



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 334

Tuesday, June 18, 2024

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 18, 2024

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1005)

[*Translation*]

INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay upon the table, pursuant to subsection 40(1) of the Access to Information Act, the report of the Information Commissioner for the fiscal year ended May 31, 2024.

[*English*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(h), this report is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

* * *

LAW COMMISSION OF CANADA

Mr. James Maloney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 2023-24 departmental plan for the Law Commission of Canada.

* * *

FEDERAL OMBUDSPERSON FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME

Mr. James Maloney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 2021-22 annual report from the Office of the Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime.

In addition, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 2022-23 annual report from the Office of the Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime.

* * *

WOMEN, PEACE AND SECURITY

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages,

the combined 2021-22 and 2022-23 progress report on Canada's national action plan for the implementation of the United Nations Security Council resolutions on women, peace and security.

* * *

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 response to 10 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.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Speaker: Call in the members.

● (1050)

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

(*Division No. 830*)

YEAS

Members

Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bendayan
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

Routine Proceedings

Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Diab	Drouin	Bergeron	Berthold
Dubourg	Duclos	Bezan	Blanchet
Duguid	Dzerowicz	Blanchette-Joneas	Block
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Bragdon	Brassard
Erskine-Smith	Fillmore	Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Fisher	Fonseca	Calkins	Caputo
Fortier	Fragiskatos	Carrie	Chabot
Fraser	Freeland	Champoux	Chong
Fry	Gaheer	Cooper	Dalton
Gainey	Garrison	Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Gazan	Gerretsen	Deltell	d'Entremont
Gould	Green	Desilets	Doherty
Guilbeault	Hajdu	Dowdall	Dreeshen
Hanley	Hardie	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Hepfner	Holland	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Housefather	Hussen	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Hutchings	Iacono	Ferri	Findlay
Idlout	Ien	Fortin	Gallant
Jaczek	Johns	Garon	Gaudreau
Joly	Jowhari	Généreux	Genuis
Julian	Kayabaga	Gill	Gladu
Kelloway	Khalid	Godin	Goodridge
Khera	Koutrakis	Gourde	Gray
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Hallan	Hoback
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Jeneroux	Jivani
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Kelly	Khanna
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Kitchen	Kmiec
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Long	Longfield	Kurek	Kusie
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAtulay (Cardigan)	Lake	Lantsman
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor	Larouche	Lawrence
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Lehoux	Lemire
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Lloyd	Lobb
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Maguire	Majumdar
McLeod	McPherson	Martel	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Mendès	Mendicino	Mazier	McCaughey (Edmonton West)
Miao	Miller	McLean	Melillo
Morrissey	Murray	Michaud	Moore
Naqvi	Ng	Morantz	Morrice
Noormohamed	O'Connell	Morrison	Motz
Oliphant	O'Regan	Muys	Nater
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski	Normandin	Patzer
Qualtrough	Robillard	Paul-Hus	Perkins
Rodriguez	Rogers	Perron	Plamondon
Romanado	Sahota	Poilievre	Rayes
Sajjan	Saks	Redekopp	Reid
Samson	Sarai	Rempel Garner	Richards
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke	Roberts	Rood
Serré	Sgro	Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Shanahan	Sheehan	Scheer	Schmale
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Seebach	Shields
Singh	Sorbara	Shipley	Simard
Sousa	St-Onge	Sinclair-Desgagné	Small
Sudds	Tassi	Soroka	Steinley
Taylor Roy	Thompson	Ste-Marie	Stewart
Trudeau	Turnbull	Strahl	Stubbs
Valdez	Van Bynen	Thériault	Therrien
van Koeverden	Vandal	Thomas	Tochor
Vandenbeld	Virani	Tolmie	Trudel
Wilkinson	Yip	Uppal	Van Popta
Zahid	Zarrillo	Vecchio	Vidal
Zuberi— 171		Vien	Viersen

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett

Williams	Vuong
	Warkentin
	Webber
	Zimmer— 148

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé

Jones— 2

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ELECTORAL PARTICIPATION ACT

The House resumed from June 17 consideration of the motion that Bill C-65, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak to Bill C-65. Before I do that, if members would indulge me, I want to send congratulations to a member of my staff, Ali Shahsmand, who is receiving his master's degree today. Based on his excellent work in my office, he could be teaching many of the classes, but he is nonetheless learning a lot through his master's degree. I am going to do my best to pop over there if there are not too many shenanigans from the other side that keep me here throughout the day. Members are pointing out that I might be the cause of some shenanigans later as well. We will see. I think that is tough, but fair.

We are debating Bill C-65 and, in particular, an amendment put forward at second reading by my colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton. I do not know that there has been much discussion of the amendment in particular, so I do want to review. The amendment proposes that the House decline to give second reading to Bill C-65, an act to amend the Elections Canada Act, as the bill would delay the next federal election so that more departing members of Parliament could collect taxpayer-funded pensions, which is a measure that is particularly offensive at a time when Canadians are struggling due to the NDP-Liberal government's inflation, carbon tax and housing costs. It is a wise and thoughtful amendment from my colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton, which I am pleased to support, and I am looking forward to discussing it.

By way of context about the state of the country right now, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, two of my children, Gianna and Phineas, are in Ottawa as well, and it is great to have them here. I was reflecting on some conversations I sometimes have with my children when I ask them to do a task. My children are very responsible 99% of the time, but sometimes, it comes to pass that a part of the house needs to be cleaned, and I tell them to put the toys away and to clean up an area of the house. Maybe I have a phone call from someone or have some work I have to do, and when I come back an hour later, nothing has changed; all the toys are exactly where they were, or maybe it is even worse. Then, I ask them what is going on and explain that they have to clean it up. They say that they have been working at it for an hour, but nothing has changed.

As parents, we want to look at not just the amount of time spent on an activity, but also the results of the activity and whether things

Government Orders

have changed as a result of the efforts that have been put in. It is a good lesson for children that their activities will be judged not just by the effort they put in, but also by the results they achieve. If people do not learn that they will be judged by the results they produce and not by the efforts they put in, they might grow up to become Liberals.

The Liberals would like us to judge their activities over the last nine years not by the results but by the amount of money they have spent and the amount of energy they have purportedly exerted on behalf of certain outcomes. However, Canadians are judging them on the results. After nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, it is undeniable that the results are much worse.

I think back to 2015 when I was first elected as a member of Parliament for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan. It was the same year that we had a change in government. We had the Conservative government of Stephen Harper prior to 2015, and the current Prime Minister came in 2015, promising real change. That was the slogan. In 2015, the Liberals' slogan was “real change”, and in 2024, their slogan is “boo hoo, get over it”. It is quite a real change that this country has experienced in nine years.

In 2015, the Prime Minister said that real change was coming and, indeed, real change is here. Rents have doubled. The violent crime rate, which was going down, has now gone back up and is continuing to be on the way back up. The national debt has more than doubled. I recall debates previously where people had concerns about the size of our national debt. The national debt has more than doubled since 2015. We are now spending more on servicing the national debt than is transferred to the provinces in health care. As this debt was escalating, the message we heard from the government was not to worry because interest rates were low. However, interest rates have not remained low, and as a result, we are paying more and more in debt servicing costs.

• (1055)

Debt is up. Costs are up. Inflation is up. Crime is up. Canadians are now looking at these results, and they are judging the government, not by its flashy slogans, by its professions of concern or by its promises to spend even more. Canadians are judging the government based on the results that are being achieved. It is amazing to hear the Liberals talk as if they just have to talk in a different way and explain what they are doing in a different way.

After nine years, Canadians have seen what the Liberals have done and have seen the results. What are they doing in response to that? After nine years of failures, costs and crime being up, what are Liberals interested in talking about in the House? What are they trying to focus our attention on? They have this new bill, Bill C-65, and in response to all these challenges and the public anger at the failures of the government, they are proposing to delay the election even further. It is unbelievable.

Government Orders

If the public is upset and it is demanding change and new direction, the Liberals had better delay the election a little longer so that they can stay in power for as long as they can and collect their pensions. That is the approach we are seeing from the Liberal government. I look around the world, and there are a number of cases where governments that are struggling for various reasons have at least the willingness to put their programs to the people and to make their cases to the voters.

We have challenged the government. Rather than a delay to the election, most people I talk to in all parts of this country actually want an election sooner, not later. They want an opportunity to pronounce on the government's failures and to replace it as soon as possible. In the context of the level of fierce criticism and of the challenges the country is facing, the responsible thing to do would be for the government members to say that they were ready to make their case, to put their case before the Canadian people and to let the Canadian people decide on that trajectory in a carbon tax election.

However, the Liberals are trying to move in the other direction. They want to delay the election further. They want to stay in power for as long as they possibly can and avoid the inevitable judgment of the Canadian people on their nine years of terrible failures and the results that it has produced for this country.

Naturally, Conservatives are opposed to the proposed bill. We believe that instead of having a later election, it is time for an earlier election. Canadians want to have a chance to rule on the many failures of the government, and we will, of course, be opposing the bill.

In addition to its evident desire to delay the election and to cling to power as long as it possibly can, the Liberal government has coincidentally put forward a date change to the election that just so happens to allow many additional members of Parliament across the way to be eligible for a pension, and that is certainly suspicious. The members across the way are putting their own pensions ahead of the desire of Canadians for an election that would allow us to replace this costly, corrupt coalition NDP-Liberal government.

The wise amendment from my colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton points out that this focus on protecting their own position and protecting their own pensions is particularly galling to Canadians at a time when so many Canadians are indeed struggling. The struggles Canadians are facing, by the way, are things that the Liberal government loves to try to blame on other people. How can we explain that after the government has pursued inflationary policies, things cost more? The government has chosen to pursue policies that make things more expensive, and on this point, the amendment mentions the carbon tax, and I want to spend a couple of minutes on the carbon tax.

• (1100)

The funny thing about the carbon tax is that New Democrats and Liberals refuse to acknowledge the basic logic of how a carbon tax is supposed to work, even as advocated by its proponents. Proponents of the carbon tax—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I have a point of order from the hon. member for Humber River—Black Creek.

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I have recognized a half a dozen times where my hon. colleague keeps talking about everything else but the amendment and the bill before us. As a reminder, this bill is about electoral reform and not about carbon tax, and not about the umpteen other things that he has mentioned.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind hon. members that there is some flexibility when members are debating. However, I would ask members when they are debating to bring it back to the legislation that is before the House.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I will just reacquaint my friend across the way, and the one person who applauded her intervention, with the fact that we are debating an amendment from the member for St. Albert—Edmonton, which says the following:

the House decline to give second reading to Bill C-65, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act, as the bill delays the next federal election so that more departing members of Parliament can collect taxpayer-funded pensions, a measure that is particularly offensive at a time when Canadians are struggling due to the NDP-Liberal government's inflation, carbon tax and housing costs.

I am, of course, speaking, as I said, about the amendment. That would be not only related to the topic, but definitively the most germane thing that one could possibly talk about: that is, the amendment that is presently before the House. The amendment highlights how the efforts by the Liberals to cling to power by their fingernails, by passing a bill to delay the election, are particularly offensive to Canadians, who would like to see the carbon tax end as soon as possible.

Canadians know that the next election will be a carbon tax election. It will provide an opportunity for the Canadian people to make a decision about whether they approve of the NDP-Liberal plan to massively hike the carbon tax in the years ahead or the Conservative plan to scrap the tax, to axe the tax in every region of the country, and for good. That is the choice that Canadians will have in the next election. A confident government would say they are ready for that choice. It would say, let us have that debate. The member for Winnipeg North says he welcomes that debate. It seems that he has more courage than the leader of his party, because the leader of his party and the minister responsible for this bill have put forward a bill to delay that great clash of ideas that will occur in the next election. Whenever the member for Winnipeg North is ready for this conversation and is ready to allow his constituents to rule on this vital question, then I suggest he tell his Prime Minister to scrap Bill C-65 as they are ready for an election.

Government Orders

I can tell colleagues that, on this side of the House, we are ready. We want to let Canadians decide: Do they prefer the radical NDP-Liberal plan to hike the carbon tax, to quadruple the carbon tax, or do they prefer the common-sense Conservative plan to axe the tax everywhere, and for good? I think Canadians will choose to axe the tax, but in any event, we are ready for that debate. We are ready to submit ourselves to the judgment of the Canadian people. Instead, the government, rather than being prepared to submit itself to the common-sense judgment of the common people, wants to be able to delay the election so the Liberals can hang on to their pensions for as long as possible, hang on to power as long as possible, rather than letting the Canadian people decide.

The government will not be able to delay this inevitable carbon tax election forever. When the inevitable carbon tax election comes, Liberals and New Democrats will have to explain the following to the Canadian people: that the very purpose of a carbon tax is to increase costs. That is what even proponents of the carbon tax say it exists to do. The carbon tax exists to make driving one's car more expensive and to make taking that family road trip more expensive, the family road trip that the Minister of Health thinks is going to burn the planet. I think it was notable after that how various people on social media were able to find posts from the Prime Minister about family road trips he has taken. The Prime Minister does not just take family road trips. He travels much greater distances, using more carbon-emitting options than the simple family van. It is another example of "do as I say, not as I do". Apparently, when everyday Canadians want to spend a few days seeing beautiful parts of our country, putting their kids in the car and travelling places, the Minister of Health thinks that is going to burn the planet. This is the kind of "do as I say, not as I do" radical extremism that we have come to expect from the radical NDP-Liberal coalition government.

Let us be clear. The purpose of a carbon tax, what it is designed to do, is to increase the price of goods so that people will consume those goods less. That is the theory behind the carbon—

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert on a point of order.

Mr. Denis Trudel: Madam Speaker, we have had approximately 150,000 opposition days on the carbon tax. Today, we are studying a different bill, and yet my colleague is talking only about the carbon tax, which—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): That is a point of debate. As I mentioned before, there is some latitude. The hon. member is talking about an amendment that mentions the carbon tax. I will let the member continue his speech. He has four minutes and 43 seconds.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, at the risk of being accused of repetition, I will clarify the point for my Bloc colleagues again, as I did earlier. We are, at present, debating an amendment put forward by my colleague from St. Albert—Edmonton, which is about declining to give second reading to Bill C-65, because the bill reveals the priorities of the government, priorities that are dead

wrong. Conservatives would like to focus on providing economic relief to Canadians. We are ready for a carbon tax election, in which the choice will be clear, between a Conservative common-sense plan and the plan of the NDP-Liberals and the Bloc to impose additional costs on Canadians, punishing new costs that would further undermine opportunity for everyday Canadians.

Here is where we are. It is clear and unmistakable that we are at a time when Canadians are overwhelmingly disapproving of the direction of the NDP-Liberal government, when Canadians' disapproval of the government reflects their own frustration and the fact that they can see how policies of the government have made their lives materially worse, how there is more poverty in this country, more division and more crime as a result of policies that have been pursued by the NDP-Liberal government. In that context, where Canadians are upset with the government, see how the government has made their lives worse and are, therefore, looking for an alternative to the current approach, the Liberal government, rather than recognizing its failures, changing course in its policies and putting its programs to the Canadian people, is focused on pushing forward legislation to try to delay when that ultimate judgment will come down from the Canadian people. That is what we are debating. That is what Bill C-65 is about.

Bill C-65 is before this House because, rather than calling an election or putting forward bills that would actually make Canadians' lives better, Liberals are focused on delaying when that election will come. Conservatives are ready to put our plan before the Canadian people, our plan to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime, our plan to focus on the common sense of Canadians.

I want to remind the New Democrats that the plan is to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime. I think we are winning converts. I think—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1110)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would remind members that they will have an opportunity to ask questions and make comments, so I would ask them to please wait until the appropriate time.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I think we are finally getting through. I think New Democrats are finally hearing us. I think they may be reflecting. The House leader—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Government Orders

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I want to remind hon. members again that they will have an opportunity to ask questions and make comments, so I would ask them to please wait.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, the NDP House leader self-identifies as a worker bee. He has told us that he is a worker bee. If we doubt that he is a worker bee, all we have to do is ask him, and he will tell us that he is a worker bee. Meanwhile, New Democrats are at committee putting forward motions specifically to avoid doing parliamentary work over the summer. Imagine that. At a time when Canadians are suffering, at a time when Canadians want their politicians to get down to work and find solutions to the challenges this country is facing, Liberals are putting forward a bill to delay the election, and New Democrats are putting forward motions so they do not have to work until the election comes. This is what the NDP coalition is about: delaying the election and doing as little work as possible until it comes.

Conservatives are ready to get down to work. We are ready to replace the government. We are ready to clean up the mess that has been created over the last nine years, because our country did not have these problems nine years ago. It will be set on the right path under the principled leadership of the member for Carleton. This is what we are offering Canadians.

Conservatives are ready for an election. We oppose Bill C-65, because we do not want to delay the election. We are ready for a carbon tax election, to put our common-sense plan before Canadians for lower, fairer and simpler taxes, to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime, to bring it home.

Let us reject Bill C-65, let us have a carbon tax election and let the Canadian people decide.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I believe the hon. member for Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill is rising on a point of order.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Madam Speaker, I want to ask if I could get unanimous consent to have my vote recorded as a ye a earlier. I was unable, for technical reasons, to vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Avalon.

Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.): Madam Speaker, before I get to my question, the member mentioned an employee who received his master's today. An employee of mine in my Hill office received two master's degrees. I do not like to be outdone by a Conservative, so I will note that. As well as having a dual master's in political science, he has been accepted into the Ph.D. program. Again, I want to congratulate my employee, Liam O'Brien.

When the member talks about moving to the election, has he spoken to the 32-plus members on his side who would not qualify for a pension when they do not get re-elected?

• (1115)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, first, I want to associate myself with the member's comments and also share congratulations to his employee who is getting his second master's. Maybe once he gets his third master's, he will see the light and become a Conservative. I wish him the best with that intellectual journey.

In terms of the views of members, the Conservative Party has been clear and united that we are ready for an election. We want an election, and we want a carbon tax election where Canadians can choose. We do not want to delay the election. As members will see when this measure comes to a vote, that is the united position of every single Conservative in the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, voting in federal elections is allowed every day at the office of the returning officer. Currently, without the law, there are four days of early voting prior to voting day, people can vote by mail and they can vote on campuses. Simply put, there are plenty of opportunities to vote.

Officially, the government is citing the need to accommodate the festival of lights, Diwali, a holiday celebrated by Indian communities, to justify postponing election day. The Liberal government has chosen to integrate the religious calendar into the electoral calendar. It has chosen to subordinate the rule of law to religious considerations. With that in mind, I would like the member to tell me what he thinks of this official reason.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, it is fair to say that I would have a bit of a different view of many aspects of the religious accommodation conversation than my colleagues do. I think that a free society, a rule of law society, should make efforts to ensure the protection of religious freedom, of the deeply held convictions of people. Religious freedom is a foundational aspect of human rights. It is in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights very clearly.

That said, the member is right that there are many different ways and times people can vote. If we have a situation in which the main election day as well as advance poll days and early voting days also intersect with religious holidays for the same community, then I think there is a much greater problem. In this case, this is just cover for the government. I do not think it is really about accommodation. It is fundamentally about the Liberals' desire to delay the election as much as possible and benefit themselves in the process.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, among the member's many useless slogans that were put forward once again today, one of them was around the Conservatives being "clear and united". I find that particularly interesting, because the member said he is not in support of this bill, yet last night the member for Calgary Confederation said very clearly that he would be in support of this bill as long as there is an amendment to move the election date back.

Government Orders

I have made it clear that I will be putting forward an amendment to see the election date put back, because I agree that we cannot be looking at legislation that will benefit members at a time when people are struggling to make ends meet.

How can the member continue to sabotage legislation that truly supports Canadians?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, the worker bees in the NDP want to tell us about amendments that they might propose, will propose or intend to propose in the future.

Let me tell the House about an amendment Conservatives have already proposed that is at present before the House. This is the amendment I spoke to, from the member for St. Albert—Edmonton, which would, on the basis of the attempt to delay the election, decline to give reading to Bill C-65. Our position is to support the amendment that is on the table, not hope that the worker bees in the NDP will, after taking sufficient time off over the summer, eventually get around to coming up with their own amendment in the future.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, to follow up on that point, it seems like we have two options here. One is to get rid of the bill altogether because there is one provision in it that is inappropriate. The other is to continue with the bill that has many important elements in it, for example, making it easier for folks to vote at advance polls, and then at committee, as is often the case here, to address the problematic provision.

Greens, of course, would strongly support what the member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith has put forward.

Why not at least support the bill, given that there are other important measures in it, and address the problematic provision at the place where that is best done, at committee?

• (1120)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, here is the legislative process in a nutshell. At second reading, we look at the principle of a bill and determine whether the principle of the bill is one that we want to support or not. The principle of what the government is trying to do is that it is looking for cover to delay the election; I think it is quite evident. The principle is that Liberals, the member for Kingston and the Islands and others, are reluctant to face the judgment of the electorate. That is what they are trying to do with the bill. We are not going to fall for this Liberal trick.

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Brampton North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, what my colleague just brought up is interesting. The principle of the bill is, essentially, to make sure that as many Canadians as possible can vote in the next election. I think that is a very noble pursuit that all members of the House should be working toward. To disenfranchise Canadians is not what we have been put in this place to do. We want the next election to be the most participated in, the most fair. The issue that came up with the October 20 election date is one that I know my community faced during the last municipal election, when the election fell on Diwali. There was an extremely low voter turnout.

In this case, it falls on Diwali. It also falls on an election in Alberta as well. Canadians will be asked to make up their mind about their federal member and their provincial member. I think this

would cause a lot of confusion and cause fewer people to come out to the polls. Let us make sure we all work together to get more people to vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I do want to assure the member that I think there will be very high participation in the next election, judging from the Leader of the Opposition's rallies and public events and the level of enthusiasm we are seeing from Canadians for the Leader of the Opposition's message. I know that many people who have never participated in politics before are finally hopeful about the direction that this country could go under new common-sense Conservative leadership.

Respectfully, the chief government whip wants us to judge the government based on its intention, not based on the results. I am not sure that is actually the intention. The publicly stated justification is one thing, but the reality of what the bill would do is delay the election date.

Liberals said that the current proposed date has some issues and problems with it. Why did the government not propose to move the election a week earlier instead of a week later? I would be willing to meet the chief government whip in the middle. How about we just have an election right now, right away? Then we would avoid the potential conflicts that the member mentioned. We are working to have the election as soon as possible, but it is a bit suspicious that they want to delay the election in order to avoid, apparently, a problematic date.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I always enjoy hearing from my colleague, but the reality is that the Harper government was terrible in taking away voting rights from racialized people, from indigenous people, from poor people and from young people. The Harper government and the member for Carleton stripped away voting rights for a whole variety of Canadians they do not seem to like or appreciate. It seems that the Conservatives are in the same frame here with a bill that would enfranchise more people, that would ensure that more people can vote, and Conservatives are opposed to it.

Why are they opposed to more Canadians voting?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, the self-identified worker bee in the corner is making things up about the record of the Harper government, as he regularly does.

The choice Canadians will face in the next election is that they will look at where this country was in 2015 and where it was in 2024, and they will say, "Are we better off in 2024 than we were in 2015? Are we better off with the Conservative government or are we better off with the NDP-Liberal government?" That is the choice, and I think the choice will look much better for us when Canadians finally have a chance to decide than it will for the buzzing bees in the corner of the room.

Government Orders

• (1125)

Mr. Michael Coteau (Don Valley East, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand in the House of Commons on behalf of the great people of Don Valley East to speak to a very important bill, Bill C-65, the electoral participation act.

The chief government whip talked about a noble pursuit to actually look at legislation and look for ways to increase participation, which is essentially what the bill is attempting to do. As members of Parliament, we should always be looking for ways to increase participation in elections. There have been some elections over the last decade where the numbers were quite low, and I have seen low numbers in Ontario in provincial and municipal elections. As members of the House, we need to look for ways to better position people so they can participate in elections. It is important to look for ways to increase accessibility.

My participation in elections go back seven elections. I have actually run seven times: three times as a school board trustee, three times as a provincial member and once as a member of Parliament. However, every single time I ran, I noticed a bit of a change in the elections overall.

I will be sharing my time with the member from Surrey—Newton.

It is important for us to reflect on elections from the past, look at those elections and look for ways to constantly make improvements. I remember the first time knocking on a door as a candidate, which was in 2003. I ran for school board trustee in Don Valley East, and I remember knocking on doors with four or five of my friends for the entire summer. We knocked on every single door throughout the riding. In the end, I was successful in winning my first election.

The cool thing about that campaign is that we got people involved who had not traditionally been involved in politics, people who saw someone like themselves getting involved in politics. I was the first person from my community, Flemingdon Park, to be elected into any level of government, so it was an important thing for our community.

I go out to different schools all the time and I speak to young people. Actually, probably one of my favourite things about this job is talking to young people about politics, going into the classrooms to talk about politics. I always remind young people that to be involved in politics, one does not have to put their name on the ballot. They can help organize or they can advocate. They can write to their elected official or work within the sector. Participation is important because it upholds our democracy and it holds our system accountable, which is an important thing for young people to recognize and to know about.

When I go into classrooms, I often talk about June 1215, which was when the Magna Carta was published. It is a document that today still holds a significant role in the timeline of increasing democracy, because it was the first document in the west that said that the king and the government were not above the people and that they should be held accountable by the people. This is the tradition in the House, that we are accountable to the people.

However, when only half the people show up to vote, there is obviously a problem in politics. We need to look for ways to increase trust, and Bill C-65 would do that. It would increase accessibility. It would increase integrity within the system, and it would also put trust back into the electoral process.

It is important to make sure that as we are building these types of bills, we look at all different ways, especially with emerging technology and the shift within our society as a whole, to make sure that people still feel that the system can be trusted. I do not know whether folks remember, but I think it was in 2011 that there was a major issue in this country with robocalls. This was a new, emerging technology.

• (1130)

Some folks got into trouble because they were using it to discourage people from voting at the correct station. They were sending them to different places to vote, and when they got there, they figured out they could not vote. It was all about voter suppression.

It is important that we, as part of our due diligence as members of Parliament in the House, look for ways to open up the process even further so that people feel they can trust the system, are a part of the system and are involved in deciding which direction they want their democracy and their government to go in.

We have seen the rise of AI over the last several years, especially over the last two or three years, which is going to be a challenge for democracy. It is going to be a challenge for places like the House of Commons and for the electoral process. We have seen recently the use of deepfakes. I know there have been challenges south of the border, and also in India during its election. The use of deepfakes is occurring more and more.

When we watch one of these AI-generated images, it is hard to determine whether it is real or fake. In fact I just saw a deepfake with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition trying to sell some type of product. I was thinking, “What is this?” It was so elaborate that it even had an anchor from one of the major media news stations interviewing the leaders. When we see this stuff, the voice and the facial expressions are so perfect, but the message is not real. We need to make sure that we as MPs put into place the right process so that these types of technologies do not disrupt our pursuit for greater democracy and so that we uphold the integrity that citizens require.

Government Orders

The other thing that I think is important in the piece of legislation before us is accessibility. We need to constantly look for ways to open up accessibility so that when someone wants to go out and vote, maybe a first-time voter, they are not discouraged by the complexity of going out to vote. A good example of that would be what happens in long-term care, and getting polling stations into those types of facilities where it is hard for people to get to a specific location because of a physical challenge. There may also be people who are living in one part of the province but might be in another part of the province on election day. How do we accommodate them?

We need to constantly look for ways to improve the system. This bill would address those challenges as well.

Also, one thing that has been a major concern for me over the last several years, not only as a former provincial member but also as a federal member, is the protection of personal data. We live in an age when personal information can be collected, reused and sold. We need to make sure the data collected by Elections Canada that is used during the process is protected, not only with respect to where it is stored but also with respect to how it is disposed of. We need to ensure that the privacy of citizens remains intact and that there is integrity connected to it, in order to ensure that we have the trust of people.

This is important for Canadians. It is important for democracy. If people think for even a second that their personal information is going to be used by a third party after an election, perhaps a political party, this would increase the likelihood of their not wanting to vote. That is why the act would put in place a process to ensure the protection and privacy of citizens.

I would like to thank the House for listening to me for the last 10 minutes. I thank the people of Don Valley East for their continued support.

• (1135)

Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Madam Speaker, the hon. member delivered a speech about the bill and never mentioned the extension of the voting date by one week to secure the pensions for about 80 MPs, which is about 25% of the House. I wish he had talked about that, because Canadians have been asking about it. We have received so many questions and emails asking about this very important element of the bill.

