, for the billionaires and for profitable corporations in Canada. We saw this under the Harper tax haven treaties, the infamous treaties that cost Canada \$30 billion each and every year, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer. It is the best of times for the oil and gas CEOs, who have received massive subsidies over the last 18 years, nine years of the dismal Harper regime and nine years continuing under the Liberal government.

It has been the best of times for the banks, with \$116 billion in liquidity supports under the Harper regime and with \$750 billion in liquidity supports under the Liberal government. We have seen that it has been the best of times for the billionaires and the wealthiest among us.

It has been the worst of times for everyone else. We saw, under the Harper regime, how food bank lineups doubled and how the cost of housing doubled. Since many of those policies were continued under the new Liberal government, of course, because they are bad policies, we saw food bank lineups double and housing prices double. Conservatives, unfortunately, just seem to have amnesia about how dismal the nine years of the Harper regime were. It created the conditions for the situation we see today.

However, this speech is not about the Conservatives and their lamentable record, with the most appalling government we have ever had in our history. It is not about the Liberal government not stepping up for Canadians. It is about, really, the hope that the NDP engenders because, being the adults in the room, under the leadership of the member for Burnaby South, the NDP got to work in that situation to ensure that Canadians actually had the wherewithal to put food on their tables and to keep roofs over their heads.

We have talked, in the past months, about many of the NDP initiatives. There was the anti-scab legislation that protects workers, for the first time in the federal regime. It is about workers being protected from replacement workers taking their jobs during strikes or lockouts. We talked about the dental care program. It is important to note that 150,000 seniors, just in the first few weeks of the NDP dental care program, have benefited from getting services. Those are seniors who, many for the first time in their lives or the first time in decades, have access to dental care. That relieves the pressure on our acute health care system because those seniors will no longer have to go to the emergency wards of our hospitals across the country to get emergency dental treatment.

Government Orders

The pharmacare program that the NDP has brought in, which has passed in the House and which hopefully will pass in the other place shortly, will make a difference for six million Canadians with diabetes, who often pay \$1,000 or \$1,500 a month for their diabetes medications and devices, and for nine million Canadian women who have to look for contraception. Finally, women's reproductive health freedom will be maintained because it will no longer be a question of whether they can afford access to contraception. There will be nine million Canadians benefiting from those measures, as well, from the NDP.

I could go on and on about other pieces of legislation the NDP has brought forward. We are ensuring a transition to clean energy to fight back against the climate crisis, and ensuring protection from food price gouging and gas price gouging by the enhancements that the member for Burnaby South offered to the Competition Bureau. All of those things are going to make a difference in people's lives. There is no doubt about that. The budget is part of this drive by the NDP to actually address what were systemic failures of the Harper regime, sadly continued by the Liberal government rather than putting into place the kind of fair tax system that Canadians do want to see and the structured services that actually benefit Canadians.

Under the Harper regime, we saw how those services were slashed, badly, to allow billionaires to take their money offshore. That was the priority of the dismal, horrible nine years under the Harper regime. It was the worst government in Canadian history and the most unbelievably cruel government in Canadian history.

• (1315)

The former Harper government forced veterans to travel long distances to access whatever services they deigned to allow veterans to continue to access, forced seniors to work years longer before they could even access a pension and slashed services, including health care services, left and right, indiscriminately, so that Mr. Harper and the group around him could give massive handouts to the banks, the billionaires and offshore tax havens. Unfortunately, Liberals continued those practices until the NDP stepped up in a minority parliament, first under COVID, forcing the government to actually put into place measures that would benefit Canadians in getting through the pandemic and now, over the last year or two, ensuring services that actually benefit Canadians. This budget bill is one of those examples.

I will note that Conservatives have had absolutely nothing to offer except nuisance amendments, and they will keep us voting for a number of hours just to basically delete portions of the bill, not in any methodical way, not in any thoughtful way and not to benefit any Canadian, but just to delay House time because that is what Conservatives seem to do. They seem to obstruct and to block. Never has a single Conservative MP stepped up for their constituents in order to make sure that there were better services in place. We saw that under the dental care debate, in the pharmacare debate, and we saw that numerous times. We are seeing that today, with respect to the affordable housing provisions that the NDP has forced the government to add.

In this budget bill, there is funding that includes universal single-payer pharmacare for diabetes, which would help six million Cana-

dians. Just to be clear, we are talking about 18,000 Canadians in each and every Conservative, Liberal, Bloc and NDP riding in the country. Eighteen thousand of our constituents, on average, in each riding in the country, would benefit from the provisions of what the NDP has forced into the budget implementation act. How could a member of Parliament vote against 18,000 of their own constituents? That is something they will have to reconcile with their constituents when they go back home.

There are also NDP provisions around building more affordable housing. Forty years ago, members will recall that the former Liberal government ended the national housing program. Since then, we have seen a steady deterioration in affordable housing. The cost of housing doubled under the dismal, terrible Harper regime, and it has doubled again under the current government. The NDP has forced provisions to ensure that we are actually building more affordable homes and preserving affordable housing. Affordable housing generally is 30% of income. It is not in assuming that Canadians can pay whatever cost the market gives them.

This budget bill also would establish a national school food program for children who are going to school hungry. It would reverse cuts in a number of areas, including the cuts to health care that the Harper regime put in place and the cuts to indigenous services that the Liberal government was proposing. It would establish a dedicated youth mental health fund and would double the volunteer firefighters tax credit. I wanted to praise the member for Courtenay—Alberni, just for a moment, for his good work in bringing that to reality. This would make a big difference for volunteer firefighters right across the country, and search and rescue volunteers, who have not benefited from the tax credits that are in place.

This is not an NDP budget. An NDP budget would actually ensure fair taxation. It would ensure that the billionaires and the wealthy corporations pay their fair share. It does make a number of steps that would make a difference.

I do want to address one critical issue that I know the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam has raised repeatedly in the House of Commons, as has the entire NDP caucus, and that is about a disability benefit that only provides a very small measure of support for people with disabilities. Earlier, I mentioned the massive amounts that have been poured into billionaires and offshore tax havens, banks, and oil and gas CEOs. Both Conservatives and Liberals, over the years, have poured hundreds of billions of dollars into the wealthiest and most privileged among us. It is a terrible legacy that the government has refused to put in place an adequate income for people with disabilities. That must change. The NDP will continue to fight for people with disabilities and will continue to fight to put in place an adequate income for people with disabilities.

Government Orders

• (1320)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one way I like to compare the contrast between the Conservative Party and the progressive budgets that we have brought forward is to look at it from the perspective that the government understands the needs Canadians have. That is why we have been able to develop a budget that deals with issues such as disability benefits, a pharmacare program and a dental care program. The member made reference to anti-scab legislation.

I am thinking that, when progressive minds come together, in fact, it can make a difference. That is in contrast to what we hear from the Conservatives, where their attitude seems to be to cut, and they spread misinformation through social media. I am wondering if the member could provide his thoughts on that aspect.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Winnipeg North and I would agree that the Harper regime was absolutely the most ruthless, cruel, terribly incompetent government we have ever seen. It was appalling.

I was in the House during that time. It is unbelievable how cruel Conservatives were to Canadians and how incompetent they were. In terms of financial management, Conservative financial management is an oxymoron. They are terrible when it comes to managing money, terrible at treating Canadians. It was an absolutely abysmal regime. It was nine years of cruelty and nine years of incompetence. It was an appallingly bad government, and it was thrown out because of all those things.

I know Canadians will remember that the next time they go to the polls. The reality is that anything good the Liberals have done has been because of the NDP forcing them to do it, whether it is dental care, anti-scab legislation, pharmacare or affordable housing. It is all thanks to the NDP.

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this member has been here as long as I have been, and I cannot believe that he can actually come up with this fiction. What he is saying is absolute fiction. The only people who could run the economy worse than the Liberal government would be an NDP government. I can assure Canadians right now that if he is so caught up in the polls and if he believes that people will see what is going on, I would ask him to withdraw their support today from the Liberal government. Let us go to the polls to find out what people really think and see who can actually grow this economy.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, we will be going to the polls. We will have millions of Canadian seniors who would have benefited from the NDP dental care program and hundreds of thousands of Canadians who would have benefited from pharmacare. Conservatives would have to justify, in their ridings, why it is that they want to slash all those programs. They were a terrible government.

I would caution my colleague, who I have a lot of respect for, that all he has to do is consult the fiscal period returns published by the Ministry of Finance. It is not a hotbed of democratic socialism or social democracy. It has shown, over the last 40 years, that the best governments at managing money in Canada have been NDP governments.

We are better than Conservatives and better than Liberals. We make sure the priorities are providing supports, providing education, providing health care and providing services to Canadians. We do not give money away. We do not blow the wad on billionaires and banks. That is what Conservatives do, and that is why they were thrown out in 2015.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it was fascinating to listen to my colleague actually bring a little bit of truth to this troubled place.

What we have seen from the Conservatives is this endless gaslighting, where they get up and talk about children not being able to eat and talk about how children have to go to food banks. Their leader, who lives in a 19-room mansion paid for by the taxpayers, with his own private chef, ordered all the sock puppets to vote against a program to get food to children.

We asked the Conservatives why they voted against food for children. They want children suffering so that they can blame our weak Prime Minister for it. It is the same as when Conservatives talked about the mental health crisis, yet they had the gall to vote against a suicide prevention hotline.

Meanwhile, New Democrats showed up. We got the national suicide prevention action plan because we actually care. We got dental care for seniors because we care. We got diabetes medications for seniors and for people because we care.

The member for Carleton, who has never had a job and who lives in a 19-room mansion in Stornoway, would get all his sock puppets to cut all those important investments, while they are saying that people are suffering.

I would like to ask my hon. colleague what he thinks it is about the Conservatives' constant gaslighting of the Canadian people, when they really do not give a damn about those who are suffering.

• (1325)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, the member for Timmins—James Bay does care. That is why he was voted by all parliamentarians just a few years ago the best constituency politician in the country, because he cares about his constituents in Timmins—James Bay. It is true—

Mr. Marty Morantz: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The statement that the member for Timmins—James Bay was supported by all parliamentarians is not true. I would ask the member to correct the record and withdraw that remark.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the member was here when the time came to vote, but that is okay. I do not need his vote to still be recognized as a strong, hard-working member—

The Deputy Speaker: I think we are descending into the weeds.

The hon. member for South Shore—St. Margarets is rising on a point of order.

Government Orders

Mr. Rick Perkins: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Timmins—James Bay is breaking his own rules in his own private member's bill when he excessively uses the term “gaslighting”. What is he going to use—

The Deputy Speaker: I think we are just descending into debate.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, voila, Conservatives are gaslighting us, so I would ask the member to withdraw—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby has a whole 20 seconds.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague from Timmins—James Bay, although I think his reference to Conservatives does a disservice to socks. The reality is that Conservatives have not contributed anything to the debates in this House for years, and that is a tragedy. They will have to reckon with their constituents when they go back with their record of not doing anything for them and wanting to cut every benefit that they have.

Mr. Maninder Sidhu (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Export Promotion, International Trade and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise in the House today to speak about our Liberal government's plan, through budget 2024, to support Canadians both now and for future generations. It is a budget that I know will help grow our economy, help young Canadians and bring meaningful investments to support so many families in my riding of Brampton East.

Through budget 2024, our government is taking swift and bold action to ensure that when young Canadians are ready to rent or buy their own homes, they have affordable housing options to choose from. With investments such as the new loan funding program for apartment constructions, we can help to ensure that they get the keys into young Canadians' hands faster.

By 2031, budget 2024 will help unlock close to four million new homes and alleviate the pressures. Our government is also providing a \$400-million top-up to the \$4-billion housing accelerator fund, which is fast-tracking the construction of over 750,000 homes across provinces and territories. As well, we have taken the necessary action with programs that support housing infrastructure through the Canada housing infrastructure fund, investing \$6 billion over 10 years. This will help communities to have the critical infrastructure necessary to bring more houses online and into housing markets faster than ever before.

Through budget 2024, our government is delivering on our promise to Canadians of fairness for all generations. First-time homebuyers can turn their dreams of home ownership into reality because we have enhanced the homebuyers plan so that they can use the tax benefits of an RRSP to save up to \$25,000 more towards their down payment. We are also increasing the amortization period on mortgages from 25 to 30 years for first-time homebuyers purchasing new builds. With these initiatives, we are sending a strong message that our government is not only taking meaningful strides, but also empowering young Canadians who want to enter the housing market for the first time. Our government is listening, and the proof of that comes through budget 2024. We developed a real plan

to help Canadians of every generation with a fair opportunity for a good, middle-class life.

Increasing the housing supply will alleviate the added pressures buyers and renters are currently facing. Fairness for every generation means unlocking 3.87 million homes by 2031. It means bringing down the cost of homebuilding. It also means helping cities by making it easier to build homes at a faster pace. It means ensuring that we have the workforce and skilled professionals to get the job done. It means building homes that suit the needs of every Canadian, whether that be a student, senior, person with disabilities or a young family.

In order to reach our housing goals, we will use every tool in our tool box to ensure that we build as efficiently and sustainably as possible. Building homes on vacant and or underutilized public lands is one of these tools, and our federal government will lead a team Canada effort federally, provincially and municipally to unlock public land for housing.

Over the next three years, budget 2024 is proposing to provide over \$5 million, starting in 2024-25, to expand our capacity to build more homes on public lands. This portfolio will include considering Canada Post properties and National Defence lands, and converting underused federal offices into homes for Canadians.

We also want to make sure that municipalities have the resources to participate in our team Canada housing strategy, which is why, in March 2023, our federal government launched the \$4-billion housing accelerator fund. This means that municipalities like Brampton receive a portion of that funding to help fast-track the construction of over 750,000 new homes across Canada. I am proud to note that other Brampton MPs and I advocated for close to \$114 million in funding through this new fund to support the building of over 24,000 homes. To keep this momentum going among Canada's fastest-growing cities, budget 2024 has proposed to provide a top-up of an additional \$400 million over four years to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, which will help unlock an additional 12,000 new homes.

With exponential growth, our government recognizes there needs to be the necessary infrastructure that supports our housing goals. This means delivering support to municipalities through the proposed new Canada housing infrastructure fund. This fund would provide \$6 billion over 10 years to help accelerate the installation of water and waste infrastructure. Our government not only is acting by building housing, but also is ensuring that our growing communities are built with purpose and created in such a way that promotes active living and more vibrant neighbourhoods.

Government Orders

I have spoken at length about housing, because Canadians should know that this federal government plans to tackle the housing crisis, and it is a very big priority to us. We are making housing affordable for all Canadians of every generation, because they deserve to have a safe and secure place to call home; a home where they can raise their families, enjoy the company of friends or be able to relax after a hard day's work.

● (1330)

Housing options allow for Canadians to choose the space and location that are right for them. In a world where the possibilities are endless, there are certain choices Canadians should never have to face, choices such as paying rent, buying food or paying for child care versus putting their career on hold.

To ensure Canadians are never forced into making a difficult choice because of the cost of living, budget 2024 would deliver initiatives to support young Canadians and families of all sizes. Affordable access to nutritious foods is a vital part of our overall health and well-being. This is especially true for young children who are at critical growth and development stages in life. Paying attention in school is even more difficult on an empty stomach that gets in the way of learning. Almost one in four children do not get enough food, and studies have proven there is a correlation between students who do not receive enough nutritious food and graduation rates.

That is why, through budget 2024, our government is proposing to launch a new national school food program, which is a necessary step toward eliminating food insecurity among young Canadians. As we work with our provincial and territorial partners, this new program would provide \$1 billion over the next five years and is expected to provide meals for over 400,000 children. Our government is fuelling the next generation of innovators because this is a team Canada approach to giving our kids the best start in life.

Our government wants Canadians and their families to start and end their day with affordable, nutritious food. We know global factors and the lack of competition among Canada's major grocery chains have contributed to pricing fluctuations. Competition within markets is a good thing, which is why this government has already made it easier for more grocers to launch their businesses to help lower costs for Canadians.

We are doing this, and so much more, through the grocery task force. Investigations regarding price inflation and stabilization will occur to help monitor best practices in the grocery sector. Additional measures such as maintaining a data hub for food prices, tackling shrinkflation and enhancing competition are all included in our government's plan to fight for fair and affordable food prices.

Our government has launched the very first national affordable child care program. This is yet another way our government is making the choice easier for younger parents with children seeking to pursue or continue their careers. Our \$10-a-day child care initiative is saving families in Brampton and across Canada thousands of dollars. In fact, in my riding alone, there is close to \$8,000 in savings for families per year. Residents in my riding are very excited for this program. We also need to create more space for parents who want to enrol their children, and so we are unlocking more space by investing in our budget to create more spaces.

The cost of child care is no longer the equivalent of a mortgage payment thanks to our federal government's initial \$1-billion investment in the child care expansion loan program, with an additional \$180 million proposed through budget 2024 to help build more child care spaces. I am also proud to say the labour participation rate of working-age women reached a record high of 85.75%, which proves our feminist economic policy benefits all Canadians.

We understand raising children can get expensive, which is why our government introduced the Canada child benefit, which has cut child poverty by more than half. Not only did we cut child poverty in Canada by more than half, we also gave seniors the support they needed by strengthening the Canada pension plan and increasing old age security for seniors aged 75 and up.

During a time when the cost in services has increased, our government is doing more than ever to help Canadians while growing our economy. Growing our economy and investing in programs that work for every generation requires a fiscally responsible approach. The good news is our government has a plan in place to do exactly that.

With Canada's net debt-to-GDP ratio the best in the G7, declining deficits and AAA credit rating, we are providing real results for Canadians and the economy. We are delivering on our fiscal goals, which we set out in our fall economic statement, setting the deficits and federal debt on a downward track.

We also factored into our government's plan new investments in sustainable green energy solutions and additional relief measures for new business owners and entrepreneurs. Building Canada's middle class requires a united approach and is fundamental to our focus on helping younger Canadians like millennials and gen Z have the same level of opportunities as their parents and grandparents did.

Fairness for every generation and these initiatives solidify our government's approach to Canadians and prove we are listening. Budget 2024 is the plan that builds our middle class, builds more homes and builds more support for small businesses and entrepreneurs while building a strong economy.

Government Orders

All in all, our government is building on its promises, is delivering actual results and has created a good plan where no Canadian is left behind. A team Canada approach lifts everyone up and takes bold action to alleviate the rising cost of living and social pressures Canadians feel. I know the constituents of Brampton East look forward to initiatives like increased child care spaces, more homes and more initiatives to attract industry and job growth. This is a budget that gives every Canadian a fair chance at success.

● (1335)

Ms. Lianne Rood (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague mentioned affordable food prices in his speech. As we know, the government is constantly deciding to introduce bad policy that is hurting our farmers and will increase the cost of food. The carbon tax is an example. Another example is the P2 plastics ban on plastic packaging for fresh fruits and vegetables. We have heard that this policy alone will increase the price of fresh fruits and vegetables by up to 34%, create 50% more greenhouse gases and create 50% more food waste, resulting in less availability of products as other countries may not ship their products to this country.

Therefore I am wondering whether the member opposite can comment on whether the Liberals will abandon their plan of the P2 plastics ban for fresh produce or at least delay it to have a proper consultation with industry where we can look at science-backed solutions to the issue.

Mr. Maninder Sidhu: Mr. Speaker, that is a very important question. Of course we want to continue supporting our farmers. The Indo-Pacific strategy is a \$2.3-billion investment, and part of that investment includes a new agriculture office that has now been opened in Manila, Philippines, to give farmers access to new and growing markets around the world. The Canada brand is very strong around the world, and farmers are now shipping to new markets around the world because of our government's policies and our Indo-Pacific strategy.

Coming back to the Canada carbon rebate, I know that families in Brampton and across Ontario really appreciate the \$1,120 they are receiving per year to support them in the cost of living.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague spoke at length about housing. It is indeed a major problem.

The housing crisis in Quebec and Canada is really two crises in one. There is the problem of availability, meaning the ability to find a home, and the problem of affordability, which is a very serious issue.

Let me give an example. Right now, most federal programs result in the construction of housing units at 80% of market cost. As a result, we are collectively paying taxes to build one-bedroom units in Longueuil that cost \$1,300 to rent and two-bedroom units in Montreal that cost \$2,000 to rent. That is absolutely unacceptable. We are paying too much for housing units that are too expensive. We do not know who can afford to live in them.

I recently spoke with the Minister of Housing. He is open to the idea of reviewing the concept of affordability in the federal pro-

grams to stop funding \$1,300 or \$2,000 units. What does my colleague think of that?

Does he not think that it is about time we really started funding social housing for the most disadvantaged Canadians, single mothers, victims of domestic violence, all of those people living in tent cities across the country?

We need to fund housing so that they can have somewhere to live.

● (1340)

[*English*]

Mr. Maninder Sidhu: Mr. Speaker, I hope to reply in French one day; I am still learning French.

In response to the member's very important question, of course there have to be many different options for housing, including co-op housing. I am sure members have seen that we have recently announced more funding for co-op housing initiatives.

With respect to growing and giving more options to municipalities across Canada through our housing accelerator fund, which I spoke about in my speech, for Brampton alone there is \$114 million to the housing accelerator fund to give municipalities the support they need to build more housing, build more infrastructure to build that housing, and reduce red tape.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we just passed the 80th anniversary of the landings on D-Day. Having been in Normandy for the 75th anniversary, I know it is incredibly emotional remembering the struggle to free Europe.

We are very concerned with the rise of the extreme right in Europe and what that will mean for the defence of Ukraine against the aggressions of Putin. There have been multiple votes in the House where the Conservatives have voted against support for Ukraine. We know that this is a pattern of the rising right and feeding to extremist fringe groups. I want to ask my hon. colleague whether the government is willing to commit to being there for Ukraine militarily, culturally and in the rebuilding in the long run, to stop Putin's aggression.

Mr. Maninder Sidhu: Mr. Speaker, that is a very important question. Of course Ukraine is a very important ally and partner, and Canada has committed to always being there for Ukraine through many different ways, including humanitarian support, military support, resources and, of course, trade support. The member spoke about a recent vote for the modernized Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement, which the party opposite, the Conservatives, has voted against.

I am not sure why the Conservatives voted against it, when President Zelenskyy came to Canada and asked for it because it will help Ukraine rebuild. It will grow both of our economies because this is what businesses want. I have sat down with Ukrainian community leaders across Canada, from Kelowna to Calgary and Halifax, and they have all asked for this, so I am not sure why anybody would vote against this crucial support for Ukraine. I can assure members that Canada remains committed to Ukraine.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague comes from a riding in the GTA in Ontario, like I do. Can he possibly speak to how the investments in infrastructure in our communities are helping to support Canadians across this country, and in particular in his riding as well?

Mr. Maninder Sidhu: Mr. Speaker, infrastructure helps enable building communities, and infrastructure helps enable building transit capacity, so Brampton MPs have come together and advocated for many different projects, like the Riverwalk project in the downtown Brampton core that will help unlock flood lands that are prone to flooding, in order to enable the building of more housing on that land.

We have unlocked more infrastructure in transit spending as well. Brampton is one of the fastest-growing cities in Canada, so we want to make sure that our constituents have transit options available. Just Friday we made an announcement of \$5 million for additional buses for our residents. We will continue advocating for our residents.

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is repeating the same promise he made nine years ago, when he said he could spend uncontrollably and there would be a rich guy on a hill somewhere who would pay the bill. Such was his promise of a more prosperous life for the middle class. Before we debate this repeated promise, let us first take a look at how things are going. As the Prime Minister himself admitted in a video on taxes a few weeks ago, the gap between the rich and everyone else has only grown. According to a chart created by Statistics Canada, the rich have grown twice as rich since the promise was made in 2015.

How are things going for the middle class? Nine out of 10 are paying more taxes than they were before this Prime Minister took office. Middle-class young people can no longer own a home, and 76% of them believe they never will. In addition, more people are using food banks than ever before in our history. Canada has had the worst GDP growth of the G7 since 2015, and the decline continues even now. The OECD has calculated that Canada's economic growth will be the worst of nearly 40 advanced economies for this decade and for three decades to come, which means that the quality of life of Canadian youth will drop compared to youth in other countries. In addition, Canada has lost \$460 billion in investments to the United States, or \$11,500 per person.

The Prime Minister's solution is to keep repeating the same election promises he made nine years ago and has since broken. Now he is proposing a new tax that will apply to health care, housing,

Government Orders

farmers, and small and medium-sized businesses. A tax on doctors means even fewer doctors when there is already a doctor shortage. A tax on farmers means more expensive food. A tax on small businesses means fewer jobs and fewer opportunities for our young people. A tax on our economy will send more money to the United States and elsewhere.

Billionaires will not pay the tax, because the Prime Minister gave them two months' notice so they could get their money out of the country before this tax comes into effect. Who will pay it, then? First, it will be people who are selling or transferring long-term assets on a one-time basis, like a grandmother trying to sell or gift part of her farm to her children so that they can have a home. Next, it will be the 300,000 businesses or, indirectly, their workers. It will simply lead to higher food costs and smaller paycheques, and it will make it harder to find a doctor. Raising taxes will not solve the problem. That is why the Conservatives will be voting against this tax on health care, food and housing.

In my first 60 days as prime minister, I will name a task force of entrepreneurs, inventors, farmers and workers, but no lobbyists. This task force will design a tax reform for lower taxes that would, one, bring home hiring and more powerful paycheques to Canada; two, bring home fairness by reducing the share of the tax burden paid by the poor and working class while cracking down on overseas tax havens and tackling government-funded corporate welfare; and, three, bring home 20% less paperwork by simplifying the tax rules. Lower, simpler, fairer.

• (1345)

We will make this a country where hard work is rewarded with a bigger paycheque and a bigger pension to buy affordable food, gas and homes in safe communities. That is just plain common sense.

[English]

Nine years ago, the Prime Minister promised that he would spend like a drunken sailor, but that there would be a rich guy on a hill somewhere who would pay the price and the middle class would prosper. How is that promise playing out? According to his own video two weeks ago, the rich are twice as rich. Their net worth has gone from \$6 trillion to \$11 trillion.

Government Orders

How is the famous middle class, which we do not hear so much about anymore? Well, 76% of people who do not own a home believe they never will. Young people who do not have help from their parents cannot own homes almost anywhere in the country today. One in five Canadians is skipping meals. In Toronto, one in 10 is going to a food bank, a city that now has 256 homeless encampments, 50 of them added in the last six weeks alone. This is the help for middle-class people and those working hard to join it. The rich have gotten richer nine years after the Prime Minister promised that higher taxes, spending and debt would make things fair. Let us look around the country today. The Prime Minister admits life sucks, in his own words. How is that fair?

Now his solution is to bring in a giant job-killing tax on health care, homes, farms and small businesses. He wants to tax away doctors when we have a doctor shortage. He wants to tax home builders when we have a housing shortage. He wants to tax farmers when we have a food price crisis, and he wants to tax small businesses when our economy is already shrinking. The results of this approach have already been shown.

Our economy is shrinking, and has been shrinking for two years. We have had the worst economic growth in the G7 per capita since the Prime Minister took office, and since 2019, our economy has shrunk 2% while the American economy has grown by 8%. Meanwhile, we have the worst housing price inflation in all of the G7, the second worst in the entire OECD, after the Prime Minister doubled housing costs. This is exactly the opposite of what the Prime Minister promised would happen if he brought in more taxes.

Who will pay this new tax? The good news is that billionaires will not pay it. The Prime Minister has given them two full months to sell their assets and get their money out of Canada to build a business south of the border or in some faraway place. Who will be left behind to pay the bills? It will be people selling long-term assets, such as the wonderful grandmother who tried to divide up her farmland so her kids could have a small property to live on and is getting hit with a \$40,000 tax bill, or the 300,000 businesses, most of them small businesses, and, indirectly, all of their workers, that will see long-term pay cuts or stalled wages as a result of their owners' inability to invest. Those people, like taxi drivers and others, who have saved up in a company, will pay higher taxes on every single new dollar they invest in our economy.

Raising taxes and punishing our health care providers, home builders, small businesses and farmers will only drive wages down and the cost of living up. That is why common-sense Conservatives will do exactly the opposite. Within 60 days of becoming prime minister, my government would name a tax reform task force of entrepreneurs, inventors, farmers and workers, but no lobbyists, to design a bring-it-home tax cut that would, one, bring home production and paycheques with lower taxes on work, hiring and making stuff; two, bring home fairness by reducing the share of the tax burden paid by the poor and working class while cutting back on tax-funded corporate welfare and cracking down on overseas tax havens; and, three, bring home less paperwork by simplifying the tax rules.

Conservatives will make this a country where hard work is again rewarded, where those who spend sleepless nights mortgaging their homes and wondering how they will pay the bills will be richly rewarded for their sacrifice in building the economy. It will be a

country based on meritocracy not aristocracy, where people get ahead by working hard, not through having a family trust fund, like the Prime Minister. It would be a country where, if one works hard, they would earn a powerful paycheque that would buy affordable food, gas and homes in safe neighbourhoods.

• (1350)

That future is for the common sense of the common people, united for our common home, their home, my home, our home. Let us bring it home.

• (1355)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we just found out moments ago that Conservatives have now decided that they will not be voting in favour of fairness for Canadians, but will, in fact, be voting today against the ways and means motion to set fairness for everybody.

Can the Leader of the Opposition take the opportunity now to explain his position because he has been absolutely mute on this for the last number of weeks?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I think the member has a problem with his earpiece because I just finished explaining my position.

My position is that a job-killing tax on health care, homes, farms and small businesses is the last thing we need in this cost of living crisis, which the Prime Minister has caused. He wants to tax doctors away when we have a doctor shortage. He wants to tax farmers when we have a food price crisis. He wants to tax home builders when we do not have enough homes. He wants to tax small business when our economy is already falling off the cliff and having the worst growth in the G7. That is insanity.

Common-sense Conservatives would bring in taxes that are lower, fairer and simpler, so that hard work would pay off with a powerful paycheque that would buy affordable food, gas and homes in safe neighbourhoods.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there are two things I would like to point out about Bill C-69.

*Statements by Members***STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

[English]

First, there is the much-touted open banking system provided for in division 16 of the bill, which my colleague from Joliette mentioned earlier in his speech. That is a real problem for Quebec. Should the Leader of the Opposition become prime minister, I would like to know whether he will repeal that division in order to give Quebec back its power over Caisses Desjardins and the other financial institutions currently regulated by Quebec.

Second, we have been hearing the leader of the Conservative Party talk about the carbon tax problem for months now. However, Derek Evans, the executive chair of Pathways Alliance and one of the financiers who contributed to his campaign, said that the best piece of advice he would give the Leader of the Opposition is that carbon policy is going to be absolutely critical to maintain Canada's standing on the world stage.

What does the leader of the Conservative Party think about Mr. Evans' advice?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, he sounds like another useless lobbyist saying stupid things. I do not listen to big corporate lobbyists like him. If the Bloc Québécois wants to listen to lobbyists, they are free to do so.

I know that big corporations and sometimes even very big corporations have no problem forcing workers to pay more tax on their gas but, personally, I cannot do that. I work for workers and consumers. That is why we are going to axe the tax.

[English]

The question points to the useless lobbyists who support the government's high-tax agenda and who always wants to raise taxes on someone else and make others pay. That is why, if one is an entrepreneur, they should fire their lobbyists and talk to the people. That is what I have been saying for years.

Finally, people need to elect a Conservative government that would axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member and I went to the same high school. In grade 10, the required reading was *The Handmaid's Tale*, which was hard to read.

I will tell members what else is difficult to read, and that is what is happening in the United States and the fact that it is looking at taking away a woman's right to choose. I think about the fact that the member has been courting incels for months at a time and that the last Conservative from Port Moody—Coquitlam was an anti-abortionist.

I want to know this for sure today, right now. Does the member support a woman's right to choose? Is he going to take away a woman's right to choose if Conservatives ever, and I hope it never happens, become government in this country?

● (1400)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, no.

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE

Mr. Fraser Tolmie (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on April 1, the Royal Canadian Air Force celebrated its centennial anniversary. This anniversary recognizes not only the importance of the Royal Canadian Air Force to Canada, it also recognizes all those who have served and sacrificed.

Moose Jaw, home to 15 Wing, was originally part of the British Commonwealth air training plan, generally considered the greatest air crew training program of all time. This tradition continues to date through the NFTC program, and 15 Wing is also home to the Canadian Armed Forces Snowbird Air Demonstration Squadron.

The Snowbirds have close ties to their local community, where the newest WHL champions, the Moose Jaw Warriors, are donning the Snowbirds logo on their jersey.

The Snowbirds showcase the professionalism and dedication of the RCAF and all other branches of the Canadian Armed Forces.

On behalf of all Canadians, I congratulate the RCAF on its centennial, and I invite everyone to join me for Air Force Day on the Hill, at five o'clock today, at the Sir John A. Macdonald Building.

* * *

HONG KONG-CANADA BUSINESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of attending the Hong Kong-Canada Business Association Ottawa Chapter's annual event celebrating the 40th anniversary of HKCBA and Asian Heritage Month.

I would like to thank Frank Eng, the president of the Ottawa Chapter, and Jesse Zhang for organizing this successful event and for inviting me.

For many years, I have attended various events organized by this organization. This year's program included a workshop with Mark Kruger, who was a previous IMF representative for Canada and a senior policy director for the Bank of Canada.

Participants included Sonja Chong, the national chair; Joseph Chung, the national vice chair; Jodi Robinson, executive director, China Trade and Investment at Global Affairs Canada; several elected officials; and over 150 business professionals.

*Statements by Members***HUMAN RIGHTS**

Ms. Anju Dhillon (Dorval—Lachine—LaSalle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago, June 1984, was seared on the Sikh psyche. The Indian army stormed the Golden Temple in Amritsar, as well as countless other gurdwaras. A religious holiday, where thousands of pilgrims would be visiting, this day was chosen to maximize damage to Sikh lives. The result of the carnage was such that the bullet-riddled bodies of pilgrims, men whose hands were still tied behind their backs, were being thrown in trucks by the hundreds to be mass cremated. This included babies and even elderly who were weak but still alive.

The sacred pool had turned red with their blood. The surrounding holy buildings damaged, the marble floors cracked under the heavy army tanks. The library that contained centuries of text was burned to ashes.

Over days and days, this terror was unleashed upon these innocent lives. No one could come and go. No help came. They were imprisoned and easy, vulnerable targets. There is no justification for this attack.

* * *

[Translation]

MICHELINE LABELLE

Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Micheline Labelle was a long-time champion of the separatist cause. She passed away on April 16 at the age of 84. Friends and loved ones may pay their respects to her family on Saturday.

Micheline Labelle was one of modern Quebec's great intellectuals, and her kindness and open-mindedness left an indelible mark on all who crossed her path.

She obtained a Ph.D. in anthropology from the Université de Montréal. Her enduring interest in the problems of racism and discrimination led her to create an international observatory that attracted the support of partners such as the Grand Council of the Crees and the Table de concertation des organismes au service des personnes réfugiées et immigrantes, an association of organizations serving refugees and immigrants. As a professor emeritus in UQAM's sociology department, she left her mark on generations of students and was awarded the Thérèse Casgrain equality prize in 1989 for her dedication to equality.

She was a lifelong advocate of secularism, and we must honour her memory by fighting that good fight.

* * *

● (1405)

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE CENTENNIAL

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Orléans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is Air Force Day on Parliament Hill. It is an opportunity to highlight the incredible work of the Royal Canadian Air Force, or RCAF, as it celebrates its centennial year.

For 100 years, members of the RCAF have served Canadians here at home and around the world. We thank them for their incredible dedication to Canada. RCAF aviators have participated in mis-

sions around the globe, including the Second World War, the Cold War, as well as NATO and NORAD operations.

Today, our government is making the largest investment in the RCAF since the Second World War. The RCAF represents the very best of Canada, and its members can count on our unyielding support. Today and always, we thank all current and former members of the RCAF. It is because of them that the RCAF has a reputation for professionalism, dedication and excellence.

Sic itur ad astra.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada is in trouble. The OECD calculated that Canada's economic growth will be the worst of nearly 40 advanced economies for this decade and for three decades to come.

Of course, the Liberal solution to any problem is to tax and tax. The Liberals' capital gains increase is their latest tax grab. They say that it will only affect 0.13% of Canadians, but this is the same government that tells us we get back more in the carbon tax rebate than we pay in carbon tax. It is laughable.

At a time when Canada desperately needs investment, growth and innovators, the government is pushing them out the door. This is not the answer.

A future Conservative government will make work pay again. We will celebrate success, not demonize it. We will build a path to prosperity and eliminate those dream-crushing barriers along the way. We are on the side of hope, growth and prosperity, and the Liberals are on the side of decay, decline and poverty.

* * *

SUPER LOCKER AWARD

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, each month a student at Notre Dame College School in Welland is awarded the "Super Locker". This honour is awarded to students who perform simple acts of kindness at their school and throughout their community.

Today, I am proud to congratulate Samantha Calderon, Dezaray St Jean, Jose Palma Alfaro, Stacey Imotsikeme, Nicole Berry, Rachel Taylor, Anasofia Gonzalez, TJ Joseph, Serena Hounslow, Ava Menary and Luca Giancola for receiving the Super Locker award this year.

These remarkable students demonstrate the importance of helping each other, showing compassion and, most important, spreading kindness, inspiring others to strengthen our responsibility to our citizenship based on the values handed down to us by previous generations of Canadians. Whether it is a warm smile, small acts of generosity or a word of encouragement, we can always make a positive difference.

Statements by Members

Let us join the Fighting Irish in congratulating these students, and let us reaffirm our commitment to spreading kindness to make the world a better place.

* * *

DARTMOUTH COVE

Mr. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Dartmouth rests on the shores of Halifax harbour, on beautiful Dartmouth Cove.

Two years ago, a proponent applied to use Dartmouth Cove as a dump for pyritic slate from construction sites to infill nearly seven acres of this cove, a cove where important marine research and activities take place and where evidence clearly shows that fish and other species are flourishing. The local councillor made it very clear that this infill would be a moonscape, not zoned for development.

Dartmouth spoke out. We continue to speak out against this infill for the sake of infill, because Dartmouth Cove is not a dump for someone's fill.

Now the proponent is threatening to sue me if I speak out. I was elected to represent the people of Dartmouth—Cole Harbour to be their voice. It is my job to bring their concerns to Ottawa, to advocate, to stand up and to speak out. Dartmouth Cove is not a dumpsite for someone's fill. I will not be silenced.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, at a time when food insecurity is skyrocketing and millions are lining up at food banks, the government is bringing forward a punishing capital gains tax hike that would disproportionately affect family farms and small business. According to the Grain Growers of Canada, it will amount to a 30% increase on what farmers have to pay Ottawa when they pass on their family business to their son or daughter.

The Conservatives have fought hard to preserve family farming, including by passing Bill C-208 in the last Parliament, but the Liberals are trying to undo it with a punishing capital gains tax hike. It is like they are trying to outlaw family businesses. If families cannot afford to farm, it will lead to more industrial farming and higher food costs.

Why is the government trying to kill family farms when all they want to do is put high-quality, affordable food on our tables? How is any of this fair?

* * *

● (1410)

NATIONAL DAY AGAINST GUN VIOLENCE

Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, gun violence is a public health issue that includes suicide, gender-based violence and gun crime.

Last Friday was National Day Against Gun Violence. In 2022, I worked with the Toronto Raptors' John Wiggins to create a day that

would honour those killed by gun violence and would commit to eliminate gun violence in all its forms.

Last year, the Prime Minister declared the National Day Against Gun Violence would be observed in Canada on the first Friday in June. Last year, we joined the Toronto Raptors and many community organizations that advocate for community safety and anti-gun violence.

This year, I hosted a round table with Halton MPs to hear from local organizations that are doing great work with youth in our community, with funding through the building safer communities fund. I was pleased to see MPs and community organizations across the country recognize the National Day Against Gun Violence with events raising awareness on the issue.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, farmers and small businesses are the backbone of the Canadian economy, particularly in rural Canada, yet after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, it continues to try new ways to divide Canadians.

The Prime Minister is hiking taxes on farmers again, but we are in the middle of a food price crisis. What the Liberals fail to understand is that after 40 years on the family farm, the blood, sweat and tears that go into being successful is not about to fund the Prime Minister's socialism experiment with the NDP. It is about filling a need in a community. It is about feeding a hungry world.

Growing a farm or a business is about providing jobs and dignity for people. I talked to Alan, a 74-year-old farmer back home who is looking to sell some farmland for his retirement. Thanks to the proposed Liberal changes to capital gains, he will lose over \$500,000 from his retirement. If the family farm cannot survive, big industrial multinational conglomerate billionaires will take over. However, that is what the Prime Minister wants.

How is that fair for Canadians?

*Statements by Members***TAXATION**

Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 93-year-old Liz Diachun, who will have to pay \$40,000 in capital gains because she was trying to gift land to her grandson and daughter, has a message for the Prime Minister. She is not rich. She does not have an extra \$40,000. She is trying to help her family. She would like to know which bank would lend a 93-year-old \$40,000.

Peter from Peterborough also has a message for the Prime Minister. He wants to know why the Liberals think it is okay to change the rules that dictate his retirement plan. He purchased an investment property in 1986 that was supposed to be his retirement. Now, because of the Liberals' increase in capital gains, he no longer has enough money to retire.

The Liberals claim they want tax fairness for every generation. How is destroying the retirement of Canadians fair?

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Michael McLeod (Northwest Territories, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 16 years ago today, our country experienced an unprecedented moment. National leaders of the indigenous organizations of Canada stood on the floor of the House to receive formal apologies from the Prime Minister and leaders of every political party. It was a historic day of non-partisanship, as we heard apologies to 80,000 survivors for the harms caused by more than a century of Canada's residential schooling policies for indigenous children.

The promises made on that day were a commitment to working together toward reconciliation. As elderly survivors leave us, it is essential that we keep alive the promises that were made to them, their families and their communities.

To mark this occasion, my constituent, Dr. Marie Wilson, is in Ottawa for the official release of her book *North to Nowhere: Song of a Truth and Reconciliation Commissioner*. As we read the book, let us all remember the solemn promises made by each of our parties and let us renew our determination to keep those promises.

* * *

● (1415)

TED FARRON AND TED BOOMER

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, two community champions in my riding were both named Ted. We mourn the passing of James Edward "Ted" Farron and Ted Boomer, both Windsor icons.