Mr. Michael Coteau: Madam Speaker, the member has been around here for a while, and he is a smart guy. He knows the process. The bill goes to committee. If improvements can be made, the member and his team can bring forward suggestions.

I was given 10 minutes today to address the issues that I thought were very important. That is why I talked about privacy, accessibility, integrity and trust. They mean a lot to me.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Madam Speaker, I welcome the remarks of my colleague opposite.

I would like to know what his position is. There are some good things in this bill, but there is also the date change. Earlier my colleague from Montcalm asked a question about changing the date for

a religious reason. I see two things here. First, the religious reason raises a number of questions. How many religions are there in Canada? Will we end up finding a date on which there are no religious holidays? I would like to hear my colleague's comments on this. Will we really have to accommodate all the various religions?

Second, there is another aspect I would like to broach. There is a proposal to postpone the elections by a week to allow more House members to qualify for a pension. This is known. Members would miss out by one day if the elections were held on the scheduled date in 2025. This too strikes us as unreasonable, given the often precarious finances of many Quebeckers and Canadians. Not only is a religious holiday being invoked to justify putting off the elections, but a delay would also allow more MPs to qualify for a pension. Does my colleague consider these to be good reasons for postponing election day?

[*English*]

Mr. Michael Coteau: Madam Speaker, that is an important question. We have such a beautiful country, from coast to coast to coast. There are so many different nationalities, a mosaic of different cultures, and it will always be difficult for us to find the perfect date. However, as MPs, we should be trying to accommodate people when possible. That should be a common-sense approach to picking an election day, and I think the member would agree with that.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, I always appreciate hearing from fellow previous school board trustees. There is a lot of value in that experience and bringing that to the House of Commons.

My question is specifically around the component of the bill that speaks to lifting the restrictions on who can assist people living with disabilities, having it removed and having the elector choose who assists them. I believe that to be a big step in the right direction, to look at who can support people in having their ballots counted.

There is also a lot of work that needs to be done once we get this bill to committee, and I am an eternal optimist, to ensure people are able to have autonomy to cast their ballots. I think about people who are visually impaired as one example.

What does the member think about the necessity of us having ballots that make it possible for all Canadians to cast a ballot for who they would like to see elected?

Mr. Michael Coteau: Madam Speaker, my father is legally blind, so I go with him when he votes. I am always amazed at how he is accommodated. The first time we went when he needed assistance, I wondered how they would do it, but it was very professional. If we can look for ways to strengthen the process, through consultation with the disability community, and make it more accessible, it would be a huge priority for me.

Government Orders

• (1140)

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey—Newton, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-65, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act. The legislation would make it easier to vote and increase voter participation across the country, which is essential to a healthy, modern democracy.

One aspect of the legislation includes legislating campus vote as a permanent program. This is particularly important because it will increase voter engagement for youth and young adults.

Coincidentally, today, my nephew, Prabh Noor Singh Dhaliwal, a recent graduate of the Wharton School of Business of the University of Pennsylvania, which is one of the top business schools in North America, is visiting Ottawa. I am proud of his accomplishments, including being elected as vice-president of sponsorship and finance for the student body. It is important that our youth are engaged in the political process and are involved in all levels of government. This is the type of legislation that would allow that.

This important bill, which supports voter participation, better protects Canadians' personal information and enhances electoral safeguards and compliance measures. On electoral safeguards, the government has been continuously improving its response to the evolving threat of foreign interference by enhancing measures and adding new measures that strengthen Canada's electoral system.

The government is not alone in ensuring our electoral system is well protected. Parliament has entrusted responsibility to the independent commissioner of Canada Elections for ensuring that the Canada Elections Act is complied with and enforced. The commissioner's work is an essential element to upholding Canadians' trust in the integrity of Canada's electoral system and maintaining a fair and level playing field for all electoral participants. The critical role of the independent commissioner of Canada Elections and how the safeguards in Bill C-65 would be enforced is what I will speak about today.

First, I will outline how the commissioner fulfils her mandate. I will then turn to the specific proposals in Bill C-65.

In order to enforce and promote compliance with the Canada Elections Act, the commissioner is primarily responsible for conducting investigations and applying a suite of compliance measures as appropriate. The commissioner may initiate an investigation in a number of ways, including following a complaint from the public, a referral from Elections Canada or on her own initiative.

If the investigation reveals any contravention of the Canada Elections Act, the commissioner has a wide range of enforcement tools at her disposal that she can deploy depending on the severity of the contravention. These tools include laying criminal charges, which may lead to prison time and/or a fine; issuing a notice of violation accompanied by an administrative monetary penalty to promote compliance; or simply issuing information or caution letters to raise awareness of the rules, and encourage those who make an honest mistake to course correct.

Which enforcement tool the commissioner chooses to use depends on what would best serve the public interest and whether the contravention has been categorized as an offence or a violation under the act. The difference between the two is that offences may re-

sult in criminal prosecution, fines and/or prison time, while violations are considered administrative contraventions and are subject to administrative monetary penalties.

Some contraventions of the act could be considered either an offence or a violation, meaning that the commissioner would consider the facts of the case to determine which route would better serve the public interest.

• (1145)

The tools available to the commissioner have proven to be effective in promoting and maintaining compliance with the act, yet, as we are well aware, there is always room for improvement.

Bill C-65 would build on the strong compliance and enforcement foundation by adding to the commissioner's tool box in five new ways.

First, to enhance the commissioner's access to information pertaining to investigation, Bill C-65 would clarify that those who have been ordered by a judge to appear before the commissioner or her staff may also be ordered to produce any relevant documents at any time before, during or after the individual's initial appearance. This clarification would help avoid potential delays in the commissioner's gaining access to relevant information and would lower the risk of documents being lost or destroyed.

Second, the commissioner's authorities to enter into memoranda of understanding or other similar arrangements with national security organizations, such as FINTRAC or the Communications Security Establishment, would be made explicit. This added clarity around the expectations for collaboration between the commissioner and government security agencies would not only facilitate investigations and ensure the commissioner can gain access to information held by other federal departments, but it would also support government-wide efforts to respond to the threat of foreign interference in our elections.

Third, Bill C-65 would give the commissioner the option to pursue administrative contraventions currently treated as offences under the act as violations. An example would be taking a ballot selfie where these types of contraventions are better dealt with by the commissioner as opposed to our judicial system.

Other examples of existing offences that would be treated as violations and subject to administrative monetary penalties under Bill C-65 include preventing apartment building access to Elections Canada or campaign staffers for the purpose of engaging voters and wearing partisan materials at polling stations.

This expansion of the administrative monetary penalty regime will support the commissioner's ability to maintain compliance with the Elections Canada Act without lengthy unnecessary criminal investigations.

Government Orders

In addition to existing contraventions that will be newly classified as violations, non-compliance with a political party's privacy policy would also now constitute a violation. This means that the commissioner will be able to issue a notice of violation and administrative monetary penalty or pursue informal measures to encourage compliance, such as issuing caution or information letters, as appropriate.

Fourth, the electoral participation act would also provide the commissioner with the ability to issue administrative monetary penalties to those who support those who contravene the act in addition to the perpetrators themselves. While the measures I have highlighted will support the commissioner in holding those who broke the law accountable, those who conspire or attempt to break the law should also face consequences.

This brings me to the fifth and last measure, which would permit the commissioner to use her powers in instances where conspiracies or attempts to contravene the Elections Act have taken place. This means that those who try to break the law or encourage others to do so can be held accountable. Similar laws on conspiracies and attempts can be found in the Criminal Code and have already proven effective.

This bill is very important to most of my constituents, who need more time to vote in the pre-elections and different means, so that maximum participation can be had.

• (1150)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague spoke about the parts of the bill that he, like us, considers very important. However, he avoided talking about postponing the elections, a proposal supposedly aimed at accommodating Canada's Indian communities for Diwali, the festival of lights.

Can my colleague look me in the eye and tell me that the Liberals are not using Diwali as a pretext for allowing 22 Liberal members and three ministers to qualify for a pension?

[*English*]

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal: Madam Speaker, contrary to what the hon. member suggested, Diwali is a religious and sacred event in the lives of many Hindus and Sikhs across the globe. We are talking about more participation on the Diwali day when people will be celebrating. There will also be a lot more traffic on the streets of major municipalities, which would distract voters from going to the polls. In fact, it is a very good suggestion. On one side, we could celebrate the religious, sacred day of Diwali. On the other side, the voters could go and vote freely with a lot more numbers during the next week, after Diwali.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Madam Speaker, I also want to congratulate the member's nephew for his graduation.

The member was just talking about transportation. In my riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam, we have an aging population, and I know a lot of seniors have a difficult time with transportation to the polls and have been asking me for an extension to make it easier, to have more days to vote. Therefore, I wonder if the member would

not mind sharing with the House what he is hearing in his riding from seniors on their ability to get transportation to the polls.

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the member's gesture toward my nephew.

I am hearing the same thing in my constituency because elderly people and people with disabilities need more time and an accessible system to vote. That is why we are encouraging having an extra two days for the advance polls so that those members of the community who are willing to vote would be able to make sure that their vote is polled and counted. I appreciate the member's concern about our seniors and people with disabilities.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we all know that the House of Commons hosts the king of cryptocurrency here, better known as the leader of the Conservative-Reform party. Within this legislation we see more transparency and accountability. For example, cryptocurrency is something that people would not be able to give through a donation, whether it is to a candidate or to a political party, not only during elections but also between elections.

I wonder if my friend could provide his thoughts on why it is important that we pass the legislation because there are many aspects of the legislation that would enhance and make our election laws stronger, healthier and better. Would the member not agree?

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal: Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North, my dear friend, is always inspiring when it comes to making suggestions about the electoral process and helping communities that need more help to participate in the electoral system.

Cryptocurrency should not be accepted as part of donations. That is why we have to make sure that we are able to strengthen the Canada Elections Act. Let us pass the bill through here and let it go to committee where all members, including Conservatives, Bloc, New Democrats and Liberals, would be able to make suggestions to strengthen the bill to make sure that we have a fair and integral election.

• (1155)

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, Canadians have a right to be thoroughly cynical about this legislation. For all the public hype about how the Liberal government wants to encourage Canadians to participate in the electoral process, notwithstanding the Prime Minister's claims that he is taking action to prevent interference in our elections from hostile foreign governments, Bill C-65 should give little comfort to Canadians who feel that our mock democracy is eroding before our very eyes.

Living in Canada is like winning the lottery. We have a history of standing for justice. We are a country dedicated to the rule of law. We are prosperous. We are safe. We have been blessed with an embarrassing abundance of natural resources. Our citizens are among the best educated in the world. We boast a strong democratic system and a commitment to peaceful transitions of power.

Since 2006, I have had the honour of serving the constituents of Abbotsford, British Columbia, who have elected and re-elected me six times through a robust, fair and transparent electoral process. This very process is what Bill C-65 claims to improve upon.

Government Orders

Trust in our democratic institutions, in our elections, is critical to a peaceful and vibrant society. Canadians must have confidence that the members of the House, who are right here in this chamber, have been elected and have arrived here fairly, without interference from foreign powers. As such, there are some provisions in the bill that we Conservatives would agree with, but we are also deeply concerned that the provisions of the bill are an attempt to conceal from Canadians a much more cynical ploy, namely the promotion of the private financial interests of the Prime Minister's NDP-Liberal caucus, a group of MPs who expect not to be re-elected again. I will get to that in a moment.

To be sure, there are provisions in the legislation that we support. To begin with, there are provisions that would make changes to third party donations. Those changes are welcome, particularly as they are aimed at preventing foreign entities from contributing to election-related activities in Canada.

With the recent revelations regarding interference in our democracy by hostile foreign actors, and the shocking disclosure that our Prime Minister failed to act in a timely manner to warn Canadian MPs and party candidates of threats to their own elections, we parliamentarians must act to ensure that our institutions remain secure and accountable to the only people who really matter, Canadians themselves, and not to hostile foreign powers. Ensuring that foreigners cannot easily donate to candidates for a federal election is a sensible, albeit very modest, improvement for a stronger democracy.

If that were the sole purpose of Bill C-65, we would be content. However, this modest improvement in our election laws is marred by other elements that are problematic. I speak, of course, of the Prime Minister's cynical efforts to extend the so-called fixed election date by one week.

A fixed election is exactly that, or it is supposed to be that, which is the setting of a fixed date for an election to take place in a predictable manner, instead of the Prime Minister gaming the system for his own partisan purposes. Sadly, the fixed election that the law prescribes is no more. Instead, the Prime Minister is cynically pushing it back. He is pushing back the fixed date to benefit his NDP-Liberal MPs who are facing imminent defeat in the next federal election.

• (1200)

According to the legislation, Canadians would have to pay more to pay for the pensions of MPs. Accordingly, this piece of legislation is now becoming known as the "loser NDP-Liberal pension protection act". That is what it is.

I will explain for Canadians who have just tuned in. They deserve to know that, for MPs to qualify for a parliamentary pension, they must have served a total of six years in the House of Commons. It just so happens there were 80 MPs elected in 2019 who will not qualify for a pension if they lose the next election. They would fall one day short. The Prime Minister, of course, sensing that he and many of his NDP-Liberal coalition MPs will not survive politically, has cynically included in this legislation before us a provision that would extend the fixed election date by one week to secure the pension entitlements of NDP-Liberal MPs.

The Prime Minister claims this extension to the fixed election date has nothing at all to do with vesting in pensions for his MPs and everything to do with the Indian festival Diwali. That is a fair point, except that he had the option of moving the date one or two weeks earlier to avoid a conflict with Diwali, or of calling an election right now, as Conservatives have asked him to do. This would spare Diwali and avoid some of the corrosive cynicism that Canadians are experiencing today, but no, the Prime Minister has again exploited our long-suffering taxpayers by favouring the financial interests of elected officials who work here and, quite frankly, are well compensated for the work they do in the House.

We should remember that it is the Liberal government that has amassed more debt than all other Canadian governments in Canadian history combined. This is the Prime Minister who so glibly proclaimed that budgets balance themselves. This is the Prime Minister who asked Canadians to forgive him for not thinking about monetary policy. What are a few more taxpayer dollars going to pension off well-to-do and well-paid politicians? On that basis alone, Conservatives will vote against this legislation. We will always promote the interests of Canadian taxpayers. By the way, it is true that 32 of my Conservative colleagues are within that group of 80 MPs, but those Conservative MPs have made it very clear that they are prepared to go into an election right now and put our Conservative vision and plan for this country to the Canadian people against the disastrous Liberal record.

There are also other elements of the bill that are problematic. Under the legislation, taxpayers would have to foot the bill for having more advanced polling days, which is more cost to taxpayers. Conservatives are also concerned about new provisions that would place the political party above the candidate on a ballot. Let me again explain that. Elections determine who we wish to have represent us in Canada's Parliament, here in the House of Commons, and which individual would be our community's voice in Ottawa.

When Sir John A. Macdonald, our first prime minister, and the other fathers of Confederation came together to create the Dominion of Canada, they agreed that Canadians should elect a hard-working person from each of their communities to represent them in our capital city, someone dedicated to serving the interests of their communities and country without compromise. This would be an individual, not a political party, who truly cares for their district and the people within it. Sadly, this bill before us flips that time-honoured principle on its head by suddenly prioritizing the party on the ballot rather than the candidate himself or herself.

Government Orders

● (1205)

Rather than marking down the candidate of their choice on the ballot, Bill C-65 would now allow a voter to simply mark down the name of a political party, and that ballot would then be valid. This provision goes against everything our parliamentary democracy has been based on for over 150 years, the premise that elected members of the House serve Canadians and that we members, not our political parties or special interest groups, are employed by and accountable to Canadian voters.

It is beyond worrying that the NDP-Liberal coalition believes bringing American-style ballot box party politics into Canada, with its attendant ballot harvesting abuses, will be embraced by Canadians. It will not, and it is not. More likely, it is our NDP-Liberal coalition friends who seek to gain an advantage over their political adversaries in the House.

I began my remarks by describing this bill as cynical, with a capital “C”. It is our Prime Minister who, over a period of nine long years, has failed to seriously address the integrity of our elections and the interference from hostile foreign actors. For many years, the Canadian government has known of foreign interference in our elections. In fact, the director of CSIS, which is our security and intelligence apparatus, warned our Prime Minister that there was a legitimate and significant threat, particularly from China, with respect to our democratic institutions and the elections that undergird those institutions.

Time and time again, the Prime Minister refused to act. It does not stop there. In July 2021, a CSIS report said that China viewed Canada as a high-priority target and invests substantially into influencing our elections and civil society. Indeed, my hon. colleague and friend, the member for Wellington—Halton Hills, has said that he and his extended family were even targets of the Communist regime in Beijing and that the Liberal government failed to let them know, to inform them of that fact.

More egregiously, the recent top secret NSICOP report on foreign interference names MPs who have wittingly or unwittingly engaged in election interference. That report, sadly, has been censored by our own Prime Minister, who refuses to let Canadians know who among us is suspected of acting on behalf of a foreign government. It is completely unacceptable that a parliamentarian who has wittingly aided a hostile foreign power should have their name protected and be able to run for re-election. That is incomprehensible, and Canadians deserve better.

Ask Canadians whether they believe someone suspected of disloyalty to our country and who is in thrall to a foreign power should remain anonymous. The overwhelming response would be absolutely no, so it is fair to ask what the Prime Minister is hiding.

Accordingly, it should surprise nobody that Canadians are losing confidence in their electoral process and have grown cynical about anything the Liberal government does or says, and yet our Prime Minister continues to claim that only he and he alone can fix his own mess and the many other things that are broken in Canada. At its very essence, this boils down to an issue of trust. Do Canadians trust the Prime Minister? Do they trust the government? Overwhelmingly, the answer to that is no.

● (1210)

Our Liberal Prime Minister and his NDP-Liberal coalition have failed Canadians so badly that we cannot even trust our electoral process. This broken country needs a fix that only a change in government can deliver. The winds of change, fortunately, are sweeping across Canada, fanned by our Prime Minister's broken promises and his reckless disregard for the institutions of our democracy.

This bill in no way fixes that. Trust has been broken, and this bill before us will do nothing to materially fix that. For all of those reasons, and many more, I will not be supporting this bill, and I do not believe any of the Conservatives in the House will be supporting this bill.

I ask again: do Canadians have a right to feel cynical? That is what I asked at the beginning of my speech. Do they have a right to feel cynical about their government? The answer is yes. They have a right to feel cynical about their government, about their Prime Minister, and yes, about this disingenuous bill.

The good news is that help and hope are on their way. Let us remember what things were like in Canada back in 2015, before the NDP-Liberal coalition broke everything. It messed it all up. Remember, we had low inflation. We had low interest rates. We had affordable homes and affordable food. We had safe streets. We had respect on the international stage. We had balanced budgets. We all had hope for a brighter and better future.

I am confident that a new government, a Conservative government, will restore the Canadian dream and the hope of a brighter future. We will axe the taxes, build the homes, stop the crime and fix the budget. Canadians are counting on us.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly going to miss that over-the-top rhetoric when this member is gone, as he has announced that he will not be running again.

I will say that he seemed to bring up a lot of issues that do not jive with what was being said previously. The member for Calgary Confederation yesterday said:

The issue that my Conservative colleagues and I have is...the date change that would create pensions for losing Liberal and NDP members. If that date changed, I would be in full support of this bill.

The only issue to Conservatives, according to the member for Calgary Confederation, is the date. The minister made it very clear yesterday, when he was speaking, that he was trying to change the date because there are also municipal elections going on in Alberta on the same day. People will effectively have to go and vote at two polling locations on the same day. The minister also said that if the committee decides it wants to put the date back to where it was, he is willing to accept that.

Government Orders

Given that this is the only thing that seems to be problematic with Conservatives, as stated by the member for Calgary Confederation, why does the member not just let it go to committee and change the date?

Better yet, during his 20 minutes of speaking, why did he not just introduce an amendment to change the date? He could do either of those, and he has not. Why?

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, there is a lot in that question but I was pleased to hear him mention Alberta. The Liberal Party and the Liberal government and former Liberal governments have never cared for Alberta. Remember the national energy plan? The reason I focused—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1215)

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

The hon. member for Abbotsford has the floor.

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I noticed that I touched a nerve. These folks over here do not care for Alberta. They do not care for western Canada. My speech focused in on the totality of this legislation. The reason my colleagues focused on the cynical ploy that is the election date is because Canadians, by and large, are not aware of this. They are not aware that the Prime Minister is monkeying around with the election date simply to protect the pensions of his own well-paid MPs. Shame on them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am anxious for Quebec to become a country so that we do not have to listen to the bickering of these three federalist parties. It will happen one day, I guarantee it.

I listened to my colleague's speech. Something we have agreed on since the beginning is that it is offensive to have wanted to change the date of the election, especially for a completely unreal reason, namely that that day is a holy day. There are many holy days because there are many religions and many days in a year. At some point, that cannot be used as an excuse to change the date. We all know that it is mainly to allow some members to get their pension.

My question is simple. Does my colleague find it as offensive as I do that they drew religion into an election date?

[*English*]

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, what I find really shocking is the Liberals are prepared to Mickey Mouse around and gerrymander our election laws to favour themselves. They are going so far as to actually try to protect and vest the pensions of MPs who would not qualify otherwise.

There is a very easy way to fix this and that is for the Prime Minister to go to the polls. Call an election right now. Let us see if the Liberals can back up their words. Everyone knows that they will never call an election now because they know they are going to lose because of their disastrous record.

As I said in my speech, I am prepared to put up the Conservatives' plan for the economy and for our country and show how we can unite Canada against the Liberals' disastrous plan any day.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the member for Abbotsford for a very long career in representing the constituents of Abbotsford.

I want to share with the member for Abbotsford that I have some great news. We have been talking about this from the onset of Bill C-65. I will be putting forward an amendment to change the election date back to the original date, so that this is no longer an issue.

We have made this very clear. The Liberal minister has made it clear that he would follow the will of the committee. The Conservatives are against it. The Bloc is against it. The NDP is against it. This is no longer a part of this legislation that we need to be worrying about.

Will the member share this with his constituents in Abbotsford, so they can also share the good news?

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, the NDP members, who are part of the disastrous coalition, are saying “trust us”. They will fix it at committee, but let it go ahead in this House. They are saying to let these pensions vest for MPs who are not going to get elected and should not have these pensions vested.

The member is asking me whether, if this gets fixed at committee, I would support it. If this change did not come along, Conservatives would be very happy. Leave the fixed election date as it is. However, I am not prepared to, any longer, accept “trust us” as being the mantra coming from the Liberal-NDP coalition.

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would say that I believe today is the 50th anniversary of the member for Abbotsford's 19th birthday. I do wish him well on this special occasion.

The member talked about foreign interference in Canadian elections. How concerned is the member about the government's response and the other coalition partner's response to foreign interference into Canadian elections? Does he share my concern that the government really has not lived up to its responsibilities in keeping Canadian elections safe from foreign interference?

• (1220)

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, it is not only the member and I who have concerns about foreign interference. We, as Conservatives, have a real concern about foreign interference

Canadians across this country are shocked to learn that the Prime Minister has already known for many years that foreign hostile actors were interfering in our elections. He knew about it, did not advise MPs who were affected by it, and did not put into place anything that would push back on efforts by foreign hostile regimes that were trying to manipulate our election outcomes.

As we know, there are a number of MPs in Canada who likely lost their re-election because of interference from the Communist regime in Beijing. Did it affect the ultimate outcome of the election? No, but it certainly affected the lives and futures of those individual MPs.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, imagine actually hearing such hypocrisy. The member is saying that the Conservative Party cares. That is a bunch of bull.

At the end of the day, let us think about this. The leader of the Conservative-Reform party—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: I only interrupt when I hear disorder in the House. There was a statement there that the hon. member used. Members cannot do indirectly what they cannot do directly. The hon. parliamentary secretary should know better.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Sometimes I get a little colourful, I guess, Mr. Speaker. I will delete the word “bull”.

At the end of the day, the point is that the Conservative leader will not even get a briefing so he could find out which members of the Conservative Party might be interfered with on the international scene. He does not even want the briefing. He would rather be naive, unlike the NDP leader or the Green Party leader.

Where does the member get off saying that the Conservatives are genuinely concerned about foreign interference, in any fashion whatsoever, when in fact their own leader will not get the security clearance to find out what is actually taking place?

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, as they have done many times before, our Liberal friends across the aisle are trying to muzzle our leader. That is not going to happen.

Our leader will speak out on the issues of the day, especially foreign interference. Foreign interference is corrosive to our democracy. These folks over there are laughing at us. Look at them, Mr. Speaker. They are mocking us for taking foreign interference seriously.

When Conservatives form government, we will take foreign interference seriously, and we will take steps to fight back and ensure that we remain free and sovereign.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to stand today to speak to Bill C-65.

First and foremost, because I do not want to forget, I want to thank and give a really big shout-out to my former colleague, past MP Daniel Blaikie, who did a tremendous amount of work on this file and deserves an acknowledgement for all the work he has done to date. I am going to try to carry the baton for the work he has handed to me. They are big shoes to fill, literally, but I will continue doing this important work.

The bill we are talking about today is an important one. We know it is vitally important for Canadians to have access to voting in a way that is barrier-free to increase the participation of Canadians across the country, so they feel their vote counts. This is a time

Government Orders

right now when it is vital for Canadians to know that our democracy is strong and that the process for everybody to vote is accessible.

We are in a climate crisis. We are feeling the impacts of that right now with the heat wave here in Ottawa. We are seeing smoke-filled skies in British Columbia from forest fires. There is flooding. There are endless examples of the ways in which we are being impacted by the climate crisis. We know that people across Canada are struggling to make ends meet, to put food on the table and to keep a roof over their head. Right now, Canadians deserve to know that our elections are fair and accessible, as well as that our democracy is strong. Therefore, it is vitally important that we are doing the work today to set Canadians up for success for elections to come.

The bill would do a lot. One of the things, and I will get into some of them, is around the two additional days of advance voting. This is really important because we know Canadians are busy and we need to make sure they have access to be able to show up at the polls and cast their vote for the candidate they feel is the best fit. Expanding these days out allows Canadians more options for being able to do so. With the passing of the legislation, there would be a phased implementation for people to vote anywhere.

I am sure that members have heard from their constituents, as I have in my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith, that there are barriers when people go to vote in federal elections. They show up at the poll, excited to cast their ballot, but are told that the polling station they need to go to is on the other side of town. Let us imagine a single mom who has worked all day, packing up her kids to get to the polling station and show her kids she is participating in our electoral system, but then being told that she has to go to the other end of town. This is a huge barrier. I hear this not only from constituents in my riding but also from Canadians across the country. They need to know that they can go to a polling station within their riding, similar to other levels of elections, and their vote will be counted.

There are also improvements to the mail-in ballot process. We know that, in previous elections, there were barriers, particularly when people registered for mail-in ballots. If they received a ballot and forgot to mail it back, then showed up at the polling station, they would not be able to cast their vote. These are busy times and, of course, this happens. This is a huge problem and an issue that is being looked at in the legislation to ensure that people who register for a mail-in ballot can still vote at the polling station and have their vote count.

There are a lot of good pieces. Another piece is around students voting. In 2015 and 2019, we had the vote on campus program, where we saw big turnouts of students showing up at the polls to cast their ballots. Unfortunately, that is no longer in place. The legislation would make the vote on campus program permanent in all general elections. It is vitally important for students to know that, while they are on campus, they can easily and accessibly cast their ballots.

Government Orders

● (1225)

This would offer an additional option for community members in the surrounding area to have another poll where they could go and cast their ballots. This is really important at a time when we need young people to participate in our elections. It is ultimately their futures that we are making decisions about today, and this is an important part of the bill.

Another piece in the bill is around long-term care polling stations. We know that many people across the country are aging in long-term care homes. They would not need to leave their residence and could instead cast their ballot right at home, at their care home. This is a huge step in making sure that the people who have contributed to our communities across the country for years and years can continue to have their votes counted.

I would like to point out something that is not in the legislation but that I would love for us to dig into further at committee stage. This is ensuring that we see an increase of polling stations, as well as having mandatory polling stations, on reserves and in Métis settlements. Because of the impacts of colonization throughout history, there are many reasons we are not seeing the participation of indigenous people across the country at the level that it should be. This would be a step in the right direction. It would make sure that indigenous people are able to vote accessibly right at home among community members.

I found it interesting to learn, just today actually, of article 5 of UNDRIP, which I want to reiterate as a very important piece to this discussion that I hope to have at committee. Article 5 of UNDRIP says, “Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and strengthen their distinct political, legal, economic, social and cultural institutions, while retaining their right to participate fully, if they so choose, in the political, economic, social and cultural life of the State.” I read that out because it is in UNDRIP, which is vitally important work that we all need to be paying attention to and prioritizing, as well as because of the fact that this could help to ensure that indigenous people understand their rights when they show up at the polls to vote for the candidate they see as the best fit at the federal level. This is work that needs to happen, and it needs to be prioritized.

Another piece of the legislation, which is something I spoke to earlier in a question, would be ensuring that people who may be living with disabilities, as one example, are able to cast their ballots. Currently, there are restrictions on who can assist in casting ballots. However, the legislation is working to address that and broaden the scope of who can support electors, specifically allowing the elector to choose who can assist them. For example, somebody could have a support worker cast the ballot on their behalf, which is very important work in the right direction toward making sure that everybody's votes can count.

In addition to that, once the bill gets to committee, we need to look at ways in which people with disabilities can maintain their autonomy and be able to cast their ballot independently, without the support of other individuals. Yes, again, I am an eternal optimist and hope that we can come together to see the bill at committee. It is great to set up those systems of support. Where we can, let us set up a system where all Canadians can show up at the polls and know

that they can confidently and successfully cast their own ballot. I think about the tremendous amount of people who are reaching out with visual impairments as just one example. People with visual impairments could cast their own ballot if the systems were set up for them to do that on their own, so it is important that we look at this.

● (1230)

Another piece I want to cover is around the inclusion of Inuktitut on federal ballots, which is vitally important. I had the honour of visiting my colleague, the member for Nunavut. In Nunavut we visited Pangnirtung and Iqaluit, and it is quite evident that there are a tremendous number of individuals living in Nunavut who speak Inuktitut as their primary and first language, so making sure that the ballots have the language spoken by the residents in the area is vitally important to decrease barriers to participation and to ensure that people understand confidently whom it is they want to vote for.

My colleague, the MP for Nunavut, has been doing an incredible amount of work on this. The member has put forward, for example, Bill C-297, which I wanted to highlight. The goal of this bill is that in an electoral district on indigenous land, the Chief Electoral Officer may require all the ballots for the electoral district to be prepared and printed in both official languages, as well as in the indigenous language or languages of the electors, using the appropriate writing systems for each language, including syllabics, if applicable. It is really important that we listen to indigenous people across the country and make sure that ballots are accessible for them to be able to vote as well. This is an example of important legislation that the government can be leaning on to move us in the right direction. I hope this is legislation that we will be reviewing very closely at committee stage.

The MP for Nunavut did actually participate in the process of a report from the Standing Committee on Procedural and House of Affairs that is entitled “The Inclusion of Indigenous Languages on Federal Election Ballots: A Step Towards Reconciliation”. There were a couple of pieces in it that I wanted to highlight. The MP for Nunavut pointed out that “most elders in Nunavut cannot read English or French.” This expands on what I was just talking about. She spoke to the fact that in order “to make reconciliation meaningful, Indigenous languages needed to be protected and promoted.”

She went on to point out that “unilingual Inuktitut speakers find the complaints process inaccessible”, so that makes it challenging for them to be able to voice the barriers that they are experiencing in being able to cast their ballots as a result of previous oppressive systems that they have experienced. Also, the MP for Nunavut told the committee that she heard of people who have been “turned away from voting in Nunavut because of language barriers.” This is clearly not good enough, and it is something we need to be looking at closely in committee to make sure that we are moving in the right direction.

Government Orders

The proposed bill does have some pieces we need to be sure to look at in committee stage. One piece is around the third-party activities. I would like to reiterate that it is vitally important that unions are able to communicate with their members. We know that “at the core of a union's mandate and function is the ability to communicate freely and effectively with...members.” Workers across the country who are unionized are impacted dramatically by the decisions being made right here in the House. We know that these decisions are life-altering. It is important that people across the country are aware of these, and it is vitally important that union representatives are able to communicate these matters with their membership. With that, there is some work that needs to happen and that needs to be prioritized at committee stage to ensure that the bill is not taking away those rights of unions across the country.

• (1235)

I would be remiss if I did not speak about the issue that seems to be coming up over and over again in the House. There was a date proposed to push forward the date of the election by one week in the legislation. Unfortunately, this is highly problematic. I cannot speak to any other members' intentions. Whether intended or unintended, the consequence of this proposal would be that members of Parliament would receive a pension that they would not have otherwise been eligible for. As I said at the beginning of my speech, there are so many people across the country struggling to make ends meet, and now is not the time for members of Parliament to think about their own financial gains or their own pensions. Now is the time for members of Parliament to create legislation that would truly help Canadians across the country.

Therefore, I want to reiterate that first priority. Once we get this bill to committee, I would be moving an amendment to ensure that this date would be moved back to the original date so this would no longer be a concern of members of Parliament and of Canadians across the country. It is vitally important that we do what this legislation intends to do, which is to strengthen our democracy and to make sure that we reduce barriers so that people would be able to fully participate in our electoral system. There is important content within this legislation that we need to be moving forward with.

Much to my surprise, but yet also not much to my surprise, in response to this portion of the legislation, the Conservatives came out with an amendment to cut and gut the entire legislation, which would see this legislation no longer move forward at all. With that, it would take all of the items that I have been talking about during my intervention today. It would take away the proposed increase in accessibility for people living with disabilities. It would take away having polls in long-term care homes or having polls on student campuses, and looking at increasing the advance polling days so that we are not so reliant on just one day. There are many important aspects in this bill.

To see the Conservatives respond by saying that we just need to cut the whole thing is not surprising because, currently, we have a system that benefits the Conservatives. We know that the existing system, where we have barriers to participation that benefit the Conservatives' corporate friends, is exactly what the Conservatives want to see maintained. Therefore, instead of putting forward an amendment to cut and gut the legislation, my NDP colleagues and I are proposing a solution to the problem, which is to amend the ex-

isting legislation to move the election date back to the original date and to see that particular issue no longer in place in the bill so that we can move forward with strengthening our democracy and with making sure that Canadians can fully participate in the electoral processes.

There is a lot of work that needs to be done to strengthen our democracy. This is an important step in the right direction, which I am fully in support of. The NDP has done a tremendous amount of work to make this legislation happen and to see all of this work put into place. There is more that needs to be done. I hope that my colleagues in this chamber will continue the important work of looking at electoral reform and looking at implementing a system of proportional representation.

The Liberal Party campaigned on the 2015 election being the last first-past-the-post election. Now would be a really wonderful time to see the Liberals follow through with that promise so that Canadians could see their votes adequately and effectively represented right here in the House of Commons. With that, I will say that this is an important bill. There is some work that needs to be done, but it is vitally important that all members unite to see Canadians show up at polling stations, feeling confident in our democracy and in their votes.

• (1240)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, they are talking about dropping the idea of postponing the official election date, which is the third Monday in October, for a totally absurd reason. That is truly bizarre. I can find no other word for it. I wonder how that ended up in the bill. Why is that in the bill?

In this discussion, the NDP has said that it will introduce an amendment, and that we should believe them. Of course everyone appears to want to introduce an amendment to this aspect if the bill is referred back to committee. Why do we not adopt the bill now, and settle once and for all the matter of postponing the date of the election so that it can be referred back to committee? I wonder what formal guarantee we have that it will disappear and we will not have to live with it.

[*English*]

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of responses around that. First of all, I am so pleased to hear that the member is in support of this legislation so that we can get it to committee to ensure that we are moving in the right direction. I am seeing a “no”, but I would like to clarify. That is what I heard, so I apologize if that is not what the member was saying. To clarify, first, this legislation needs to make sure we look at increasing accessibility for Canadians to be able to cast their ballots. We do need to look at other things that happen in those timelines.

I believe that the strength in this legislation is that we would be looking at not having all of our options on one day. Rather, we would be looking at Canadians having multiple ways in which they could participate, such as expanding the advance voting days and having the polling stations accessible and available. We need to not have just one day as the main date. That would help resolve many issues we are talking about today.

Government Orders

• (1245)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, with respect to the whole issue around changing the election date, I appreciate it, and I support the member's initiative to change the date. Maybe at committee they would find that a week earlier is better because it would help to accomplish a bunch of things, and I think that would be great.

I took note about the issue of proportional representation the member talked about. If we go back to the supply and confidence agreement between the Liberals and the NDP, some issues listed under “democracy” are these: a “commitment to...work with Elections Canada to...expand [voter participation]”, a change of the election rules to “[allow] people to vote at any polling place”, “[improvements to]...mail-in ballots” so that “voters...are not disenfranchised” and a commitment “to ensuring that Quebec’s number of seats in the House of Commons remains [consistent].” There was no talk, in the supply and confidence agreement with the Liberals, about proportional representation. If it is an issue that is so important to the NDP, why did they not bring it up and put it into that agreement?

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron: Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I know, as a fact, that this issue was brought up by the NDP with the Liberals to try to get it into the supply and confidence agreement. We could not get the Liberals to agree. This is an unfortunate series of events.

However, I would like to reiterate that there was an opportunity, aside from this legislation we are talking about today, for the Liberals to show their support for proportional representation and for electoral reform when I brought forward Motion No. 86, recently. That motion came to a vote, in this exact chamber, for members of Parliament to vote for a national citizens assembly on electoral reform so that Canadians could provide their voices on how to best move forward.

An hon. member: I voted in favour.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron: Mr. Speaker, I heard that the member voted in favour, but many of the Liberals and the Conservatives, which I would like to call the “Conservative-Liberal coalition”, voted against the motion moving forward, so we did not see Motion No. 86 pass.

Perhaps the Liberals, who are in the position of power, could put forward legislation to see electoral reform happen.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Nanaimo—Ladysmith for her work and congratulate her on her speech.

What we are seeing today with this bill is the NDP once again forcing the Liberals to make our voting system more accessible. As my colleague mentioned, that is the least of it for the New Democrats, who have far more ambitious goals. She spoke of her Motion No. 86, which, unfortunately, was rejected by both Liberal and Conservative members.

My colleague also spoke about the Liberal Party's betrayal regarding electoral reform. The Liberals told us that the first-past-the-post system would never be used again. The New Democrats continue to promote a proportional representation system because it is fair, it fosters better democracy and it respects the will of the people and what Canadians want.

Why is having proportional representation so important for the people my colleague represents and for our democracy?

[*English*]

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for all of his work. One thing that gave me optimism when putting forward Motion No. 86, despite it failing, was that members across party lines voted in favour of looking at how to improve our electoral system and strengthen our democracy. This gives me the optimism to believe that just because Motion No. 86 did not pass, it does not mean there are no opportunities for members of Parliament to make it happen. The Liberal government is in power right now, and it can make it happen today. It can follow through with its promise that the 2015 election would be the last first past the post election, but it is too late for that.

How about this? The upcoming election will no longer be a first past the post election and we can move forward with a system of proportional representation. That can happen today. The Liberals can follow through with their promise, although with a very long delay. My hope is that will happen.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up on the fact that a lot of aspects in the legislation would provide strength to the Elections Act. It would make it stronger, healthier and better for Canadians and our democratic system as a whole. I cited things such as enhancing accountability for individuals donating to the campaign, issues like cryptocurrency and other ways to shed more light on it.

I wonder if the member could provide her thoughts on some of the things that we do not necessarily talk much about during this debate. A lot of detail within the legislation would add a great deal of value and strength to our elections.

• (1250)

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron: Mr. Speaker, if anything has come to light in the last few months, it is the importance of all legislation looking at the potential of foreign interference, the prevention of and identification of foreign interference. This needs to be implemented in all legislation. Yes, there are some components within this bill that look at addressing that, as the member mentioned, such payments or donations that are not allowed to be made through money orders or cryptocurrencies, as well as looking at who can donate and ensuring they are permanent residents and Canadian residents. These components are part of a bigger puzzle of work that we need to be doing together to ensure that foreign interference is identified, prevented, avoided altogether and that there be accountability when it does happen.

I was happy that all members of Parliament voted together on the recent foreign interference bill, Bill C-70. My hope is that we will see that work, and this work, strengthened, so this is no longer as problematic as has come to light in the last few months.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us acknowledge the fact that any legislation amending the Canada Elections Act is significant. This act is the cornerstone upon which the legitimacy of parliamentary democracy, elected officials and, by extension, the government, lies.

My first comment is that this important bill was introduced 48 hours before the summer break, along with a gag order. That is great for debate. They want to facilitate voter turnout. That is the obsession behind this bill, and yet the Canada Elections Act is one of the most lax when it comes to the ability to vote. I will get back to that later.

This is an important bill, fundamental to the legitimacy of parliamentary democracy, yet it was introduced with a gag order. They do not want much discussion. Moreover, people will go on vacation and they are supposed to know what is in the bill. The Liberals think that, during vacation, the bill will get media coverage; they will talk about it and list all of its benefits. Working this way is an affront to the intelligence of members of Parliament and voters.

That is not all. The bill also proposes postponing an election set for a specific date. The October 20, 2025, election would be postponed to October 27, 2025, supposedly to accommodate the Hindu festival of lights, which is not a provincial or federal holiday.

It may have been a noble intention, but this noble intention is hiding the elephant in the room, which is allowing 22 Liberal members and three ministers to get their pension. Let me point out that it is the Liberals who introduced the bill. They were one day short of eligibility for a pension. That is their true motivation.

In my opinion, the rule of law should not be subject to religion. Anyone who has a modicum of respect for religion does not use a belief system to justify a pension. That is what this outgoing government is doing while claiming that it is a very important bill.

Now we are being told that this part could always be removed from the bill. However, even if I had wanted to make an amendment, the Conservative Party's amendment does not allow me to introduce a sub-amendment.

That is why the Bloc Québécois will be voting against this bill. We cannot endorse such a travesty. We cannot endorse an affront to voters' intelligence. If there were only one day to vote, in addition to the two days of early voting, we might consider it. Now, if we add the two days proposed under Bill C-65, there are six days of early voting. That is unheard of anywhere else in the country.

● (1255)

Why have six days of advance polling? It is because voters have developed a habit of going to the polls before election day. Add in election day and voters have seven days, yet that is still not enough. Not only are there six days of advance polling, but voters can go and vote every day at the returning officer's office.

Now we are being told that there is a festival of lights, which will affect people's ability to go and vote on the big day. We pointed out that they can also vote by mail, but the government said no, we really must accommodate them. It truly feels the need to sacrifice the rule of law to religion, because it is a religious holiday. What a load

of rubbish. That is why I am saying that this is an insult to voters' intelligence.

When there are six days for advance polling, in addition to election day, when people can vote every day at the returning officer's office, when people can vote by mail, when there is a mobile polling station for people with reduced mobility and when people can vote in a long-term care home, I do not want to hear about how access to voting is being restricted. What more do they want? The next Elections Act will add two more advance polling days. Election day is no longer the only day when people go out to vote.

We are being told that the election really needs to be put off by one week. This one-week postponement proves how little regard this government has for municipal democracy. In Quebec, there will be elections happening six days later in over 1,100 municipalities. In 2021, turnout fell by 6% because there was a federal election at the same time, although the federal election finished much earlier than the municipal election, which is also on a fixed date. It is not like anyone can claim to be unaware that there will be elections in Quebec in more than 1,100 municipalities. It is 1,108 or 1,109, if memory serves. It is not like no one knows about it. It is on a fixed date, so it always happens at the same time. This government has so little regard. There are municipalities where the turnout in 2021 was as low as 18%, despite a desire and indeed a need to treat municipal governance not as an administrative extension of the Quebec government, but as a full-fledged government in its own right, a local government.

From a logistics standpoint, how will the Chief Electoral Officer go about finding polling places? I would love to hear someone explain that. That will really be something. In 2021, it was already difficult enough. It was a total mess. Now the Chief Electoral Officer will have to compete with municipal returning officers. Will the Chief Electoral Officer be able to use municipal facilities as polling places? The answer is no, not a chance. In Quebec, it is already hard to secure schools to use for advance polls. That is the reality. Those geniuses across the way say it is because they want to accommodate the festival of lights, but it was certainly not a brilliant decision on their part. That is the least we can say.

There are some good things in this bill, to be sure. The problem is this obsession with voting accessibility.

● (1300)

This government is so obsessed with voting accessibility that it is forgetting the need to strike the right balance between preserving the integrity of the process and preserving voting accessibility.

Government Orders

This bill could have been worded in such a way as to simply provide for polling stations in post-secondary institutions, two extra days of advance voting, an easier process for setting up polling stations in care homes, and better tools to combat foreign interference and to ensure the integrity of the electoral process. Had the bill been worded that way, the Bloc Québécois would have considered it worthwhile, but what about municipal elections? Are municipal elections not important?

Did my colleagues know that voter turnout was 44.7% in 2017? In 2021, it was 38.6%. Remember what happened in Quebec in 2008. We need to learn from the past, because these things really happened. In 2008, there was a federal election, and the Jean Charest government called an election in Quebec for six days after the federal election day. Voter turnout in Quebec had always been around 80%, 81%, 78% or 79%, but this time it dropped to 57%. Obviously, people thought he would be punished because he had just been elected. No one had decided to oust the minority government. He wanted to get both hands on the wheel. He focused on the economy, but Quebecers' savings in the Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec were in free fall, and there was no more money under the mattress. The Caisse lost \$40 billion. Because he did not want to face this economic disaster during an election, he called an election.

We have fixed-date elections. Unless we bring down the government next spring if it presents a budget no one wants, the election date is set. Bill C-65 states that the Chief Electoral Officer can make accommodations if the fixed election date is in conflict with municipal elections. That is in the bill. However, they decided to choose the festival of lights, a religious holiday, over municipal democracy. Earlier, I heard someone say that Alberta would be holding municipal elections around the same time, and so will Quebec.

In my opinion, someone who has their priorities straight, based on principle, does not subordinate the rule of law to religion, especially when the religious holiday in question is not even recognized as a statutory holiday. If we had to consider all of the different communities' holidays, we might have a hard time. This is creating a precedent. If we decide to accommodate everyone, we will have a bit of a problem. I do not think these communities are even asking us to do that. These people are not even asking for it, and for good reason. They will have plenty of ways to avoid losing their right to vote. For example, they could vote by mail. In fact, the bill would improve the conditions surrounding this special voting method.

• (1305)

It makes no sense. We understand what we need to understand: The government is weaponizing a religious belief, a religious holiday, for purely pecuniary and political purposes. Then it wonders why people are cynical about their representatives and why people do not bother to vote. Does anyone here think there will be enough lampposts during the next election to support the posters for all these municipal and federal political parties? The parties in the House of Commons are not the only ones that will be represented in the federal election. It will be chaos.

The Liberals could at least have made some space and factored that into the bill. This would have given the Chief Electoral Officer

the freedom he needs in the lead-up to the election to make sure the process goes smoothly, with no complications, because there are going to be insurmountable logistical problems on the ground.

They should just go talk logistics with the returning officers. As candidates, we had to meet with the returning officers during the last election. They were tearing their hair out. I am anxious to see whether my returning officer has any left. I think it is the same person as in 2021.

For all these reasons, the Bloc Québécois will definitely not be supporting this bill without any other guarantees, even in principle, because this was not an acceptable principle to present to the House.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a double standard at play here that should be pointed out. The Bloc party articulated quite well, much like the member just did, why postponing the date of the election would have a negative impact on the province of Quebec because of Quebec's municipal elections.

At the time when the Bloc first raised the issue, it was not even aware there was a municipal election taking place in the province of Alberta on the exact date of the next scheduled federal election. When I pointed that out to the member in the Bloc Party, the response was that it was not the Bloc's problem and that it represents Quebec.

There are many members of Parliament who are national in their thinking. Many of them sit in the Alberta caucus in the Conservative ranks, and they seem to have completely forgotten that particular point. The minister made it very clear that he will support what the committee has to propose.

The NDP is proposing we change the date. We are open to ideas. Should we be respectful of the municipal election, with Calgary and Edmonton having the same election date as the federal election? Those who live in Calgary and Edmonton would be going to vote for a mayor and a prime minister, their members of Parliament. Should we at least be open to the idea at the committee stage?

• (1310)

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, it happens all too often that we show up in committee after having voted for a bill in principle, but we do not get a chance to introduce amendments because of the Liberal majority.

The Canada Elections Act is too important to take that risk. There is no way we can trust people who had the gall to present what they did. It is crooked, and we do not trust people like that.

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague's speech. He clearly explained the problems Quebec would have if a federal election were held a few days before or after municipal elections are held in every municipality in Quebec. It is very difficult.

Government Orders

We went through this in 2021. We saw our municipal colleagues hold elections at the same time as ours. We would run into each other going door to door. That being said, I want to reach out to the NDP. If the NDP is prepared to bring down the government, we could have an election in the coming weeks. Would my colleague be amenable to that?

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, this is not enough to bring down a government.

I would tell my colleague that I hope to get Bill C-282 passed for our farmers before triggering an election. This bill is now in the Senate and is being held up by Conservative and Liberal senators, despite the fact that it was passed almost unanimously in the House. I hope my colleague feels the same way I do.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks. I know how interested and passionate he is about democratic and electoral issues. We both sat on the Special Committee on Electoral Reform back when the Liberals were still claiming they wanted a different voting system, one that would be fairer, more democratic and more egalitarian. They have since changed their tune.

We have all reached the same conclusion regarding this bill. By changing the date of the elections, this bill will allow a number of House members to qualify for a pension. The thinking is that perhaps the Liberals have bad intentions. The Conservatives are criticizing the Liberals today, but most of the members who would benefit from the date change are Conservatives. The hypocrisy on both sides of the House is indeed something to behold.

The bill is not perfect, but does my colleague agree that adding advance polling days, improving voting by mail and special ballots, and allowing students to vote on campus are nonetheless steps in the right direction?

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my speech, had the bill been drafted to include only those things, our position would probably have been different. I would add that, absent a guarantee that this crooked addition will be removed from the bill, there is no way we can support sending the bill to committee.

This bill also provides that the Chief Electoral Officer may consider conflicts with another election. This is an important measure. For my part, I do not question the Chief Electoral Officer's impartiality or logistical ability to organize elections worthy of a self-respecting parliamentary democracy.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all I am asking the member to do is to apply to the province of Alberta the same standards he applies to the province of Quebec with respect to the election law. If the member is concerned about the municipal election in the province of Quebec, should he not at least be concerned about the municipal election in Alberta? It is an issue of fair treatment. Someone can be a separatist in Quebec and still be sympathetic to the democracy in other regions of the country.

• (1315)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, I have said many times in the House that I am indeed a separatist, but if I am a separatist, it is because I am fundamentally a democrat, since the democratic ideal is contained in the idea of a people's sovereignty. Just because I am willing to acknowledge that I do not know everything, that does not mean I am against the idea of ensuring that the election in Alberta holds up. I too share this concern. Democracy means democracy for everyone, and not just here but the world over, because we are also fighting for democracy beyond our borders.

[*English*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I know that the member is from Quebec; usually I would speak French, but I want to be clear to the parliamentary secretary, who keeps raising the point, and I would like to hear the member on it.

I am an Alberta MP. The Local Authorities Elections Act in my province, in section 11, says that any municipality can move up its election to the Saturday before a federal or a provincial election. It is a non-issue, and it is a talking point the Liberals keep abusing in order to try to curry favour or find a way to wedge the Bloc in its principal position on the bill.

What does the member think about the issue? The Liberals seem to want to use Alberta as a talking point, the same way they sometimes use the member's province as a talking point, to further their political ambitions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that was a question for me. My colleague's comment was about what the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons said.

The Deputy Speaker: As a reminder, members can ask questions or make comments.

The hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean.

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the real question being asked today is this: What was the government's reason for pushing back the election date from October 20, 2025, to October 27, 2025? The reason it gave had nothing to do with municipal elections. It was about the Indian community's festival of lights.

In my colleague's opinion, how could anyone draw a connection between a religious celebration and the date of a general election?

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, this is the elephant in the room. It is nothing but an excuse, a self-serving use of religion as a pretext for purely financial gain.

It is unfortunate because it fuels public cynicism toward elected officials. It paints everyone in the House with the same brush.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to my colleague.

Government Orders

If I understand correctly, the Bloc Québécois is going to support the NDP's amendment to set things straight. The election will take place on the originally scheduled date.

We saw this idea of taking voting rights away from a large number of Canadians emerge under the Conservatives, especially the voting rights of low-income and racialized people. We saw how the impact of the Harper government restricted Canadians' right to vote.

Does my colleague agree that what the Harper government did should never happen again? All members should be pushing to ensure that everyone across Canada is able to vote in federal elections.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Harper government was penalized in 2015, so I think that the member has his answer.

When a government goes beyond the democratic interest, the public is smart enough to penalize that government. I trust the public's intelligence. I trust voters' intelligence.

Indeed, everyone must be allowed to vote. When a society allows an individual to vote, it is the ultimate gesture of integration. The social contract is sealed by this right to vote. In receiving this right, members of the public have the responsibility to prove their eligibility as voters.

• (1320)

[English]

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the House today to speak to Bill C-65, the electoral participation act, which amends the Canada Elections Act.

One of the cornerstones of our democracy is our electoral system, and at the root of that system is the Canada Elections Act. I would go so far as to say we all stand here today as beneficiaries of this key piece of legislation, having been chosen by Canadians through free and fair elections. The Canada Elections Act is already recognized worldwide for its robust rules, administrative procedures, tight political financing rules and strict spending limits. It is also recognized for how it promotes transparency, fairness and participation in elections.

We know that Canada is not immune to the growing threats aimed at undermining confidence in the democratic electoral process around the world. For that reason, Bill C-65 proposes a number of improvements to the Canada Elections Act to continue to maintain the confidence of Canadians in our electoral system, which remains the envy of many countries.

Bill C-65 addresses three targeted priorities. The first priority is to encourage participation in the electoral process. The second priority is to enhance the protection of Canadians' personal information. The third priority is to further safeguard the electoral process. Allow me to provide an overview on each of these priorities, starting with voter participation. Unfortunately, we know that voter turnout has been declining over the last two general elections. To help counter this trend, measures proposed in this bill aim to remove barriers to voting and expand the ability for people to participate in Canada's federal election.

We also know that in recent decades, more and more Canadians are choosing to vote ahead of polling day, either through advance polls or voting by mail. In fact, voting at advance polls has increased in every general election since the year 2000, with over one-third of the voters choosing advance polls in the latest general election. To better respond to Canadians, Bill C-65 provides voters with an additional two days of advance polls. That means a total of six advance polling days in addition to election day, making it even more convenient for Canadians to cast their ballots.

This would be a welcome addition, but we know it can be difficult for Elections Canada to hold advance polls in remote and isolated communities because of a lack of poll workers and suitable polling places. To overcome these challenges and ensure all electors have ample opportunity to vote, Bill C-65 provides new flexibility to set up advance polling stations for the days and hours needed to effectively serve electors in more remote communities, many of which are indigenous communities. Voting by mail, also known as voting by special ballot, is growing in popularity and this trend is expected to continue.

This is why Bill C-65 proposes five improvements to the current special ballot process. First, for the fixed-date election, voters will be able to register earlier for a special ballot at the start of the pre-election period, which is June 30, to help reduce late ballots. Second, all electors will now be able to register online a convenient option for voters.

Third, voters will be able to cast their ballot by returning their special ballots in person to a polling station rather than having to mail it back. This was a popular temporary measure tested in the 2021 election. Fourth, people who register for a special ballot but do not use it, for example, by not mailing it, before the deadline, will be able to vote in person at their polling station with safeguards in place to ensure no one votes twice.

• (1325)

Fifth, if a voter writes down a party's name on their special ballot, the ballot would be counted as a vote for the candidate, provided the party has endorsed a candidate in that riding.

Mr. Ken McDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hate to interrupt my colleague in his speech, but there is a loud noise outside the chamber. I can hardly hear the person two seats away speaking.

The Deputy Speaker: I appreciate the intervention. The Sergeant-at-Arms is going back there to see who is making all the noise.

I just remind all of our members, when we are coming into our lobbies, to make sure we try to keep our volume down. The sound is coming from the back as people enter. Again, this is a reminder to members in our lobbies and all those who are here today.

The hon. member for Nepean.

Government Orders

Mr. Chandra Arya: Mr. Speaker, despite the growth in popularity of advance polls and special ballots, voting on polling day still remains the most popular option for how Canadians vote. That is why our government also wants to pave the way to make it easier and more convenient for those who vote on election day to eventually be able to vote at any polling station in their electoral district. This would shorten lineups for voting, provide more options for voting, make voting more convenient and allow election officers to make better use of their time. However, this significant change can only be done after the appropriate technology and procedures have been tested, to ensure the integrity of the voting process.

This is why Bill C-65 asks the Chief Electoral Officer to prepare two reports for Parliament on implementing voting at any polling station through a phased approach.