Ted Farron was a long-time local business owner of Farron's Gourmet Butcher Shop, but known in the boxing circles. He and his wife Michelle supported endless causes like hospice and recruiting physicians. He was one of only four civilians to be made an honorary member of the firefighters association. I first met Ted when he hired a person from my supportive employment program that I ran.

Ted Boomer is also synonymous with Windsor's Bluesfest, founding the event in 1995 and bringing in top performers to Windsor Essex for decades, like Ace Frehley from Kiss, Nazareth, Iggy

Pop, Jeff Healy and Gord Downie, to name a few. I got to know Ted when he and his wife Louise brought the Bluesfest to downtown and gave us international fame.

Both Teds were local community boosters and will be missed by many. My condolences go to their families and friends, who can take comfort in knowing their local legacies will live on. I know that I, and many others, remain influenced by their character and contributions.

* * *

[Translation]

MAÉLI GRIGNON

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there are some people who never cease to amaze, and Maéli Grignon is one of them. Her future career in science is sure to be a resounding success. At just 15 years old, she has already won a Technoscience award as well as a bursary from the Université de Montréal when she last took part in the Quebec final of the Exposciences competition.

Her favourite subject is none other than the famous Higgs boson, and she is just as excited to talk about it as she is to explain it. It is an honour to have her with me on Parliament Hill today, accompanied by illusionist Luc Langevin, who has been the science fair's spokesman for the past 10 years. A science enthusiast himself who studied for a Ph.D. in biophotonics, he was Maéli's inspiration and piqued her interest in physics from a very young age.

I thank Mr. Langevin for continuing to bring us his magic as well as a passion for science. I hope that Maéli will soon fulfill her dream of visiting CERN, but above all, I hope that her career, which I will follow with interest, is nothing short of exceptional.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Robert Kitchen (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when someone gets sick and needs treatment, what do they do? They go to a doctor. Unfortunately, after nine years of the costly NDP-Liberal coalition, Canada is hemorrhaging doctors at an alarming rate. The changes to the capital gains tax are having deep impacts on Canada's already struggling health care system, and the situation is only getting worse.

According to the Canadian Medical Association, the risk of already overstretched physicians' leaving the profession or reducing their hours in response to heightened taxation is real. Over six million Canadians do not have access to a family doctor, and as someone who lives in a rural area that is short on health care professionals, I can say it will be frightening to see family doctors, dentists and chiropractors leaving Canada in droves

Doctors warned about the impacts of unnecessary and harmful tax, but they were ignored. It will be regular Canadians who will lose access to diagnosis and treatment, ultimately paying the price for the government's incompetence. With Canada already lacking 30,000 family doctors, and more leaving every day, it is clear that the NDP-Liberal government is simply not worth the cost.

* * *

RETIREMENT CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed (Vancouver Granville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on a cool September day in 1993, my very apolitical grandfather took me excitedly to a campaign office. As we approached the office, he said, "Remember this day; you are helping elect a woman who will show Canada the value that refugees can bring and what we Ismailis will do for Canada." That campaign office belonged to Mobina Jaffer. While she would not win that election, she would eventually be named to the other place, where she would take her rightful place as a trailblazer in Parliament.

Mobina Jaffer has been a champion for women's and children's rights and human rights; a proud African; a proud Ismaili Muslim; a proud mother, daughter, grandmother and wife; and a proud Canadian. Senator Jaffer's time in the other place has been all about improving the quality of life of others, all with humility and good humour.

As her time in the other place comes to an end and she returns home to her beloved B.C., we express our gratitude to her husband, Nuralla, and her children and family for sharing her with Canada. I thank her for her wisdom and her kindness that she has shown to me and to so many others. She has left her mark on Canada, leaving it a better place every single day. The value that refugees bring, and what Ismailis and all of us can do, is what she has exemplified every single day of her remarkable career.

ORAL QUESTIONS

• (1420)

[Translation]

The Speaker: Colleagues, before we begin oral questions, I would like to remind you of the importance of ensuring that your earpiece is either on your ear or in your desk.

[English]

That way we can make sure to provide the safest environment for our interpreters.

* * *

[Translation]

TAXATION

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, nine years ago, the Prime Minister promised that he would engage in out-of-control spending and that a rich guy on a hill, not the middle class, would pay for it. Nine years later, what is the reality?

Oral Questions

Nine out of 10 members of the middle class are paying more taxes. The wealthiest have doubled their net wealth, according to a video released by the Prime Minister a few days ago, and the majority of middle-class young people cannot even buy a home. Given that he has already broken this promise, why should we believe him now?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2024 is rooted in the priority to deliver fairness for every generation. It is about asking the wealthiest Canadians to pay a bit more when they sell their extremely profitable investments. We will use that to invest in more housing for young people, more dental care for seniors and more child care spaces for young families.

We are here to help those who need it, but the Conservative Party just announced that it will side with the wealthiest Canadians. It will not be there to help the middle class and those working hard to join it.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what he said nine years ago, and the result, according to his own data published on his Twitter account, is that since he came to power, the wealth of the richest Canadians has doubled, along with the taxes paid by the middle class. The cost of housing has also doubled. Why is it that every time he promises to raise taxes on the rich, it is the poor and middle class who end up footing the bill?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is the same kind of justification the Conservative Party gave in 2015 when it voted against increasing taxes for the top 1% to lower them for the middle class. It is the same kind of argument it gave to vote against the Canada child benefit, which has lifted hundreds of thousands of children out of poverty.

The situation is no different today. It is defending benefits for the wealthiest in this country, while we are asking for a little more to help with housing for young people, to help seniors with dental care and many other things.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, nine years ago, the Prime Minister promised he could spend uncontrollably and there would be a rich guy on a hill somewhere who would pay the bill. The middle class would not have to pay.

What is the result? According to the Prime Minister, the total net worth of the richest Canadians has doubled since he took office. Meanwhile, nine in 10 middle-class Canadians are paying more tax. Housing costs have doubled, so 76% of middle class youth believe they will never afford a home. Two million people line up at a food bank because they cannot afford to eat on a middle-class salary.

Oral Questions

Given that the Prime Minister already broke this exact same promise over nine years, why should we believe him this time?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if it did not have real-world impacts on Canadians, it would almost be amusing to watch the Conservative leader tie himself in knots to try to justify voting in favour of advantages for wealthy Canadians when they sell really profitable investments.

We are asking them to pay a little more so we can invest more in housing for young people to be able to have the same kinds of opportunities previous generations did. We have delivered dental care for over 200,000 seniors in just the last six weeks. We are delivering more spaces in child care.

We are stepping up for Canadians. The Conservatives are stepping up for the rich.

• (1425)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, real-world impacts are what we have today after nine years of the Prime Minister's promising to tax, borrow and spend us into fairness.

According to the StatsCan data he put out himself, since he became Prime Minister, the net worth of the wealthiest Canadians has doubled. Why? It is because the taxes he puts always land on the middle class. Nine in 10 middle-class people are paying higher taxes. The vast majority of Canadians and 100% of the middle class are paying higher carbon tax. His last round of small business tax hikes hit plumbers and electricians, not the rich.

Why is it that every time Prime Minister mentions the middle class, they get poorer?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our price on pollution delivers more money to eight out of 10 Canadians right across the country with the Canada carbon rebate, and today there is an opportunity for everyone in the House to stand up and ask the wealthiest Canadians to pay a little more when they sell extremely profitable investments. We are doing that on this side of the House.

The Conservatives will be protecting the advantage that is there for the wealthiest Canadians, while we invest more in housing, while we invest more in dental care and while we invest more in Canadians who need it.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if someone is a small business owner and has even one dollar of investment gain, they pay the higher tax that the Prime Minister is promising, because there is no exemption inside the 300,000 small businesses.

It is incredible that during a housing shortage, he wants to tax home builders. During a health care shortage, he wants to tax away our doctors. During a food crisis, he wants to tax our farmers, and while our economy is shrinking more than any other economy in the G7, he wants to tax our small business job creator.

Is this not the definition of insanity?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for eight weeks, since we put our budget forward, the Conservatives have been incredibly careful not to say a thing about the capi-

tal gains rate we are raising. They did not want to talk about it for two full months, and today, when they are choosing to vote with the wealthiest Canadians and against young Canadians who need more housing, young Canadians who need a better break and seniors who need dental care, they are all trying to spin it in nine different ways. The reality is they have an opportunity to vote with middle-class Canadians, and they are choosing to vote against them.

* * *

[*Translation*]

JUSTICE

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is not really in the habit of listening to or reading the RCMP's suggestions. This time, the RCMP is saying that it does not have the tools it needs to deal with the threat that hate speech poses to security and social harmony. The RCMP does not have the tools it needs to do its job.

The religious exemption in the Criminal Code enables people to engage in verbal abuse and openly invite violence, and obviously that is a valuable tool for people who do in fact want to incite violence.

Will the Prime Minister agree to repeal the religious exemption from the Criminal Code?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, hate speech and anti-Semitism have no place in Canada.

Our government is fighting racism and hatred like no other government has before by introducing the online harms act, with funding to strengthen measures to protect mosques, synagogues and places of worship, and with our plan to criminalize Holocaust denial.

We recognize that more needs to be done. We will continue to work with our police forces and to strengthen the necessary laws to keep everyone in this country safe.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is how to waste 35 precious seconds.

The streets of Montreal and other cities in Quebec and Canada are the site of demonstrations and open incitements to hatred, if not outright violence. Demonstrators are even calling for the extermination of the people of Israel.

What will it take for this Prime Minister to start protecting the people he is responsible for?

• (1430)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been investing in more protection for mosques, synagogues, places of worship, and community centres for years. We are going to keep working with police forces across the country to protect people. At the same time, we are going to underscore how important it is that all Canadians remember our values of respect, openness, tolerance and acceptance.

We will continue to be there to allow people to protest lawfully and peacefully, but also to counter hate speech and calls for violence.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Liberals finally woke up. They realized that it is unfair for nurses and carpenters to pay more taxes than billionaires. Well, clearly they did not have a problem with that for the past eight years.

Why did the Prime Minister let carpenters and nurses pay more taxes than billionaires for eight straight budgets in a row?

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I am just going to ask the hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George to please not take the floor unless he is recognized by the Chair.

The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the very first things we did in 2015 was to raise taxes on the wealthiest 1% and lower them for the middle class. I will recall that the NDP, at that time, actually voted against that measure. However, right now, we are putting forward a measure to ask the wealthiest Canadians, who make a tremendous amount of profits when they sell extremely profitable investments, to actually pay a bit more on those profits. That way, we can invest in more housing, in more supports for seniors and in a range of things to create fairness for every generation. The Conservatives are choosing to vote against that, and they are standing with the wealthiest once again.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister could have done this eight years ago.

[Translation]

Yesterday, the Liberals came back to planet earth. They realized that it was unfair for nurses to pay more tax than millionaires, although the Liberals did not have a problem with that for the past eight years.

Why did the Prime Minister force nurses to pay more taxes than millionaires over eight consecutive budgets?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would remind the House that, in 2015, we raised taxes on the wealthiest 1% and lowered them for the middle class. At the time, the NDP voted against those measures.

Oral Questions

We are always fighting for the middle class and those working hard to join it. That is why we are asking the wealthy, people who make huge profits selling their investments, to pay a little more so that we can provide housing, dental care and more child care spaces for Canadians who need them.

Unfortunately, the Conservatives are once again siding with the wealthy and against middle-class Canadians.

[English]

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister is about to impose another job-killing, wage-cutting, price-hiking tax on Canadians, and she wants us to believe the latest fairy tale that, somehow, we will all be better off if the Prime Minister just raises taxes again. We have heard this for nine years. Let us take a look at the result.

Canada is on track for the worst decline in living standards in four decades. Nine out of 10 middle-class families now pay more in income taxes, and Statistics Canada officials say that Liberal policies since 2015 have cost Canadians \$4,200 in lost wages per worker.

The Liberals have made the middle class worse off with their last eight budgets. Why should anyone believe that the ninth time is the charm?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for the past eight weeks, we have watched the unedifying spectacle of the Conservatives squiggling and squirming, deflecting and evading. However, today the Conservatives have no choice; today, they had to pick a side, and we are now seeing the side they have chosen. The Conservatives are coming out against fairness. They think a nurse or a plumber should pay tax at a higher rate than a multi-millionaire. Canadians are watching. Canadians now see whose side the Conservatives are on.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for nine years, Canadians have suffered from the terrible consequences of Liberal economic policies. Now what are the Liberals doing? For young Canadians struggling to be able to afford to buy their first home, the Liberals are raising taxes on home builders. For families barely able to afford groceries and lined up at food banks, the Liberals are raising taxes on the farmers who produce the food. For thousands of Canadians who have gone years without having a family doctor, the Liberals are chasing even more doctors away with a new tax on medical professions. How is any of that fair?

Oral Questions

• (1435)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have been trying so hard to fake it. They have been trying so hard to pretend they actually care about working Canadians. However, today, there is a vote coming; they finally have to pick a side. Today, every single member of the House is going to have to choose: Are they on the side of a nurse, a plumber or a teacher, or are they on the side of a multi-millionaire? The Conservatives are very clear: They are against fairness. They are in favour of the wealthy lobbyists who advise them.

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are finding that the harder they work, the more they are punished. The incompetent finance minister wants people to believe that her job-killing taxes impact only the very rich. However, they will impact doctors, farmers and small business owners. They will impact a restaurant owner who has been in the community and leases their building. They will impact tradespeople, such as plumbers and roofers, who reinvest in their businesses and their equipment and eventually want to stop working. The finance minister is raising their taxes in the name of fairness because she spent all the money that she already took from them. How is any of that fair?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one thing that is kind of astonishing is that, after having been mute or, one might want to say, gagged for eight weeks, the Conservatives have finally found some passion around this issue. Is it not astonishing that, when given an actual opportunity to choose to side with a plumber, to side with a nurse or to side with their multi-millionaire lobbyist pals, the Conservatives are choosing to vote against fairness? Canadians are watching.

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the answer again proves that the minister does not read her own briefing notes. When a small business owner retires and sells their assets, the minister wants to take a bigger piece of that because she could not control her own spending.

Those are the people whom the Liberals call rich. They are people like my own father. If he were alive today, he would be left high and dry in his retirement years, the years when he needed those earnings the most. He started as a taxi driver in this country and went on to invest in a small business, year after year, in a personal corp because he did not have a pension.

How is any of that fair?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, squiggle and squirm as they might, it is really hard to put lipstick on a pig. That is exactly what the Conservatives are trying to do today.

The Conservatives have found themselves unable, when it really counted, to side with working people. They have been unable to vote for fairness, to vote for the nurse, to vote for the plumber, and now they are evading responsibility for that choice. However, we will not let them. We are in favour of fairness, and they are not.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this fast-and-furious finance minister unveiled her latest job-killing scheme to screw over Canada's middle class to bankroll

her incompetency. Newcomers such as my family came here for the Canadian dream, had very little, worked hard, saved money and started a small business. She calls them tax cheats and vilifies their success. This job-killing capital gains tax hike will destroy their life's work. They can save it all by cancelling their Disney+.

Before the minister runs away from the microphone again, does she think her attack on small businesses is actually fair?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for the past eight weeks, the Conservatives have been dithering and delaying and deflecting. They were squirming. They were so uncomfortable because they recognized they had to make a really big choice: Were they actually going to be on the side of working people, Canadians who live paycheque to paycheque, or on the side of multi-millionaires?

Today, we know whose side they are on. We are voting for fairness. The Conservatives are voting against it, as we always knew they would.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister and the leader of the NDP can do as many photo ops with their bikes as they want, but these champagne socialists are taking money from the middle class to give to rich Liberal insiders, their elitist Bay Street buddies and the bloated bureaucracy. This job-killing tax hike vilifies success, punishing small businesses and their workers. That is why GDP per person in Canada is collapsing and Canadians are poor.

Before she spends another billion dollars next week to service her debt, can she tell us if this is fair?

• (1440)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a quote from a debate in the House of Commons: "monstrous increases in capital gains [are] making the rich vastly richer and creating a kind of aristocratic feudal economy". Does anyone know who said that? It was the member for Carleton. Today, he is leading his party in voting to make those gains even more monstrous by voting in favour of that aristocratic feudal economy.

When we vote for fairness, Conservatives vote against it.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Sauvons l'ACIC coalition informed us in an open letter that the NFB has decided to modernize its independent filmmaker assistance program. Modernize should mean improve. Unfortunately, this is far from an improvement.

Previously, to have access to NFB editing rooms, there were two conditions: be a filmmaker and have a project funded by a public institution.

The NFB is set to impose three new conditions, including complying with its editorial policy. When a Crown corporation wants to impose a message, that is called propaganda.

Is the minister going to let this slide?

Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that the NFB is currently looking at its program that supports independent filmmakers.

Its mandate is clear: to support a diversity of independent filmmakers, including French-language filmmakers. I will ensure that it continues to fulfill its mandate.

I invite the filmmakers to share their concerns with NFB management, which is independent and will make decisions accordingly.

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Pierre Perrault, Norman McLaren, Léa Pool, Micheline Lanctôt, Denys Arcand, Pierre Falardeau and Denis Villeneuve are all Quebec filmmakers who were able to benefit from the NFB, a testing ground for daring independent cinema.

It is a safe bet that none of them would measure up to the NFB's content policies nowadays. More importantly, none of them would agree to submit to them.

We know that the NFB is independent. The minister does not need to remind us of that. However, we were under the impression that our cinema was independent, too.

Can the minister rein in the NFB so that our filmmakers are not hemmed in by its ideological criteria?

Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have always supported the NFB over the years because we know how important it is to nurture the next generation of Quebec and Canadian filmmakers.

As a matter of fact, all the names my colleague mentioned highlight the level of talent, diversity and quality we have here in Quebec and Canada. We will continue to support them. That is why we have increased virtually all our cultural budgets. We know how important that is.

We do it because we believe in our talent, we believe in the importance of culture. We are going to keep doing it.

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Canada's independent filmmaker assistance program was working just fine. No one was complaining, but it was not quite restrictive

enough for the NFB. This seems to be a running theme with Crown corporations.

Letting artists be artists is no longer an option, I guess. The government has to tell them who to be, what to think, how to express themselves and on what topics. They need to adhere to a certain format and fit into certain boxes at all times.

The situation with the NFB is worrisome. It makes sense that the cultural sector is rallying together and rising up.

Whose side will the minister be on? Will she side with the arts or with state propaganda?

• (1445)

Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I commend the work of the filmmakers in the coalition and of all those in Quebec who continually stand up to ask institutions to give them adequate support.

Our government is listening. We have proven that with budget after budget since 2015 by bringing in new supports, including support for Telefilm Canada. We support the NFB and we have added money to the Canada Media Fund. All of this is to ensure that there is diversity in terms of content and that filmmakers are able to bring their talent to our screens and promote Quebec and Canada around the world.

We will continue to be there for our culture industry.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the average doctor is \$300,000 in debt from medical school, and the Ontario Medical Association said that the latest NDP-Liberal tax grab would put “further pressures on the viability and sustainability of a fragile system” and “could force existing physicians out of practice and dissuade new grads from practicing in Canada.”

Canadians are in the midst of a health care crisis. Why is the Minister of Finance making it harder for Canadians to find a family doctor?

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the critic for his first question in almost a year on the matter of the health care crisis in this country. I can tell him that it is extremely important that nurses, doctors and everybody pay the same tax rate. We want to make sure it is fair. We have been making critical investments, in every province and every territory, of \$200 billion. However, in order to make those investments in our health care system, we need a fair and just tax system. We are making sure we do that precisely so that we can make the investments and not have the cuts we would see with the Conservatives.

Oral Questions

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every week I speak to Canadians who do not have a family doctor. How is this fair? The elderly, Canadians with chronic diseases, Canadians with mental health struggles, kids with cancer; none of them can access the health care system. How is this fair? The Canadian Medical Association says things are only going to get worse. They say this tax would jeopardize efforts to recruit and retain doctors.

As physicians leave this country en masse, how many Canadians will go without health care due to this NDP-Liberal tax grab?

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a fair and just tax system will not threaten our health care system. What will threaten our health care system is eliminating dental care for seniors, eliminating pharmacare and cutting into health care, and that is exactly what we have seen from the Conservatives. We were able to make, for the next 10 years, 200 billion dollars' worth of investments with provinces and territories. Those are put at direct risk and jeopardy because of Conservative cuts. I find it interesting that the only time they have ever asked health care questions in this House is when we started talking about fairness and making sure that everybody pays their fair share.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of this Prime Minister, more than 2.3 million people in Quebec do not have a family doctor. According to the *Journal de Montréal*, a retiree named Serge Gagné was told, "You don't belong here. You don't have a family doctor."

The Canadian Medical Association made it clear that, given the ongoing doctor shortage, "These changes could jeopardize ongoing efforts across Canada to recruit and retain a high-quality health workforce."

How many families, mothers and seniors will this Prime Minister force to go without a doctor because doctors choose to practise elsewhere?

How is that fair to Mr. Gagné?

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time the Conservative Party has asked questions about our health care system. I find that very interesting because, from my perspective, the threat to that system is not fairness or equality; the threat is costs, pure and simple. The Conservatives want to cancel major investments in dental care, pharmacare and agreements with every province and territory.

We must continue to invest in our health care system.