The first report, which must be tabled 120 days before the next fixed-date election, would outline the measures that would be put in place for the 2025 election, so that voters can vote at any table within their riding's polling station in 2025. This is a critical first step for voters, to be able to walk into their polling station and go to whoever is available to cast their ballot, rather than waiting in line based on alphabetical order of their last names. This is possible because Elections Canada has been testing the use of an electronic list of electors to ensure the success of this technology, including in the Durham by-election earlier this year.

The second report, to be tabled in 2027, would look at what is needed for voters to be able to vote at any polling station anywhere in their riding by 2029. This report would outline expected costs, new technology and any legislative amendments needed for full implementation. These are critical milestones toward giving electors the flexibility to be able to vote in person anywhere in their riding.

I also want to take a moment to highlight the targeted new initiatives that would make voting easier for post-secondary students, residents of long-term care facilities and electors who may require assistance in marking their own ballot, such as electors with disabilities.

For students, Bill C-65 would enshrine the vote on campus program that Elections Canada has offered in past general elections. Working with willing post-secondary institutions, as it did in 2015 and 2019, Elections Canada would set up offices on campus so that Canadian students studying anywhere in Canada would be able to easily vote for any candidate in the student's home riding during a general election. In 2015, close to 70,000 electors cast their votes through this initiative at 39 post-secondary campuses. In 2019, more than 110,000 electors voted at approximately 100 post-secondary campuses. Currently, an estimated 120 campuses across the country are set to host the program at the next general election.

With respect to residents in long-term care, the pandemic highlighted for all of us in this chamber the challenges faced by those residents when trying to vote. During the 2021 election, the Chief Electoral Officer rose to this challenge and established a process for those residing in long-term care facilities to vote safely. Bill C-65 would facilitate voting for the residents in long-term care homes across Canada, building on the success of the Chief Electoral Officer's temporary changes made in 2021.

First, returning officers would work with the staff of these facilities to identify the most convenient dates and times for residents to vote. Voting would continue to be 12 hours in total but could be spread over more than one day to take into account the specific needs of residents.

• (1330)

Second, proof of address would no longer be required for those residents choosing to vote in their long-term care facilities. Many residents have difficulty proving their residence because identity documents are often in the possession of family members, or they no longer have a driver's licence, which is the most common proof of residence. This change removes an unnecessary obstacle to voting for those in long-term care.

In addition, the Canada Elections Act already permits electors to request and receive assistance at the polls, including to mark their ballot, from Elections Canada officials, friends or family. However, this assistance is currently limited to a friend, spouse or family member. Bill C-65 proposes to remove these restrictions and give electors the freedom to choose their assistant, including caregivers or personal support workers. To maintain both the integrity and the secrecy of the vote, a solemn declaration would continue to be required from the assistant. Election workers would also continue to be available to assist electors if needed.

The final measure to support participation in our electoral process that I will speak to is the proposal that the Chief Electoral Officer prepare a report for Parliament on a three-day election period for any general elections held in 2029 and beyond. This report would allow for a detailed consideration of the feasibility and the path forward, given the considerable operational shift and electoral integrity implications that a three-day election period would bring. It would also identify challenges and potential solutions for implementation.

The second key priority of Bill C-65 is further protecting the personal information of Canadians. In this day and age, personal information is a coveted commodity that must be protected, including in the electoral process and by federal political parties.

In order to do so, the government took a first step in 2018 through Bill C-76, the Elections Modernization Act, introducing the first-ever policy requirements as a condition of party registration. Another step was taken last year through Bill C-47, the Budget Implementation Act, 2023, to affirm that the Canada Elections Act is the exclusive and national regime applicable to federal political parties and those acting on their behalf.

Government Orders

Bill C-65 proposes to expand on these measures to better protect personal information. In order to be a duly registered political party with Elections Canada, each political party must already provide a policy on the protection of personal information. This condition of registration would be maintained, but Bill C-65 adds the following new privacy policy requirements.

Political parties must have the appropriate physical, organizational and technological safeguards, such as locked filing cabinets, in place and must restrict access to those who need it. It would ensure that suppliers or contractors who receive personal information from political parties have the equivalent safeguards in place. Parties must notify affected individuals in the event of a serious breach. It would also prohibit political parties from selling personal information, providing false or misleading information regarding why personal information is collected, and disclosing personal information to cause harm.

The privacy regime under the Canada Elections Act recognizes that outreach, communication and engagement between federal political parties and voters are essential to a healthy, modern democracy. Personal information is at the root of the dialogue between political parties and the Canadian electorate. It is therefore essential that this information be protected accordingly, which is exactly what Bill C-65 proposes to do.

• (1335)

Finally, I am proud to highlight the measures proposed in Bill C-65 to safeguard the electoral process.

This year is an important year for elections around the world. While Canada's next federal election is not scheduled until 2025, over 60 countries, encompassing almost 50% of the world's population, will have elections in 2024. I would like to highlight the elections that were just concluded this month in the largest democracy in the world, India, where about one billion people were eligible to vote, approximately 900-odd million, with about 60% turnout. I think the elections were held over a period of seven to eight weeks. Interestingly, I am told that it is proposed, going forward, that in the next general elections in India, the federal elections will be held simultaneously with about 32 states, 32 provinces, in India.

As I mentioned earlier, we are fortunate in Canada to have one of the most secure and reliable electoral systems in the world. Canada's electoral system is grounded in accessibility, fairness and integrity through the Canada Elections Act. Canadians have confidence in their electoral system. In a survey by Elections Canada following the 44th general election, 82% of participants felt that Canada's voting system was safe and reliable. Yet, Canada's democracy, like other democracies globally, is being tested. Rising security threats that undermine the credibility of democratic elections include foreign interference, disinformation, the misuse of evolving technologies and the threat against its participants.

To address these concerns, Bill C-65 introduces a series of amendments to the Canada Elections Act to further protect the integrity of the electoral system from these threats.

The Canada Elections Act already has strong and wide-ranging measures to help counter these threats to the electoral system. However, as the threats evolve, so too must our response. Currently, cer-

tain provisions of the Canada Elections Act apply only during elections. Since people and entities with ill intentions do not limit their activities to a specific time frame, Bill C-65 would expand certain provisions beyond the election period. This includes expanding existing bans so that they are not limited to the election period, specifically those against foreign influence on an elector to not vote or to vote in a certain way, and misleading publications that falsely purport to be from someone they are not, such as the Chief Electoral Officer or a political party.

Like all my hon. colleagues in this House, I have great faith in, and a deep appreciation for, Canada and its democratic institutions. Bill C-65 would further strengthen Canada's world-renowned electoral system, which is at the heart of our democratic system.

• (1340)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with this bill the government is proposing that the 2025 elections be held a week later than the date that had been set.

The government claims that this is on account of a religious holiday, Diwali, a festival held by the Hindu religious group. Apparently there are other groups that celebrate it as well, namely the Sikhs and Buddhists.

I quickly logged on to the Statistics Canada site to ascertain the proportion of religious groups present in Canada. The site counts over 21 religious groups. I noted that 2.3% of Canada's population is Hindu, 2.1% Sikh and 1% Buddhist.

What this government is proposing to do, then, is to push back the elections to allow less than 4.5% of the Canadian population to celebrate their religious holiday. I would remind members that in Canada, over 34.6% of the population do not practise any religion and 29.9% are Catholic, so I find this a little curious. I have to ask myself whether it is not irresponsible, or even dangerous, to start changing such an important date as the federal election date on account of a religious holiday.

I was speaking about the 21 religious groups identified. There are probably a number of religious holidays for these groups, perhaps more than 365, so if we try to be fair, we might end up never finding a day during the year to hold the federal elections.

I wonder whether it is not irresponsible on the government's part to invoke this reason for postponing the elections.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Chandra Arya: Mr. Speaker, as a Hindu by religion, I do not need the election date to be postponed so I can celebrate my religious holiday. As the member mentioned, there are many religious groups in Canada. There are Jewish Canadians, Buddhist Canadians and Muslim Canadians. To accommodate every single religious day not being affected by election day would be very difficult going forward.

One of the flexibilities proposed in this legislation is to provide the Chief Electoral Officer the flexibility to determine a fixed date on which the election should, depending on the circumstances surrounding that date. It can be similar to provincial or municipal elections. What we are promoting is to provide flexibility. I agree that we cannot start making exceptions based on the religious requirements of various Canadians.

This is not the only issue on the election date. I was recently at committee when one of the major corporate players declined to appear, stating that it was during the quiet period enforced by the Ontario Securities Commission. Parliament is supreme. We cannot make exceptions based on witnesses called to appear before any parliamentary committee.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the NDP member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith, who has really opened the debate and discussion on electoral reform in this Parliament.

One of the things the member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith raised today was the opportunity for persons with disabilities to have an independent and private vote in an election, even from home, if we go to what could be telephone voting. I want to know what the member thinks about the fact that there are persons with disabilities who do not have the opportunity to secretly and privately vote in an election because they need an assistant.

Mr. Chandra Arya: Mr. Speaker, one of the important things we have proposed is to ask the Chief Electoral Officer to submit a report on how we can make it easier for people with different abilities to actively participate in elections by using whatever technologies are made available.

The member mentioned voting by telephone. I am not very sure that, as of today, the technology is secure enough for any Canadian to vote privately using the telephone as a voting system. Hopefully, in the future, the technology will advance so that every single Canadian, with whatever abilities, should be able to vote privately and securely.

• (1345)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about diversity in Canada. When I think of diversity, I think of Eid celebrations taking place today in our Muslim community, or Christmas celebrations in the month of December, or Diwali, a festival of lights, light over darkness, and I participate in that. We do not have to be of a particular faith to enjoy or participate in a celebration.

We need to put into perspective that the suggestion brought forward also reflects on the fact that there is a municipal, province-

wide election taking place in the province of Alberta, in Calgary and Edmonton, with two million-plus people. Is that not worth at least giving some thought to and, at the very least, sending this legislation to committee? The minister has indicated he will support the will of the committee.

Mr. Chandra Arya: Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. colleague. There is an municipal election in Alberta, with about two million Canadians participating, and we need to look at changing the date of the election. At the same time, as a Hindu by religion, I do not want it signalled that the Canadian government is making any concessions to Canadians, due to their religious faith and practices, that the election date needs to be changed.

As the hon. member said, Diwali is not just celebrated by Hindu Canadians. Many other Canadians of different religious faith groups also participate, like we participate in all religious faith groups and heritage events of Canadians.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have an interesting question related to the government's commitment to indigenous peoples. It has been very obvious that the government publicly has stated that it supports indigenous peoples' rights, most particularly the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Particular to that document, it suggests, in article 5, that:

Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and strengthen their distinct political, legal, economic, social and cultural institutions, while retaining their right to participate fully, if they so choose, in the political, economic, social and cultural life of the State.

Does the member have any comments as to when or how the government will continue to advance reconciliation, continue to advance the principles of the United Nations declaration, in particular to this legislation, and ensure that indigenous people can be seen as self-determining and even sovereign if they so choose?

Could the member speak to his support, if he does have it, of indigenous people's pursuit of self-determination and sovereignty?

Mr. Chandra Arya: Mr. Speaker, our government has done tremendous work on the reconciliation process with indigenous communities. Even in this bill specifically, I can state that for many indigenous people who live in the northern parts, in the remote parts, we have made specific efforts so that their participation in the electoral process is pain-free.

[Translation]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as is often the case with the Liberals, this is a pretty hypocritical piece of legislation. On the pretext of expanding democracy or access to democracy for senior citizens, students and so forth, we are presented with a bill that is actually aimed at allowing Liberal members at risk of losing their election to qualify for a pension.

If such a thing is even possible in the House, I would like my colleague to tell us in good conscience what he thinks of the substance of this bill. At a time when there is a housing crisis, when senior citizens are struggling and when every dollar is needed to help Canadians, what does he think of the fact that we are spending hours debating and voting on a bill aimed solely at allowing Liberal members to collect a pension? When he looks into his heart, what does he think of this?

Government Orders

• (1350)

[English]

Mr. Chandra Arya: Mr. Speaker, Canada's Canadian democratic system is the envy of the world. One of the reasons why we are the best in the world is that we always try to improve on what we have now.

The member touched upon students and seniors in long-term care facilities. We have made provisions especially to encourage easier voting by seniors in long-term care facilities and voting by students on campus, which is increasing year by year. In 2015, around 70,000 students voted. That increased to more than 110,000 in 2019, and it will increase much further in 2025.

Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon.

The Liberals call it Bill C-65, the electoral participation act, but maybe it would be more accurately titled as the “Help our friends qualify for a pension act.” Perhaps that was an unwritten part of the deal by which the New Democrats have propped up the incompetent Liberal government for two years, two years that have shown us this was not a good deal for Canadians.

The NDP pharmacare program only covers two types of medication, which is not what Canadians were promised. It is just another broken promise, like so many the NDP have supported.

Now, though, there would be guaranteed pensions for those first elected to the House of Commons in the general election of 2019, pensions they would not qualify for if the 2025 election were held at its scheduled date of October 20, 2025. What a reward for propping up the Liberals.

This bill, rather than encouraging electoral participation, would delay the day when Canadian voters can hold parliamentarians to account in a federal election. In the process, it ensures that taxpayers are on the hook for millions of dollars in pension payments that might not have been required.

The government tells us that the next election cannot be held as scheduled on October 20, 2025, because it conflicts with Diwali, a festival celebrated by many Canadians. The Liberals want to move it a week later, to October 27. It is merely a coincidence that 80 members of Parliament would qualify for a pension on October 26, 2025, a pension they would not qualify for if they were to be defeated on October 20 or if they choose not to offer themselves to the voters once more.

Of course, just about every day is a holiday or a special occasion for someone. October 20, 2025, is Guatemala's revolution day. It is also Heroes' Day in Kenya, Jamaica and the British Virgin Islands. For Jews, it is Sukkoth. Let us not forget the date is also International Chefs Day and World Osteoporosis Day. Serbia will be celebrating Belgrade Liberation Day on that day. In Vietnam, it is Women's Day. In Ukraine, it is breast cancer awareness day. Those are all dates worthy of celebrating, even if the Liberals do not mention them as important enough to mention as a reason for changing the fixed election date.

There is no perfect date for an election, no date that does not conflict with something else for some people. That is why we already have advance polling in place. Even more, those unable to get to an advance poll can vote anytime at the returning office in their riding.

No one is being forced to vote on Diwali. Who is the government trying to fool? The date change is not about Diwali; it is about securing pensions. If that were not the case, why not move the date earlier in October or even into September?

The Canadian Taxpayers Federation tells us that the change means 80 additional MPs would be eligible to collect a pension. The estimated lifetime pension costs, should all 80 of those members lose their seats or opt to retire rather than face voters, is \$120 million.

We already know that \$120 million means nothing to the Liberals. Having saddled Canadians with record deficits and the biggest national debt in our history, they apparently do not see that as an amount worth worrying about. What they do not seem to realize is that people care about government spending.

Canadians understand debts must be repaid. Canadians know it is ludicrous to pay more on interest to service the debt than we pay on health care. Canadians realize that such a fiscal irresponsibility needs to stop. It is also too bad that Liberals and their NDP allies seem incapable of grasping the simple math involved.

As custodians of the public purse, the \$120 million should make us pause and think before supporting this legislation. However, neither the Liberals nor the NDP have shown any understanding of the value of a dollar. They seem to believe that government can spend and spend, and who cares if it is our grandchildren or great-grandchildren who have to pay the bills. All that matters is that they get their pensions.

• (1355)

I am sure that once I am finished and the floor is open to questions, some brave Liberals or New Democrats will point out to me that there are many Conservatives who would benefit if the bill passes. That is true, but Conservatives are united in their opposition to the legislation, even those who stand to benefit if it passes. This is a matter of principle and honour. Conservatives do not believe in changing the rules to benefit themselves.

I would like to list the names of those who are set to benefit from the legislation. The Canadian people need to know who would make money from the change. I think those names should be in the record of the House; however, the rules prevent me from naming them. The rules and conventions of this place, as it is sometimes the case, allow members to pretend that the truth does not matter. What Canadians do know is that when the former members of Parliament receive the pension cheques, money that came from Canadian taxpayers, they will have the former members' names on them.

Statements By Members

They will not be addressed to “the minister of the environment” or to “President of the Treasury Board”. Nowhere will the cheques read “payable to the parliamentary secretary” or “payable to Minister of Environment and Climate Change”. Whether they are for the member of Parliament for Edmonton Strathcona or the member of Parliament for Don Valley North, the pension cheques will have their names, the names of real people, but under the rules, I cannot mention those names here.

No wonder so many Canadians are fed up with this place and feel that all politicians are hypocrites. I should point out that any member who would be affected by the date change, anyone who was first elected in the general election of 2019, would be in a conflict of interest if they vote in favour of the bill.

The Conflict of Interest Act is quite clear:

...a public office holder is in a conflict of interest when he or she exercises an official power, duty or function that provides an opportunity to further his or her private interests or those of his or her relatives or friends or to improperly further another person’s private interests.

[Furthermore] no public office holder shall make a decision or participate in making a decision related to the exercise of an official power, duty or function if the public office holder knows or reasonably should know that, in the making of the decision, he or she would be in a conflict of interest.

No minister of the Crown, minister of state or parliamentary secretary shall, in his or her capacity as a member of the Senate or the House of Commons, debate or vote on a question that would place him or her in a conflict of interest.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[*English*]

NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR VICTIMS OF TERRORISM

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, June 23 is National Day of Remembrance for Victims of Terrorism. Thirty-nine years ago on this day, Air India Flight 182 was blown up mid-air by a bomb planted by Canadian Khalistani extremists. It killed all 329 passengers and crew members, and it is the largest mass killing in Canadian history.

Unfortunately, many Canadians are not aware that even today the ideology responsible for this terrorist attack is still alive among a few people in Canada. The recent celebration of the assassination of Hindu Indian prime minister Indira Gandhi by Khalistan supporters, glorifying violence and hate, shows that the dark forces have been energized again and point to dreadful times ahead. Hindu Canadians are rightfully concerned.

I stand in solidarity with the families of the victims of the Air India bombing.

* * *

EDMONTON OILERS

Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 82 years ago, the Toronto Maple Leafs rallied from a 3-0 series deficit to win the Stanley Cup final. No team since has managed to do that in a final series.

Our hopes and dreams, as a nation, now rest with the Edmonton Oilers in their quest to bring the cup home where it belongs. It has been 31 years since a Canadian team won the cup. The Oilers were down three to games to one, but Saturday night’s 8-1 victory showed us that we are right to believe.

The Oilers, like their fans, never give up. The team is battling back. Game five is tonight. As a nation, let us rally behind Canada’s team, the Edmonton Oilers.

The Stanley Cup belongs here. Let us bring it home.

* * *

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I marched in the York Pride parade alongside York Pride, PFLag, the York Region Liberals and thousands of others who joined in unity to celebrate and support the 2SLGBTQI+ community.

This past weekend also marked the beginning of Eid al-Adha, the Feast of Sacrifice, one of the most important celebrations in the Muslim community, which is observed by many in my riding. In the past I have also joined with them.

When communities gather to celebrate, we all can observe or participate to learn more. With understanding and familiarity, we are able to accept and appreciate the unique and diverse neighbours we all have here in Canada. These occasions remind us to stand against discrimination and to ensure that everyone, regardless of their sexual orientation, gender identity, religion or culture feels valued and safe.

As we approach Canada Day, let us all do our part to ensure we are inclusive and proudly united as we work together to build an even better Canada.

Happy Pride. *Eid Mubarak*. Happy Canada Day.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MAISON DES CAGEUX DU FLEUVE SAINT-LAURENT

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, some folks from the Maison des Cageux in Lanoraie are on Parliament Hill today.

Isabelle Regout and Alexandre Pampalon are walking encyclopaedias who know everything there is to know about raftsmen, expertly immersing their visitors in the impressive universe of these brave, adventurous men.

Listening to the stories of Jules Verne, Charles Dickens, Joseph-Charles Taché and many others, one can imagine floating down the river on one of these wooden cages made up of several rafts, on often very rough waters.

Statements By Members

Thanks to Isabelle and Alexandre's efforts, many of the figures in these stories will soon be designated as historical figures who have shaped our heritage. One example is Jos Montferrand, renowned for his large stature and leaving his footprints on the ceiling. Another is Honoré Beaugrand, the author of the legendary Chasse-galerie, told in as many versions as there are storytellers.

Congratulations to the folks at the Maison des Cageux. Their diligence and perseverance are keeping our collective memory alive.

* * *

[*English*]

JAPANESE CANADIANS

Mr. Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, recently we celebrated Asian Heritage Month, a time when we honour the historic and profound contributions of Asian Canadians, who have shaped our nation.

Growing up, I was fortunate to have a true Canadian hero, Art Miki, as my next-door neighbour. In 1988, Art successfully lobbied and worked alongside Prime Minister Brian Mulroney to have Canada officially apologize to and compensate Japanese Canadians for the horrific treatment they were subjected to, including forced confinement to internment camps during the Second World War.

Art Miki's contributions extend beyond this historical achievement, as he continues to educate through a new book that has captured important chapters of Canadian history. Art continues to advocate for a Canada that is more inclusive, equitable and recognizing of our vast cultural mosaic. Individuals like Art Miki exemplify the best of Canada.

I thank Art for the personal impact he has had on shaping me as an individual and for his lasting contributions to our country.

* * *

● (1405)

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the francophonie is at the heart of Canadian identity. It represents a fundamental pillar of our history and culture. It is a source of pride for our country to count among us francophones who, across the country, contribute to Canada's vitality and linguistic diversity.

On June 24, I am very proud as a Quebecker to celebrate Quebec's national holiday, an emblematic day that brings together Quebeckers and all those who carry in their hearts the love of our dynamic and endearing nation.

How can we talk about Quebec's national holiday without talking about Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day? This celebration, that draws its origins from popular traditions, has become a time for festivities across Quebec, but also in countless francophone communities from coast to coast to coast.

Throughout Canada's history, as Quebeckers, we have contributed to building a unique and prosperous country. I wish everyone a happy national holiday and a happy Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day.

* * *

CANADA'S NATIONAL HOCKEY TEAMS

Ms. Anna Gainey (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Westmount, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize and celebrate the outstanding team captains who are visiting Ottawa today. Three of Canada's national hockey teams won gold medals at the world championships this year.

[*English*]

Tyler McGregor, captain and top scorer of the men's national para hockey team, led his squad to gold at the World Para Hockey Championship. Porter Martone, who broke Canada's all-time tournament scoring record, was instrumental in the team's gold medal at the U18 world championship. Marie-Philip Poulin, "Captain Clutch" and three-time Olympic gold medalist, led the women's national team to its 13th gold medal at the women's world hockey championship.

[*Translation*]

These remarkable athletes and their teammates have inspired players and fans across Canada with their performances on the ice and their commitment to their communities. I congratulate them all.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES MONTH

Mr. Terry Sheehan (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is National Indigenous Peoples Month, a time to recognize and honour the contributions of indigenous peoples, their knowledge and wisdom along with their continued commitment to protecting the land and the creation.

This month I want to recognize and thank the countless elders, knowledge keepers and leaders from Batchewana, Garden River, Michipicoten, Mississauga, Sagamok, Missanabie Cree, Serpent River and Thessalon, along with the Sault Ste. Marie historic Métis community. They work tirelessly to teach and guide, and to pass down their sacred knowledge and their language.

I also want to recognize the on-reserve and off-reserve indigenous peoples who inhabit Bawating and the surrounding area. They are integral to the prosperity of Algoma and are leaders in so many ways.

I am going to spend this month continuing to educate myself on how we can continue to walk the path of reconciliation together. Happy National Indigenous Peoples Month.

Chi-meegwetch.

ETHICS

Mr. Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the Prime Minister, the scandals are adding up and Canadians are paying the price. The Auditor General's damning revelations of the Liberals' green slush fund underscore the depths of corruption happening under the Prime Minister.

The Auditor General made it clear that the blame lies directly at the feet of the industry minister, who failed in his duty to protect taxpayers. Over \$123 million in contracts were illicitly awarded. There was \$76 million to Liberal insiders, including the Prime Minister's hand-picked chair of the green slush fund, who siphoned off \$217,000 to her own company.

Conservatives demand accountability. We demand that every misspent dollar be returned immediately. Thanks to Conservative action, the RCMP now has access to all relevant documents allowing it to investigate and uncover the full extent of the rot.

The Liberals have lost the moral authority to govern. Common-sense Conservatives are ready to clean house and end the Liberal corruption once and for all.

* * *

CHILDREN'S LITERATURE

Ms. Anita Vandenberg (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable constituent of mine, Varavadi Monaghan. When she arrived in Canada 30 years ago, the first books her husband, Harry, gave to her were the classic *Anne of Green Gables* series by L.M. Montgomery. She loved the books so much that she decided to translate them into Thai, her mother language. It took over a year to translate them; it was a true labour of love.

It is a fitting tribute in a year that would have been L.M. Montgomery's 150th birthday. Ms. Monaghan is looking forward to travelling to Cavendish, P.E.I., which is the site that inspired the *Anne of Green Gables* series. The books will be presented to Thai and Canadian dignitaries as a symbol of the cultural bridge between our two countries. This is a testament to the universality and relevance of the stories of our iconic protagonist, Anne.

Now, thanks to Varavadi, another generation of children can enjoy these inspiring tales.

* * *

• (1410)

TAXATION

Mr. Ryan Williams (Bay of Quinte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister's latest tax hike is a direct hit to the Canadians who are lucky enough, after nine years of the Liberal government, to find themselves still in the middle class. Despite the government's attempts to start a class war, the real Canadians who would be hit the most by the tax are the middle class. They are the union leader and the worker selling the home they inherited from their parents, the small business owner trying to retire by selling their business and the farmer selling the family farm to their children. They are the real victims of the Liberal government's cruel tax hike, which would rob the working class and middle class to pay for the obese

Statements By Members

government and its reckless spending. The job-killing capital gains tax would make finding a family doctor even harder, raise food prices even higher, drive the number of home starts even lower and make starting a small business even pricier. Instead of Liberal-NDP tax hikes, we need common-sense tax reforms that will make taxes lower, simpler and fairer. This will bring home prosperity to all Canadians and all who live here.

* * *

CARBON TAX

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years under the current Prime Minister, his inflationary carbon tax is driving up the cost of everything, making life more expensive than ever before. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has already proven that the carbon tax, just like the Prime Minister, is not worth the cost.

As a result of Conservative pressure, the Liberals were finally forced to reveal the true damage to the Canadian economy caused by the carbon tax. That economic hit, adjusted for inflation, is \$30 billion a year, or almost \$2,000 per Canadian family. The government hid this number for years and even tried to silence the Parliamentary Budget Officer to keep him from exposing this information. The Prime Minister cannot be trusted to be honest with Canadians.

Conservatives continue to call for the full release of all the data on how the carbon tax hurts Canadians. The NDP-Liberal coalition must be transparent in terms of the harm it is causing Canadians until common-sense Conservatives can axe the tax.

* * *

EID AL-ADHA

Mr. Terry Duguid (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend marked the beginning of Eid al-Adha. During Eid, families come together to pray, share meals and distribute food to those in need, stressing the importance of unity, charity and sacrifice. It is a time to deepen bonds with family and friends, to show kindness to others and to reflect on the blessings of life.

As Eid passes this year, let us recognize the contributions of the Muslim community to our society and reaffirm our commitment to promoting diversity, understanding and respect for all faiths. Let us acknowledge the challenging times faced by many in our communities.

Statements By Members

As politicians, we must do more to combat all forms of racism, including Islamophobia, while ensuring all have access to proper mental health supports as we feel the devastating impacts of conflict and loss of innocent lives throughout the world. May Eid usher in a year of joy, peace and understanding.

Eid Mubarak.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, for Indigenous peoples to celebrate National Indigenous History Month and the upcoming National Indigenous Peoples Day, a lot of hurdles must be dismantled. Gaps persist from the decades of underinvestment in ensuring indigenous peoples can thrive. While Conservatives made cuts, Liberals tout increases, but these do not come close to closing the gaps.

Just these last weeks, we heard racist attitudes freely expressed without repercussions. Indeed, racist attitudes are protected in the House. When this happens, indigenous peoples suffer the consequences. It is indigenous peoples who will remain overrepresented in the justice system and who will have less access to health care. It is indigenous children who will keep going to school after sleeping in substandard, overcrowded housing conditions.

I take this time to remind indigenous peoples to voice and stand for their rights, show their strength by using their cultures and speaking their languages, and celebrate their strength.