* * *

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of this Prime Minister, Quebec farmers are crying out for help. Canadian farmers have been clear. They are saying that, by increasing the capital gains inclusion rate to two-thirds, the government is jeopardizing the success of real intergenerational farm transfers to young farmers across Canada.

The Prime Minister wants to tax farmers in the midst of a food-pricing crisis. The Prime Minister wants to jeopardize the future of farming in the regions.

How is that fair for future generations of farmers?

• (1450)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the daughter of a farmer, I understand our farmers' situation.

I want to point out that we increased the lifetime exemption for farmers. I also want to point out that Quebec had a choice and that the Quebec finance minister decided to follow the federal government's lead on capital gains because Quebec needs revenue, for example for health care.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Jean-René Patry is 80 years old. He has worked his entire life and is still working, although he is starting to feel tired. Even though he works, he is forced to live in his van. With his pension and earnings from odd-jobs, an apartment in Montreal is now beyond his means. All of that is the result of the Liberals and the Conservatives leaving housing in the hands of speculators. Mr. Patry knows full well what is needed: social housing, and the sooner the better. Thousands of people just like him are no longer able to put a roof over their heads.

What does the Minister of Housing have to say to all the people like Mr. Patry across Quebec and Canada?

Hon. Soraya Martinez Ferrada (Minister of Tourism and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would tell Mr. Patry that today is a day that will go down in history. Today we are going to implement tax measures that will ensure fairness and allow us to invest in housing, health care and medication. I hope the NDP will follow our lead.

What we are doing today is making sure that we are going to call on multi-millionaires to do a little more to help Mr. Patry.

* * *

[English]

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, over one million Canadians with disabilities cannot afford bare necessities. They cannot keep up with groceries, housing or their medication costs.

The Liberals promised that their new Canada disability benefit would lift Canadians with disabilities out of poverty; it will not. The \$200 does not even scratch the surface of an adequate income.

Oral Questions

Will the finance minister admit the Liberals messed up the roll-out of this benefit, listen to the community feedback and fix their botched mess?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sameer Zuberi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Diversity, Inclusion and Persons with Disabilities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for her question.

[*English*]

We are the government that has brought in the disability benefit. We are the government that has funded this benefit within this budget, to the highest tune of \$6 billion. There will be 600,000 Canadians who will be supported through this benefit.

This is a critical moment for Canadians, for our government and for all of us working together. I want to thank all who have been advocating and working for this. We are building a fairer and more inclusive Canada.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Iqwinder Gaheer (Mississauga—Malton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian families know that the Liberal government will be there to support them when they need it most.

Government programs, such as \$10-a-day child care and a pharmacare system that helps to pay for contraceptives, have allowed a record number of women to enter the workforce. This is huge for Canadian families and the economy.

Can the Minister of Families notify this House how we will continue to advance this progress and further enhance generational fairness?

Hon. Jenna Sudds (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we are proud of the programs that we have put in place to help Canadian families get ahead. Generational fairness means asking the most fortunate Canadians to pay a little more. It means ensuring that our tax system is fair.

Today, Conservatives have made it clear that they are not in favour of fairness. They would rather cancel \$10-a-day child care, cancel our national school food program and cancel dental care for those who need it. Really, this is definitely not fair for Canadians.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' increase in the capital gains inclusion rate from 50% to 67% is a direct attack on Canadian farm families.

The Liberals like to claim that this will only impact the ultra-rich, but that just is not true. This will impact family farms and young farmers who are just trying to take over the family farm. The average grain farm will easily exceed the lifetime exemption rate.

This tax increase is not fair and will jeopardize the economic viability of farm families and our rural communities. Will the Prime

Minister end his attack on family farms that are just trying to put food on our table?

• (1455)

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that when my hon. colleague and his government were in power, they slashed half a billion dollars at Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. They slashed \$200 million out of the business risk management program. The question I have is, how much more would you slash if you ever got the chance to slash?

I can assure Canadians that we have reinstated the funding to Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, and we have reinstated the funding to the business risk management program. We have supported and will continue to support farmers in this country.

The Speaker: I would like to remind the hon. minister that, of course, questions should be put through me. That is the best way that it should be done.

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is not reassuring that the agriculture minister still does not know that there is going to be a capital gains inclusion rate change that is going to impact Canadian farmers.

Farmers are trying to work hard every day to feed Canadians. The only thing this tax change is going to do is feed an obese Liberal government. The Liberals say this is about fairness, but it is not fair to young farmers. When they buy the family operation, they are burdened with millions of dollars in debt.

This is a gift to the ultra-rich who will buy up family farmland, making mega-multinational industrial farms. Will the Prime Minister admit this is not a tax on the ultra-rich, it is an attack on the very survival of family farms?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past nine years, the Conservative Party has a record. When it was asked to vote to lower taxes on the middle class, what did it say? No. When it was asked to approve a Canada child benefit, what did it say? No. When it was asked to vote on child care, on pharmacare and on dental care, what did it say? It said no.

Why is it that when Canadians look to the Conservative Party to stand up for them, it takes a seat?

The Speaker: I would like to remind all members on the government side, as well as all members generally, that chanting is not permitted in the House.

The hon. member for South Shore—St. Margarets.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, lobstermen in Nova Scotia fish for our food, risking their lives in the winter.

Oral Questions

Waves crashing over them, fishing in blizzards and high seas, they risk their lives for 40 years so that they can save a little to retire on the sale of their boat and their licence. The NDP-Liberal latest tax grab on fishermen is to increase, massively, the tax on the sale of their licence, boat and gear, even after the fishing exemption.

Why do the NDP-Liberals think that robbing fishermen of a dignified and honest retirement is fair?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is an important day for Canadians, because, today, after eight weeks of truly undignified dithering and deflecting, the Conservatives have finally shown their true colours. We now know what they really stand for. They had a chance to stand with the plumbers, welders, nurses and teachers, but they have decided that multi-millionaires should pay lower taxes than working Canadians. That is just—

The Speaker: The hon. member for South Shore—St. Margarets.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only thing the Liberal minister is doing is bringing in retirement-killing taxes on fishermen. Mrs. J. and her husband from Nova Scotia worked for 50 years to build their lobster and fish-buying business. They sold their business to create their modest retirement income by investing the proceeds, creating a humble retirement.

They paid their fair share of taxes already but Liberals want to take more of their retirement income.

Why does the Prime Minister think that robbing an 85-year-old widow of her hard-earned, dignified retirement income is fair?

• (1500)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have already, today, at last, established that the Conservatives are against parents, that they are against a nurse or a welder paying taxes at a fair rate. They want a nurse or a welder to pay more tax than a multi-millionaire.

What else are the Conservatives saying? They are saying that they are going to cut, cut, cut. They are going to cut the dental care that is providing care for people in Atlantic Canada. They are going to cut the early learning and child care. They are going to cut pharmacare.

* * *

[Translation]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, farmers suffered disastrous harvests last year, due in part to natural disasters. Last week, they finally reached an agreement with the Quebec government on compensation and have said loud and clear that now it is Ottawa's turn.

Representatives of produce growers are in Ottawa today. They met with the minister this morning to remind him that they exist and that they deserve support. They have been calling on the feder-

al government to provide emergency assistance for almost a year now.

When will the minister finally listen to them and trigger the AgriRecovery program?

[English]

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my hon. colleague's concern. He knows that I am concerned too. I did meet them and I appreciate the work that he has done with the farmers but he is well aware that AgriRecovery is a joint effort between the Government of Canada and the provincial governments across the country.

I can share with the House that we have been working closely with the Government of Quebec and that things are progressing well. I know the farmers need the money, and we will work as fast as we can, making sure that we follow proper procedures to get the money in the hands of the farmers as quickly as we can.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while the Weather Network is predicting another high-risk summer for natural disasters, the federal government has yet to provide any compensation for last year's disasters. We are not off to a good start.

What is the result? One in five farms is unable to pay its debts. One in ten farms wants to shut down within a year. Emergency assistance is urgently needed. Farmers have been calling on Ottawa for almost a year now. Quebec called for the program to be triggered seven months ago.

Will the minister finally trigger the AgriRecovery program now?

[English]

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my hon. colleague's question and concern. I am fully aware that the farmers need the funding as quickly as possible. There is a procedure to follow. I think my hon. colleague is well aware that we are following that procedure with the Quebec government, and as soon as I possibly can, and it is approved, I will make sure the money is in the hands of the farmers, which is much needed, as quickly as possible.

* * *

HOUSING

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, during a housing crisis, the Liberal finance minister is making things worse.

The new capital gains tax will kill investments in Canada and drive up the cost for those who provide housing. Rental experts are saying that the consequences of this tax hike would be disastrous in the short, medium and long term, citing concerns for viability of long-term investment. This will lead to fewer places to rent and more costs to renters.

Canadians are already facing the highest average asking rent ever. So, how is it fair that the Liberals are putting the brakes on new housing when Canadians can barely afford to rent?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us remember that this member is from a party whose leader got seven affordable units built when he was in charge of housing. Let us remember that the Conservatives' housing plan would actually put more tax on home builders, and let us remember that this is the party that believes in cuts, cuts, cuts. They are going to cut dental care. They are going to cut pharmacare. They are going to cut early learning and child care.

• (1505)

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that member has lost all credibility with Canadians, and a job-killing tax on health care, homes, farms and small businesses is the last thing that Canadians need right now in a cost of living crisis.

This new tax will not build any homes; it will only discourage investment in purpose-built rentals. Richard Lyall, residential construction expert, said there's "not a chance" the Liberals will meet their own housing targets.

Housing starts are down, and this tax hike will only make it worse. The Prime Minister is not worth the cost. How is it fair that the Liberals are raising taxes when homebuilding starts are down?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the member, she talks about credibility, but she was at the House of Commons committee meeting responsible for housing when an expert from the rental sector told her that her party's position on not waiving GST for the building of purpose-built rentals was deeply irresponsible. On top of that, she voted against her community of Kelowna getting almost \$32 million to incent zoning changes that will lead to the building of 20,000 homes over the next 10 years.

That is the Conservative Party. Its members identify problems, but they never offer solutions.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of this Liberal government, rents are skyrocketing and affordable housing is getting scarcer.

Canadians are struggling and now the Prime Minister wants to make the situation worse by adding a tax on housing. The Corporation des propriétaires immobiliers du Québec says that adopting this measure would result in even higher rents, which is definitely something to avoid, given the current context.

This Prime Minister wants to increase taxes on housing in the midst of a housing crisis. How is that possible?

Hon. Soraya Martinez Ferrada (Minister of Tourism and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have good news for my colleague opposite. This morning, Statistics Canada reported that April saw a record number of new building

Oral Questions

permits granted. In fact, 22,600 new permits were granted in a single month. That number, 22,600, is far greater than 6.

* * *

TAXATION

Ms. Emmanuella Lambropoulos (Saint-Laurent, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we know that the countries that create major inequalities between the rich and the poor end up failing. Whether we are talking about child care, the Canada child benefit, dental care, affordable housing and so on, we are there to support those who need it. In Canada, we are bringing in a fairer tax system for all generations.

Can the minister tell us what our government is doing to strengthen our social safety net, which benefits all Canadians?

Hon. Soraya Martinez Ferrada (Minister of Tourism and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense for a nurse to pay a higher tax rate than a multi-millionaire. That is currently the situation.

We have a duty to ensure fairness. By increasing the capital gains tax, we will invest more in housing, more in prescription drugs, more in the social safety net.

Today, it is clear that the other side of the House has chosen a camp, that of the multi-millionaires.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals will do anything to make people believe that they are standing up for the middle class, but people are not buying it after nine years of reckless policies that have exacerbated inequalities.

Now, the Liberals are going after the dead and grieving families with the federal capital gains tax. We are talking about a tax hike on inheritances.

Are the Liberals so desperate that they are prepared to tax the dead and those who are grieving?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is an important day for Canadians. Today, every member must make a choice. Each and every one of us must decide whether we are in favour of fairness, whether we think that a nurse should pay less taxes than a multimillionaire. In our party, we know what we think.

Today, Canadians also know what the Conservatives think. They are against fairness. They support multi-millionaires.

• (1510)

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have made our choice.

Oral Questions

We choose to help older people who are thinking of their children, who want to leave them a reasonable inheritance. Those people know these tax measures will eat into the value of that inheritance, leaving less for their children. We cannot allow them to be put in that position.

Can the Minister of Finance explain why the value of inheritances left by people who will soon no longer be with us are going to be drastically reduced by the federal government's tax?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since I came to the House nine years ago, and I daresay since the Leader of the Opposition took his seat 20 years ago and proceeded to do little else, the Conservatives have voted against reducing taxes for the middle class, against the Canada child benefit, against funding child care, against dental care and against pharmacare.

Every time Canadians ask the Conservatives to stand up for them, they remain seated.

[English]

Mr. Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, farmers, fishers, families and physicians will all be impacted by this tax. The government either did not know this was the case or did not care. Had the government actually taken the time to ask StatsCan, it might have found out that almost 50% of the people impacted by this tax, otherwise, make less than \$100,000 a year.

Why does the government continue to insist on purposely misleading Canadians about who will be impacted by this job-killing tax?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the only party trying to mislead Canadians is the Conservative Party, because it has been trying to pose as the party of the little guy. Today, the Conservatives had to make a choice. It was a hard choice for them. It took them eight weeks of struggle, but, at the end of the day, the Conservatives made the choice they always make. They are voting against fairness. They are voting in favour of austerity. They are voting in favour of their rich lobbyist friends. That is what they always do.

HOUSING

Mr. Michael Coteau (Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, many young people in my riding of Don Valley East are worried about not being able to find a place to call their home. They see housing being used more and more as a way to make money, and it is hurting their possibility of home ownership.

Can the Minister of Public Services and Procurement tell this House what the government's plan is to make housing more affordable and to help build a fairer future for all young Canadians?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike Conservatives, who have been treating home ownership like a casino, we put in place a foreign buyers ban so that foreign speculators no longer price out hard-working Canadian families. Unlike the Conservatives, we are working with MPs in the GTA to use public lands for affordable homes and not for the profits of the highest bidders, and our plan

for tax fairness is asking wealthier Canadians to pay a bit more so we can build more homes faster. Will the Leader of the Opposition support that plan for housing: fairness and tax fairness?

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for decades, the Mushkegowuk Cree of James Bay have fought to end substandard health and to get a proper hospital built, but now that the deadline is looming for the future of the Weeneebayko hospital, the federal government has walked away. If it does not return to the table with funding, the construction companies will quit and the provincial funding will evaporate, and all these years of hard work will be lost. The communities and the NDP have called on the Prime Minister to intervene.

It is now or never, so is the minister willing to commit today to flow the funds so this hospital in James Bay can finally be built?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Indigenous Services and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every Canadian in this country deserves access to health care, and that is why we are working so closely with the hospital, with Ontario, to make sure that residents in the Moosonee area can actually access health care, just like every other person in Ontario. I met with the board yesterday, I met with Grand Chief Fiddler, and the Prime Minister has also written a letter confirming our commitment to this project.

● (1515)

CHILD CARE

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are jeopardizing affordable child care by refusing fair pay and benefits for child care workers. In Alberta, experts say child care workers earn less than a livable wage, driving many away from the sector. However, this is an issue across Canada, as low pay and benefits are common for child care workers, most of whom are indigenous and women of colour.

When will the Liberals get serious about affordable, quality child care and create a national workforce strategy for child care workers that actually works?

*Business of Supply***GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[English]***BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**

OPPOSITION MOTION—FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

The House resumed from June 10 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3:19 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion of the member for Trois-Rivières related to the Business of Supply.

Call in the members.

● (1535)

The Deputy Speaker: The question is as follows. May I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[Chair read text of motion to House]

● (1545)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 808)

YEAS

Members

Aboultatif	Aitchison
Albas	Alghabra
Ali	Allison
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arnold
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Block	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Bragdon
Brassard	Brière
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Cannings
Caputo	Carr
Carrie	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Chambers
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Chong
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cooper	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Dancho
Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets

Hon. Jenna Sudds (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for her advocacy. I know she cares deeply about early childhood education. I am happy to share back in response to her question that we are working with the provinces and territories on a national strategy for the workforce. I look forward to moving that forward. There is a lot of work to be done as we work to create 250,000 new spaces, and the early childhood workers are at the heart of that strategy.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: This year, Canadians are commemorating the 80th anniversary of D-Day, giving us the opportunity to recognize the sacrifices that the men and women in the Canadian Armed Forces have made and continue to make on our behalf.

[Translation]

I want to be sure that citizens across the country are aware of the sacrifices that members of the Canadian Armed Forces have made and continue to make on their behalf.

[English]

This year we are also marking and celebrating the centennial of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

Accordingly, I wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of members of the Royal Canadian Air Force, including Lieutenant-General Eric Kenny, commander of the Royal Canadian Air Force, and Loreena McKennitt, who is departing after 10 years of serving as its honorary colonel.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been consultations with all the parties and I—

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: Even before the hon. member has been able to raise the issue, I am hearing “no” in this room. Once again, I would like to remind all members, please, to do negotiations and consultations, as much as possible, so that we can use the time of the House very efficiently.

The hon. member for Vancouver East is rising on another point of order.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am. Actually, I had not even said what I was going to say. I am not quite sure how members would know pre-emptively what I was going to raise.

The Speaker: I am sorry, but I could not hear the hon. member for Vancouver East at all. Can the hon. member please just make her point, so I can just hear what she is raising?

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker. There has been consultation with—

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: I am afraid that I am hearing, right off the top, that there is not unanimous consent for the hon. member.

Business of Supply

Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	Ng	Noormohamed
Dhillon	Diab	Normandin	O'Connell
Doherty	Dong	Oliphant	O'Regan
Dowdall	Dreeshen	Patzner	Paul-Hus
Drouin	Dubourg	Pauzé	Perkins
Duclos	Duguid	Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Dzerowicz	Plamondon	Poilievre
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Ellis	Epp	Redekopp	Reid
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Rempel Garner	Richards
Falk (Provencher)	Fast	Roberts	Robillard
Ferreri	Fillmore	Rodriguez	Rogers
Findlay	Fisher	Romanado	Rood
Fonseca	Fortier	Rota	Ruff
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Sahota	Sajjan
Fraser	Freeland	Saks	Samson
Fry	Gaheer	Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Gainey	Gallant	Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Garon	Gaudreau	Schiefke	Schmale
Gazan	Généreux	Seeback	Serré
Genuis	Gerretsen	Sgro	Shanahan
Gill	Gladu	Sheehan	Shields
Godin	Goodridge	Shipley	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Gould	Gourde	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Gray	Green	Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Guilbeault	Hajdu	Small	Sorbara
Hallan	Hanley	Soroka	Sousa
Hardie	Hepfner	Steinley	Ste-Marie
Hoback	Holland	Stewart	St-Onge
Housefather	Hughes	Strahl	Stubbs
Hutchings	Iacono	Sudds	Tassi
Idlout	Ien	Taylor Roy	Thériault
Jaczek	Jeneroux	Therrien	Thomas
Jivani	Johns	Thompson	Tochor
Joly	Jones	Tolmie	Trudeau
Jowhari	Julian	Trudel	Turnbull
Kayabaga	Kelloway	Uppal	Valdez
Kelly	Khalid	Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Khanna	Kitchen	Van Popta	Vandal
Kmiec	Koutrakis	Vandenbeld	Vidal
Kram	Kramp-Neuman	Vien	Viersen
Kurek	Kusie	Vignola	Villemure
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Virani	Vis
Lake	Lalonde	Vuong	Wagantall
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Warkentin	Waugh
Lantsman	Lapointe	Webber	Weiler
Larouche	Lattanzio	Wilkinson	Williams
Lauzon	Lawrence	Williamson	Yip
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Zahid	Zarrillo
Lehoux	Lemire	Zimmer	Zuberi— 320
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)		
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert		
Lightbound	Lloyd		
Lobb	Long		
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)		
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)		
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)		
Maguire	Majumdar		
Maloney	Martel		
Martinez Ferrada	Masse		
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)		
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)		
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty		
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)		
McLean	McLeod		
McPherson	Melillo	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Morrice— 2
Mendès	Medicino		
Miao	Michaud		
Miller	Moore		
Morantz	Morrison		
Morrissey	Motz		
Murray	Muys		
Naqvi	Nater		

NAYS

Members

PAIRED

Members

Khera Vecchio— 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

PUBLIC COMPLAINTS AND REVIEW COMMISSION ACT

The House resumed from June 10 consideration of the motion that Bill C-20, an act establishing the public complaints and review commission and amending certain acts and statutory instruments, be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-20.