* * *

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

ÉRIK CANUEL

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebec recently lost one of its most brilliant film directors, Érik Canuel, to cancer at the age of 63.

Érik Canuel got his start in the business producing ads and music videos for the likes of Sylvain Cossette, Sass Jordan and Vilain Pin-gouin. He quickly rose through the ranks to become an icon in the industry.

He worked on the popular television series *Fortier*, but it was in film that he really made his mark. His works include *The Pig's Law*, *Red Nose*, *The Last Tunnel*, *The Outlander* and his 2007 mega-hit, *Bon Cop, Bad Cop*, which won the Genie for best picture and the billet d'or at the Jutra Awards.

At a time when Quebec cinema seemed to swing from dark art-house films to fluffy comedies, Érik Canuel set out to produce a clever blend of genres, always with a healthy dose of suspense and action.

Our thoughts are with his family and loved ones, of course. I am grateful to Erik Canuel for proving that Quebec's film industry can do anything and can do it very well.

[*English*]

LEADER OF THE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal-NDP government is not worth the cost or the corruption. Thanks to—

The Speaker: I am going to interrupt the hon. member. I am going to ask the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay to please not speak unless he is recognized. I am going to ask the hon. member for—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

I am going to ask the hon. member for Calgary Midnapore to start from the top.

The hon. member has the floor.

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie: Mr. Speaker, the Liberal-NDP government is not worth the cost or the corruption. Thanks to the leader of the NDP, Canadians have been forced to endure one more year of this cover-up coalition avoiding accountability. From the \$60-million arrive scam app to the \$200 million spent on McKinsey and the \$1-billion green slush fund, the NDP and its leader have been there to cover up for the Liberals at the expense of taxpayers. Now the NDP is putting forward motions at parliamentary committees to block any attempts to uncover the truth in those scandals over the summer.

How many more billions of taxpayer dollars need to disappear for the leader of the NDP to finally stand up to corruption, stand up to the Prime Minister and say “enough is enough”? This summer, while they protect the Liberal Prime Minister, Conservatives will continue to fight not only for the truth but also for Canadians, each and every day.

* * *

JOHN MURPHY

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the passing of John Murphy, the former member of Parliament for Kings—Hants, who contributed a lifetime of work to advancing the public good.

After obtaining his master's degree in social work, John became the director of the Fundy Mental Health Clinic and later a psychiatric social worker at the Valley Regional Hospital. He also taught at Acadia University. Following his time in Parliament, John served as the chair of the National Council of Welfare, advocating for initiatives to reduce poverty. He was awarded the Sovereign's Medal for Volunteers and the Queen Elizabeth II's Diamond Jubilee Medal for his many contributions to community.

He was a man of faith, and when I visited him in his final days, he was not afraid of death. He knew he had lived a good life, a life worth living. He was enjoying one of his favourite songs, the Irish tune *Danny Boy*.

I know I speak on behalf of all members of the House in extending condolences on John's passing to his wife, Julia; his children, Pat and Kelly; and the entire family. May he rest in peace.

ORAL QUESTIONS

• (1420)

[*Translation*]

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the radical Liberal Minister of Environment's decree is jeopardizing thousands of forestry jobs in Quebec.

I will reverse this radical decree and protect those jobs, but, until then, the cost of wood for building housing is going to go up, and that is on top of the jobs that will be lost.

How many Quebecers are going to lose their jobs because of this radical Liberal decree?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government has been responsible for protecting species at risk across the country for decades. When we need to protect species at risk, in this case caribou, we work with the provinces that have jurisdiction. We are looking at how to protect species at risk, as well as jobs.

I look forward to continuing to work with the Quebec government to protect both the environment and jobs.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Quebec nation is capable of doing both. This falls under provincial jurisdiction.

It is because the Bloc Québécois has kept this radical Liberal government in power that this minister is now adopting this job-killing decree. What is more, the Bloc MP for Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia said that the Bloc Québécois recognizes that Ottawa might interfere in this file.

Why did the Prime Minister listen to the Bloc Québécois's advice about getting involved in Quebec's jurisdiction to kill jobs in the forestry sector?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every day brings fresh evidence that the Conservative Party absolutely does not understand that the way to build a strong future is to marry the environment and the economy. We cannot build a strong economy without protecting the environment. That is exactly what we are doing.

On their side, they have neither the capacity, nor the plan, nor the interest in protecting species at risk, our environment or the future for children across the country.

We need a plan to protect the environment. That is what we are providing, and it is something the Conservatives do not have.

* * *

[*English*]

TAXATION

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is not just common-sense Conservatives who are saying that the Prime Minister's latest tax hike on small businesses, farmers, home builders and health care is not worth the cost.

Oral Questions

Now, former Liberal Treasury Board president Scott Brison says the Prime Minister's support for the tax hike is a combination of moral sanctimony and economic complacency for ministers who simply do what PMO tells them. He calls it “socialist bafflelegab.”

Why is the Prime Minister going ahead with killing jobs and raising costs with what his own Liberals call socialist bafflelegab?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, despite the Conservative leader's partisan attacks, the rise in capital gains inclusion rates is very simple. If Canadians make more than \$250,000 in profit from selling investments in a given year, we are asking them to share a little more of those profits with Canadians who need those investments.

Whether it is by investing in housing, whether it is standing up for school food programs or whether it is delivering dental care to seniors, these are investments we are making to support Canadians by asking the wealthiest to pay their fair share.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is not partisanship from me; it is his own former Liberal Treasury Board president who calls it socialist bafflelegab. In fact, the tax begins applying on the very first dollar that a small business earns.

He has been promising that raising taxes would make life fairer. We found out today from Food Banks Canada that a record-smashing 25% of Canadians now live in poverty after nine years of his taxes, his deficits and his doubling housing costs.

Why is he going ahead with the same “wackonomics” that caused the poverty in order to solve it?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talks about affordability, but he is standing against raising taxes on the wealthiest so that we can give more supports to those who actually need it. He is standing against our school food program, which would help 400,000 kids across the country have fuller bellies as they study, and would take about \$800 a year of pressure off of the families that are pressed with the cost of groceries. We are continuing to deliver dental care supports to seniors and, as of next week, we will be delivering dental care supports to young people and Canadians with disabilities. We are there for Canadians. He is voting against it.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has been nine years that the Prime Minister has been promising trickle-down economics, where if he takes money away from small businesses and workers it will go from one level of government to another level of government to another level of government. It will trickle down.

Oral Questions

Right now, 25% of Canadians are living in poverty, which is something the Prime Minister tried to cover up, just like he covered up his own data that showed 25 billion dollars' worth of extra costs with the carbon tax, which is nearly \$2,000 in carbon tax cover-up for every single family. How can we trust anything he says about taxes, poverty or money?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition hid for eight weeks while he was trying to come up with an answer for us asking the wealthiest to pay their fair share so that we could invest in fairness for every generation. I think he needs to go back to the drawing board because his answer is completely illogical and unfounded.

The reality is, when it comes to delivering for Canadians who are struggling with food prices, we have a national school food program that would help 400,000 kids, which his party is voting against. Conservatives talk about affordability, but they are only interested in themselves and their political advantage.

* * *

[Translation]

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Premier of British Columbia, David Eby, wrote to the Prime Minister to ask him to do a better job of sharing information on foreign interference with his province.

We know that the Prime Minister is not very proactive when it comes to foreign interference. In a very partisan way, he would rather shut his eyes and hope that the problem goes away. However, as we saw in Quebec with Hydro-Québec, the problem is that foreign interference is not just happening at the federal level.

Why is the Prime Minister refusing to share critical information on foreign interference with the Quebec and provincial governments?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, we are working with our security and intelligence services so that we can provide secret, classified information to the provincial premiers to better address the very real issue of foreign interference.

Our government has also created more mechanisms and institutions to counter foreign interference than any other government. We will continue to be open, transparent and rigorous in the way that we counter foreign interference.

I thank the leader of the Bloc Québécois for getting his security clearance. We would like the Conservatives to do the same.

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's scatterbrained, laissez-faire approach to domestic security has consequences.

There are consequences to his refusal to provide information about the Winnipeg lab, to the point of suing the Speaker of the House, to his stubborn refusal to launch a commission of inquiry for months on end, to his refusal to co-operate with the Quebec and provincial governments on sharing information. The Prime Minister

is part of the problem, not the solution. He needs to get his act together.

What is he waiting for to provide Quebec and the provinces with the information in his possession?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we just passed Bill C-70 in the House, with the support of the Bloc Québécois, and sent it to the Senate for further study. This bill will allow for more rigorous and regular information sharing with the premiers of the provinces and territories on issues of foreign interference and national security that involve them.

We are working in a respectful and collaborative way to fight to protect our democracy together.

[English]

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for three months, the Prime Minister has known about the serious allegations that parliamentarians are knowingly working with foreign governments to undermine our country, yet we do not know if he has had a single conversation with any member of his caucus. The Conservative Party leader does not even want to know about the serious allegations of foreign interference that directly impact his party. Why do both of these leaders put the interests of their parties ahead of the interests of our country?

● (1430)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as all parliamentarians know—

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. member for Battle River—Crowfoot knows that he should not be speaking at this time.

I would ask the right hon. Prime Minister to start from the top, please.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, all parliamentarians in the House know how important it is to protect our democracy from foreign interference. That is why we have been working together, whether it is on the national security committee of parliamentarians that we created over the objections of the Conservative Party, through strengthened mechanisms within our national security universe or through election interference monitoring by top public servants. We have taken more actions on preventing foreign interference than any other government, and we have continued to work with independent commissions, such as the public inquiry, to get to the bottom of it.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has known and has not taken action.

[Translation]

For three months, the Prime Minister has known about the allegations that parliamentarians are knowingly helping India and China. He thinks he is better than everyone else, but he has not taken action. As for the Conservative leader, he is hiding because he does not want to know the truth.

Oral Questions

Why are these two leaders putting their own interests ahead of the national interest?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the things we saw last week was that the leaders of the NDP and the Green Party obtained the security clearance to read the entire classified NSICOP report. That gave them a different perspective on this issue, from both sides of the coin.

The Conservative leader, on the other hand, chose ignorance. He does not want to get the security clearance that would give him access to classified information, because he would rather just make partisan attacks.

* * *

[English]

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister divides to distract. He turns groups against each other. He fans the flames. He gave funds to an anti-Semitic Holocaust denier. Even before October 7, hate crimes were up 162%.

Since, we have seen the rise of Hamas-inspired hate camps at university campuses that intimidate Jewish students and promote genocide. Will the Prime Minister finally summon the courage to join with me and call for these hate camps to be shut down and closed up so that students can safely go back to school?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Leader of the Opposition recognizing the divisive rhetoric and the division that is occurring in Canadian society right now. We have a problem with hatred. We have to address that problem. We know that the statistics show that hate crimes are on the rise 130% in the last five years.

That is why I was proud to stand with CIJA when we tabled Bill C-63, the online harms legislation that would improve penalties for hate crimes, provide a definition of hatred and ensure that we are keeping Canadian communities safe. The special envoy on anti-Semitism supports the bill. CIJA supports the bill. I am just wondering why the Leader of the Opposition does not.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he is worried about those hate camps, all while he allows 700 agents of the Iranian regime to openly operate in Canada four years after they killed 55 Canadians and 30 permanent residents, and after they funded the brutal massacres of October 7. There have six years of excuses, and they did nothing, but with a by-election on Monday and the Prime Minister desperately needing to pad his margins, it turns out that there might be enough pressure for them to finally ban the IRGC terrorists, who they should have banned years ago before they set up shop here to terrorize our communities

Why does the Prime Minister always put himself ahead of the safety of Canadians?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speak-

er, our government has taken a series of measures to hold the murderous Iranian regime to account. We have consistently set and taken measures, including under immigration legislation. We have listed the Revolutionary Guards Quds Force as being a terrorist entity. We take advice from national security agencies in listings, and we think that hon. members should allow that process to take place. When we have some news, we will be making an announcement appropriately.

* * *

● (1435)

[Translation]

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is not for nothing that people are saying that the Minister of Environment needs to step down. Once again, he is going after forestry workers. He is jeopardizing thousands of jobs in Saguenay, even though Quebec has the largest network of protected areas for woodland caribou.

He wants to go ahead and impose his decree without understanding the social and economic impacts. A minister who lives in Montreal will never understand our regional issues. It feels like they want to shut down the regions.

When will the Minister of Environment stop punishing forestry workers, who are just trying to do their job and earn a living?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to remind my colleague that I was born and raised in the very beautiful town of La Tuque, just south of Lac-Saint-Jean, in the very beautiful riding of my friend, the Minister of Industry.

Second, Quebec itself has been promising to present a caribou recovery plan since 2016. In a joint letter between the federal government and the Government of Quebec in 2022, the Government of Quebec once again promised to put forward a caribou protection strategy and to protect at least 65% of the species' habitat.

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, how many times has the environment minister come to Saguenay to meet with forestry industry representatives? Once? Twice? No, it is zero times. He cannot even be bothered to leave Montreal.

The forestry industry is crucial for us. He does not seem to understand that. He needs to stop being so stubborn and scrap his decree. Thousands of jobs are at stake, and that represents thousands of families. The Conservatives will always protect forestry workers' paycheques.

Oral Questions

Can the minister respect Quebec's jurisdictions once and for all and leave forestry workers alone?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a little guy from La Tuque and a little guy from Shawinigan are definitely not going to take lessons from the Conservatives on how to develop our regions and protect them.

On our side of the House, we know how to balance the economy with our environmental obligations. We have always invested in the forestry industry, and we will always invest in the forestry industry.

Workers watching at home know that on our side of the House, we will always do what it takes to stand up for them, build a stronger Canada and make sure there are jobs for this generation and generations to come.

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, nine years of this Liberal government is nine years of interference in Quebec's jurisdictions. The Minister of Environment wants to impose an emergency decree that will restrict the activities of forestry workers and jeopardize thousands of jobs in this sector in Quebec.

Only a Conservative government will protect forestry workers' jobs. Strangely enough, the member for Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia supports this Minister of Environment, saying that he can interfere in provincial jurisdictions.

When will this minister stop interfering in Quebec's jurisdictions with his radical ideas?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we understand that the forest is part of the DNA of our country and that the forestry workers who have worked in this industry are important.

Not only are we investing in the industry, but we are in the process of considering and developing new technologies because we want to help the forestry industry. We want it to have a future not only in the 20th century, but also in the 21st century. We are working with our international partners and with innovative companies.

The people watching us know that we will always be there for workers in the forestry industry.

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years in office, this Liberal government still does not know its place.

It continues to impose its incompetence on the provinces. It wants to adopt an emergency decree to protect the boreal caribou and trample all over the jurisdictions of the Government of Quebec, which is trying to protect jobs, nature and the economy. For some reason, the Bloc Québécois is helping the Liberals at every turn.

Will the Minister of Environment set aside his radical ideas, mind his own business and let Quebec look after its own affairs?

• (1440)

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have been here for nine years. They are waking up. Today is Groundhog Day. The Conservatives are waking up.

We have been there for the forestry industry from the start. We have been there for years, we are there today and we will be there in the future. What we are doing is protecting the jobs of today and tomorrow. Forestry workers understand that.

On this side of the House, we will continue to work, and we will let the Conservatives talk.

* * *

SENIORS

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the age well at home initiative is a perfect example of the federal government's heartlessness. Since 2022, the Government of Quebec has been asking Ottawa to send it the funds, given that the initiative concerns a Quebec jurisdiction, while Ottawa keeps trying to impose conditions.

Today, the federal government would rather stop sending cheques to seniors than reach an agreement with Quebec. Clearly, this government's priority is not to help people, but to make all the decisions and then try to look good by handing out cheques with maple leaves on them.

When is this government going to transfer the money instead of abandoning seniors?

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 thank my colleague for her question.

The age well at home initiative is a national program designed to help seniors age safely and with dignity. Our government has invested \$90 million across the country so that community organizations can submit projects. Some organizations in Quebec have submitted projects, and we are going to work hard with the Government of Quebec to ensure that they receive their funding.

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is definitely a problem. This government had already created two classes of seniors. The government refuses to increase old age security for seniors aged 65 to 74, but seniors aged 75 and over are getting an increase.

With its age well at home program, Ottawa is again creating two new classes of seniors, specifically seniors in Quebec and those in Canada. Seniors in Quebec will not receive assistance from Ottawa under the program, which helps them stay in their own homes and supports community organizations, but seniors in Canada will.

What is the government waiting for to transfer the money? Why is it holding Quebec seniors hostage?

Oral Questions

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, community organizations have been working hard to present and develop projects under this national program. Seniors need these projects, which involve things like delivering meals and helping with transportation.

We are working on solutions with Quebec because we want to make sure that community organizations get the money they need to help seniors. There are not two classes of seniors; there is only one, and this government will be there to help them all.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, training is the way to address the labour shortage. That is what guarantees a skilled workforce across all economic sectors. Everyone agrees. There is consensus among workers, employers and the government.

However, Ottawa is cutting transfers and now there is a shortfall of \$145 million. We know the government is tired, but it needs to wake up. Will it reconsider its decision to cut workforce training transfers?

Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we came to power, we made significant investments in training several million workers from coast to coast to coast. The additional investment in question was not renewed in the 2024 budget because it was a temporary measure.

We are here to work with the provinces. We are going to do that. We are going to continue to train nearly one million people a year. That is what we are doing. It is a shared jurisdiction. We are here for Canadian workers from coast to coast to coast.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal-NDP Prime Minister is robbing hard-working Canadians to pay for his out-of-control spending. The level of that thievery was exposed last week when the Liberals were forced to admit that their carbon tax scam robs our economy of \$30 billion a year and it picks the pockets of every single Canadian family of \$2,000 a year. The environment minister is not worth the economic vandalism he has wrought on Canadians.

Will the minister admit that his carbon tax is a scam and just resign?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a deception was revealed last week. The deception was the fake pose of the Conservatives to pretend to be on the side of working people. Last week, we gave them a choice. We said they could be on the side of a nurse or a welder, a Canadian who lives from paycheque to paycheque, or they could side with a multi-millionaire. It did not surprise anyone on this side

of the House that the Conservatives, yet again, chose their rich lobbyist friends. Shame on them.

• (1445)

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the NDP-Liberal carbon tax scam was exposed last week, and it confirms what every hard-working Canadian already knows: It makes life unaffordable. The Liberals' own data, which they desperately tried to hide, shows the Liberal carbon tax scam robs Canadian families of \$2,000 a year. This is money that they would put on dance fees, hockey registration or a summer vacation, or just to put food on the table. The truth is hard-working Canadians cannot afford the environment minister's carbon tax scam.

Will he admit it is a failure, just resign and give Canadians a break?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there really has been a scam that has been revealed. For weeks, for months, the Conservatives have been trying to distract and deceive. They have been trying to bamboozle Canadians. They have posed as being on the side of working people, on the side of people who live from paycheque to paycheque, but last week they showed their true colours and they voted against the plumber and the nurse. Now Canadians know whose side they are really on.

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the environment minister has been caught covering up a damning secret from Canadians. After years of telling Canadians they would be better off from the carbon tax, his own government's data has proved him wrong. The carbon tax will cost the Canadian economy \$30 billion every year. That is nearly \$2,000 per Canadian family.

Now that we know the environment minister chose to vandalize the Canadian economy with this carbon tax, will he do the right thing and resign?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that climate change has already cost Canadians \$25 billion in the last 10 years alone. Not five years from now, not 10 years from now, it is already happening. If we do not do anything, it is going to be an extra \$35 billion to Canadian taxpayers.

What we are doing on this side of the House is we are helping Canadians fight climate change and we are helping Canadians win affordability, which is why eight out of 10 Canadian families get more money back from carbon pricing than what they pay.

Oral Questions

Mr. Clifford Small (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the NDP-Liberal costly coalition can no longer dispute the Parliamentary Budget Officer's finding that the carbon tax will cost most Canadians more than they pay in. The Liberals' own report, which Conservatives forced them to release, shows that carbon tax will cost every single family in Canada \$2,000 per year and will cost the Canadian economy \$30 billion per year. This is nothing short of economic vandalism.

After nine years, will the Prime Minister finally do the right thing and fire his environment minister, or will he once again prove he is not worth the cost?

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Labour and Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us go through the numbers yet again. For a family of four in Alberta, it is \$1,800; in Manitoba, it is \$1,200; in Ontario, it is \$1,120; in Saskatchewan, it is \$1,504; in New Brunswick, it is \$760; in Nova Scotia, it is \$824; in PEI, it is \$880; and in Newfoundland and Labrador, it is \$1,192 a year. To most people, that is a lot of money. To these guys, it is phony.

* * *

GROCERY INDUSTRY

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, people are increasingly turning to food banks in Halifax because of sky-high grocery prices, with food bank visits having risen by 21% since last year. Instead of tackling the corporate greed gouging these families, the Liberals gutted the NDP's bill to address price-fixing and harmful mergers that are increasing prices for Canadians. Just like the Conservatives, they would rather protect CEO profits over lowering prices for Canadians.

Why do the Liberals choose corporate power and profits over the people of Nova Scotia?

• (1450)

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we did not only choose the people of Nova Scotia, we chose all Canadians when we called all the CEOs of the grocery chains to come to explain themselves in Ottawa, to answer to this government and to answer to Canadians. We have introduced one of the most comprehensive reforms on competition because we want more choice, less consolidation and more competition. If the NDP and Conservatives want to do something, they should call Walmart and Costco, like I am doing, to ask them to sign the grocery code of conduct so we bring fairness in this country for all grocers across the nation.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Air Canada made \$2 billion in profits last year, but apparently that was not enough, because now Canadians are facing steep summer price hikes at a time when they can least afford it. WestJet is even charging people \$25 just to book a ticket by phone. These costs affect northern communities super hard, because flying is often the only option for people there. The government's response has been crickets.

Whether it is grocery chains, oil and gas companies or airlines, the Liberals seem perfectly fine with corporations gouging Canadians. Why is that?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, WestJet makes its own business decisions, but charging extras for customers who book flights over the phone makes absolutely no sense.

On this side of the aisle, we are working with the Canadian Transportation Agency to increase transparency of fees to make life more affordable. What are they doing? They are voting against all of that.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, June is National Indigenous History Month. It is time to reflect on the legacy and impacts of colonialism, and work together toward a better future. This is top of mind for the 12,000 first nations and non-indigenous residents who live in the Weeneebayko region in northern Ontario.

Could the Minister of Indigenous Services tell us what the government is doing to ensure that everyone has fair access to quality health care?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Indigenous Services and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Brampton South for her advocacy. She is right that for too long indigenous people have been facing discrimination as they access health care. However, everyone in the country has the right to quality health care.

In 2018, our government contributed \$158 million to plan the replacement of the Weeneebayko hospital in northern Ontario. As I said in the House last month, we are going to get that health centre built. The federal government is contributing \$1.2 billion so that all members in the Weeneebayko area region have equal access to health care.

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the \$30 billion carbon tax cover-up has been exposed. The costly cover-up coalition hid a secret government report proving that the carbon tax scam commits \$30 billion of economic vandalism. The culprit of this cover-up is the environment minister, who has a profound love of orange jumpsuits and handcuffs. He did it to protect the leader of the NDP's pension. Those champagne socialists are not worth the cover-up or the cost.

Why has the environment minister not been fired for misleading Canadians?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the average income in Calgary Forest Lawn is \$35,000. The average person in Calgary Forest Lawn can only dream of having an income of more than \$250,000 a year. However, their MP thinks that the average person earning \$35,000 in Calgary Forest Lawn should pay tax at a higher rate than a multi-millionaire making a profit of more than \$250,000 a year. That is shameful.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it looks like the minister has a Ph.D. in wackonomics. Facts are like common sense. In the government, they are not so common.

The proud socialist environment minister's woke, radical, extreme agenda sent two million Canadians to a food bank and one in four into poverty. His government hid a secret report that proves the carbon tax scam costs Canadians an extra \$30 billion. If anyone in the private sector covered up a \$30 billion loss from shareholders, they would be fired.

How the hell does that guy still have a job?

• (1455)

The Speaker: This is a message for all hon. members to be very careful about the language they use in the House.

The hon. Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance.

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me share some economic analysis, "Here we have a monstrous policy of transferring wealth from wage-earners to asset-holders, from the working class to the wealthy....Here we have a policy that is specifically designed to transfer wealth from those who earn wages to those who earn capital gains through their assets." Who said that? The current Conservative leader. He was railing against the holders of assets and claiming to support working people, but we learned last week that is fake populism.

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, Canada is on track for the worst living standards in 40 years.

Now the Prime Minister and his radical finance minister are hiking taxes on farmers to pay for their inflationary spending, all during a food crisis. A new report indicates that the Liberal's job-killing tax hike will cost average farmers 30% more in taxes.

Oral Questions

Canadians know that when you tax a farmer who grows the food and tax a trucker who ships the food, it is all Canadians who pay the price. How is that fair?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the proud daughter of a farmer, I know the huge contribution farmers make to our country. That is why I am glad that with these tax measures, we are able to increase the lifetime capital gains exemption to \$1.25 million for each farmer in Canada.

I also know that farmers are hard-working people. They are on the side of the working people, not on the side of the multi-millionaires, but that is not the side the Conservatives are on.

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, more Canadians are struggling to feed their families, and 25% of Canadians are living in poverty. The Liberals can spin this a hundred different ways, but Canadians know the truth.

First, the government punished Canadians with the carbon tax. Now, it is imposing a job-killing tax hike on the people who produce and provide the services we need to survive. The farmers, welders, plumbers, home builders, doctors and small business owners will all be decimated by this hike.

Will the minister commit to exempting any Canadian earning less than \$120,000 a year from this job-killing tax hike?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are showing not only that they are fake populists, but also that they are populists who cannot do math.

We have been really clear that the new level of capital gains inclusion kicks in only after each individual has made \$250,000 in capital gains, and they can do that every single year. That is the reality, and the Conservatives are ashamed of themselves.

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mrs. Julie Vignola (Beauport—Limoulu, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal government is slipping again when it comes to the French language. Canada Post is hiring unilingual anglophone mail carriers in Beuil and in Saint-Rémi. Canada Post claims that people do not have to speak French to deliver the mail. Let us remind them that in Quebec, we work in French. We will not tolerate Canada Post anglicizing the workplace of Quebec employees.

It is just further evidence that the Charter of the French Language should be paramount. Knowledge of French is essential in Quebec.

Will the minister immediately set Canada Post straight?

Oral Questions

• (1500)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving me the chance to remind the entire House that all federal institutions, including Crown corporations like Canada Post, are subject to the Canadian government's Official Languages Act. The good news is that this act was strengthened in the past few years. For the first time in this country's history, this act and the Canadian government recognize that we must defend the French language throughout Canada, but especially in Quebec.

This is everyone's responsibility. It is the responsibility of the Canadian government. What is more, we have a multi-billion dollar plan to help communities across the country.

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, by hiring unilingual anglophone employees, Canada Post is undermining the right of all its employees in Quebec to work in French. This issue is putting the reformed Official Languages Act to the test.

Let us not forget that Quebec and the Liberals reached a compromise that does not require federal corporations to comply with the Charter of the French Language. Canada Post is using that compromise to anglicize its workplaces.

Does the minister realize that this is further proof that, reform notwithstanding, the Official Languages Act still promotes the anglicization of Quebec?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, for the first time in this country's history, the new Official Languages Act recognizes that French is in jeopardy in Quebec and that it must be protected across the country, but especially in Quebec. I have already answered that question. I made it clear that all Crown corporations are subject to the same treatment.

I have a few seconds left, so, on behalf of all members, I want to thank the latest cohort of pages, who will soon be leaving us, for their outstanding service over the past year.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Larry the plumber from Winnipeg told the finance committee this morning that the Liberal change to the capital gains tax is not fair to his generation. He is not wealthy. He does not have a gold-plated public sector pension or a trust fund to fall back on, like the Prime Minister—

The Speaker: Colleagues, I am having difficulty hearing the hon. member's question. I am going to ask him to start from the top.

The hon. member.

Mr. Marty Morantz: Mr. Speaker, Larry the plumber from Winnipeg told the finance committee this morning that the Liberal change to the capital gains tax is not fair to his generation. He is not wealthy. He does not have a gold-plated public sector pension or a trust fund to fall back on, like the Prime Minister. He worked hard to build a small plumbing company, to save for retirement, for his

family, and now, the Prime Minister is pulling the rug out from his retirement plan, penalizing his hard work.