● (1600)

[English]

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

(Division No. 809)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison	Fortier	Fortin
Albas	Alghabra	Fragiskatos	Fraser
Ali	Allison	Freeland	Fry
Anand	Anandasangaree	Gaheer	Gainey
Angus	Arnold	Gallant	Garon
Arseneault	Arya	Gaudreau	Gazan
Ashton	Atwin	Généreux	Genuis
Bachrach	Badawey	Gerretsen	Gill
Bains	Baker	Gladu	Godin
Baldinelli	Barlow	Goodridge	Gould
Barrett	Barron	Gourde	Gray
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste	Green	Guilbeault
Beaulieu	Beech	Hajdu	Hallan
Bergeron	Berthold	Hanley	Hardie
Bérubé	Bezan	Hepfner	Hoback
Bibeau	Bittle	Holland	Housefather
Blair	Blanchet	Hughes	Hutchings
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney	Iacono	Idlout
Block	Blois	Ien	Jaczek
Boissonnault	Boulerice	Jeneroux	Johns
Bradford	Bragdon	Joly	Jones
Brassard	Brière	Jowhari	Julian
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Calkins	Cannings	Kelly	Khalid
Caputo	Carr	Khanna	Kitchen
Carrie	Casey	Kmiec	Koutrakis
Chabot	Chagger	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Chahal	Chambers	Kurek	Kusie
Champagne	Champoux	Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Chatel	Chen	Lake	Lalonde
Chiang	Chong	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)	Lantsman	Lapointe
Cooper	Cormier	Larouche	Lattanzio
Coteau	Dabrusin	Lauzon	Lawrence
Damoff	Dancho	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Davidson	DeBellefeuille	Lehoux	Lemire
Deltell	Desbiens	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Desilets	Desjarlais	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Lightbound	Lloyd
Diab	Doherty	Lobb	Long
Dong	Dowdall	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Dreeschen	Drouin	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Dubourg	Duclos	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Maguire	Majumdar
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi	Maloney	Martel
El-Khoury	Ellis	Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Epp	Erskine-Smith	Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier
Fast	Ferreri	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)
Fillmore	Findlay	McGuinty	McKay
Fisher	Fonseca	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean
		McLeod	McPherson
		Melillo	Mendès
		Mendicino	Miao
		Michaud	Miller
		Moore	Morantz
		Morrice	Morrison
		Morrissey	Motz
		Murray	Muys
		Naqvi	Nater
		Ng	Noormohamed
		Normandin	O'Connell
		Oliphant	O'Regan
		Patzner	Paul-Hus
		Pauzé	Perkins
		Perron	Petipas Taylor
		Plamondon	Poilievre
		Powlowski	Qualtrough
		Rayes	Redekopp
		Reid	Rempel Garner
		Richards	Roberts
		Robillard	Robiguet
		Rogers	Romanado

Government Orders

Government Orders

Rood	Rota
Ruff	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Scheer	Schieffe
Schmale	Seeback
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shields	Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Small
Sorbara	Soroka
Sousa	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Stewart
St-Onge	Strahl
Stubbs	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thomas	Thompson
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Uppal
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Van Popta
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Weiler	Wilkinson
Williams	Williamson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zimmer
Zuberi— 323	

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Khera

Vecchio— 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

The Deputy Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded divisions, Government Orders will be extended by 25 minutes.

* * *

WAYS AND MEANS

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS NO. 25

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved that a ways and means motion to introduce an act to amend the Income Tax Act and the income tax regulations be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, we absolutely would ask for a recorded division.

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

● (1640)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 810)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long

Government Orders

Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Kmiec	Kram
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Kusie	Lake
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	Lantsman	Lawrence
Masse	Mathysen	Lehoux	Leslie
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Liepert	Lloyd
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Lobb	Maguire
McLeod	McPherson	Majumdar	Martel
Mendès	Mendicino	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miao	Michaud	McLean	Melillo
Miller	Morrice	Moore	Morantz
Morrissey	Murray	Morrison	Motz
Naqvi	Ng	Muys	Nater
Noormohamed	Normandin	Patzer	Paul-Hus
O'Connell	Oliphant	Perkins	Poilievre
O'Regan	Pauzé	Rayes	Redekopp
Perron	Petitpas Taylor	Reid	Rempel Garner
Plamondon	Powlowski	Richards	Roberts
Qualtrough	Robillard	Rood	Ruff
Rodriguez	Rogers	Scheer	Schmale
Romanado	Rota	Seeback	Shields
Sahota	Sajjan	Shipley	Small
Saks	Samson	Soroka	Steinley
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Stewart	Strahl
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke	Stubbs	Thomas
Serré	Sgro	Tochor	Tolmie
Shanahan	Sheehan	Uppal	Van Popta
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Vidal	Vien
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné	Viersen	Vis
Singh	Sorbara	Vuong	Wagantall
Sousa	Ste-Marie	Warkentin	Waugh
St-Onge	Sudds	Webber	Williams
Tassi	Taylor Roy	Williamson	Zimmer — 118
Thériault	Therrien		
Thompson	Trudeau		
Trudel	Turnbull		
Valdez	Van Bynen		
van Koeverden	Vandal		
Vandenbeld	Vignola		
Villemure	Virani		
Weiler	Wilkinson		
Yip	Zahid		
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 208		

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Bloch	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genius
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen

PAIRED

Members

Khera Vecchio — 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

● (1645)

[*English*]

It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Royal Canadian Mounted Police; the hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, Mental Health and Addictions; and the hon. member for St. Albert—Edmonton, Democratic Institutions.

* * *

[*Translation*]

**MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE REVIEW COMMISSION
ACT (DAVID AND JOYCE MILGAARD'S LAW)**

BILL C-40—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-40, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, to make consequential amendments to other Acts and to repeal a regulation (miscarriage of justice reviews), not more than five further hours shall be allotted to the consideration at report stage and five hours shall be allotted to the consideration at third reading stage of the bill; and

Government Orders

That, at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration at report stage and at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration at 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 said stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

[English]

The Deputy 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 or use the “raise hand” function so that the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in the question period.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Fundy Royal.

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the bill, as amended from committee, is now a significant departure from what was presented by the minister's predecessor, former minister Lametti, on the miscarriage of justice bill. Originally, when the bill was presented by former minister Lametti, he noted:

It is important to note that the miscarriage of justice review process is not an alternative to the justice system, nor is it another level of appeal. Rather, it provides a post-appeal mechanism to review and investigate new information or evidence that was not previously considered by the courts.

In a radical departure from what was originally proposed, at committee, the minister has had Liberal members appeal the bill so that there would no longer be a requirement to appeal a court decision before someone could avail themselves of the wrongful conviction path. The standard by which the new Liberal-appointed commission would look at a wrongful conviction is whether one may have occurred. That is the lowest threshold of all international comparisons, and it is a much lower threshold than Canada's current threshold, which is that a miscarriage of justice likely occurred.

Did the minister consult with his predecessor about the radical departure, which would create a two-tiered justice system and result in a revictimization of victims' families when they have to go back before the courts?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to address that with a measure of credulity, but I find it troubling that the member filibustered this very bill for 30 hours at committee and then proposed report stage amendments that would entirely gut the bill.

With respect to my discussions with the former minister, David Lametti, we talked about the importance of the bill. Here is why we talked about it. We talked about overrepresentation of Black and indigenous persons in our justice system. We talked about the fact that only 29 cases in over 20 years have ever seen the light of day in terms of wrongful conviction, whereas in the same time frame in the United Kingdom, 542 have seen the light of day. That does not mean that the U.K. is doing things worse; it means they are finding the cases.

What I find most troubling about the Conservative Party's position on the bill is that, somehow, keeping innocent people festering in prison has, incredibly, become a partisan matter.

The reason we are time-allocating the bill is that we need to move on correcting an injustice. We will be firm in our conviction in doing so.

• (1650)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that, in the House, we have seen Conservatives blocking every good piece of legislation and refusing to let things go through, such as dental care, pharmacare and affordable housing. Conservatives opposed all those pieces of legislation.

With respect to Bill C-40, miscarriage of justice, it would seem to me that it is incumbent on all of us to have a justice system that functions well and does not put innocent people behind bars. That does not seem to be the perspective of the Conservative Party. The Conservatives want to block this legislation. The Conservatives want innocent people to remain behind bars. It is a profound disservice to Parliament that the Conservatives have been blocking this legislation, and they have not really offered any explanation except for the fact that they oppose everything that would benefit people, all measures of justice.

I want to ask my colleague why Conservatives have opposed the bill, tried to block it at every step and filibustered it at committee when it would provide justice in this country and a mechanism to ensure that innocent people are not kept behind bars.

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I wish I had an answer. The only thing I can do is speculate that somehow, for some reason, there is a partisan interest in ensuring that wrongfully convicted men and women continue to remain in prison in this country. That, to me, is a shocking proposition, and I desperately hope that I am incorrect in that regard.

I would also point out to the member for New Westminster—Burnaby that the member for Fundy Royal prides himself on championing victims' rights. He has raised this repeatedly at the justice committee. For his own edification, I would reiterate that a dedicated victim services coordinator to support victims, explain the review process and assist with the development of procedural policies is entrenched in the bill.

The only conclusion I can draw is that, if someone is a victim of a crime, then they are supported by the Conservative Party of Canada, but if one is a victim of a wrongful conviction, they are simply left to fester in prison. That kind of intellectual inconsistency is unbecoming of this chamber and should be a subject of reproach for His Majesty's official opposition.

[Translation]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am keen to ask the minister a question.

When it comes to miscarriages of justice, there is the issue of the time allotted for these cases to be dealt with, and, obviously, the issue of the number of judges available. The minister has a responsibility to appoint these judges. Will he respond to the demands of the Bloc Québécois to proceed more quickly and ensure that fewer people are left behind in our justice system?

Government Orders

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's question, even though it is not related to the bill we are discussing at this time.

For the record, the previous government appointed 65 judges a year. I, on the other hand, appointed 113 judges in 10 months. That means I am doing my job twice as quickly as the previous government. I am going to keep doing it, because it helps our justice system and victims, especially victims of miscarriage of justice.

[*English*]

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I receive a lot of phone calls from constituents within the riding of Waterloo. Constituents often ask about this chamber. Right now, we are debating and will be voting on having to use time allocation to, once again, advance legislation.

This morning I had meetings set up, and we had to go to orders of the day because we have an official opposition that refuses to call the question. Even earlier today we voted on Bill C-20. The Conservatives had been filibustering that legislation, putting up automated speeches, most likely through ChatGPT, yet when it came time to call the question and to vote, the Conservatives did support the legislation because it was important legislation.

Why are we having to debate time allocation? Why are we having to make sure that we get the legislation called to a question? Unfortunately, there are some members who will not get to speak to this legislation because the official opposition, under its leader, refuses to call the question.

The member for Fundy Royal did ask a question today, and the only thing he has done really well was to make sure that the House advanced the issue of ensuring that there was no longer conversion therapy in Canada. It is something the member does not speak to, but he was the member who moved the motion to have unanimous consent because the Conservatives did not want to debate it.

How do we ensure justice is served? Why are we using time allocation?

• (1655)

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, we are using time allocation because the members of the official opposition have openly indicated that they have zero interest in proceeding with the bill. The Conservatives' most recent effort has been to propose report stage amendments that would completely gut the legislation. The Conservatives have no interest in supporting the bill because, I guess, wrongfully convicted men and women deserve to fester in Canadian prisons.

What I would underscore, in terms of the access to justice points that were made by the member for Waterloo, is that access to justice is replete throughout this document. This new commission would ensure that there is information provided to the public and potential applicants about miscarriages of justice. The commission would provide translation interpretation services. It would provide assistance to those who cannot afford a lawyer. The commission would even provide assistance in obtaining the necessities of life, such as food and housing.

Through those types of measures, we would reach out to people who might not have the resources to ensure that they can vindicate

their own rights and remove themselves from the situation of being wrongfully convicted. The fact that this has become partisan is really unbecoming of this chamber.

Mr. Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo. I am quite dismayed at the minister's response because he keeps on saying it is disappointing that this matter has become partisan. If there is one person who is making this issue partisan, he should look in the mirror and have a conversation with him in the morning when he is brushing his teeth.

As a prosecutor and as a defence lawyer, I came up against issues of wrongful conviction. In fact, there was a time, even as prosecutor after a guilty plea, that I dealt with this issue. To say that Conservatives do not care about justice and that this is a partisan issue could not be further from the truth.

Justice is increasingly important. Nobody wants a wrongful conviction. That does not mean that we rush out generational legislation that would fundamentally change everything we have come to know about our justice system and create a parallel system in which the rule of law as we know it, with three hundred to four hundred years of tradition, is thrown out, and here we are with time allocation on this very issue.

Nobody wants to see a wrongful conviction. If we do not want to see a wrongful conviction and we want to get this right, why are we moving time allocation on a bill that is so important?

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I respect that member's background in the law. I respect his role as prosecutor. I would remind him that, when he was a prosecuting Crown, his duty was not to secure convictions. His duty was to the court and to the advancement of the law. He rightfully points out that a wrongful conviction serves no one in this country, in this chamber or in the courts where he used to prosecute in British Columbia.

The point is that, with this legislation, we are not purporting to usurp the role of a trial court or an appellate court. The legislation, and I am sure he has read it, but I will remind him, talks about either giving the commission the power to return it to a trial court, in a first instance, or to, on a question of law, go to a court of appeal. That is an important mechanism. It would take that power out of my hands, or the hands of any other minister of justice, and it would put it in the hands of a review commission. It is the same model that is used in the United Kingdom. They have unearthed 542 wrongful convictions in a 20-year period. The number we have unearthed is 29.

The number of indigenous and Black persons festering wrongfully in our prisons is atrocious. I would hope that overrepresentation is a concern for that member and for all of his colleagues, and if it is, if we take him at his word, then he should get behind the bill.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Julie Vignola (Beauport—Limoulo, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when a bill is introduced in the House, we know that it goes through several months of study. There are first and second reading stages and then the work in committee, where the bill may be amended. That has been done for this bill.

Government Orders

I would like the minister to explain what changes have been made to the bill and how these changes improve or dilute the bill.

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I can talk about one improvement that I already mentioned when another member asked me a question.

In some exceptional circumstances, it is necessary to provide a victim of a miscarriage of justice with an opportunity to apply for a review of their file even if the decision was not appealed. It is an exceptional measure. This was suggested by several stakeholders who appeared before the committee. After listening to their testimony, the committee presented the same type of amendments. This is a change that was made to this bill. I believe it will improve access to justice for victims of miscarriages of justice. That is the basic theme of this bill, and it is what we must promote in our justice system.

• (1700)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): How odd, Mr. Speaker. The Conservatives always block all the good bills. They did it to dental care, pharmacare and housing. Bill after bill, the Conservatives block everything.

This bill is about miscarriages of justice, about innocent people who end up behind bars. They are denied their freedom for years and years. The Conservatives say that they do not care, that this does not matter to them. I think it is appalling that they blocked this bill in committee and are now blocking it in the House. I think it is appalling that the Conservatives exhibit no conscience in how they approach their work in the House.

I have a question for my colleague, the minister. Why are these Conservatives refusing to give people who are not guilty their freedom when those people are spending years and years behind bars even though they are innocent?

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I wish I had a better answer to give, but all I can really do is speculate.

Of the 29 people who have been found to be victims of wrongful conviction, none are women. In that group of 29 people, there are six racialized individuals. It is really incredible that this does not strike the Conservative Party as odd. The Conservatives do not seem to think there might be a problem. The figures show that Black and indigenous people are overrepresented in our prisons and courts. The fact that, over the last 20 years, only six racialized people have been found to be victims of wrongful conviction does not trouble the Conservatives. It does not impact them at all.

This shows that they have no interest in promoting a system where wrongful convictions can be identified and overturned. I find that so sad.

[*English*]

Mr. Tako Van Popta (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we agree that the criminal justice review rules need to be revised. We just disagree that an alternative justice system should be created, as did the former minister of justice. A press release introducing the bill stated, “The proposed new commission would not be an alternative to the justice system. Applicants would first need to exhaust their rights of appeal before requesting a miscarriage of justice review by the commission.”

The current Minister of Justice apparently also believed that until a short while ago. He said this at committee: “You need to have exhausted your appeals, at least to a court of appeal or, in some instances, all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada.” We actually agree with that. Why did the minister change his mind? Why create an alternative justice system?

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I respect the member and his work on the justice committee. I do not respect the interpretation he has just put on the floor of the House. What the bill talks about is that rights of appeal must be exhausted. Appealing to a court of appeal per existing case law or appealing all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada would not be necessary.

What I explained in French, and I will explain again in English, is that we heard repeatedly at committee from interveners who talked about the fact that even pursuing an appeal can be an impediment to accessing justice for people who are impecunious, racialized, disadvantaged or vulnerable. In certain exceptional circumstances, the law should safeguard the possibility for even a person who has not exhausted an appeal to raise their hand to say that they believe they have been treated unfairly by the system and have been wrongfully convicted. In exceptional circumstances, those types of cases should be permitted to be heard by a review commission. Does it guarantee that a review commission would decide that it should go back to a trial court or to an appeal court on a question of law? It does not. The key point is that it would allow them an entry point. It would not determine the final outcome.

The notion the member is positing, which is that we are somehow subverting the entire justice system, is simply false on its face. We are replicating a system that has been well-used in the United Kingdom, where they are finding these cases. We are not. We are not serving Canadian victims. That party tends to prize itself as always being on the side of Canadian victims, except when someone is a victim of a wrongful conviction, it would appear.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for this debate that we are having. This debate is important and essential. It is on a bill that essentially seeks to restore trust in the system and restore independence as well.

Through several studies conducted at the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, we saw that this issue of rebuilding trust and loss of trust in the system, especially among indigenous women, is critical. We are seeing this, especially now, with the red dress alert. It strikes at the heart of this issue.

What will the minister's bill do to restore women's trust in the justice system?

• (1705)

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question.

Government Orders

If we create a new commission, that commission will have the resources as well as the mandate to look for cases.

To do that, the commission could intervene directly with inmate communities in the prisons, such as the Prison for Women in Kingston. The representatives of the commission could visit them. They can distribute leaflets, discuss the situation with the inmates and explain what they should do if they believe they have been mistreated or are victims of a miscarriage of justice.

I note once again that of the 29 cases there have been over the past 20 years, not one involved a woman. That is statistically improbable. It is ridiculous that this situation is not being resolved.

If we are unable to enact this bill, the status quo will prevail, and this will not serve the women the member is talking about.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we do not see any form or sense of co-operation coming from opposition members in wanting to deal with legislation and ultimately see it coming to a vote.

My question to the minister is specifically in regard to trying to put a human face on the issue that we are talking about. David Milgaard and the Milgaard family are fairly well known in Manitoba and, I would even suggest, beyond Manitoba's border. I think it is one of the reasons why this legislation is important for all of us to reflect on.

I am wondering if the minister could provide some of his thoughts in regard to that particular file.

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, David Milgaard's case is taught in every law school in this country. It was certainly taught to me in 1995 when I was at U of T's law school. It is taught because the injustice that befell that individual was such a tragedy, that he was wrongfully convicted and served for over 20 years in prison for a crime that he never committed. He carried that as an albatross but also as a force for change going forward after his removal from prison, as did his mother. This bill is actually named David and Joyce Milgaard's Law because the then-minister of justice, David Lametti, made a direct commitment to that family that he would get the bill done. What I am trying to do right now is to see that commitment through. It is important to David Milgaard. It is important to every law student and every lawyer out there. It is important to everyone who cares about the justice system.

Most importantly, it is important to the people, hopefully, who are listening right now from prisons around this country and understanding that if one is wrongfully convicted, there is a means for restoring justice for one in one's particular case, and this commission will help do that.

That is vindicating David Milgaard and what his life stood for, and that is vindicating the rights of Canadians everywhere in this country.

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is hard to know where to begin. He compares the new system to the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom requires, with regard to applicants

for a wrongful conviction, for the commission to consider that there is a real possibility that a wrongful conviction occurred.

In the case that he has put forward now for Canada, the new rule will be that a miscarriage of justice may have occurred. Minister Lametti urged the committee to consider the importance that this is not simply another avenue or another appeal.

What the minister has done is remove the requirement to appeal. What we will be doing is opening the floodgates for everyone who is convicted, at first instance, who feels they did not get a fair shake, to now go back into the system. This revictimizes victims.

We know that the government is failing when it comes to justice. The stats bear that out. I will not list them all, but virtually in every way that one measures, crime in this country has gotten worse. Flooding our justice system for re-hearing cases of those that have been convicted of serious crimes only serves to revictimize true victims.

If the minister knows of individuals who he feels have been wrongfully convicted, he is in a position to do that. As justice minister, there is currently a process for those who have been wrongfully convicted. This process, as put forward, is deeply flawed. I would ask him to reconcile the U.K. standard, that there is a real possibility of a miscarriage of justice or wrongful conviction, versus his new made-up standard, of which there is no international parallel, that a miscarriage may have occurred.

● (1710)

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, let me start with the fact that it is puzzling that the words “systemic racism” never come out of that member's mouth or come out of any of his other colleagues' mouths. They do not come out when we are talking about mandatory minimum penalties. They certainly do not come out when we are talking about wrongful convictions.

For my second point, let us also talk about how we got to this bill. It was informed by the important input of Dean Juanita Westmoreland-Traoré, a Black woman, and Harry LaForme, an indigenous man who happens to be a judge. Those two people represent the two key demographics we are trying to address with this bill, which that member selectively ignores.

Thirdly, yes, our standard is “a miscarriage of justice may have occurred”. It is in the interest of justice in doing so. That standard evolved from the commission recommendations from LaForme and from Westmoreland-Traoré. Will we stand by that standard? That is absolutely right. We will stand by the standard.

He talked to me about the fact that I do not seem to know the law I am duty-bound to implement. Newsflash to the member for Fundy Royal, in fact, I do not go out and search for wrongful convictions. They come to my desk. The point he is missing is that, in the last 20 years, 29 cases have come to my desk or my predecessor's desk. In the same time period, 542 came in the U.K.

Government Orders

Does that mean that the U.K. has some woefully atrocious justice system? No, it means it has a mechanism for searching for the cases. I do not understand, ideologically or for partisan reasons, why on earth any member of Parliament would have a vested interest in not searching out injustice where they see it. That is what we are trying to do with this bill. If they do not want to do that, that is their choice, but they are not going to stand in our way of seeking justice for victims in this country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is not about the substance of Bill C-40, but about the time allocation motion.

There are times when the Liberals filibuster, for example at the Standing Committee on Official Languages. They have done that at several meetings now because they refuse to accept the majority decision at the Standing Committee on Official Languages.

In this case, they are tabling a time allocation motion for much the same reason. When the Liberals do it, it is good, but when another party does it, it is bad. I would like to know what my colleague thinks.

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I believe that time allocation is useful if it is used when necessary. In this case, it is necessary.

We saw how the Conservatives behaved when the bill was being studied at the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. They filibustered for more than 30 hours. In the House, they decided to propose report stage amendments that would completely gut the bill.

It is abundantly clear to all Canadians watching that the Conservatives' currently have zero interest, whether in committee or in the House, in reversing miscarriages of justice. They may well say that they are looking for another way of going about it. The fact is that the current method is not working.

[*English*]

We are not succeeding right now because we are not finding the cases. There are certainly more cases out there. This commission would give us the tools for doing so. That is why we are importantly promoting the establishment of a commission, because it can make change and have an impact on real people's lives, including the victims that the member for Fundy Royal likes to speak about. He conveniently omits victims of wrongful convictions, which is quite selective, from my perspective, and certainly irrational and intellectually hypocritical.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost confidence in our independent institutions, especially when it comes to our justice system. I know oftentimes people in this chamber like to pretend they are judge and jury, but I know there are people without partisan stripes who are able to do that work, and that is why that confidence remains.

I also know that our justice system is not perfect and, though mistakes are rare, what we are noticing is that there are mistakes made and they should be corrected in an efficient manner. I have heard from constituents as well that wrongful convictions have a devastating impact on a wrongfully convicted person, but also on

the victims who deserve truth and justice. We are going to have to go through report stage because members of the Conservative Party of Canada decided, at report stage, to amend the legislation so that nothing would exist in it, meaning once again they do not want to address the concerns that exist.

The minister spoke about systemic racism and discrimination that we know exists within our country. I would like to hear from the minister what measures have been put in place, so that when this commission and the steps are established, we do it in a way that we learn from the past and that the very people who we are trying to serve are served.

● (1715)

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the statistics, they have been mentioned in the discussion about mandatory minimum penalties. An indigenous adult in this country is six times more likely to be incarcerated than that percentage of the population. For an indigenous youth, it is eightfold. For a Black person in this country, it is threefold. Every single one of those demographics is overrepresented in our system.

What are we doing in this very bill? We would ensure we have a commission, first of all. That commission would be made up of between five and nine individuals and the legislation specifically says that those members would reflect the diversity of Canadian society and would take into account the overrepresentation of certain groups in the criminal justice system, including indigenous people and Black people. That is entrenched in the legislation as a specific mandate for this commission in terms of its composition and the types of cases it would seek out.

That is how to address systemic overrepresentation and racism. It would be wonderful if the party opposite, His Majesty's official opposition, could both utter those phrases and actually tackle the issue.

Mr. Tako Van Popta: Mr. Speaker, I was happy to hear the Minister of Justice speak highly of the U.K. experience. A representative from the United Kingdom commission told us about the threshold language that it uses, that there is a real possibility a miscarriage of justice occurred, which is much higher than the wording that is being proposed in Bill C-40. The witness also told us about a large body of jurisprudence that supported that language. I read a lot of those cases and I agree that the United Kingdom got it right.

Why does the Minister of Justice not agree with that and adopt the United Kingdom's language, something that Conservatives could support?

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I would say that if the member supports the U.K. commission model, then he should get behind this bill. We are moving away from a model that arrives on my desk to a model that has a commission, which is the first point. The second point is that we are informed by the study that was done by former Justice LaForme and former dean of law, Juanita Westmoreland-Traoré. It is important in terms of putting a Canadian lens on the pernicious issue, and the very Canadian issue, of overrepresentation of Black and indigenous people in our justice system. That is a unique Canadian response to a unique Canadian problem. We have looked at the U.K. model, and we are perfecting the U.K. model through this very bill.

[Translation]

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

The question is on the motion.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we are comfortable passing it on division.

Mr. Rick Perkins: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded vote.

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1800)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 811)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Battiste	Beech
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly

Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Miller
Murray
Ng
O'Connell
O'Regan
Powlowski
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Singh
Sousa
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Trudeau
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Government Orders

Julian
Kelloway
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Maloney
Mathysen
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
Oliphant
Petipas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 170

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval
Bergeron
Bérubé
Blanchet
Block
Brassard
Brunelle-Duceppe
Caputo
Chabot
Champoux
Cooper
Dancho
DeBellefeuille
d'Entremont
Desilets
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Fortin
Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Beaulieu
Berthold
Bezan
Blanchette-Joncas
Bragdon
Brock
Calkins
Carrie
Chambers
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
Deltell
Desbiens
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Gallant

Private Members' Business

Garon	Gaudreau
Généreux	Genuis
Gill	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Larouche	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Michaud	Moore
Morantz	Morrice
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Normandin	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Perkins	Perron
Plamondon	Poillievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Savard-Tremblay	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shiple
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Therrien	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudel	Uppal
Van Popta	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vignola	Villemure
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer— 152

PAIRED

Members

Khera Vecchio— 2

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare the motion carried.

And the Clerk having announced the results of the vote:

[English]

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I wish to seek the support of the House. On the third reading of Bill C-20, I ran into difficulties with my phone app as I was walking to committee. I would like to seek unanimous consent to record my vote as yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from June 4 consideration of the motion that Bill C-332, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (coercive control of intimate partner), be read the third time and passed.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise to debate this bill today, and I would like to focus my comments on a specific aspect of coercive control, for which there remains very few easy-to-access and easy-to-deploy de-escalation tools for victims. It is my hope that parliamentarians in the other place will consider the addition of these components to this bill, particularly as it pertains to specific tools to assist law enforcement officials in stopping coercive control from happening.

To set the context for this issue, I would like to refer to the Women's Legal Education & Access Fund, or LEAF. It developed a position paper on the criminalization of coercive control in response to this bill. In it, it defines “coercive control” as follows:

Coercive control is a concept used to describe a pattern of abusive behaviors in intimate partner relationships, based on tactics of intimidation, subordination, and control. This can include, among others, behaviors such as isolation, stalking, threats, surveillance, psychological abuse, online harassment, and sexual violence.

Other sources discussed threats of extortion, including so-called revenge porn, as one of the abusive behaviours also used to exert coercive control.

In its paper, LEAF raises the concern that the process of criminalizing coercive control may encounter significant challenges to legal success and that it may be “difficult to translate clearly into actionable criminal law.” One of the recommendations it makes to at least partially address this issue reads as follows: “Federal, provincial and territorial governments should take a proactive approach in focusing on the prevention of intimate partner violence.”

I would like to focus on two actionable, concrete ways to prevent two specific behaviours or components of coercive control: online harassment and revenge porn. In nearly nine years of power, the Liberal government has not taken material action to address the growing threat and breadth of online harassment, particularly as it relates to coercive control. The government's recently introduced and widely criticized Bill C-63, which many experts say would force Canadians to make trade-offs between their charter rights and their safety, does not adequately address the issue of women who are subject to a pattern of abusive behaviour online. Even if it did, today the minister admitted in the Toronto Star that the bill's provisions, which rely on the creation of an onerous new three-headed bureaucracy, would take years to functionally come into force.

Private Members' Business

Canadian women do not have time to wait for the minister's foot-dragging. Online harassment has been an issue for years, and the government has not ensured that our laws have kept pace with this issue. For evidence of this, I encourage colleagues to read the Canadian Resource Centre for Victims of Crime's guide to cyberstalking, which admits as much, saying that, when victims seek to report incidents of cyberstalking, "individual officers may be unfamiliar with the crimes or technology in question and may be uncertain about how to proceed."

Indeed, last month, an article was released that was headlined, "RCMP boss calls for new politician anti-threats law". It cited the need for more provision to protect politicians from online harassment. I asked myself, if the RCMP cannot protect me, how are they going to protect anyone in my community from the same threat? We should all reflect upon this issue because across Canada, at this very moment, women are receiving repeated, unwanted, harassing digital communications, and the best that many victim services groups can do to help, because of government inaction, is offer advice on how they can attempt to be less of a victim.

Women should not have to alter their behaviour. Potential harassers should be held to account, and their behaviour should be de-escalated before it escalates into physical violence. To do this, I encourage parliamentarians in the other place to consider the following in their review of this bill. They should ask the government to create a new criminal offence of online harassment that would update the existing crime of criminal harassment to address the ease and anonymity of online criminal harassment, which groups, in the deliberation of this bill, have noted as a component of coercive control.

Specifically, this new provision would apply to those who repeatedly send threatening or sexually explicit messages or content to people across the Internet and social media when they know, or should know, that it is not welcome. This could include aggravating factors for repeatedly sending such material anonymously and be accompanied by a so-called digital restraining order, which would allow victims of online criminal harassment to apply to a judge to identify the harasser and end the harassment. This would give police and victims clear and easy-to-understand tools to prevent online harassment and also prevent the escalation of this abuse to physical violence.

● (1805)

It would also allow for national awareness and education campaigns to be developed on what happens when someone criminally harasses somebody online. This would address a major issue of intimate partner violence and make it easier to materially and concretely stop coercive control. Members of the governing Liberal Party agreed to the need for these measures in a recent meeting of PROC related to the online harassment of elected officials.

In addition, the government must do more to address so-called revenge porn as a component of coercive control. An academic article entitled "Image-Based Sexual Abuse as a Means of Coercive Control: Victim-Survivor Experiences" states:

Victim-support advocates and domestic violence sector workers have increasingly acknowledged the role that image-based sexual abuse plays in the perpetuation of intimate partner abuse.... Image-based sexual abuse refers to the non-consensual taking or sharing of nude or sexual images (photos or videos), including making

threats to share intimate images.... In the context of an intimate relationship, image-based sexual abuse can include any of the following acts: taking or sharing nude or sexual images without consent; threats to share intimate images to coerce a partner into sharing more intimate images or engage them in an unwanted act; and/or recording and or disseminating of sexual assault imagery.

However, colleagues, this has become even more of a concern given the advent of deepfake intimate images. I have been raising this issue in the House for over a year, and the government has still not moved to update the definition of "intimate images" in Canada's Criminal Code to specifically include deepfake intimate images. This component is not in Bill C-63.

This inaction is already harming women. A Winnipeg high school student had deepfaked intimate images circulated against her; no charges were filed, likely because of the gap in our law. As it relates to coercive control, can members imagine how easy it would be for an abuser to create so-called revenge porn to use against their victim using online technology? The government must act now, but if it will not, we parliamentarians must. Therefore, I ask members of the other place to consider the following in the review of their bill.

They should consider updating Canada's existing laws on the non-consensual distribution of intimate images to ensure that the distribution of intimate deepfakes is also criminalized via a simple definition update in the Criminal Code. This could be done easily and likely with all-party support in this place. It is shameful that the government has not moved to do that to date. In addition, the government admitted today in the Toronto Star that it is committed to dogmatically sticking with Bill C-63 as its only way to address online harms. This is despite widespread criticism and despite admitting that even the few supportable provisions in the bill would not come into force for years. Therefore, we in the opposition must look for ways to address these issues outside the government, particularly since online harm is a growing component of coercive control.

Private Members' Business

In addition to what I have already suggested, as parliamentarians, we should address the broader issue of online harms by doing things such as precisely specifying the duty of care required by online platforms. This should be done through legislation and not backroom regulation. The duty of care could include mechanisms to provide parents with the safeguards, controls and transparency to prevent harm to their kids when they are online; mechanisms to prevent and mitigate self-harm, mental health disorders, addictive behaviour, bullying and harassment, sexual violence and exploitation, and the promotion and marketing of products or services that are unlawful for minors; and mechanisms to implement privacy-preserving and trustworthy age verification methods, which many platforms have already built, to restrict access to any content that is inappropriate for minors while prohibiting the use of a digital ID in any of these mechanisms.

As well, we require mechanisms to give adults a clear and easy-to-use way to opt out of any default parental controls that a duty of care might provide for. Then, through legislation, we should ensure the appropriate enforcement of such measures through a system of administrative penalties and consequences by government agencies and bodies that already exist. In addition, the enforcement mechanisms could provide for the allowance of civil action when duties of care are violated in an injurious way.

To address coercive control, we need to address online harassment. I hope that colleagues in the other place will consider the suggestions I have made to do just that.

• (1810)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, today, I am pleased to contribute to the debate on Bill C-332, which amends the Criminal Code to make controlling or coercive conduct an offence. The Bloc Québécois is in favour of the principle of this bill.

This bill, which was introduced by the member for Victoria, is part of a growing trend among legislators working to address coercive violence. In recent years, the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights produced a report on this issue, which was tabled in the House on April 27, 2021. The Standing Committee on the Status of Women also examined this issue, as did the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage as part of its study on safe sport. In sport, people in a position of authority can exercise coercive control over their athletes.

I am the Bloc Québécois critic for sport. The Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage heard testimony from many athletes who shared how they were abused and mistreated. I commend them for their courage and I want to assure them that we will do everything we can to strengthen this legislation. This bill is not perfect and many shortcomings have already been identified. However, there is nothing preventing the federal government from making amendments to the laws governing sport or to any provisions of other justice and human rights legislation.

I am going to talk about coercive control in sport. I will also address how this inappropriate practice can lead to abuse and mistreatment of athletes. This phenomenon is often hidden under the

guise of discipline and performance requirements. It deserves special attention because it destroys not only careers, but lives.

With the Paris Olympic Games just around the corner, I invite my esteemed colleagues to reflect on the importance of recognizing that there is another reality facing Olympic and Paralympic athletes. There is another side to the medal. Behind every dazzling victory and every gold medal, there are often enormous sacrifices, endless hours of training and sometimes silent suffering. The pursuit of sporting excellence can push some athletes to their extreme limits, and the pressure to succeed can be overwhelming. Under this facade of glory and success, the realities of overtraining, ignored injuries and unrealistic expectations can lead to situations of abuse and coercion. Acknowledging these darker aspects is essential to striking a balance between the pursuit of performance and the preservation of athletes' well-being, ensuring that sport remains a source of personal development, not distress.

Coercion manifests itself in different ways in the world of sport. It can be physical, such as forcing someone to train beyond their pain threshold; psychological, through intimidation or threats; or emotional, through manipulation or constant put-downs. Unfortunately, these practices are often justified by the need to perform and reach goals. In addition, an imbalance of power can develop in coach-athlete relationships. Athletes are constantly in a situation of give and take and may not be capable of recognizing the intent behind each gesture in isolation. However, that vulnerability provides fertile ground for a predator to make the ultimate gesture by escalating to aggression. Respect may not always be present, it seems.

For example, young athletes are often exposed to intense pressure from an early age. In many cases, they are pushed by coaches or even by their own parents to reach new heights without taking into account their physical and mental limits. This excessive pressure can lead to permanent physical trauma, as well as serious psychological problems such as anxiety, depression and even suicidal behaviour. Coercion, however, refers to the disconcerting behaviours and meaningless gestures that are subtly made when athletes come into contact with someone who has bad intentions.

Right now, I am remembering the meeting where the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage heard poignant testimony from Justice Rosemarie Aquilina of the State of Michigan. Almost of us have heard about the gymnastics abuse scandals, the stories that made headlines and galvanized public opinion. Take the case of Larry Nassar, the former team doctor of the United States national gymnastics team, who sexually abused hundreds of young gymnasts under the guise of medical care. For years, these young girls were forced to remain silent, often out of fear of retaliation or shame, reinforced by a culture of coercion and blind obedience.

Here in Canada, I am not sure if my colleagues have watched Rick Westhead's documentary, *Broken: Inside the Toxic Culture in Canadian Gymnastics*, where he covers the case of the infamous Brubakers, who did the same thing to Canadian gymnasts, and the silence and role of Gymnastics Canada in all this. I want to thank the team at Gymnasts for Change for taking a courageous stand, including Kim, Abby, Melanie, Emily, Jessica, Ryan and all the other warriors.

• (1815)

I would also like to thank My Voice, My Choice; Can't Buy My Silence; Athletes Empowered and Global Athlete. They are heroes. Over the past few weeks, athletes have been sharing their stories on Jean-Luc Brassard's show, *L'envers de la médaille*. Athletes have also told their stories to the Standing Committee on the Status of Women and the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. In addition, numerous cases have made headlines in Quebec and Canadian newspapers. These are cases of abuse that could have been prevented if athletes' signals had been interpreted correctly or if better laws had been in place, of course.

I remember coming away from committee meetings shaken and stunned. These emblematic cases could have been prevented if proper safeguards had been in place and the victims had been taken seriously from the outset. How many investigations have been stonewalled by police investigators and by people within the sport federations themselves? Unfortunately, the culture of performance and the policy in sport of winning gold medals at all costs have often blinded those in charge. They have overlooked obvious warning signs. Each time, I ask myself why our society allows these things to happen.

This bill makes perfect sense today because it represents a major step forward in sport as well. It is a first in a series of changes needed to better protect victims of coercion. In sport, these victims are unfortunately all too often underage children. I still believe that a public inquiry is needed, pursuant to part 1 of the Inquiries Act, to get to the bottom of the issue of maltreatment and abuse in sport. Public inquiries have always revealed systemic problems and proposed possible solutions.

I have called upon the federal government, as well as the Minister of Sport and Physical Activity and her predecessor, to launch a public inquiry. The Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage just completed its report on safe sport, which will be tabled in the House very soon. I look forward to discussing it. Until then, I want to remind the House that the consequences of coercion and abuse in sport are deep and lasting. Physically, athletes can suffer irreversible injuries. Psychologically, they can develop post-traumatic stress disorder, eating disorders and addictions. The emotional impact can include loss of self-esteem, feelings of shame and relationship issues. The impact on an athlete's career in sport can be catastrophic. Many promising young talents are forced to leave their sport early after being abused. This not only deprives individuals of their passion and potential, it deprives sport more generally of its future champions.

In conclusion, the Bloc Québécois strongly supports Bill C-332's objective of better protecting victims of coercive or controlling violence. However, certain significant flaws require further considera-

Private Members' Business

tion to guarantee that the bill is effective and fair. It is vital to expand the scope of the bill to allow former partners, family members, neighbours and colleagues to testify. This could help put an end to the system of "their word against mine".

What is more, the severity of the sentences needs to be assessed and the presence of children in situations of coercive violence should be considered an aggravating factor. It is also crucial to examine the impact of this new offence on family law and child protection, as well as the reasons prosecutors frequently drop certain charges to opt for lesser charges, undermining the administration of justice and public trust. The Criminal Code already has 35 sections that can be applied in domestic or spousal violence cases. It is imperative that they be strictly enforced and that we find ways to ensure that prosecutors use them more in cases of coercive or controlling violence.

Finally, it is critical to overcome the difficulties related to the collection of evidence and the strength of the prosecution's case, while protecting the presumption of innocence. A debate needs to be held to balance out the duty to protect victims of controlling or coercive conduct and the right of the accused to a fair trial. By addressing these issues, we could enhance victim protection and make justice more effective and more fair for everyone, as well as ending the culture of silence, of course.

We can take action now. This toxic culture has deep roots, which is why we need to act on several fronts. We can start by raising awareness and educating athletes on their rights from a very early age. Coaches and leaders must be trained to recognize and prevent coercive and abusive conduct. Sports organizations must implement strict policies against maltreatment and provide safe, confidential mechanisms for reporting abuse. Athletes must be encouraged to speak out without fear of retaliation and must be given the support they need when they do so. We need to end the culture of silence. That is important. It is essential. It is also vital that we get parents and families involved in this process, because they play a key role in protecting and supporting young athletes. Parents must be informed about the signs of coercion and abuse and know how to respond effectively to protect the children.

• (1820)

[English]

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today to speak on the issue of coercive control, something that I know jeopardizes the safety and well-being of countless women and gender-diverse people across Canada, an invisible violence that has been ignored for far too long. I really want to thank my colleague, the member for Victoria for tabling this important piece of legislation that seeks to alleviate the struggles of people who experience coercive control, the majority of whom are women and gender-diverse people.

Private Members' Business

Coercive control includes different kinds of abusive behaviour like isolating individuals from family or friends, depriving them of basic needs, threatening to harm them or their children, and closely monitoring and controlling their behaviour. It takes a significant toll on those who are victimized and deprives them of their charter right to be free from harassment and discrimination, and to live in dignity, which also includes violence against one's thoughts and spirit that impact their daily life and everything they do.

I have often heard that when somebody is physically punched, we can see that abuse. With coercive control, it is difficult to see that abuse. The experience of people who have been victimized by coercive control has lasting impacts that are lifelong for many.

It is critical that we address the issue of coercive control in light of the general rise of violence against women and gender-diverse folks across Canada, particularly targeted within rates of violence. We know that the highest rates reported are for indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ individuals. Rates of domestic violence have increased by approximately 30% since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, while more than 50% of Canadian women over the age of 16 have experienced physical or sexual violence in their lifetime. Again, statistics are significantly higher for indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ individuals.