Will the Prime Minister exempt plumbers like Larry from the capital gains increase, yes or no?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these deflecting and deceiving Conservatives should be a little bit careful when it comes to talking about gold-plated public pensions. After all, their leader has worked his entire life for the government. He currently lives in government accommodation—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Colleagues, like I was having difficulty hearing the member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, I am also having difficulty hearing the Deputy Prime Minister.

I would ask that the Deputy Prime Minister please respond again, from the top, and I am asking all members to please allow the Speaker to be able to hear the member.

Hon. Chrystia Freeland: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to do so.

These deflecting and deceiving Conservatives should be a little careful when it comes to talking about gold-plated public pensions. After all, they are led by someone who has worked his entire life for the government and someone who currently lives in government, luxurious housing and has a government chef.

Now, when it comes to working people, we are on their side. The Conservatives have just shown that they are not.

* * *

• (1505)

[Translation]

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment, with the support of the Bloc Québécois, is preparing to force more radical policies on Quebecers by imposing a decree that will destroy the forestry industry in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean.

TVA Nouvelles reports that the Bloc environment critic also believes that it is fine for Ottawa to get involved in the caribou issue. The Conservative Party is the only one defending Quebec's forestry workers.

Can the Minister of Environment let Quebec manage its territory the way it sees fit?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. He knows very well that we have always been there for the forestry industry. We will always be there for the forestry industry.

Forestry workers understand that we have to balance the environment and the economy. They, too, want to ensure there are jobs now and for generations to come.

That is why we will continue to invest in innovation, continue to support the industry and always side with forestry workers in Quebec and across the country.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance, who never thinks about farmers or consults them.

With help from the Bloc Québécois, she found a new way to undermine our farming sector. This new tax increase on capital gains will jeopardize the retirements and succession plans of our farming families. The president of the UPA, Martin Caron, wrote the minister a letter on June 6. It was a heartfelt plea denouncing this situation.

Will she make a promise today that no farmer will lose their retirement because of this tax increase?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a proud farmer's daughter, I truly want to reassure my hon. colleague that I often talk with farmers and I respect their work very much.

That is why I am proud to announce that on June 25, we are increasing the lifetime capital gains exemption to \$2.5 million for a couple. This is an important measure for farmers in Quebec and Canada.

* * *

DENTAL CARE

Ms. Patricia Lattanzio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, thousands of seniors, including those in my riding of Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, have already been to see their dentist to get dental care. This shows the importance of implementing the Canadian dental care plan.

Unfortunately, the opposition continues to oppose this program day after day.

Can the Minister of Public Services and Procurement give us an update on how successful this program has been for seniors in Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not only is the Conservative leader against the Canadian dental care plan, but he also misled seniors in Quebec City by saying on the radio just a few days ago that the Canadian dental care plan does not exist and that people should not try to register for it. That shows contempt for seniors in Quebec.

The good news is that it is not working, because over one-third of the two million seniors who have already registered are in Quebec. Another piece of good news is that, next week, as of June 27, all children between the ages of zero and 18 and people with disabilities will also be able to sign up for the new Canadian dental care plan.

Oral Questions

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, congratulations for all the wrong reasons. Canada is now a world leader in high taxes. Ranked behind only Chile and Denmark, we now have the third highest capital gains tax rate in the world. In the midst of a productivity crisis, how can the Minister of Small Business support a tax hike that will kill jobs and decimate our entrepreneurs?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yet again, the Conservatives need to work just a little harder, not only on being less hypocritical about support for working Canadians, but also on just getting their facts straight. After this move, the capital gains rate in Canada will be lower than the tax paid in California or in New York City. Furthermore, the METR, Canada's marginal effective tax rate, is the lowest in the G7, and anyone who read the budget would have seen that.

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, this Prime Minister is not worth the cost. Shaughn, a 20-year veteran planning to retire next year, is gutted that he will have to put that off, given the Liberal government's punitive policy on capital gains. It was not enough for the Prime Minister to leave veterans high and dry because they were asking for more than he could give. Now, despite Shaughn's decades of service and prudent planning for his retirement, the Prime Minister wants to take even more, so my question is this: How is that fair?

● (1510)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have already established that the Conservatives are not on the side of working Canadians. They are not on the side of the nurse, the plumber or the soldier who is living from paycheque to paycheque. They are on the side of the multi-millionaire who has already made \$250,000 in capital gains profit in a given year. However, in opposing this measure, they are also opposing dental care that will help nine million Canadians, school food for 400,000 children and our plan to build four million homes in Canada. Shame on them.

*Oral Questions***ETHICS**

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the environment minister is already under fire for his \$30-billion carbon tax cover-up. He was a lobbyist for Cycle Capital. Cycle Capital companies got more than \$200 million from the Liberal green slush fund. Now we learn that he is still a big shareholder in Cycle Capital, and since he became environment minister, Cycle Capital companies have gotten another \$17 million from the green slush fund.

Liberal insiders are getting rich on taxpayer money. There is a carbon tax cover-up. The environment minister is profiting from the green slush fund sleaze. When will Liberal corruption end?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, do those members know what is profiting from all the work of this government and all the members in the House? It is record investment in green technologies in our country. We rank number one, ahead of China, for the battery ecosystem in the country and have more—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Colleagues, we are almost there. There are a couple of more sleeps.

The hon. Minister of Innovation, from the top, please.

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne: Mr. Speaker, I have more to say for the sleepy Conservatives.

On this side of the House, we know what we are doing. Thanks to the work of this government, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Environment and the Prime Minister, we have seen record investment in our country. We rank first in the world for the battery ecosystem, ahead of China. In Windsor, St. Thomas, Bécancour and Kingston, Canadians are winning, Canada is winning, and we will fight for Canada at every step of the way.

* * *

DENTAL CARE

Mr. Tony Van Bynen (Newmarket—Aurora, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last month, eligible Canadians were able to begin receiving care under the Canadian dental care plan. In my community of Newmarket—Aurora and across Canada, many seniors who have not been able to afford a dentist are now able to visit participating dental providers.

Could the Minister of Health update the House with respect to how many Canadians have already received care under the plan, and about the newest cohort that can begin applying for the Canadian dental plan?

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Newmarket—Aurora for his incredible advocacy, along with the parliamentarians in the House who are standing with vulnerable Canadians who need dental care.

In just six weeks, more than 200,000 seniors from coast to coast were able to receive dental care. To put that in practical terms, the call centre got a call yesterday from an 87-year-old woman, in tears, because for the first time since she was 11 years old, somebody allowed her to get her mouth taken care of.

We are going to make sure that all nine million Canadians everywhere in the country get the care they need.

* * *

• (1515)

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Ms. Lindsay Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, members of the Canadian Armed Forces have been saying for years that their grievance system is broken. Today's ombudsman's report confirmed this. On average, Canadian Armed Forces members have to wait 1,000 days to get compensated when there is a mistake with their pay. People are frustrated, they are tired and they are angry. Our men and women who bravely serve our country and keep Canadians safe deserve better.

The government keeps failing our armed forces. Will the minister tell us the steps he will take to implement the ombud's recommendations?

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from COVID-19 to natural disasters and for their excellent work in Europe, our brave men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces have always been there for Canadians. It is our job to make sure that members of our forces and their families are well supported.

That is why I have accepted all of the ombudsman's recommendations to transform and modernize our military grievance system. As well, we are making significant new investments to support those members, with \$100 million for child care, nearly \$300 million for a housing strategy and nearly \$500 million to digitize the health care records. We and our government will always be there for the members of the Canadian Armed Forces.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, between 2010 and 2020, 191 Canadian military personnel died by suicide. Instead of addressing mental health challenges, Liberal and Conservative governments have cut funding, putting veterans at risk.

The Burns Way is ready to provide more trained, peer-to-peer support to our brave veterans, particularly for indigenous and 2SLGBTQIA+ veterans. They deserve nothing less.

Will the minister commit today to funding The Burns Way, yes or no?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I first want to take a moment to thank the members of the veterans affairs committee for the important study they presented last week on women veterans. We certainly recognize that a lot of work needs to be done, and I want to commend all the members who worked on this report.

On the issue of mental health services as well, two years ago the Department of Veterans Affairs Canada ensured that when members of the Canadian Armed Forces or veterans apply for mental health services, they can have access to those services immediately without any assessments. We want to make sure that when veterans are applying for services, they will have the care that they need when they need it the most.

* * *

HARDEEP SINGH NIJJAR

The Speaker: Following discussions among representatives of all parties in the House, I understand there is an agreement to observe a moment of silence in memory of Hardeep Singh Nijjar, assassinated in Surrey, British Columbia, one year ago today.

I now invite hon. members to rise.

[*A moment of silence observed*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2024, NO. 1

The House resumed from June 17 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, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: It being 3:20 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the motions at report stage of Bill C-69.

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

- (1520)

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2 to 31.

- (1535)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 831*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barlow

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett

Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer — 117

Government Orders

Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCaulley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiple
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

NAYS

Members

Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bergeron
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Boissonnault

Government Orders

Boulerice
 Brière
 Cannings
 Casey
 Chagger
 Champagne
 Chatel
 Chiang
 Collins (Victoria)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 Desbiens
 Desjarlais
 Dhillon
 Dong
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gainey
 Garrison
 Gazan
 Gill
 Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hughes
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Joly
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Lebouthillier
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Miao
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Perron
 Plamondon
 Qualtrough
 Robillard
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sgro

Bradford
 Brunelle-Duceppe
 Carr
 Chabot
 Chahal
 Champoux
 Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 DeBellefeuille
 Desilets
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Drouin
 Duclous
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garon
 Gaudreau
 Gerretsen
 Gould
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hussen
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lemire
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendès
 Michaud
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 Normandin
 Oliphant
 Pauzé
 Petitpas Taylor
 Powlowski
 Rayes
 Rodriguez
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan

Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Sorbara
 Ste-Marie
 Suds
 Taylor Roy
 Therrien
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandal
 Vignola
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 207

Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sousa
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thériault
 Thompson
 Trudel
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vandenbeld
 Villemure
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé

Jones— 2

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 2 to 31 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 32.

[*Translation*]

A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 33.

[*English*]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with the Liberal members voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting yea.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, it is the birthday of the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, so I would like to say that, in his honour, we accept to apply the vote and we will be voting no.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, Greens agree to apply the vote, and we will be voting against.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 32, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 832*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultatif
 Albas
 Arnold
 Barlow
 Berthold
 Block

Aitchison
 Allison
 Baldinelli
 Barrett
 Bezan
 Bragdon

Government Orders

Brassard	Brock	Casey	Chabot
Calkins	Caputo	Chagger	Chahal
Carrie	Chambers	Champagne	Champoux
Chong	Cooper	Chatel	Chen
Dalton	Dancho	Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Davidson	Deltell	Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Doherty	Dowdall	Coteau	Dabrusin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Damoff	DeBellefeuille
Ellis	Epp	Desbiens	Desilets
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Fast	Ferreri	Dhillon	Diab
Findlay	Gallant	Drouin	Dubourg
Généreux	Genuis	Duclos	Duguid
Gladu	Godin	Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
Goodridge	Gourde	El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Gray	Hallan	Fisher	Fonseca
Hoback	Jeneroux	Fortier	Fortin
Jivani	Kelly	Fragiskatos	Fraser
Khanna	Kitchen	Freeland	Fry
Kmiec	Kram	Gaheer	Gainey
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Garon	Garrison
Kusie	Lake	Gaudreau	Gazan
Lantsman	Lawrence	Gerretsen	Gill
Lehoux	Leslie	Gould	Green
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Liepert	Lloyd	Hanley	Hardie
Lobb	Maguire	Hepfner	Holland
Majumdar	Martel	Housefather	Hughes
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)	Hussen	Hutchings
McLean	Melillo	Iacono	Idlout
Moore	Morantz	Jen	Jaczek
Morrison	Motz	Johns	Joly
Muys	Nater	Jowhari	Julian
Patzer	Paul-Hus	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Perkins	Poilievre	Khalid	Khera
Redekopp	Reid	Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Rempel Garner	Richards	Kwan	Lalonde
Roberts	Rood	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Ruff	Scheer	Lapointe	Larouche
Schmale	Seebach	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Shields	Shipley	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Small	Soroka	Lemire	Long
Steinley	Stewart	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Strahl	Stubbs	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Thomas	Tolmie	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Uppal	Van Popta	Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Vecchio	Vidal	Masse	Mathysen
Vien	Viersen	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Vis	Wagantall	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Warkentin	Waugh	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Webber	Williams	McLeod	McPherson
Williamson	Zimmer— 116	Mendès	Miao
		Michaud	Miller
		Morrice	Morrissey
		Murray	Naqvi
		Ng	Noormohamed
		Normandin	O'Connell
		Oliphant	O'Regan
		Pauzé	Perron
		Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
		Powlowski	Qualtrough
		Rayes	Robillard
		Rodriguez	Rogers
		Romanado	Rota
		Sahota	Sajjan
		Saks	Samson
		Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
		Scarpaleggia	Schieffe
		Serré	Sgro
		Shanahan	Sheehan
		Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
		Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
		Singh	Sorbara

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr

Government Orders

Sousa	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 206

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé	Jones — 2
--------	-----------

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 32 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 33 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 34. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 35 to 37.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement from all parties to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with the Liberal members voting nay.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party of Canada will agree to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against this motion.

• (1540)

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 34, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 833*)

YEAS

Members

Aboulttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
Doherty	Dowdall

Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCaughey (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiple
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Vierson
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer — 116

NAYS

Members

Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bergeron
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin

Damoff
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petipas Taylor
Powlowski
Rayes
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez

DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saarich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Miao
Miller
Morrisey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen

van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 206

Government Orders

PAIRED

Members

Jones— 2

Bérubé

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 34 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 35 to 37 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 38.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, again, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement among the parties to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote. Conservative members will be voting in favour of the motion.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting against.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 38, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 834*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barlow
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Gallant
Genius
Godin
Gourde

Government Orders

Gray	Hallan	Fisher	Fonseca
Hoback	Jeneroux	Fortier	Fortin
Jivani	Kelly	Fragiskatos	Fraser
Khanna	Kitchen	Freeland	Fry
Kmiec	Kram	Gaheer	Gainey
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Garon	Garrison
Kusie	Lake	Gaudreau	Gazan
Lantsman	Lawrence	Gerretsen	Gill
Lehoux	Leslie	Gould	Green
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Liepert	Lloyd	Hanley	Hardie
Lobb	Maguire	Hepfner	Holland
Majumdar	Martel	Housefather	Hughes
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)	Hussen	Hutchings
McLean	Melillo	Iacono	Idlout
Moore	Morantz	Ien	Jaczek
Morrison	Motz	Johns	Joly
Muys	Nater	Jowhari	Julian
Patzer	Paul-Hus	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Perkins	Poilievre	Khalid	Khera
Redekopp	Reid	Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Rempel Garner	Richards	Kwan	Lalonde
Roberts	Rood	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Ruff	Scheer	Lapointe	Larouche
Schmale	Seeback	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Shields	Shipley	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Small	Soroka	Lemire	Long
Steinley	Stewart	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Strahl	Stubbs	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Thomas	Tolmie	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Uppal	Van Popta	Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Vecchio	Vidal	Masse	Mathysen
Vien	Viersen	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Vis	Wagantall	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Warkentin	Waugh	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Webber	Williams	McLeod	McPherson
Williamson	Zimmer — 116	Mendès	Miao

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali	Murray	Naqvi
Anand	Anandasangaree	Ng	Noormohamed
Angus	Arseneault	Normandin	O'Connell
Arya	Ashton	Oliphant	O'Regan
Atwin	Bachrach	Paupé	Perron
Badawey	Bains	Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Baker	Barron	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste	Rayes	Robillard
Beaulieu	Beech	Rodriguez	Rogers
Bendayan	Bergeron	Romanado	Rota
Bibeau	Bittle	Sahota	Sajjan
Blair	Blanchet	Saks	Samson
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney	Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Blois	Boissonnault	Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Boulerice	Bradford	Serré	Sgro
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe	Shanahan	Sheehan
Cannings	Carr	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Casey	Chabot	Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Chagger	Chahal	Singh	Sorbara
Champagne	Champoux	Sousa	Ste-Marie
Chatel	Chen	St-Onge	Sudds
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Tassi	Taylor Roy
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier	Thériault	Therrien
Coteau	Dabrusin	Thompson	Trudeau
Damoff	DeBellefeuille	Trudel	Turnbull
Desbiens	Desilets	Valdez	Van Bynen
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	van Koeverden	Vandal
Dhillon	Diab	Vandenbeld	Vignola
Drouin	Dubourg	Villemure	Virani
Duclos	Duguid	Weiler	Wilkinson
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi	Yip	Zahid
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith	Zarrillo	Zuberi — 206

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé

Jones— 2

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 38 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 39. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 40 and 41.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting no.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives do agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the result of the previous vote and is voting against the motion.

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

(The House divided on Motion No. 39, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 835*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif

Albas

Arnold

Barlow

Berthold

Block

Brassard

Calkins

Carrie

Chong

Dalton

Davidson

Doherty

Dreeshen

Ellis

Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)

Fast

Findlay

Généreux

Gladu

Goodridge

Gray

Hoback

Jivani

Khanna

Kmiec

Kramp-Neuman

Kusie

Lantsman

Lehoux

Aitchison

Allison

Baldinelli

Barrett

Bezan

Bragdon

Brock

Caputo

Chambers

Cooper

Dancho

Deltell

Dowdall

Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)

Epp

Falk (Provencher)

Ferrerri

Gallant

Genuis

Godin

Gourde

Hallan

Jeneroux

Kelly

Kitchen

Kram

Kurek

Lake

Lawrence

Leslie

Lewis (Essex)

Liepert

Lobb

Majumdar

Mazier

McLean

Moore

Morrison

Muys

Patzner

Perkins

Redekopp

Rempel Garner

Roberts

Ruff

Schmale

Shields

Small

Steinley

Strahl

Thomas

Uppal

Vecchio

Vien

Vis

Warkentin

Webber

Williamson

Government Orders

Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)

Lloyd

Maguire

Martel

McCaughey (Edmonton West)

Melillo

Morantz

Motz

Nater

Paul-Hus

Poilievre

Reid

Richards

Rood

Scheer

Seebach

Shipley

Soroka

Stewart

Stubbs

Tolmie

Van Popta

Vidal

Viersen

Wagantall

Waugh

Williams

Zimmer— 116

NAYS

Members

Ali

Anandasangaree

Arseneault

Ashton

Bachrach

Bains

Barron

Battiste

Beech

Bergeron

Bittle

Blanchet

Blaney

Boissonnault

Bradford

Brunelle-Duceppe

Carr

Chabot

Chahal

Champoux

Chen

Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)

Cormier

Dabrusin

DeBellefeuille

Desilets

Dhaliwal

Diab

Dubourg

Duguid

Ehsassi

Erskine-Smith

Fonseca

Fortin

Fraser

Fry

Gainey

Garrison

Gazan

Gill

Green

Government Orders

Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Rayes	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Sorbara
Sousa	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 206

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé

Jones — 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 39 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 40 and 41 defeated.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 42. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 43.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting nay.

[Translation]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote. Conservative members will be voting in favour of the motion.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, Greens agree to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

● (1545)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 42, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 836)***YEAS**

Members

Aboultarif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bezan	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	Desbiens
Desilets	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

Government Orders

Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Larouche
Lehoux
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Normandin
Paul-Hus
Perkins
Plamondon
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Rood
Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shields
Simard
Small
Steinley
Stewart
Stubbs
Therrien
Tolmie
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lawrence
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Michaud
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Patzner
Pauzé
Perron
Poilievre
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Sinclair-Desgagné
Soroka
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Thériault
Thomas
Trudel
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer— 148

Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garrison
Gerretsen
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
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 Koevenden
Vandenbeld
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Fortier
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Gazan
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
Oliphant
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 174

NAYS**Members**

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Battiste
Bendayan
Bittle
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Cannings
Casey
Chahal
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith

Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Carr
Chagger
Champagne
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fisher

PAIRED**Members**

Bérubé Jones— 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 42 defeated. Therefore, I declare Motion No. 43 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 44. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 45.

Government Orders

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results from the previous vote to this one, with Liberal members voting nay.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the votes, with Conservatives voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: The New Democratic Party of Canada agrees to apply the vote and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting against.

(The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 837*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	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	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCaulley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre

Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viens
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer— 116

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blancy
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	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Jen	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera

Government Orders

Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Rayes	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Sorbara
Sousa	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 206

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé Jones — 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 44 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 45 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 46. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 47 and 48.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, once again, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting no.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting no.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting against.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting against.

(The House divided on Motion No. 46, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 838*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	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	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shiple
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs

Government Orders

Thomas
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer— 116

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)

Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bergeron
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)

MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski
Rayes
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 206

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé

Jones— 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 46 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 47 and 48 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 49. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 50 to 78.

[*English*]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this one, with Liberals voting no.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives do indeed agree to apply the vote, with all Conservatives voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

[Translation]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting in favour.

[English]

(The House divided on the Motion No. 49, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 839)

YEAS

Members

Aboultiaf	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bezan	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	Desbiens
Desilets	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	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Normandin	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Perkins	Perron
Plamondon	Poilievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff

Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shields
Simard
Small
Steinley
Stewart
Stubbs
Therrien
Tolmie
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

Government Orders

Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Sinclair-Desgagné
Soroka
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Thériault
Thomas
Trudel
Van Popta
Vidal
Viens
Villemure
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer— 148

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Battiste	Beech
Bendayan	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	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garrison	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Long	Longfield

Government Orders

Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Miao	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Singh	Sorbara
Sousa	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thompson
Trudeau	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 174

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé Jones — 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 49 defeated. Therefore, I declare Motions Nos. 50 to 78 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 79. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 80 to 129.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this one with Liberal members voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

• (1550)

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens again agree to apply the vote and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting against.

[*English*]

(The House divided on the Motion No. 79, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 840*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	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	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzner	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poillievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipleigh
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer — 116

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree

Government Orders

Angus
 Arya
 Atwin
 Badawey
 Baker
 Barsalou-Duval
 Beaulieu
 Bendayan
 Bibeau
 Blair
 Blanchette-Joncas
 Blois
 Boulerville
 Brière
 Cannings
 Casey
 Chagger
 Champagne
 Chatel
 Chiang
 Collins (Victoria)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 Desbiens
 Desjarlais
 Dhillon
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garon
 Gaudreau
 Gerretsen
 Gould
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hussien
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lemire
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendès
 Michaud
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 Normandin
 Oliphant

Arseneault
 Ashton
 Bachrach
 Bains
 Barron
 Battiste
 Beech
 Bergeron
 Bittle
 Blanchet
 Blaney
 Boissonnault
 Bradford
 Brunelle-Duceppe
 Carr
 Chabot
 Chahal
 Champoux
 Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 DeBellefeuille
 Desilets
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gainey
 Garrison
 Gazan
 Gill
 Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hughes
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Joly
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khara
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Leboutillier
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 MacKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Miao
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 O'Connell
 O'Regan

Pauzé
 Petitpas Taylor
 Powlowski
 Rayes
 Rodriguez
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sousa
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thériault
 Thompson
 Trudel
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vandenberg
 Villemure
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

Perron
 Plamondon
 Qualtrough
 Robillard
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Sorbara
 Ste-Marie
 Sudds
 Taylor Roy
 Therrien
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandal
 Vignola
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 206

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé

Jones— 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 79 defeated and therefore declare Motions Nos. 80 to 129 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 130.

[*Translation*]

A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 131 to 141.

[*English*]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results from the previous vote to this one, with Liberals voting against.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party again agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting against.

(The House divided on Motion No. 130, which was negated on the following division:)

*Government Orders**(Division No. 841)***YEAS**

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	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	Ferri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seebach
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer — 116

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains

Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
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	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Paupé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Rayes	Robillard

Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 206

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé

Jones — 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 130 negatived.

I therefore declare Motions Nos. 131 to 141 negatived.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 142. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 143 to 145.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberals voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party of Canada agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, Greens again agree to apply the vote, and we will be voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting against.

[*English*]

(The House divided on the Motion No. 142, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 842*)

YEAS

Members

Aboulttaif
Albas

Aitchison
Allison

Arnold
Barlow
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Glady
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzer
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

Government Orders

Baldinelli
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCaulley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiplely
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer — 116

NAYS

Members

Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bergeron
Bittle

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bibeau

Government Orders

Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski
Rayes
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai

Blanchet
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saenich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay

Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 206

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé

Jones— 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 142 defeated. Therefore, I declare Motions Nos. 143 to 145 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 146. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 147.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberals voting nay.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, again, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting against.

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting against.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 146, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 843*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barlow
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers

Government Orders

Chong	Cooper	Chatel	Chen
Dalton	Dancho	Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Davidson	Deltell	Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Doherty	Dowdall	Coteau	Dabrusin
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Damoff	DeBellefeuille
Ellis	Epp	Desbiens	Desilets
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Fast	Ferri	Dhillon	Diab
Findlay	Gallant	Drouin	Dubourg
Généreux	Genuis	Duclos	Duguid
Gladu	Godin	Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
Goodridge	Gourde	El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Gray	Hallan	Fisher	Fonseca
Hoback	Jeneroux	Fortier	Fortin
Jivani	Kelly	Fragiskatos	Fraser
Khanna	Kitchen	Freeland	Fry
Kmieć	Kram	Gaheer	Gainey
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Garon	Garrison
Kusie	Lake	Gaudreau	Gazan
Lantsman	Lawrence	Gerretsen	Gill
Lehoux	Leslie	Gould	Green
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Liepert	Lloyd	Hanley	Hardie
Lobb	Maguire	Hepfner	Holland
Majumdar	Martel	Housefather	Hughes
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)	Hussen	Hutchings
McLean	Melillo	Iacono	Idlout
Moore	Morantz	Ien	Jaczek
Morrison	Motz	Johns	Joly
Muys	Nater	Jowhari	Julian
Patzer	Paul-Hus	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Perkins	Poillievre	Khalid	Khera
Redekopp	Reid	Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Rempel Garner	Richards	Kwan	Lalonde
Roberts	Rood	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Ruff	Scheer	Lapointe	Larouche
Schmale	Seebach	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Shields	Shipley	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Small	Soroka	Lemire	Long
Steinley	Stewart	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Strahl	Stubbs	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Thomas	Tolmie	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Uppal	Van Popta	Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Vecchio	Vidal	Masse	Mathysen
Vien	Viersen	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Vis	Wagantall	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Warkentin	Waugh	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Webber	Williams	McLeod	McPherson
Williamson	Zimmer — 116	Mendès	Miao

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali	Michaud	Miller
Anand	Anandasangaree	Morrice	Morrissey
Angus	Arseneault	Murray	Naqvi
Arya	Ashton	Ng	Noormohamed
Atwin	Bachrach	Normandin	O'Connell
Badawey	Bains	Oliphant	O'Regan
Baker	Barron	Pauzé	Perron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste	Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Beaulieu	Beech	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Bendayan	Bergeron	Rayes	Robillard
Bibeau	Bittle	Rodriguez	Rogers
Blair	Blanchet	Romanado	Rota
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney	Sahota	Sajjan
Blois	Boissonnault	Saks	Sanson
Boulerice	Bradford	Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe	Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Cannings	Carr	Serré	Sgro
Casey	Chabot	Shanahan	Sheehan
Chagger	Chahal	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Champagne	Champoux	Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
		Singh	Sorbara
		Sousa	Ste-Marie
		St-Onge	Sudds
		Tassi	Taylor Roy

Government Orders

Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Tumbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 206

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé	Jones— 2
--------	----------

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 146 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 147 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 148. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 149 to 153.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I know everyone is anticipating what I am about to say, so I believe that, if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting nay.

• (1555)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, Greens again agree to apply the vote, and we will be voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting in favour.

(La motion n° 148, mise aux voix, est rejetée par le vote suivant:)

(*Division No. 844*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bezan	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	Desbiens
Desilets	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	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Normandin	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Paupé
Perkins	Perron
Plamondon	Poilievre
Raves	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Savard-Tremblay	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shiplay
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Therrien	Thomas
Tolmie	Trudel
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vignola	Villemure
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer— 148

NAYS

Members

Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Carr

Government Orders

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé Jones— 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 148 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 149 to 153 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 154. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 155 to 163.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting nay.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives do agree to apply this vote. However, Conservatives will be voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens again agree to apply the vote and will be voting against.

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting against.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 154, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 845*)

YEAS

Members

Casey
Chahal
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garrison
Gerretsen
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
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

Chagger
Champagne
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Gazan
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
Oliphant
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 174

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	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	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram

Government Orders

Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Garon	Garrison
Kusie	Lake	Gaudreau	Gazan
Lantsman	Lawrence	Gerretsen	Gill
Lehoux	Leslie	Gould	Green
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Liepert	Lloyd	Hanley	Hardie
Lobb	Maguire	Hepfner	Holland
Majumdar	Martel	Housefather	Hughes
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)	Hussen	Hutchings
McLean	Melillo	Iacono	Idlout
Moore	Morantz	Ien	Jaczek
Morrison	Motz	Johns	Joly
Muys	Nater	Jowhari	Julian
Patzer	Paul-Hus	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Perkins	Poilievre	Khalid	Khera
Redekopp	Reid	Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Rempel Garner	Richards	Kwan	Lalonde
Roberts	Rood	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Ruff	Scheer	Lapointe	Larouche
Schmale	Seebach	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Shields	Shipley	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Small	Soroka	Lemire	Long
Steinley	Stewart	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Strahl	Stubbs	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Thomas	Tolmie	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Uppal	Van Popta	Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Vecchio	Vidal	Masse	Mathysen
Vien	Viersen	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Vis	Wagantall	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Warkentin	Waugh	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Webber	Williams	McLeod	McPherson
Williamson	Zimmer — 116	Mendès	Miao
		Michaud	Miller
		Morrice	Morrissey
		Murray	Naqvi
		Ng	Noormohamed
		Normandin	O'Connell
		Oliphant	O'Regan
		Pauzé	Perron
		Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
		Powlowski	Qualtrough
		Raves	Robillard
		Rodriguez	Rogers
		Romanado	Rota
		Sahota	Sajjan
		Saks	Samson
		Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
		Scarpaleggia	Schieffe
		Serré	Sgro
		Shanahan	Sheehan
		Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
		Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
		Singh	Sorbara
		Sousa	Ste-Marie
		St-Onge	Sudds
		Tassi	Taylor Roy
		Thériault	Therrien
		Thompson	Trudeau
		Trudel	Turnbull
		Valdez	Van Bynen
		van Koevorden	Vandal
		Vandenbeld	Vignola
		Villemure	Virani
		Weiler	Wilkinson
		Yip	Zahid
		Zarrillo	Zuberi — 206

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
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	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé

Jones— 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 154 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 155 to 161 defeated.

Hon. Rechie Valdez (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yea.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will be voting no.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: The Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP members have agreed to apply the vote.

Because it is the last vote, I will just very quickly say, “Go Oilers”.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, Greens agree to apply the vote, and we will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting against.

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 846*)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Battiste	Beech
Bendayan	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	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury

Erskine-Smith	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garrison	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saaneich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinity	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Miao	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Petipas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Singh	Sorbara
Sousa	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thompson
Trudeau	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 174

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bezan	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Block

Privilege

Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	Desbiens
Desilets	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	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Normandin	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Perkins	Perron
Plamondon	Poilievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Savard-Tremblay	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Therrien	Thomas
Tolmie	Trudel
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vignola	Villemure
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer— 148

PAIRED

Members

Bérubé

Jones— 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

When shall this bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

● (1600)

PRIVILEGE

FOREIGN INTERFERENCE AND ALLEGED REPUTATIONAL HARM TO
MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I sent you a notice of my intention to raise a question of privilege related to the revelation contained in the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians' "Special Report on Foreign Interference in Canada's Democratic Processes and Institutions".

The committee reviewed over 4,000 documents, including over 1,000 intelligence products. The NSICOP report is an alarming wake-up call in terms of the depth and insidious nature of hostile foreign state actors' efforts to covertly undermine Canada's democratic processes and institutions. China and India are both identified as the most aggressive foreign states; they are deploying wide-ranging and multi-faceted tactics in foreign interference activities in Canada.

The shocking allegations that some members of Parliament wittingly or semiwittingly worked with foreign state actors is not only unsettling, but it is also a betrayal of Canadians, who trusted them to act in Canada's best interests and not a foreign state's interests. The report did not provide any names, and as such, all 338 members of the House, including those who have since left this chamber, are under a cloud of suspicion for having intentionally or semi-intentionally worked with a foreign state to undermine Canada's democratic processes and institutions.

My intervention today will not cover the national security aspect of this extremely concerning situation. Instead, it will focus on the damage to the reputations of all members of the House of Commons.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice, third edition, outlines the rights and immunities of members of Parliament on page 107. There is a section on "Freedom from Obstruction, Interference, Intimidation and Molestation". It states, "Members of Parliament, by the nature of their office and the variety of work they are called upon to perform, come into contact with a wide range of individuals and groups. Members can, therefore, be subject to all manner of interference, obstruction and influences."

On page 112, it goes on to say the following:

The unjust damaging of a Member's good name might be seen as constituting an obstruction if the Member is prevented from performing his or her parliamentary functions. In 1987, Speaker Fraser stated:

The privileges of a Member are violated by any action which might impede him or her in the fulfilment of his or her duties and functions. It is obvious that the unjust damaging of a reputation could constitute such an impediment.

Privilege

I would submit that what has been revealed in the NSICOP report constitutes such an impediment for all members of Parliament. Throughout the report, there are many references to how some parliamentarians are willing participants with foreign states. We can take, for example, paragraph 55 of the NSICOP report. It notes, “Some elected officials...began wittingly assisting foreign state actors soon after their election.” It goes on to say, “members of Parliament...worked to influence their colleagues on India’s behalf and proactively provided confidential information to Indian officials.”

Paragraph 56 states that there was “a textbook example of foreign interference that saw a foreign state support a witting politician.”

Paragraph 59 states that “the PRC had established an informal foreign interference network”, where those in “the network...worked in loose coordination with one another and with guidance from the consulate...to covertly support or oppose candidates in the 2019 federal election.” Moreover, the “network had some contact with at least 11 candidates and 13 campaign staffers, some of whom appeared to be wittingly working for the PRC.” The report also “described the network’s efforts to keep federal political candidates away from events that the PRC considered to be ‘anti-China,’ such as a pro-Hong Kong rally; noted similar activities by another network in the riding of Don Valley North; and identified specific individuals involved.”

Paragraph 68 states, “an Indian proxy claims to have repeatedly transferred funds from India to politicians at all levels of government in return for political favours, including raising issues in Parliament at the proxy’s request.”

Paragraph 72 states, “PRC officials allegedly interfered in the leadership races of the Conservative Party of Canada.” Following this, paragraph 73 “describe[s] India’s alleged interference in a Conservative Party of Canada leadership race.”

• (1605)

Paragraph 164 states that “some Parliamentarians are, in the words of the intelligence services, ‘semi-witting or witting’ participants in the efforts of foreign states to interfere in our politics.”

Paragraph 57 even notes an example of a former MP, and the report refers to:

...a particularly concerning case of a then-member of Parliament maintaining a relationship with a foreign intelligence officer. According to CSIS, the member of Parliament sought to arrange a meeting in a foreign state with a senior intelligence official and also proactively provided the intelligence officer with information provided in confidence.

We do not know who the elected official associated with each allegation is. In the face of such alarming revelations, this means that all members are tainted and that the reputation of the whole House is put in question.

Since China and India are the top two countries cited as being most aggressive in foreign interference activities, I would submit that those of us who are Chinese Canadians or Indo-Canadians are at a greater and heightened risk of unjust reputational damage.

There are a few examples throughout the years of similar situations where a prima facie case of privilege was found because the reputation of the House was put in question. In March 1966, the

House was gripped for several days with the Munsinger case when the then minister of justice, Mr. Cardin, alleged improper conduct on the part of ministers in the former Diefenbaker government. Mr. Cardin stated that certain members of the House were involved with Greta Munsinger, a “self-admitted espionage agent” in the employ of the “Russian intelligence service”.

On March 10, four questions of privilege were raised by the members in relation to the statement made by former minister Cardin. Speaker Lamoureux ruled immediately that there was a prima facie case of privilege, even though all four motions were ultimately ruled out of order by the Chair for various reasons. One was disallowed immediately because the motion was too general and did not specify the charges against the minister. One requested that the minister substantiate his charges. The other two motions sought the resignation of Minister Cardin.

In May 1976, a former member of Parliament, Mr. Choquette, was quoted as saying, while giving testimony in open court, that “if everyone who had ever taken or given \$600 or \$700 bribes in their life were arrested, 50 per cent of the MPs would no longer be sitting.... I know it because I was an MP for five years.”

The matter was raised as a question of privilege. Speaker Jerome ruled immediately and stated that he had no difficulty in agreeing that there was indeed a question of privilege.

We also had a situation in 1983, when several articles in the Montreal Gazette alleged that Mr. Mackasey, member for Lincoln, was a paid lobbyist. In her ruling of March 22, 1983, Speaker Sauvé said, “An allegation of criminal or other dishonourable conduct inevitably affects the Member’s ability to function effectively while the matter remains unresolved.”

From selected decisions of Speaker Jeanne Sauvé, we can read about this case:

Not only do defamatory allegations about Members place the entire institution of Parliament under a cloud, they also prevent members from performing their duties as long as the matter remains unresolved, since, as one authority states, such allegations bring Members into “hatred, contempt or ridicule”.

I fear that this is where we are under these circumstances. Without disclosure of the names of the parliamentarians who are “‘semi-witting or witting’ participants in the efforts of foreign states to interfere in our politics”, we may subject all members of the House, including former and sitting MPs, to hatred, contempt or ridicule. Indeed, this is already happening.

Government Orders

• (1610)

Outside this chamber, just yesterday, there were individuals shouting, questioning and jeering about who the traitors may be. Members of Parliament had to walk past these individuals on the members' way to the House to do their work. I believe we must find a way to disclose which MPs are knowingly, intentionally, wittingly or semi-wittingly engaging with foreign states or their proxies to undermine Canada's democratic processes and institutions. I believe this can be done in a way that does not compromise national security.

If there are no consequences for MPs who knowingly help foreign governments act against Canadian interests, we will continue to be an easy target. This will further erode the trust and faith Canadians have in our democratic processes. If allowed to continue, it will further impugn the integrity of the House. Revealing any member of Parliament, former or present, who is a willing participant in foreign interference activities would have the effect of deterring this kind of behaviour. Moreover, it would send a clear message to those foreign states that this cannot continue and that they will not be able to continue to use parliamentarians in this way. This will further reassure the public of the integrity of the House.

I strongly believe that the House should refer the matter to the procedure and House affairs committee. A possible way to deal with the issue would be for committee members to undergo the necessary security screening to examine the unredacted report and look into the allegations about parliamentarians who were “witting or semi-witting” participants in the efforts of foreign states to interfere in our politics.” We could allow the named parliamentarians to be informed and to come before the committee as witnesses; we could then explore options on how to disclose the named parliamentarians without compromising national security or police investigations of the matter.

Madam Speaker, if you find a prima facie case of privilege in this case, this is the motion I would move: That the matter of reputational harm done to all members of Parliament as a consequence of the redaction of parliamentarians' names from the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians, or NSICOP, report entitled “Special Report on Foreign Interference in Canada's Democratic Processes and Institutions” be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I thank the hon. member. Her comments will be taken under advisement, and the Chair will come back to the hon. member as soon as possible.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Madam Speaker, given the importance of the subject that my colleague just raised, I would like to reassure the House. Conservative members are ready to meet this summer at the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs to study this issue, to advance the study already under way on foreign interference and to consider today's question of privilege more specifically.

I advise the House that we prefer to reserve comment for the time being. We will return to this later.

Mrs. Julie Vignola (Beauport—Limoilou, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Bloc Québécois understands the importance of the situation and the importance of the study that needs to be done on this matter. We choose to exercise the right to reserve comment for the time being.

• (1615)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would also like to review the comments that the member has put on the record. We will report back at some point in the future.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I also want to add a few comments and thank our colleague from Vancouver East.

[*English*]

The matters raised, as we all know, are of critical importance. I have listened carefully to the member for Vancouver East. I want to read her question of privilege. It is clearly pressing and urgent that Parliament come together. At this point, I would like to reserve further comments, as other representatives of parties in this place have done. I hope to pursue conversations, as I have indicated in a letter to all party leaders and to all members of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians.

However, I think the member for Vancouver East has raised a critical issue. Once I have read her question of privilege carefully and considered whether it is consistent with respecting the top secret nature of the full, unredacted report, I would like to add my thoughts.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Well noted.

* * *

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2024, NO. 1

Hon. Rechie Valdez (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-69, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 16, 2024, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, what a pleasure it is to be able to rise and highlight a number of issues that I think are really important for those who are going to take the time to follow the debate we are going to be having on the important piece of legislation before us.

Government Orders

Virtually from the very beginning, just under nine years ago, we have seen a government that has been focused on Canada's middle class and those aspiring to become a part of it. It has been focused very much on a sense of fairness for generation X and millennials to ensure that all Canadians feel that they are a part of the economy and of our society, while at the same time recognizing the true value of the Government of Canada providing the types of services Canadians would like to see and to have supports put in place. As a government, we have seen, over the last number of years, a number of actions that have really made a positive difference in all of our communities.

We often hear stats being brought forward by the opposition in an attempt to try to portray things in a negative way. We have the leader of the Reform-Conservative party across the way who likes to travel the country and talk about Canada being broken when nothing could be further from the truth, especially if we compare Canada to any other country in the world. If we put into context how Canada has been performing over the last eight to nine years compared to Stephen Harper and the nine years he was the prime minister, one of the key indicators is jobs. Jobs are so critically important to building an economy and a society. In the nine years of Stephen Harper, there were one million jobs. Let us contrast that against the two million-plus jobs created by this government working with provincial jurisdictions, Canadians, municipalities and the many different stakeholders out there.

Let us look at the types of investments we have made over the years. As a government, even though the official opposition has been more focused on character assassination, we have never lost our focus on serving Canadians. Let me give members a specific example.

In the first budget we presented, one of the initiatives was an extra tax increase on the 1% wealthiest in Canada's society. At the same time, we decreased taxes for Canada's middle class. Let us focus on the 1% wealthiest and the belief that people need to pay their fair share. Back in 2015-16, going into that budget, is when that was incorporated. If we fast forward to today, we have a capital gains tax increase that is being implemented. The New Democrats, the Greens and the Bloc support it, but not the Conservatives. I would like to emphasize that when I say "Conservative", I am suggesting the far-right Reform-Conservative Party we have today. I say that because its members are very critical of the government for increasing the capital gains tax.

An hon. member: Yes, we are.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, one of them just said that they are. That is the reform element.

● (1620)

Brian Mulroney actually increased it more, albeit Brian Mulroney, in fairness, was a Progressive Conservative. Do not confuse that with the Reform-Conservatives that we see today. In fact, the best way to summarize the difference between the Reform-Conservatives and the Liberals, as I said the other day, is Liberals care and Conservatives cut. That is the bottom line. The Conservatives have a hidden agenda they will not talk about, which means taking away services, many of which we have put in over the last number of years.

We are talking about services that genuinely matter and that provide supports to Canadians in every region of this country. They are programs that are in this budget and programs that were established many budgets ago. A good example of that is the child care program. Remember, in the last election, when we were campaigning and saying that we were going to bring in a national child care program that would provide \$10-a-day day care in all regions of our country?

How did the Conservative Party respond to that? At the time, Conservatives said that they were going to rip up the deals. They did not believe in a national child care program that delivered \$10-a-day day care. The election went by. The government continued to work on the issue. Every province and territory signed on. As a result of the efforts of the government, we now have a national child care program that delivers \$10-a-day day care and child care. The Conservative Party is on the record as saying that it would like to rip up those deals, based on the last election.

Fast forward it again to today, where we see programs that are going to be there to support millions of Canadians in different ways. We hear about the dental program. Hundreds of thousands of seniors have now registered for the dental program; I think it is close to two million. We have literally tens of thousands who have already benefited from a program that has just been rolled out. The Conservative Party is committed to cancelling that program. Even though literally thousands of seniors in each and every one of their ridings would benefit by that program, Conservatives would still cut the program.

What about the national pharmacare program that we talk about? It is a program that is delivering, whether it is free contraceptives or dealing with the issue of diabetes. Diabetes is a serious disease in Canada. There is a substantial cost to it. For the first time ever, we would have a program that would deal with those two issues in a very tangible way. Once again, we have a Conservative-Reform Party saying that it would also cut that program because Conservatives do not believe that the federal government has a role to play in that area. They are so far to the right, they want to see the federal government's presence in our national health care diminished.

What does that say about the \$200 billion, which is billion with a "b", of investment in health care in the next 10 years, in terms of money being transferred over to provinces? Under the Canada Health Act, it clearly indicates that the national government does have a role to play. Canadians love our health care system, in a very real and tangible way. Often, when we ask someone what makes them feel good about Canada, they will often talk about health care.

Government Orders

• (1625)

The Conservatives are no different from the Bloc, the separatists. They do not want the federal government involved in health care at all. The Bloc asks that the government to give it more money, and the Conservatives say that it will not give as much money and that all it needs to do is give some money. Canadians need to be aware that this Reform-Conservative party is putting health care on the block. To what degree is it going to fulfill the commitment we have made for that \$200 billion to ensure that future generations have critically important health care? I do not say lightly that the Liberal Party genuinely cares and that it will be there for Canadians. We have demonstrated that.

Let us look at what took place during the pandemic. In every way, the federal government stepped up to the plate and delivered, whether it was vaccines, supports for small businesses or providing disposable income to literally millions of Canadians in every region of this country because we knew the federal government needed to play that role, unlike the Conservative Party of Canada. However, it does not stop there.

For the very first time, in this budget, there is the single-largest increase to establish a disability program. It is a great step forward. It is \$200 a month, a significant amount of money. It recognizes that the national government does have a role to play. That is the contrast between the Conservatives and the Liberals. I will not have a problem in 2025 talking about that contrast because I believe that Canadian values are a whole lot closer to what the Liberal Party is talking about than what the Conservative Party is talking about.

I want to talk about two issues. The Canada Infrastructure Bank is a program about which many Conservatives are critical. Other opposition members criticize the Canada Infrastructure Bank. We only need to look at Hansard to get a very clear indication of the number of MPs, particularly the Conservative-Reform MPs, who are critical of it. In essence, the Conservative-Reform government says that it would get rid of the Canada Infrastructure Bank.

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the finance critic says “yes” in agreement. There is no change there. That is their intent. They want to get rid of the Canada Infrastructure Bank, and it is because they do not understand—

• (1630)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman is rising on a point of order.

Mr. James Bezan: Madam Speaker, I am hearing impaired and have incredible difficulty listening to the member for Winnipeg North. I would ask that you show some compassion and ask the member to defer the rest of his speech to this time next week.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That is definitely not a point of order, but I would ask the hon. member to perhaps lower the tone of his voice.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the member always has the option to leave the room if he is feeling uncomfortable.

The truth does hurt, and I can appreciate that. At the end of the day, if I had any sense of a progressive nature, I would feel very uncomfortable within the Conservative Party today. Remember Joe Clark? Joe Clark, like the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, was a Progressive Conservative. The former prime minister said that he never left the Progressive Conservative Party; the progressive left the Conservative Party.

Brian Mulroney said that the Conservative Party today has amputated the progressive nature of the party. Members do not want to know what Kim Campbell says; a lot of it is unparliamentary. With that attitude and the Reform-Conservative party, the far right MA-GA movement that has moved into the Conservative Party, I welcome the 2025 election.

Canadians will understand the type of issues the Conservative-Reform party opposes. Let me get back to the two examples I was giving prior to the interruption. The Conservative-Reformers oppose the Canada Infrastructure Bank. The Canada Infrastructure Bank represents about 10 billion dollars' worth of investments.

An hon. member: It has built zero products.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, contrary to what the Conservative critic is heckling from across the way, there are a lot of projects. There are over 40 projects, and many of them are in the province of Alberta, where rumour has it there are some Conservative members of Parliament.

Why would Conservatives want to kill a program that is delivering jobs in tangible ways, green jobs, and contributing literally hundreds of millions of dollars of investment, with much of it going to agriculture. In the province of Alberta, there is a project to enhance irrigation so there will be more diversification in the province, yet Alberta MPs and the Conservative-Reform party are constantly saying no and that they are going to get rid of the Canada Infrastructure Bank.

There is also broadband.

I am going to let the government House leader stand for his point of order.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the excellent speech of my colleague did not warrant interruption, but I do want to request that the ordinary hour of daily adjournment of the next sitting be 12 midnight, pursuant to order made Wednesday, February 28.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to order made on Wednesday, February 28, the minister's request to extend the said sitting is deemed adopted.

Government Orders

• (1635)

[*English*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2024, NO. 1

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the Conservative reformers across the way flip-flopped on the price on pollution. We know that. Do members remember the flip-flop? All the Conservative members campaigned on and said they support a price on pollution. They did a flip-flop.

I am imploring and begging them to please reverse the decision on the Canada Infrastructure Bank. It is a good thing; it really and truly is. Not only is there \$10 billion coming in from the national government, but we will also see twice that amount coming in from other entities. The Internet will be expanded to over 250,000 Canadians. All forms of capital infrastructure will be built in all regions of the nation.

The Alberta MPs should do some homework. They should take a look at what the Infrastructure Bank is doing in Alberta. They really need to stop with the political spin that they are getting from their leader's office. They should wake up, smell the coffee and recognize a good idea when they see it. The Canada Infrastructure Bank is doing wonders across the country in many different ways.

I was going to say it was the bad decision of the Conservative reformers from last year, but it was actually Trump, when they made the decision to vote against the Canada-Ukraine trade agreement. That was totally amazing. It was the first time ever that the Conservatives voted against a trade agreement. Why do I say that? It is because no government in the history of Canada has signed off on more trade agreements than the current government. In the first three quarters of last year, Canada was number one in the G7 in terms of foreign investment coming in. If we compare it to the entire rest of the world, we were number three.

Corporations and individuals around the world are looking at Canada as a place to invest. Canada has generated more than two million jobs. We can compare our GDP-to-debt ratio, and we are doing exceptionally well, especially if we compare it to the rest of the G7.

Yes, there is room for us to continue to grow. That is why I am excited about 2025, when with a four-year mandate, we will continue to work with willing partners across the way, not only to fulfill the mandate but also to continue to work for Canadians.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is hard to tell where to start, but I would like to start by commenting on the very first part of the member's afternoon maiden speech, where he talked about the Liberal income tax cut to the middle bracket. That was not a cut for the middle class. The median earnings for the middle class in 2016, were about \$34,000. The middle income only started at \$44,000.

In fact the Liberal Party cut the taxes of every single member of Parliament by hundreds of dollars because anyone earning less than \$45,000 per year, in that fiscal year, got nothing less. In fact all they got were more carbon taxes put on them, and nothing has

changed in the nine years since then. Even more punishing carbon taxes have been added on top. Would the member now admit that it was not an income tax cut for the middle class, that in fact the median income that year was around \$34,000 and that the Liberals have simply pulled the wool over people's eyes?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I suspect that the member opposite, like a number of the Conservatives, should be quite embarrassed, but some of them were not here in 2016 when the voting took place.

Let there be no doubt; there were two major initiatives. One of the initiatives was the special increased tax on Canada's wealthiest 1%. The Conservatives voted no. The decrease was for Canada's middle class, and the Conservatives voted no on giving Canada's middle class a tax break. For those with lower incomes, there was an enhancement of the Canada child care benefit, which literally took money away from millionaires and put it in the pockets of those who had very low incomes. I could go on, about the GIS and the substantial increase for Canada's poorest seniors, for example. This all took place in the first budget, and the Conservatives voted no.

• (1640)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Julie Vignola (Beauport—Limoilou, BQ): Madam Speaker, that was another example of our colleague's eloquence. Unfortunately, it is also another example of the alternating glorification and demonization, depending on which party you belong to.

I would like to remind the House that any money transferred by the federal government does not just appear out of thin air or grow on trees. It comes from taxes paid to Ottawa by Quebec and Canadian taxpayers. It is also the debt that Quebec and Canadian taxpayers will have to pay.

I would still like to understand the logic. When a place like Quebec already has all the health, dental and pharmacare infrastructure in place, why is it absolutely necessary to create a second structure that will cost even more, simply because the federal government has decided to meddle in what Quebec is already doing very well?

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I am afraid you will not give me the amount of time I would require in order to give a detailed answer to my friend, but let me make the suggestion to her that all she needs to take a look at is the number of people in the province of Quebec who are actually registered for the dental program, and she will find that there is in fact a need for the program.

I will go further by saying that there is a need in virtually all the different regions of the country. We see that by the number of people who are actually registering, and we have not even completed the full rollout where we will see more and more individuals ultimately being able to register.

Government Orders

It is important we recognize that Canada is a vast country with many different regions. There are some things in which there is a need for the federal government, in working with different jurisdictions, to try to provide the programs that provide some equity and a sense of fairness so that, if someone happens to live in Vancouver, in Halifax or anywhere in between, they can get, for example, their diabetes medication.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, the NDP has been working for years to make sure that every Canadian has access to the dental care they need. We were driving forth motions in the House over the last decade that the Liberals and Conservatives voted against, and the Bloc seemed to not support them either. One of the things we are most proud of in our confidence and supply agreement is that the NDP compelled the government to bring forth a dental care program that will see nine million Canadians go to the dentist and get their teeth fixed.

My question, because we are talking about the budget here, is on the financing. The Liberal government has provided a dental fee guide that provides reimbursement to dentists, denturists and dental hygienists at about 89% of fee guides. This is resulting in dental professionals' not wanting to sign up for the program and is setting the stage for co-payments when our confidence and supply agreement says no co-payments for anybody making under \$70,000.

My question to my hon. colleague is this: Will he push his colleagues in the Liberal Party to raise those fees such that the Canada dental care plan pays 100% of the fees that are charged normatively across this country so our oral health professionals get paid appropriately and so people get the care they need without having to go into their pockets?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, as all members know, in the last election, a minority government was elected, which meant that as a governing party we needed to be able to work with and get the support of opposition members in order to be able to fulfill our mandates. At the end of the day, the NDP has played a very important role in many of the different initiatives. My colleagues, along with others, have supported the initiatives, some a little longer than others, but at the end of the day, we have a great opportunity to do some wonderful things. Fortunately, because of a sense of co-operation, we have been able to do that.

In terms of the specific questions and advocacy, I know that the member has a fairly positive relationship with the current Minister of Health, and I am sure he will no doubt have the discussion with the minister directly.

• (1645)

Mr. Darrell Samson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Rural Economic Development and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague a very important question. We realize that since COVID it has been challenging out there. Affordability is a big issue. Our government has been focused on supporting Canadians through various programs. Two that I want to speak of are our Canada child benefit and the early years benefit, which are helping young families prior to children's entering school, and then afterward, helping them and supporting them. Those are two big programs in my riding.

I would like the member to share how people in his riding are responding and sharing some feedback on affordability when looking at some of the investments we have put in place to support families.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I really appreciate the question, because it reminds me that a few weeks back, the Prime Minister came to a local school in Winnipeg North, where he highlighted the school nutrition program. That program is going to help somewhere in the neighbourhood of 400,000 children attending school. The response we received from stakeholders in Manitoba was absolutely positive and encouraging.

I can recall that in 1988, Sharon Carstairs, the leader of the Liberal Party back then in Manitoba, was talking about children needing food to learn. They cannot learn on an empty stomach. She was right in 1988, and today, we are supporting a national level program that will see more children being fed nutritious food in our schools. That is a positive thing.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Julie Vignola: Madam Speaker, I want to pick up on the answer my colleague gave a few minutes ago. Some Canadian provinces have little or no pharmacare coverage and do not have the infrastructure in place for the dental care program. Quebec has both, and there is a concept called the right to opt out with compensation.

Why does the federal government refuse to give Quebec the right to opt out with compensation? This would avoid creating a second structure for Quebecers while allowing the rest of Canada to have its own structures.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, let me give a specific example. Provinces come up with great ideas at times, and often the national government will take a look at them to see how we might expand on them. A good example is our health care system. Saskatchewan came up with a good idea, and ultimately it was spread across Canada. Quebec had an excellent idea in regard to \$10-a-day child care. We took that idea and expanded it across the nation. It increases a sense of fairness and equity for all Canadians.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, Carbon Pricing.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Madam Speaker, the school of wackonomics is open, and the Liberal-NDP Prime Minister is the dean. What will people learn in this school? They will learn that budgets balance themselves, that the economy is people and absolutely not numbers and that somehow raising taxes will put out forest fires.

Government Orders

The newest graduate, who just graduated with a Ph.D. in wackonomics, is none other than the out-of-touch Liberal finance minister. She learned that once Canadians are put into a cost of living crisis, they can be told to solve it by cancelling Disney+. If they cannot afford gas, groceries and home heating because the government has raised the carbon tax scam, they can buy a bike for themselves, especially those who live in rural Canada.