It is particularly alarming that we see intimate partner violence leading to a rise in femicide. According to Stats Canada, between 2009 and 2022, 18% of solved homicide victims were killed by an intimate partner, with women most often being the victims. Because of rising violence, over 70 municipalities have declared gender-based violence an epidemic, something that the Minister of Justice affirmed in a letter to the Ontario coroner's office. I urge the current government to stop talking about a crisis of violence and actually take action to finally address it.

Although this bill is a positive step, there have been some concerns raised about the bill, which I know that the member for Victoria has committed to trying to rectify, particularly from the National Association of Women and the Law, which comprises over 250 women's organizations. Particularly because we must do whatever is needed to end the epidemic of violence, we must also take evidence-based approaches to ensure that policies we put forward work best for empowering those who are victimized. Sometimes we do things for positive reasons, but they can indirectly cause harm. It is for this reason that I would like to express some of the concerns surrounding the coercive control legislation voiced by women's organizations and experts at the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, including the National Association of Women and the Law, which, as I said, represents over 250 feminist organizations across Canada. While we all are deeply concerned by the rise in gender-based violence and intimate partner violence, organizations like NAWL have expressed concerns with the legal consequences that can arise for victims and survivors when we criminalize abusive behaviour without addressing the broader context of sexism in the legal system, primarily impacting Black people, indigenous people and people of colour.

• (1825)

According to experts, less than a quarter of women and gender-diverse people who experience violence and abuse have enough

faith that their accusation will be taken seriously to report it to the police. Instead, their encounters with the legal system mostly occur in the realm of family law, where issues of parenting are adjudicated. In this context, abusers use judicial violence to perpetuate abuse post-separation.

Central to this violence is the pseudo-scientific concept of parental alienation: Women who report family violence are systematically suspected of being alienating, that is, trying to manipulate their children and destroy the father-child relationship. This occurs even when there are criminal charges, investigations or convictions based on a father's violence or abuse. On the so-called "parental alienation" theory, the UN special rapporteur on violence against women and girls stated the following: "the discredited and unscientific pseudo-concept of parental alienation is used in family law proceedings by abusers as a tool to continue their abuse and coercion and to undermine and discredit allegations of domestic violence made by mothers who are trying to keep their children safe."

The concept of "parental alienation" serves as a tool to revictimize, discredit and silence victims of family violence, particularly mothers. When a mother makes an allegation of family violence or coercive control, she is suspected of trying to "alienate" her children. Accusations of parental alienation are primarily directed at women, especially victims of intimate partner violence. Legal experts tell us that a theory of parental alienation is used almost systematically when women report intimate partner violence, including coercive control, by abusers and their legal teams, yet judges and court officials across Canada usually believe these false accusations, or it is not uncommon for them to believe these false accusations, due to an inherent bias against believing women who report abuse.

If we criminalize coercive control and tell victims to go and report violence without addressing the family law crisis, we might unknowingly be putting victims at risk. If mothers do report coercive control, they will be suspected of parental alienation and may risk losing their children. Some mothers are even advised by their own lawyers not to disclose domestic violence in family court due to the risk of being accused of parental alienation. Some women have said that if they had known in advance the consequences of parental alienation accusations, they never would have reported abuse or violence by an intimate partner.

With this context in mind, we need a holistic approach to addressing coercive control, expanding beyond the realm of criminal law to encompass the nuances of family law. This includes, for example, prohibiting the pseudo-scientific concept of parental alienation in courts and ensuring that judges take seriously women's accusations of violence. Failure to do so risks leaving a large percentage of victims vulnerable to continued exploitation and manipulation.

These factors are what we must consider when creating policies to address coercive control. It is absolutely imperative that solutions we propose to an issue as serious as this one do not contribute to the struggles of victims and further empower abusers.

The bill proposed by the member for Victoria is a wonderful first step in the process of finally addressing coercive control. I look forward to working with her and other members in this House to also look at outside issues within family law, including parental alienation, to ensure that those fleeing violence are safe to do so without consequences.

• (1830)

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-332, an act to amend the Criminal Code on coercive control of an intimate partner. The bill would strengthen Canada's legislative framework addressing intimate partner violence, creating a new offence aimed at better protecting victims of coercive control in intimate relationships.

Coercive control involves ongoing conduct that deprives victims of their autonomy. It is a pernicious form of intimate partner violence and a significant risk factor for extreme violence. I have spoken with respect to this many times, not just in the House but also in committee. When I was part of the justice committee, we studied this very egregious behaviour, which is a predeterminer of intimate partner violence within communities and within homes.

Before speaking specifically to Bill C-332, I want to thank the member for Victoria and the member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke for their dedication to this cause. It is really important, and I appreciate their dedication. I am also grateful to all the individuals and organizations that provided evidence to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights during its study of this piece of legislation and its 2021 study on coercive control in intimate relationships more generally. That includes my own Chief Nishan of our Peel Regional Police. I appreciate all of their hard work on this.

Gender-based violence, including intimate partner violence, is unacceptable and has no place in our country. Intimate partner violence is one of the most pervasive forms of violence against women. Our government is committed to ending the gender-based violence epidemic. Criminalizing coercive control is an important step to achieving this end; it is preventative, and it is very important in terms of how we work together in our communities.

• (1835)

[*Translation*]

I am very pleased to see that the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights has passed the government's amendments to Bill C-332, which were largely developed with the input of the

Private Members' Business

provinces and territories, stakeholders and the experiences of other countries that have criminalized coercive control. The amended offence is now modelled on Scotland's domestic violence offence, which was strongly recommended by stakeholders who supported introducing such an offence.

[*English*]

Specifically, the amended offence would criminalize engaging in a pattern of conduct with intent to cause the accused person's intimate partner to believe their physical or psychological safety is threatened. It would also criminalize being reckless as to whether the pattern of conduct could have this effect. "Pattern of conduct" is defined broadly to include subtle forms of abuse that are not criminal in and of themselves; that is, it is conduct that could reasonably be expected to cause the victim to believe that their physical or psychological safety is being threatened.

The committee's amendments not only are responsive to stakeholder input but also further the bill's pressing objective of protecting victims in coercive control cases. For example, the bill would amend the Criminal Code to do the following.

It would require courts to impose a weapons prohibition bail condition where an offender is charged with a coercive control offence, unless the justice considers that such a condition is not required in the interest of the safety of the accused or the safety and security of a victim of the offence or of any person, and to consider imposing additional conditions to ensure the safety and security of the victim where the offender is released on bail.

It would also make the appointment of counsel for cross-examination mandatory on request by victims in coercive control cases where the accused person is unrepresented and seeks to cross-examine the victim themselves, unless the judge or justice is of the opinion that the proper administration of justice requires otherwise.

It would also authorize the taking of DNA from those convicted or discharged of the bill's proposed coercive control offence, which would assist with the investigation and prosecution of intimate partner violence cases.

It would also require courts to issue a weapons prohibition order where an offender is convicted or discharged of the coercive control offence.

Private Members' Business

The amended bill also responds directly to several concerns raised by stakeholders, including by removing the requirement for proof that the victim was afraid. We have heard that requiring such evidence places a burden on the victim to testify, which is going to be a revictimization. It also requires them to show the effect of the accused's behaviour on them. We know in other areas of law, and now here, that another approach is possible, one that requires evidence showing that a reasonable person in the victim's circumstances would believe that their physical or psychological safety was threatened. This approach does not necessarily require a victim to testify and is familiar to Canadian courts.

The bill would also remove the best interests defence, which was included in the bill as introduced. Significant concern was expressed that this defence could have resulted in excusing abusive conduct, in particular toward cognitively impaired and disabled individuals, based on the claim that the coercive conduct at issue was actually in their best interest.

The bill would also delay the coming into force of the offence so that criminal justice practitioners could be trained on how to enforce it. Many stressed the importance of training prior to implementation, in particular because coercive control is an ongoing conduct offence, which is unusual in criminal law as the vast majority of criminal offences are incident-based.

The bill underscores the message that all forms of intimate partner violence are serious, including the more subtler forms, which have so often gone unrecognized. Supporting Bill C-332 is one of many concerted efforts that the government has taken to end gender-based violence, including intimate partner violence and to support victims of both.

For example, in 2021, the Government of Canada announced over \$600 million in funding over five years to address gender-based violence in Canada. Of this, Justice Canada was allocated \$48.75 million to ensure access to free legal advice and legal representation for survivors of sexual assault and intimate partner violence.

In 2022, the government allocated funding of \$539.3 million over five years to enable provinces and territories to enhance services and supports within their jurisdictions to prevent gender-based violence and support survivors through the national action plan to end gender-based violence. I am pleased to have learned that bilateral agreements between the Government of Canada and all 13 provinces have been finalized.

I realize I am coming to the end of my time, but I am looking forward to working with all parties in this House to ensure that we are eradicating and actively preventing gender-based violence from occurring in all communities, including mine in Mississauga—Erin Mills.

• (1840)

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am very proud to be standing in the House today to talk about Bill C-332. It is such an important bill because it talks about amending the Criminal Code around controlling and coercive conduct. I want to thank the member for Victoria for bringing this forward into the House. I also want to take this opportunity to thank

the member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, who brought forward a bill in the 43rd Parliament that is very much the same.

This is an important bill because, when we look at any kind of intimate partner violence or gender-based violence, we need to make the world safer by saying that this is real and that it happens. One of the most concerning issues of our time has been an increase in domestic violence. Especially, during the pandemic, it rose in Canada by 50%. When people were in their homes trying to stay safe, all too often, they became far less safe. One challenge, of course, in addressing these issues is that there is nothing in place at this time about criminalizing coercive and controlling behaviour.

This matters a lot. So often, it happens in little ways. There are these kinds of behaviours where a person is having a relationship or has a connection with someone and see little things that are done all the time. These things minimize a person's reality and control them so that they cannot have the freedom that they should have. It takes away a little part of the self.

I remember working with people who had gone through some sort of gender-based violence and intimate partner violence. One thing they were clear about with me was that it was all these little things that kept happening.

In the beginning, it just seemed as though, if a person just gave up a little piece of themselves, it would bring peace into the relationship. They thought everything would then be okay. Even if they felt uncomfortable with it, there was nowhere to go to say that the person they were with was now taking away all of their credit cards, would not let them have access to their own bank account or was telling them that they had to leave and come back at certain times.

Even when they reported it, nothing could be done. There was no recognition of that behaviour, something that was actually leading to a very dangerous place. That is why I am so supportive of the bill: It is important that we start telling people that this is inappropriate behaviour.

Before I took on my role as a politician, in my job as the executive director of the Immigrant Welcome Centre of North Vancouver Island, I remember working with a lot of newcomer women who had come to Canada through different avenues. They had been sponsored by a spouse or had come over as a caregiver. It was shocking how often that was taken advantage of.

I remember one woman, in particular, who came into our office quite agitated and angry with Canadians. When we sat her down to talk about it, she told us the story of meeting a Canadian man in her home country. They fell in love, she married him, and she was then sponsored to come back to Canada to live with him. When she arrived in Canada, things slowly started to change with her husband; he was very clear that, in Canada, women did not have the same rights as men. Of course, we know that is not the case, but if one is a newcomer woman, one may not know this.

She was very angry because, after she came to Canada, he had done things such as change the locks on the doors. He actually made it so that, when the doors closed in the house, they locked automatically. He did not give her a key. If she got caught outside, he would be very angry with her.

We had to work really hard to get this woman into a safe place. When I look at this here, I can see very clearly that, if it had been criminalized in this place, we would have been able to move a lot faster with her. I hope that, as we do this, we remember the important part of teaching women and people who are in vulnerable groups that this is not okay behaviour. It is those small things.

• (1845)

I have talked to so many people who have survived this behaviour. It teaches them not to trust themselves because their reality is rejected by the person they have this relationship with. When a person cannot trust themselves, it really leads to paths where they do not take care of themselves in the way that they should because they feel like they have done something wrong, and that is the most despicable part of this behaviour, as far as I am concerned. When we take away a human being's ability to trust themselves and to know what does and does not feel good for themselves, it is a terrible form of abuse that is often minimized. It often leads to violence, as those people do not have the ability to defend themselves because they have been picked at for so long that they no longer understand their own human rights.

I am glad to have this bill put forward. We have to remember that this kind of behaviour is consistent with early warning signs of femicides, and we need to stop that. It is not only about the physical violence, although that is so important, but also about these small behaviours and these warning signs of aggressive behaviour and toxic relationships, which include coercive and controlling behaviour.

In my riding, there are many spaces to help people flee violence, and I want to acknowledge all of them; they do incredible work. One that has always stayed close to my heart is the work done in Campbell River at the transition home. It has the beautiful history of Ann Elmore Haig-Brown. She was a woman who worked very hard in that area of Campbell River to make sure that women, largely, were protected. Even though she did not have an official safe house, she created one in her own home. She made sure that women and children fleeing abusive relationships were protected. She often kept them in her own home or in the cottages around her home. She was very quiet and discreet, and she never shared anyone's reality, but she kept them safe. I think that kind of work is so important. She started a pathway towards Campbell River being able to move forward to have its own transition home and to move on to the other services provided by the Ann Elmore transition house in Campbell River.

When we look at the history of domestic abuse and of intimate-partner violence, we can see this path that has always been there. Women and children were fleeing violence and were not able to come forward to talk about inappropriate behaviour that is controlling. Because there was nothing there, the gaps just became wider. The other important thing is that it creates less trust in people who provide the supports, such as police or RCMP, for example. If a

Private Members' Business

person cannot come in and get the help they need right away, it means they do not have trust in those systems, which makes it harder to ask for help later. Adding this is really going to allow police and RCMP to be able to take action much sooner than they are able to today. A big part of this should also include making sure that they get the training to understand what this behaviour looks like and how to call it into reality.

I want to mention that this bill also includes a provision that would allow victims of coercive and controlling behaviour to be recognized by the legislation, even after the relationship has ended. This is really important because for so many people who go through this experience and who are able to get away, for one reason or another, when they look back at it, they can see the pattern that started so much earlier. It is important that this is there because it would allow people to really call on that. In our society, we have to make sure that people are held to account for the actions that they take, so this is important. It means that people are not silenced and that when they are ready to come forward and speak, this would be there for them.

I want to thank everybody who works so hard to keep people safe. I think it is about time that we take that step forward to make sure that we are even safer and that the legislation is there to take action sooner.

• (1850)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Victoria has five minutes for right of reply.

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to start by thanking all of my colleagues who have been advocates on the issue, who have listened to survivors and their families and who are committed to ending gender-based violence and intimate partner violence.

Over the past year, working on the bill, I have heard hundreds of stories from Canadians across the country about how coercive control has impacted their lives. Coercive control is a pattern of behaviour intended to isolate, manipulate, control and often terrorize one's partner, stripping away their autonomy and their self-worth. It is an insidious form of violence that often goes unnoticed and not talked about, until it escalates. Then it becomes something much more visible and much more tragic. It is one of the most common precursors to physical violence. Coercive control is so widespread, and there are so many stories.

Today I want to talk a little bit about a few people who have travelled from Sault Ste. Marie. They are here in Ottawa tonight for the debate and for tomorrow's vote. Angie's Angels is a group that was formed a week after the murder of Angie Sweeney. Angie was a vibrant, loving person whose life was brutally cut short by femicide at the hands of her ex-boyfriend. Angie's ex-boyfriend used controlling tactics throughout their relationship, and when she left, the situation escalated violently. Her tragic story is all too common, and it is a stark reminder of the danger posed by intimate partner violence and coercive control.

Adjournment Proceedings

Angie's Angels is working to share Angie's story to raise awareness about intimate partner violence. It is calling for stronger protections for victims and for survivors. Angie's parents, Brian and Suzanne, and her best friends, Amanda and Renee, have channelled their grief and pain into this amazing action. They want to make sure that no family and no community has to go through the pain that they have. Their bravery and their dedication in the face of such an unimaginable loss is nothing short of heroic. They have turned their horrific personal tragedy into a powerful force for change, and for that they deserve our utmost support and respect.

Caitlin Jennings was someone who was a bright light to the people who knew her. Her father, Dan, connected with Angie's Angels after Caitlin was killed in London. Her life was also cut short when she became the victim of a coercive, controlling intimate partner. Dan has told me that if coercive control had been criminalized, Caitlin would still be here with us today. His words stuck with me, and I think they should stick with everyone in the chamber. We should all feel the urgency of tackling gender-based violence.

A woman is killed every six days in Canada. Caitlin's story and Angie's story are not isolated incidents. They are part of a larger, systemic problem that we as legislators have the power to address. Passing the bill is one important step, but we must do so much more.

When we vote on the bill, I want members to think about Angie and Caitlin, and to think of Angie's and Caitlin's loved ones who have dedicated their time and so much of their lives to preventing situations like theirs from happening. As legislators, we have a responsibility to stop this kind of abuse. I urge my colleagues to work with me to ensure that the bill makes its way rapidly through the red chamber and becomes law as quickly as possible. Let us pass the bill and take a crucial step towards a safer, more just society.

• (1855)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on the motion.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*English*]

Ms. Laurel Collins: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to Standing Order 98, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, June 12, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, Conservatives are sharply focused on the well-being of Canadians, which is why our priorities are to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime. The NDP, along with the NDP House leader, who has some things he wants to say during my speech, has been propping up the Liberals, in spite of how mired they are in corruption. While Conservatives have been—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1900)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): This is not the proper time for any individuals to be interrupting, and there are no questions and comments, so I would recommend that members listen very carefully.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan has the floor.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, they should listen very carefully, indeed. The NDP might learn something because New Democrats are propping up the corrupt NDP-Liberal government while Conservatives remain focused on the best interests of Canadians. We remain laser-focused on axing the tax, building the homes, fixing the budget and stopping the crime, but Liberals and New Democrats have been focused on themselves. The evidence is clear: mounting corruption, damning Auditor General report after damning Auditor General report, multiple negative reports from the Ethics Commissioner against the Prime Minister and so many RCMP investigations that it is hard to keep track of all these Liberal scandals.

Just last week, there were Auditor General reports on the green slush fund and on the government's close relationship with McKinsey. We have continuing investigations, ongoing, into the arrive scam scandal, spending that was voted for by the NDP-Liberal coalition. This is part of a broader pattern of the debasement of the government contracting system by giving contracts to companies that are based in people's basements, tiny companies that receive contracts and subcontracts without actually working on anything to do with the project but that are collecting massive benefits in the process.

It is a government mired in corruption, and after nine years, as Liberals and New Democrats have focused only on themselves, it is no wonder Canadians are worse off, which is why we need a common-sense Conservative government that would focus on the well-being of Canadians and giving Canadians back control of their lives, ending the costly criminal corruption that we have seen under the Liberals and replacing it with Conservative common sense.

Adjournment Proceedings

In particular, we are seeing as well the troubling abuse of indigenous procurement under the government, which is designed to give opportunities for indigenous peoples to benefit from government procurement. However, we are seeing so much abuse of this that under the government there are situations where a tiny company is able to receive contracts under the money set aside for indigenous procurement and then subcontract, likely entirely to non-indigenous companies because there has been no tracking of the subcontracting.

The government operations committee has requested documents about which companies got the subcontracts through indigenous procurement, and there has been a complete absence of information provided in relation to subcontracting. We have cases where money is supposed to be set aside specifically to make life better for indigenous Canadians, yet Dalian Enterprise and the Minister of Indigenous Services have said that the purpose of this program is only to identify the identity of the company initially receiving the contract and not to assess benefits to indigenous communities. This is another clear abuse of government contracting.

Conservatives will stand up for reform in this system. We will fight corruption in the NDP-Liberal government and call for a replacement of that corrupt government with common sense.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, that was quite a bit to listen to. The member started off by talking about the bumper-sticker issues, the themes of the Conservative Party going into the next election. Maybe I could spend a bit of time just talking about that also. At the end of the day, I love the contrast between the Conservatives and the Liberals going into the next federal election, about 18 months from now, I anticipate.

Thinking in terms of the difference, one of the ways I can put it on the table is to say that we have Conservatives who believe in “chop, chop, chop”, as one of the ministers has often made reference to, and then we have the government that understands the needs of Canadians and continues to provide all sorts of programs of great value to Canadians.

On the issue of procurement, this is something that has been happening for generations, and at the end of the day, one of the greatest procurement scandals that we have witnessed was during Stephen Harper's government, when we had a \$400-million procurement scandal for CSC.

It is important to recognize here that just because the Conservatives across the way tack on the word “scandal”, that does not necessarily make it a government scandal. In fact, if we take a look at the government's actions on ArriveCAN, I believe that, at the end of the day, Canadians would understand and appreciate that as a government, when the issue was brought to the attention of the department, the department took immediate action. In terms of looking into the matter, it was ultimately referred to the RCMP. There is a process that is in place in order to protect the integrity of the procurement process, and the government has assigned out responsibilities to make sure there is going to be a consequence where there has been found to be abuse.

The member then went on to talk about indigenous procurement. I would advise the member to take a look at the Shoal Lake water

treatment facility, the procurement process that went on there and the many different benefits. Indigenous people and indigenous community leaders talk about how long it took for them to actually get that water treatment put into place, because the former government, Stephen Harper's, completely ignored it. If we take a look at how it was actually constructed, we will find that through the federal government working in co-operation with and supporting the incredible leadership coming from Shoal Lake 40, we were able to build a wonderful water treatment that was led by Shoal Lake, and the procurement process was indigenous-driven. At the end of the day, it has received many different awards.

The bottom line is that in regard to ArriveCAN, we continue to move forward. The government is very much aware of the serious nature of the issues, and we will continue to look into the matter. Had the government not taken action, then the member might be able to have some credibility on the issue, but virtually from day one, the government has been on top of the issue and will continue to ensure that the taxpayer is protected.

● (1905)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, the member did talk a lot of nonsense in his remarks, but I do want to just zero in on one thing. He talked about Stephen Harper. That member loves talking about Stephen Harper. Every intervention is about Stephen Harper. Let me put to him two things on that. Number one, I think Stephen Harper was a great prime minister. He accomplished a lot for Canada. I think if we were to ask Canadians about their quality of life, the state of crime, the economy and many other issues, compared to when Stephen Harper was in office, they would say that things were much better under Stephen Harper than they are under the current Prime Minister.

Let me put to the member as well that Stephen Harper was prime minister nine years ago. If someone is in a government that has been in power for nine years, and they are still blaming the problems of this country on their predecessor, I think they have really missed the vital importance of taking responsibility. They cannot infinitely run against their predecessor. They have to take responsibility for their own actions.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the government actually does do that. I will often cite Stephen Harper because members opposite like to give a false impression of many of the wonderful initiatives that the government has actually taken. For example, the Conservatives will criticize the government in terms of the economy, trying to say that our economy is broken, yet as a government, in well under nine years, we were able, by working with Canadians, to create over two million jobs. That contrasts to Stephen Harper's million jobs. There are so many comparisons that one can draw, and we draw the comparisons because the Conservative Party goes around the country giving all sorts of misinformation. Among those things is that the country is broken, when in fact it is not, and we continue to move forward.

*Adjournment Proceedings***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 the House that the Senate has passed the following bill, to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-273, an act to declare the Chignecto Isthmus Dykeland System and related works to be for the general advantage of Canada.

● (1910)

MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTIONS

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Liberal minister responsible for legal hard drugs is misleading Canadians. The government is claiming that the so-called safe supply program is working, but the facts say otherwise. In Abbotsford alone, the number of overdoses between 2013 and 2022 went up by 820%, meaning that Abbotsford has seen a near 1,000% increase in overdoses over the last 10 years.

The minister should also be aware that in 2014, unregulated drug deaths from fentanyl were at 22.2%, but by 2023, this figure soared to 85.3%. B.C. Health service delivery areas reported 990 unregulated drug deaths in 2019 and over 2,500 deaths in 2023. Despite the B.C. Medical Association's 2009 recommendations for addiction care improvements, treatment bed availability has remained stagnant for 15 years. Clearly, there is a disconnect between the Liberal government, Canadian tax dollars and the true needs of Canadians in this field.

The minister must acknowledge the failure of legalizing hard drugs. Even Premier Eby is backpedalling on these policies that have caused devastation in the province. The government owes an apology to all those it harmed by its radical drug experiment over the last year. The 2023 federal budget announced a piddling \$20.2 million for a new community-based program to prevent substance abuse in young people. We do not know where any of that money is going or how it is going to be spent.

Currently, drug overdoses are the leading cause of death among youth aged 10 to 18 in British Columbia. A boy named Jacob Wilson in my riding tragically died from an overdose at age 21. He was turned away after repeatedly seeking help and support at our local hospital. Recently, an 18-year-old University of Victoria student died of an overdose and schools across B.C. are now calling for an expansion of emergency measures, such as training students for CPR and the use of naloxone kits. I might add that it is not only at universities, but in high schools as well. We should let that sink in. Children in our high schools have to be trained on the use of naloxone because drug toxicity is the number one cause of death for kids aged 10 to 18.

In my own riding in British Columbia, parents have to routinely clean up needles at parks where children play soccer. This weekend, I asked one of the key coaches how many needles were found this week. I was told they are found every day in the corner of the field where my kids and hundreds of other kids play every week. Public beaches now post signs warning of dirty needles at the most popular spot to play beach volleyball at Kits Beach in Vancouver.

The minister's recommendations on this radical experiment have not helped our children. People are scared to go on public transit.

People are scared of our downtown cores. People are scared to visit certain shops and restaurants at certain times of day. People are scared to go into our hospitals. Businesses across British Columbia are outlining a deteriorated climate and talk about a crime tax because of hard drugs. The RCMP has confirmed that the so-called safe supply has infiltrated the black market.

When will the government end this radical experiment so that our communities can feel safe again?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development and to the Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I imagine that my colleague opposite is pleased, since he got his video clip, but I would like to set the record straight.

The overdose crisis is one of the worst public health crises Canada has ever faced. There is no easy solution. The crisis is fed by a supply of illegal drugs that are becoming more toxic, unpredictable and deadly by the day. It is also driven by underlying socio-economic concerns and problems in accessing treatment. By working together, we can put a stop to the harmful effects of this crisis and the far too many needless deaths across the country.

[*English*]

No one order of government cannot address this crisis alone. That is why we are working closely with all orders of government, indigenous communities, partners and stakeholders to implement a holistic approach to addressing substance use and related harms, focused on promoting public health and protecting public health.

● (1915)

[*Translation*]

Working with the provinces, territories and other partners across the country means implementing solutions they propose, monitoring them closely and making the necessary adjustments along the way. If we do not try something different, we cannot expect different results.

We need to be open to finding new solutions to put an end to this crisis. If the Conservatives had come along on the trip taken by the Standing Committee on Health, they would have heard this for themselves, from the organizations that are working hard on the ground every day.

*Adjournment Proceedings**[English]*

The recent amendment to B.C.'s exemption for personal drug possession demonstrates the point. We granted B.C.'s request to prohibit the possession of controlled substances in public spaces because the province identified a concern and sought to adjust its approach. B.C. told us these changes were needed to provide law enforcement with additional tools to address public drug use when safety issues arise, while ensuring that it continues to treat personal drug use as the health and social issue it is, and we listened.

[Translation]

Public safety is a priority for the government, which is working hard to find innovative solutions to this toxic drug crisis. We are working closely with our national and international partners, including Public Safety, the RCMP, the Canada Border Services Agency and Canada Post, to stem the flow of illegal drugs, give border officers the tools they need to intercept illegal drugs and precursors, and collaborate with private sector partners to tackle the laundering of proceeds of drug trafficking.

The government is also continuing to invest in other evidence-based supports and services to address this crisis. For example, budget 2024 includes a new \$150-million commitment for a fund to support communities, municipalities and indigenous communities. This funding will enable a rapid response to heavily affected communities that have urgent and critical needs related to this crisis.

[English]

With the ultimate goal of providing Canadians with timely access to prevention, harm reduction, treatment and recovery services and supports they need, we will continue to work with municipalities, provincial and territorial governments, law enforcement, indigenous communities and people with lived and living experience.

Mr. Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, I am not looking for a clip. I am addressing the incredibly challenging situation that we find in British Columbia today.

My question to the member for Sherbrooke is, if given the chance, would she legalize hard drugs as her government did in British Columbia? Given the chance, would she adopt a policy that has led, statistically, to record overdose deaths of children from hard drugs? Given the chance, would she repeat the horrendous policy that has really made British Columbians lose faith in our institutions and public order? If given the chance, would she do that in Quebec?

[Translation]

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière: Madam Speaker, the thing we need to remember is that every person who uses drugs needs to have access to the help that best works for them. By offering a wide range of options, we increase the chances that they will find the one that best meets their needs.

Stigmatization may be a barrier to accessing these services. That is why the fight against stigmatization is also a priority for the government. When people who use drugs feel judged, they hesitate to ask for help or to turn to the services that are available. They also hide their drug use.

What we are trying to do is adopt policies and programs based on health and compassion to create a society where substance abuse problems are considered a chronic health problem that needs to be treated without judgment.

[English]

Building pathways away from the criminal justice system and towards health and social services is part of a broader approach across these systems with the goal of reducing harms and saving lives while keeping communities safe.

- (1920)

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Madam Speaker, the cover-up continues. The Prime Minister covered up Beijing's interference in the 2019 and 2021 elections, because it benefited the Liberal Party. When he got caught, the Prime Minister went to extraordinary lengths to cover up what he knew and what he failed to do about Beijing's interference.

When the procedure and House affairs committee commenced hearings to get to the bottom of Beijing's interference, the Prime Minister repeatedly ordered Liberal MPs on the committee to obstruct the work of the committee and to block the production of relevant documents. Instead of calling a public inquiry, the Prime Minister appointed a long-standing family friend as his fake rapporteur to write a whitewash of a report exonerating the Prime Minister. When the fake rapporteur got to work, he hired a bunch of Liberal hacks who wrote that whitewash of a report that the Prime Minister wanted. However, when the report was not able to be held up to basic scrutiny, the fake rapporteur resigned and the Prime Minister was dragged kicking and screaming into calling a public inquiry.

Upon the inquiry being struck, the Minister of Public Safety assured Canadians that the commissioner, Madam Justice Hogue, would have access to all relevant documents. It turns out that the minister was insincere with his words, because *The Globe and Mail* has reported that the Prime Minister has withheld an undisclosed number of documents from Madam Justice Hogue. The Prime Minister's personal department, the PCO, has admitted that of the documents turned over to Madam Justice Hogue, fully 10% have been redacted. I underscore that these are documents that Madam Justice Hogue has requested. The Prime Minister is obstructing the work of Madam Justice Hogue to fulfill her core mandate, which is to determine what the Prime Minister knew, when he knew about it, and what he did or failed to do about foreign interference threats, including Beijing's attack on our democracy.

Adjournment Proceedings

Madam Justice Hogue issued her first report a few weeks ago. It is a damning indictment of the Prime Minister. Among the conclusions that she makes is that the Prime Minister made decisions with respect to countering foreign interference on the basis of giving consideration to direct electoral consequences. In other words, the Prime Minister put his interests and the interests of the Liberal Party ahead of working to counter foreign interference to protect our sovereignty and our democracy. That was based on the documents that the Prime Minister allowed Madam Justice Hogue to see. One can only imagine how much more damning her report would have been had she been able to see all of the documents.

Now, as Madam Justice Hogue prepares to write a second report, to be issued in the coming months, the cover-up continues. If the Prime Minister has nothing to hide, then why will he not stop the obstruction, stop the cover-up and turn over all of the documents requested by Madam Justice Hogue?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, just to start, it is interesting how the member continued with the character assassination of an outstanding Canadian. When he is talking about the special rapporteur, he is really talking about is the former governor general.

When the member labelled him as a Liberal appointing all these other Liberals, what people should realize is that the Right Hon. David Johnston was actually appointed as Governor General by former prime minister Stephen Harper. The last time I checked, Stephen Harper was not a Liberal; he was a Conservative and a man who was held in fairly high esteem. It is unfortunate that the Conservatives with their ramped-up rhetoric felt it was necessary to throw him under the bus in the fashion they did. Personally, I thought it was somewhat disgraceful.

Having said that, when we think about what we are talking about this evening, nothing could be further from the truth in terms of the manner in which the government has actually dealt with foreign interference. In fact the Government of Canada not only consulted but worked openly with all recognized parties of the House to collaboratively develop the terms of reference for the commission.

All parties agreed to the terms of reference as well as to the appointment of the commissioner herself. One of the key aspects of the terms of reference is that the commission essentially has unlimited access to classified information related to its mandate. The terms of reference are very clear: The commission is to have access to certain cabinet documents that are relevant to its work.

The government agreed to this approach, although it is exceedingly rare for something of that nature to occur. Cabinet confidence is a bedrock principle of the Westminster system of government. The notion that such a principle can be thrown out in a sweeping approach to government records undercuts the very same democracy we are actually trying to protect.

All of the cabinet documents that were committed to in terms of the reference have already been provided to the commission. I would contrast the manner in which we as a government have approached the issue to the manner in which the leader of the Conservative-Reform party has approached it to date. The leader of the Conservative-Reform party has not even acknowledged, or desired

in any way to actually get, the security clearance necessary in order to get the information that will answer the types of questions the member is looking to answer. He does not want to get it. He intentionally chooses to be ignorant of the facts.

Contrast that to the leader of the New Democratic Party. In fact, the leader of the Green Party had a very interesting public press conference earlier today after getting the debriefing and was very clear with Canadians as to what she thought. At least she took the interest and the time not only to get the clearance but also then to look at the unredacted report. We know what her comments are.

However, that does not solve the appetite of the Conservatives to go on a vengeful character assassination hunt, in terms of what it is and who it is they can go after. I am surprised and disappointed in the leader of the Conservative Party, but I should not be because even when he was the minister responsible for Elections Canada, in that important role he did absolutely nothing on foreign interference. He knew then that it was an issue but chose, intentionally, to do nothing.

● (1925)

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, the parliamentary secretary is misrepresenting the facts to the extent that he suggested that all relevant documents have been turned over to Madam Justice Hogue.

The procedure and House affairs committee passed a motion to get to the bottom of the Prime Minister's obstruction with respect to turning over documents. On June 7, counsel to Madam Justice Hogue wrote to the committee, stating, "the interest of the commission and the interest of the committee would appear to align."

In short, the Commissioner agrees with the committee that the Prime Minister needs to turn over the documents. The Prime Minister cannot pick and choose which documents to turn over to Madam Justice Hogue, because a core aspect of what she is examining is the Prime Minister's conduct, the decisions that he made and, frankly, his failures to protect our sovereignty and democracy from foreign interference.

It begs this question: What is it in the documents that is so damning to the Prime Minister that he is hiding them from Madam Justice Hogue?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, put very simply and in point form, the Government of Canada worked openly and collaboratively with all recognized parties inside the House to develop the terms of reference of the commission. That is a fact.

The government continues to support the commission by providing tens of thousands of classified documents, while respecting the terms of reference and the underlying principle of cabinet confidence and safeguarding the critical interests of Canada and its allies. That is a fact.

No matter what spin the Conservatives put on it or what misinformation they provide to Canadians, it is always better if we stick to the facts of the matter. By the way, I would conclude that the leader of the Conservative-Reform party should also take advantage and get the debriefing so he will be better informed.

Adjournment Proceedings

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopt-

ed. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:30 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 11, 2024

Points of Order

Oral Questions—Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker 24731

Privilege

Alleged Breach of Deputy Speaker's Impartiality— Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker 24731

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux 24732

Motion 24732

Motion agreed to 24734

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2024, No. 1

Bill C-69. Report stage 24734

Speaker's Ruling

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès) 24734

Motions in Amendment

Mr. Gourde 24734

Motions Nos. 1 to 9 24734

Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) 24734

Motions Nos. 10 to 16 24734

Mr. Kmiec 24734

Motions Nos. 17 to 27 24734

Mr. Schmale 24735

Motions No. 28 to 38 24735

Mr. Baldinelli 24735

Motions Nos. 39 to 48 24735

Mr. Ste-Marie 24735

Motions Nos. 49 to 78 24735

Mr. Hallan 24736

Motions Nos. 79 to 161 24736

Mr. Gourde 24737

Mr. Turnbull 24739

Mr. Thériault 24739

Mr. Julian 24739

Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) 24739

Mr. Turnbull 24741

Mr. Trudel 24741

Mr. Johns 24741

Mr. Kmiec 24741

Mr. Turnbull 24743

Ms. Collins (Victoria) 24743

Ms. Michaud 24744

Mr. Baldinelli 24744

Mr. Turnbull 24745

Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe 24746

Ms. Barron 24746

Mr. Ste-Marie 24746

Mr. Turnbull 24748

Mr. Gourde 24748

Ms. Barron 24748

Mr. Hallan 24749

Mr. Turnbull 24750

Mr. Johns 24750

Mr. Turnbull 24751

Mr. Melillo 24752

Ms. Chabot 24752

Ms. Barron 24753

Mr. Coteau 24753

Mr. Julian 24753

Mr. Lamoureux 24755

Mr. Allison 24755

Mr. Angus 24755

Mr. Sidhu (Brampton East) 24756

Ms. Rood 24758

Mr. Trudel 24758

Mr. Angus 24758

Ms. O'Connell 24759

Mr. Poilievre 24759

Mr. Gerretsen 24760

Mr. Fortin 24760

Ms. Zarrillo 24761

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Royal Canadian Air Force

Mr. Tolmie 24761

Hong Kong-Canada Business Association

Mr. Arya 24761

Human Rights

Ms. Dhillon 24762

Micheline Labelle

Ms. Gaudreau 24762

Royal Canadian Air Force Centennial

Mrs. Lalonde 24762

Taxation

Mr. Lawrence 24762

Super Locker Award

Mr. Badawey 24762

Dartmouth Cove

Mr. Fisher 24763

Taxation

Mr. Vis 24763

National Day Against Gun Violence	
Ms. Damoff	24763
Taxation	
Mr. Patzer	24763
Taxation	
Ms. Ferreri	24764
Indigenous Affairs	
Mr. McLeod	24764
Ted Farron and Ted Boomer	
Mr. Masse	24764
Maéli Grignon	
Ms. Normandin	24764
Health Care Professionals	
Mr. Kitchen	24764
Retirement Congratulations	
Mr. Noormohamed	24765

ORAL QUESTIONS

Taxation	
Mr. Poilievre	24765
Mr. Trudeau	24765
Mr. Poilievre	24765
Mr. Trudeau	24765
Mr. Poilievre	24765
Mr. Trudeau	24766
Mr. Poilievre	24766
Mr. Trudeau	24766
Mr. Poilievre	24766
Mr. Trudeau	24766
Justice	
Mr. Blanchet	24766
Mr. Trudeau	24766
Mr. Blanchet	24766
Mr. Trudeau	24767
Taxation	
Mr. Singh	24767
Mr. Trudeau	24767
Mr. Singh	24767
Mr. Trudeau	24767
Mr. Scheer	24767
Ms. Freeland	24767
Mr. Scheer	24767
Ms. Freeland	24768
Ms. Lantsman	24768
Ms. Freeland	24768
Ms. Lantsman	24768
Ms. Freeland	24768
Mr. Hallan	24768
Ms. Freeland	24768
Mr. Hallan	24768
Ms. Freeland	24768

Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Champoux	24769
Mrs. St-Onge	24769
Mr. Champoux	24769
Mrs. St-Onge	24769
Mr. Champoux	24769
Mrs. St-Onge	24769
Health	
Mr. Ellis	24769
Mr. Holland	24769
Mr. Ellis	24770
Mr. Holland	24770
Mr. Berthold	24770
Mr. Holland	24770
Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. Berthold	24770
Ms. Freeland	24770
Housing	
Mr. Boulerice	24770
Ms. Martinez Ferrada	24770
Persons With Disabilities	
Ms. Zarrillo	24770
Mr. Zuberi	24771
The Economy	
Mr. Gaheer	24771
Ms. Sudds	24771
Taxation	
Mr. Barlow	24771
Mr. MacAulay	24771
Mr. Barlow	24771
Mr. MacKinnon	24771
Mr. Perkins	24771
Ms. Freeland	24772
Mr. Perkins	24772
Ms. Freeland	24772
Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. Perron	24772
Mr. MacAulay	24772
Mr. Perron	24772
Mr. MacAulay	24772
Housing	
Mrs. Gray	24772
Ms. Freeland	24773
Mrs. Gray	24773
Mr. Fragiskatos	24773
Mrs. Vien	24773
Ms. Martinez Ferrada	24773
Taxation	
Ms. Lambropoulos	24773
Ms. Martinez Ferrada	24773
Mr. Paul-Hus	24773
Ms. Freeland	24773
Mr. Paul-Hus	24773

Mr. MacKinnon	24774
Mr. Chambers	24774
Ms. Freeland	24774
Housing	
Mr. Coteau	24774
Mr. Duclos	24774
Indigenous Affairs	
Mr. Angus	24774
Ms. Hajdu	24774
Child Care	
Ms. Gazan	24774
Ms. Suds	24775
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	24775

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Foreign Interference in Democratic Institutions

Motion	24775
Motion agreed to	24776

Public Complaints and Review Commission Act

Bill C-20. Third reading	24777
Motion agreed to	24778
(Bill read the third time and passed)	24778

Ways and Means

Government Business No. 25

Ms. Freeland	24778
Motion for concurrence	24778
Motion agreed to	24779

Miscarriage of Justice Review Commission Act (David and Joyce Milgaard's Law)

Bill C-40—Time Allocation Motion

Mr. MacKinnon	24779
Motion	24779
Mr. Moore	24780
Mr. Virani	24780

Mr. Julian	24780
Mr. Lemire	24780
Ms. Chagger	24781
Mr. Caputo	24781
Mrs. Vignola	24781
Mr. Julian	24782
Mr. Van Popta	24782
Ms. Larouche	24782
Mr. Lamoureux	24783
Mr. Moore	24783
Mr. Beaulieu	24784
Ms. Chagger	24784
Motion agreed to	24786

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code

Bill C-332. Third reading	24786
Ms. Rempel Garner	24786
Mr. Lemire	24788
Ms. Gazan	24789
Ms. Khalid	24791
Ms. Blaney	24792
Ms. Collins (Victoria)	24793
Division on motion deferred	24794

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Mr. Genuis	24794
Mr. Lamoureux	24795

Message from the Senate

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes)	24796
--	-------

Mental Health and Addictions

Mr. Vis	24796
Mrs. Brière	24796

Democratic Institutions

Mr. Cooper	24797
Mr. Lamoureux	24798

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: <https://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 des communes.

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 :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>