We have had nine years of an out-of-touch government that has been nothing short of wacko. Its wacko policies are the reason why today we are seeing two million Canadians going to a food bank in a single month, with a million more projected for this year. Now we have found out that one in four Canadians is living in poverty. Wacko, extreme, woke policies have put Canadians in this position today.

Speaking of schools, schools have students. Today, after nine years of the Liberal government, students are going through a housing hell. In fact, all Canadians are living through a housing hell. It is because the government spent \$90 billion on housing, only to double housing costs. Not only did it do that, but housing starts have declined in this country according to its own housing department, the CMHC. However, the government still shovels millions of dollars in bonuses to the department that has caused this issue under one of the most incompetent housing ministers, previously the most incompetent immigration minister, in Canadian history. High interest rates are a massive barrier to home builders. This is what we are hearing from every home builder and developer and even those who want to get into homebuilding.

How did we get here? How did interest rates get so high? It is because when the Liberal-NDP government spent more than every single government before it combined, it created a cost of living and inflation crisis. In fact, 40-year highs in inflation have happened. It had a lot of wasteful spending too, and what did that do? That made the Bank of Canada raise interest rates at the most rapid rate in Canadian history.

That is why Canada, according to the IMF, is now most at risk of a mortgage default crisis. It is this high rate of interest that is stopping homebuilding. It is putting Canadians in a bind and taking more and more from their paycheques every single month. Now OSFI, which testified at the finance committee, is warning about a price shock, as mortgage renewals could see a 50% increase in price.

I can imagine when the finance minister and Prime Minister told people to borrow as much as they wanted because interest rates would stay low for a very long time. What they did not know was that the incompetent Liberal-NDP government would pour billions of dollars of fuel on the inflationary fire that it started, making interest rates go up. Now, when people renew their mortgages, they are sometimes renewing at double or triple the rate. That is not what they were promised. They were supposed a “responsible government”. What they ended up getting was a housing hell, and a high-debt, high-tax, high-spend government, which put them in this position.

Now we are seeing people with good-paying jobs, like nurses and teachers, living in their cars, and students who have to live under bridges. In some cases, 16 students are living in one small

space. It is because the Liberal government doubled their rents and doubled their mortgages, and now they are in a housing hell.

● (1650)

We also found out that delinquencies are on the rise. It is because Canadians have to shoulder the burden of nine years of bad policy-making. It put them in that position.

I recently talked to a single mom in my community who has three kids. She said that she left an abusive relationship and moved out on her own. Of course, she is one of the people whose rent has doubled. It went up. It has doubled over the last nine years, but recently, she had a \$300 increase in her rent. For a single mom with three kids, it was already hard enough to pay for gas, groceries and home heating, so what did she do? She had to move in with her abusive ex-husband because she could not afford day care and could not afford to buy food. In fact, she was already starting to skip meals. She is one of the one in four experiencing food insecurity.

When I spoke to her, she had the exact same story: It was not like this before. She came here as an immigrant and did everything right. She went to school here. She got a job. She had kids. She was married at one time. However, all she got was a government that worked against her, that raised her taxes and that made her cost of living more and more expensive.

This is not the only story. There are millions of Canadians in this kind of situation, to the point where people are asking why they moved to this country. Most of them are now thinking about leaving. Last year, more than 400,000 people left Canada. The top two reasons were the high cost of living and their credentials were not recognized, especially those who moved here as immigrants.

What did the government decide to do? It thought it was a brilliant idea to jack up the carbon tax scam. We found out last month that again rents are at the highest rate they have ever been. On top of that, for these same people, these Canadians who are trying to get to work in their car, trying to buy nutritious meals for their kids and themselves or trying to stay warm in the winter, all of those costs went up by 23% because the government jacked up the carbon tax scam by 23%.

Government Orders

This should be a wake-up call for the out-of-touch government. It should be an absolute wake-up call given the poverty report that came out today. We now know that we cannot believe anything that comes out of the government's mouth. It did not tell the truth about how many people were in poverty. That was proven today. We have found out that one in four Canadians could possibly be living in poverty. That is unheard of in this country. It was never like this before. It just goes to show that everything the government has done has made life worse for everyday Canadians.

We hear the government say over and over again that life has never been better for everyone here, that they should enjoy what they have and enjoy what it gives them. However, the number of Canadians in poverty, which we heard about today, could rise. It is 30% for Canadians aged 18 to 30 and 44.5% for single-parent households, while 42% of renters cannot afford two or more household essentials. Some 21.7% of Canadians cannot cover an unexpected expense of more than \$500, while 8.8% of Canadians cannot pay their bills on time. On top of this, 7.2% of Canadians cannot afford to heat or cool their homes. The truth is that working Canadians will have to foot the bill for the government's spending once again.

The government talks about tax fairness. Never have Canadians had a bigger tax burden than after nine years of the Liberal-NDP government.

Let us start with the carbon tax, a scam that it hid from Canadians recently. Did members know that it had a gag order on the PBO, which was asking to release a report, a damning report that proved the carbon tax scam committed \$30 billion of economic vandalism? That means \$30 billion was taken away from the economy, taken away from the paycheques of workers and taken away from investments into things like equipment and other capital investments.

● (1655)

It is no wonder Canada's productivity is worse than it was in 2014. In fact, there are seven straight quarters of productivity decline. What does that mean? To the average person, that means Canadians are poorer, and it is easy to tie that in with the poverty report that we see today. Despite the sunshine that the Liberal-NDP government tries to portray with its economic vandalism over the last nine years, the reality is that Canadians are poorer than they have ever been before, and it is only getting worse. The Liberals introduced tax hikes, such as the carbon tax scam, but they hid the damning report from their department. It took the PBO's courage, after Conservatives put on pressure, to release the report that proves there was \$30 billion of hidden costs in the scam on Canadians.

In fact, because the Conservatives put the pressure on and forced the papers to be released, to no surprise, the day that the vote was supposed to happen, the Liberals released the report. The report proved what Canadians already know, which is that the Prime Minister and the carbon tax scam are not worth the cost. The carbon tax has raised the cost of gas, groceries and home heating. Because of the tax, costs have gone up to our farmers, to our truckers and to everyone else. That is why we are seeing the record rise in poverty in this country.

The Liberals sold the scam as something that would automatically fix the environment. They tell us that, if we pay a bit more tax, they will pour it over top of the forest fires and put them out. The reality is that emissions have gone up and the forest fires have not gone. Every claim that the government had that the carbon tax scam was to fix the environment was false. The government's own department officials admitted that they do not tie in how much of the carbon tax scam is related to so-called fixing climate change, which is what the Liberals say. It does not work like that, and that is why they are not tracking it. Even they know it is not worth the cost.

Just yesterday, the PBO admitted to our common-sense Conservatives that the cost of climate change would have no effect on the cost of the carbon tax scam to Canadians. The PBO proved it. People just have to pull up the blues from the committee yesterday, and it is clear to see that the Liberals keep jacking up the carbon tax, but it has done nothing to fix the environment. How embarrassing that is for a government whose members claim to be stalwarts of the economy and the environment, but their ranking on the climate change index fell. It fell four spots, to 62 out of 67 on the world stage, but it is on par with the embarrassing Prime Minister, who jet-sets around the world just to embarrass Canada further. We need serious leadership once again in this country.

The PBO also said that Canadians pay more into the tax than what they get back. The claim that eight out of 10 Canadians get more back in rebates than what they pay into it is false, and the PBO proved that, over and over again. Carbon tax scam 1, which the PBO did costing and an analysis on, proves that a majority of Canadians, six out of 10 households, are worse off because of this scam compared to what they get back in rebates.

There is another part to this whole thing. It is called carbon tax scam 2, the clean fuel regulations. That has zero rebate, and it affects every single Canadian in every province. The PBO, yesterday, admitted to me that, if a majority of Canadian households are worse off with carbon tax scam 1, which has the phony rebates, then when we factor in carbon tax scam 2, which has no rebates, overall, a majority of households are still worse off. Therefore, the Liberals' claim that it leaves Canadians better off is false, and the claim keeps being proven wrong over and over again.

• (1700)

On top of all of that, the Liberals introduced a job-killing capital gains tax hike, which is a direct attack on hard-working farmers, fishermen, physicians, tradespeople, home builders and, of course, small business owners. Today, the finance committee heard from a plumber who talked about how his small business is his retirement savings. He did not put money into RRSPs, and he does not have a pension because he put all of his time, effort and money into his business. He admits that he is not rich. He is not one of the ultrarich that the government keeps talking about. He did everything right. He worked as hard as he could to leave something for his kids, his grandkids and their kids. However, on par with the Liberal-NDP government, hard work is punished in this country.

I know many people who live in Calgary Forest Lawn who left their home countries and took a big risk to come here. They took the risk because they wanted to go to a country where they were promised that, if they worked hard, they could make something of themselves and leave something for their kids. After nine years of the Liberal-NDP government's failed economic policies, the Canadian dream they were promised is broken. It is gone. That is why nine out of 10 young people say they have lost the dream of home ownership. That is why two million Canadians are going to food banks in a single month, and people with good jobs are living in their cars or tents.

They have a government that will not stop attacking their success. In fact, it vilifies success. The greedy government will do anything to fill its coffers. The only people it really cares about are rich Liberal insiders, like those with the \$22 billion in consultant fees that it paid. Not all Canadians are well connected like that. They wish they were, but the government is doing everything it can to work against hard-working Canadians.

We heard from a farmer today who only wanted to work hard, make food for Canadians and leave his farm to his four daughters. However, once again, this job-killing capital gains tax hike would ensure that less will go to his kids and their kids and more will go to the greedy government.

As I mentioned before, Canada is in a productivity crisis. GDP per person has gone down. That is the definition of how successful people are in this country. It has gone down, and it continues to go down. The government drove away \$460 billion of investment that went to the U.S. It made sure that U.S. workers get paid better than Canadians. That means Canadian workers get 58¢ of investment for every dollar of investment that goes to an American worker. The government's high-tax, high-spend ideology has driven away investment and workers from this country. What did that do? That made talent leave as well and, with that, made Canadians poorer.

I will tell Canadians that hope is on the horizon. It was not like this before the Liberal-NDP government, and it will not be like that after it is gone. After the next carbon tax election, when the member for Carleton would become the prime minister of this country, Canadians would get what they deserve and what they have been promised by this common-sense Conservative government. We would axe the tax. We would take the tax off for good for everybody and bring down the cost of gas, groceries and home heating. We would build the homes by incentivizing municipalities to build.

Government Orders

We would fix the budget and bring in a dollar-for-dollar law. Indeed, we would make sure that income taxes are lower, simpler and fairer for all Canadians and not punish hard work as we have seen being done under the government.

We would also stop the crime. We have seen drugs, disorder and chaos increase all across the country. We would put an end to that. We would once again bring home the Canadian dream of working hard and being able to accomplish great things. We would bring it home.

• (1705)

Mr. Darrell Samson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Rural Economic Development and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague talked a lot about two issues that I am concerned about, which are affordability, of course, and housing. Our government has been focused, in the last number of years, on key issues for families and supporting Canadians. If the member is saying that we have an affordability problem, a housing crisis, et cetera, then why are the Conservatives voting against all the good programs that we are bringing forward? On the dental program, they voted against it. On pharmacare, they voted against it. On early learning and child care, they voted against it. On the Canada child benefit, again, they voted against it.

When the member talks about axing the tax, what he is actually saying to Canadians is that, if the Conservatives take power, they would axe all those programs. It is easy to understand because they are voting against them, which means they are not in favour of them. I would like the member to tell me, and tell Canadians, if he would axe all those good programs or not?

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Madam Speaker, let me start by saying that when we form government, Canadians would be able to realize the Canadian dream.

The member is asking why we voted against some of those measures. Well, it is clear to see that we do not want to be complicit in the economic vandalism of this Liberal-NDP government, which, after the last nine years, sent two million Canadians to a food bank and made one in four go into poverty.

We are not gullible like the NDP, which needs to protect our leaders' pension like they keep doing by propping up the government. We are going to do what is right for Canadians. We would axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget, stop the crime and bring back that Canadian dream.

Government Orders

• (1710)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, the budget implementation measures in Bill C-69 are full of interference in the jurisdictions of Quebec and the provinces. Whether it is a question of housing, health, education or the banking sector, the fiscal imbalance really is on full display.

I would like to know what my colleague thinks.

[*English*]

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Madam Speaker, my colleague makes it very clear that, after nine years of the Liberal-NDP government, everything is broken. Everything he is listing is just a list of the things that the government has done.

We see that Confederation is also more broken than it ever has been before because the divisive Prime Minister has pitted region against region, sector against sector and Canadians against Canadians. However, that is what he wants. He rules by dividing, and then he deflects and blames. We would bring home a country that is more united.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, I had the benefit of being in the same finance committee meeting as my hon. colleague this morning where I heard the same evidence about the capital gains inclusion rates. Of course, most of what my hon. colleague has just said in here was simply contradicted by the evidence, including that there is zero evidence that the capital gains inclusion would have any negative effect on job creation in this country.

The member seems to be opposed to raising the capital gains inclusion rate. I am wondering if he can explain why the Mulroney Conservative government raised the capital gains inclusion rate in 1988 from 50% to 66.67%, and then again, in 1990, to 75%. Were the Conservatives wrong about the capital gains inclusion rate then, or are they wrong now?

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Madam Speaker, first of all, the member was in the committee when a small business owner was there, a plumber, who did everything right, worked as hard as he could to leave something for his kids and their kids, but the capital gains tax is going to punish all that hard work. This member sat there, yet he would rather listen to Liberal-NDP-paid economists than everyday, hard-working Canadians. That is a problem with the government. It keeps propping up the Prime Minister to protect its leader's pension, all at the expense of the suffering of Canadians.

Second, let me remind the member that when John Manley, who was the finance minister under the Liberals, reduced the capital gains tax to 50%, what ended up happening? Well, productivity went up. Government revenues went up. Do members know why? It is because it helped stimulate the economy once again.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened intently to the member's speech. As well, I listened intently to the last two NDP-Liberal MPs who asked questions. The funny thing is that they complained that, when the Conservatives attain government, we would cut their great programs, such as the green slush fund from which, of that billion dol-

lars, almost \$400 million went to conflicted directors' own companies.

I am wondering if the member could expound on the other great Liberal programs that have resulted in this kind of corruption, which the Conservatives would end when we assume power.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Madam Speaker, first of all, we are going to cut the number of Liberal seats in this House when we form government. That is the first thing we will cut, and, of course, we are going to axe the tax. We are going to cut the tax on gas, groceries and home heating, and, indeed, we will cut out the corruption. My friend, who is a great hockey player, highlighted just one piece of a plethora of corruption that we have seen under the government. There is the WE scandal and the green slush fund that is growing in scandal every single day, which he and other members are doing a great job of highlighting. We are also going to cut out the Infrastructure Bank, which has built exactly zero projects. It is a \$30-billion program. It has built zero projects, yet it has shovelled millions of dollars to Liberal-connected insiders. This is the kind of corruption we are going to cut under a common-sense Conservative government once the member for Carleton becomes Prime Minister.

• (1715)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is interesting that the finance critic for the Conservative-Reform party says that they are going to cut the Infrastructure Bank. He is just reaffirming a policy that we know. My question for him is this: Is the member aware of the many projects that are taking place in his home province? One of the examples would be the investments in irrigation, which is helping farmers diversify. Liberals have continuously been there to advocate for farmers, and the farmers would actually be fairly disappointed in the Conservatives' not recognizing the importance of irrigation in the province of Manitoba.

Why does the Conservative Party oppose that particular program?

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Madam Speaker, that is a bit rich, coming from the most anti-Alberta government in Canadian history. We thought Trudeau 1 was bad, but under the current Prime Minister, we have never seen such brazen attacks on the hard-working people from my province, the greatest province in this country, Alberta, as those that have come from the Prime Minister. The attacks do not stop, whether they are on our province, on our energy sector, on our farmers, or on everyday hard-working Canadians.

I do not think there is any Canadian today who can trust that whatever the government is doing is in the best interest of Canadians. We recently saw that with the carbon tax scam, where the environment minister, who is probably one of the most anti-Alberta ministers I have ever seen, hid a report that proved to Canadians that there is a \$30-billion carbon tax loss to the economy and to workers. The government did everything it could to hide that report, so I do not know anyone who can trust that the government is doing anything in the best interest of Canada or Canadians.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andr anne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, in his speech, my colleague talked about the cost of living and touched on the issue of housing. At the moment, there is a trend on both the Liberal and Conservative sides. There is a coalition trying to interfere in Quebec's areas of jurisdiction when it comes to housing.

Both the Leader of the Opposition's bill and the latest budget from the party opposite attempt to get tough with cities so they will propose housing solutions. These magic wands will not work. Instead, the money earmarked for housing could be transferred unconditionally to Quebec, because housing comes under Quebec's jurisdiction. What does my colleague think?

[*English*]

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Madam Speaker, let me just correct the record first. The only coalition is the carbon tax coalition of the Liberals, the NDP and the Bloc. There is no way we would be complicit in any way like the Bloc has been in making sure that housing costs have doubled. That is not something we were complicit in. I will say that our common-sense plan to fix the housing crisis in this country will do just that. We will bring up the supply by incentivizing municipalities to build and stop the gatekeeping—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mend s): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Joliette has the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, Bill C-69 is a budget implementation omnibus bill that creates or amends 67 different acts. The government promised never to use this type of thing, but for the past several years, it has continued to do so.

Bill C-69 enacts, among other things, the consumer-driven banking act, which establishes that it is the federal government alone that regulates this sector and that the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada acts as the regulator.

We asked the government to take this division out of Bill C-69 and correct some of its shortcomings over the summer so it could come back this fall with a framework that does not give Bay Street an unfair advantage over other financial institutions, that respects the jurisdictions of Quebec and the provinces, and that will be administered by a competent body. However, the government just voted against our request. The government is not working well. It is not listening, it is being partisan, and it is undermining Quebec. That is why we will be voting against this bill.

I am going to talk more about the open banking system, beginning with some context. As things stand, all financial services are based out of financial institutions that people do business with directly. These institutions are legally and financially responsible in the event of fraud or data theft, so they are fiercely protective of our personal data. Under an open banking system, financial institutions will have to share our data with platforms that will enable us to access all our accounts with one click. It would be a minor revolution. Ultimately, we can envision a system in which financial institutions essentially just create financial products, with client relations being handled by tech companies that do not themselves provide financial

products, but act as intermediaries and data aggregators. That calls for a framework.

People want the flexibility an open banking system offers. That is why financial technology or fintech companies have already started coming on line despite the legal limbo. They are not well regulated, so they find other ways to evolve. Users themselves provide their credentials. The app goes into a user's account, extracts data from the screen and stores it. Financial institutions' secure networks get regular visits from actors outside the financial sector, and that makes them vulnerable. The more advanced these strategies get, the greater the risk.

We know that the level of risk varies. An aggregator that scans public data to show us mortgage rates at all financial institutions in one click is low risk. When it collects our personal data to give us a detailed picture of our financial situation, that carries more risk for the protection of sensitive personal information, namely financial information. If the app can be used to perform transactions, which implies that it places orders, that opens up a whole new level of risk, the risk of fraud. Let us also not forget that a series of orders quickly placed with the help of an AI system could completely destabilize all financial institutions. What about the principle of needing to know the customer? That principle is the foundation of our anti-money laundering laws. How can a financial institution apply this principle when it is communicating via an app?

Lastly, an important part of risk is the financial capacity to take on risk. Without that, the consumer could lose everything. Prudential regulations have to adapt. What we need is a clear framework with clear obligations and responsibilities.

The financial sector is a shared jurisdiction. The federal government has authority over banks and federally incorporated financial institutions. Financial institutions that are not banks, namely credit unions and trust companies, fall under the jurisdiction of Quebec and the provinces. Financial intermediaries, such as investment dealers and financial advisers, fall under the jurisdiction of Quebec and the provinces. Tech companies in the financial sector are not currently regulated, but they are likely similar to financial intermediaries.

● (1720)

There are different models in all this. There is the Interac approach. The Interac system, which enables exchanges between institutions and allows us, for example, to use our debit card everywhere, was developed by the financial companies themselves. These companies agreed on a common technology and standards to ensure that transactions are secure. Companies that adopt and comply with the common standards can join the system and offer Interac. This is the approach taken by the United Kingdom. In Canada, it is the approach that was favoured by the Advisory Committee on Open Banking in 2021.

Private Members' Business

The advantage of this approach, which is the simplest and most flexible, is that each government retains full regulatory power and adopting the open banking system does not result in any transfer of power. The disadvantage is that it is a form of self-regulation. The standard adopted may very well be aimed primarily at developing the sector rather than protecting citizens. Personal information, financial risks and fees come to mind. The banks, which initially advocated self-regulation, realized that squeezing out the legislator would not work and that co-operation would be a more realistic option.

Another approach, the one that we advocate and prefer, is the securities approach. Securities fall mainly under provincial jurisdiction, but Ottawa has laws governing federally incorporated companies. The Supreme Court of Canada 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 corporations legislation is very similar to the federal corporations legislation 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.

For years now, the federal government has wanted to centralize securities regulation in a single commission and concentrate the entire financial sector in Toronto, to the detriment of Montreal in particular. Quebec and the Quebec business community have always opposed this. In 2021, my party successfully amended the budget implementation bill to close the federal office responsible for creating a single securities commission. It was a really nice moment in a committee meeting over Zoom. I remember it clearly. The model of co-operation between governments, which has survived repeated attacks by the federal government, is still going and is working well. As I was saying, the securities model is the approach that my party and I favour for the open banking system.

However, in Bill C-69, Ottawa is opting for unilateralism and centralization. As I was saying earlier, Bill C-69 enacts the consumer-driven banking act, which would make the federal government the sole regulator of this sector, with the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada serving as the regulator. That is a problem, too. The agency does not have the qualifications to do that at all. Since fintechs are not under federal jurisdiction, Ottawa has opted to regulate them indirectly by regulating how 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. Institutions that are not federally regulated will be ignored. They can opt in voluntarily with approval from 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, because of the sensitive nature of the medical data they hold, or intermediaries such as brokers, but the framework will likely 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.

• (1725)

In practical terms, 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. That is no small thing.

We are getting ready to pass this bill at third reading in the House, but 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 still unclear.

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, under this bill, 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. That is ridiculous.

The fact that Quebec institutions will be subject to two uncoordinated regulatory bodies could be downright dysfunctional and give banks an egregious advantage over co-ops and trust companies. That is unacceptable.

• (1730)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): We have to move on to Private Members' Business. The hon. member will have eight minutes and 30 seconds remaining when the House resumes consideration of this bill.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from May 23 consideration of Bill S-224, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (trafficking in persons), as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Madam Speaker, when the Bloc Québécois leader's office informed me that I would be delivering a speech in the House about Bill S-224, I thought it was a joke, but it is not. Apparently I really have to do this.

Private Members' Business

Bill S-224 is quite simple. It contains a single clause. The committee worked hard on this. We heard from witnesses, and we ended up deciding to delete the clause in question as well as the title of the bill. As such, what we are left with now is just the bill number, S-224.

What can I say about that number? It does bring back some memories. Originally, the purpose of this bill was to better protect sex workers from human trafficking.

The challenge—indeed, the obstacle—we almost always face when attempting to define a concept is that what we do not say has a much greater influence on what we mean than what we do say. We tried to amend the definition, and witnesses told us that, far from helping, the bill was actually detrimental. The bill would likely have equated “sex work” with “human trafficking”.

I will quote Ms. Lam, executive director of the Canadian Alliance for Sex Work Law Reform. On June 12, 2023, she said, “If Bill S-224 passes, anyone who helps sex workers stay safe...will be charged with human trafficking. People will be too afraid to be associated with sex work, making sex workers more isolated and vulnerable.” That short quote pretty much sums up the problem we faced.

The Bloc Québécois proposed an amendment that would have allowed us to develop a definition more respectful of the comments and notes we received from various witnesses in committee. We were trying to come up with a definition for a person who exploits another person. Unfortunately, our amendment was rejected in committee, and we are left with this empty shell as a result.

I could go on at length about the virtues of the legislative definition and protecting sex workers, but those listening to me will tell me that I am wasting their time. Therefore, with the Speaker's permission, I will stop there, but I will say that we must not abandon Bill S-224. I think that protecting sex workers is important. Human trafficking is something we absolutely must ban and fight as best we can, but, once again, we will have to work a little harder to ensure that we define these concepts properly and that we do not harm rather than help.

[*English*]

Mr. Jamil Jivani (Durham, CPC): Madam Speaker, I stand in the House today in full support of Bill S-224 in its original form.

I want to commend my colleague, the member for Oshawa, for his hard work and tireless advocacy on behalf of human trafficking victims. I consider him to be a friend and a mentor, in addition to being my neighbour. I have seen the hard work he has put into fighting for victims of crime and trying to get all parties on board with a common-sense idea to hold offenders who commit the crime of human trafficking to a higher standard than we hold the victims.

Unfortunately, the bill has been attacked by the Liberal government with not only an amendment that hollows it out and guts it, but also an amendment that goes so far as to actually delete all of the contents of the legislation, making it meaningless and also making the bill ineffective in challenging the status quo. Unfortunately, it is on brand for the Liberal Party of Canada to disrespect victims of crime, to maintain a status quo of chaos and disorder, and to not

stand up for those who are suffering from the way the justice system currently operates.

The Liberal Party of Canada does not support victims of human trafficking, just as they do not support victims of all crimes. It is not a government interested in serving the interests of law-abiding citizens, but is more concerned with being easy on criminals. Undermining Bill S-224 is completely on brand because we know how little they care about victims of crime.

I can go over the record. Liberal bail policies, for example, have turned courthouses into turnstile houses. Police officers work very hard in our communities to make arrests, to enforce the law and to keep our communities safe, only to see those who they arrest released back into the community to commit the same crimes over and over again. Catch-and-release bail policies have contributed to a spike in all sorts of crimes across Canada, from auto theft to violent crime, and are contributing to a system of chaos and disorder.

We have also seen the Liberal government's approach to enforcing drug laws. Certainly, members would recall that in British Columbia we saw the results of a sadistic experiment to legalize hard drugs, further promoting chaos and disorder. We also have a problem of judge shortages. We have seen that the government is not interested in appointing enough judges to ensure that we have a functional justice system. Long delays have caused cases of violent crime to be thrown out of the courts.

I ask anyone hearing my words to just imagine being a law-abiding citizen, who does everything that they have been asked to do, such as going to school, getting a job, paying taxes and contributing to this country, and a crime is committed against them or their family. The system that they pay into does not have their back. In fact, it is so ineffective that the person who committed the crime against them never has to face consequences for his or her actions.

That is the system of chaos and disorder that we have under the Liberal government because, again, it does not have the backs of law-abiding citizens. Instead, it is concerned with being easy on criminals. This system of chaos and disorder is the status quo under the current Prime Minister. The reality is that by opposing Bill S-224, by putting forward an amendment that renders it absolutely meaningless, the Liberal government is clinging to the status quo. It is clinging to the chaos and disorder that it has caused.

Private Members' Business

The crime of human trafficking is a particularly heartbreaking one. It exploits the most vulnerable people in our communities. For those of us from Ontario, it hits close to home. From 2012 to 2022, two-thirds of the human trafficking cases reported across Canada occurred in Ontario. The 401 Highway corridor has become a hub for trafficking crimes. It is fair for Canadians to expect some action from the government to address these concerns. We have heard from police officers who are frustrated with the status quo and who have said quite openly that it makes it harder for them to do their jobs.

• (1735)

I would like to quote a member of the Durham Regional Police Service, who I am fortunate enough to say serves my home community of Durham. Constable Jeff Tucker said, “There is a lack of understanding for the victims. The victims are retraumatized every time they have to testify over and over again.... The criminal justice system provides more rights to the accused than the victims.... Victims are not protected by the system, only criminals.”

This is a very serious problem, and it is not hard to see why police officers would be disappointed with the status quo we have. Currently, under the law, only 8% of human trafficking offenders are convicted, and Bill S-224, in its original form, sought to solve this problem.

The justice system is broken, to put it bluntly, and it is not hard to figure out who is responsible. The Liberal Prime Minister, in power for nine years, is responsible. Despite all his efforts to claim no responsibility for his own actions, he has broken the justice system, and a course correction is necessary.

I would like to use my time to share the perspective of the mother of a human trafficking victim. Lynda Harlos has been a champion for Bill S-224 in its original form. Lynda is an advocate in the fight against human trafficking and is the founder of the organization Parent With A Purpose, where she is a sex trafficking and abuse prevention educator, and she shares her story of being the mother of a sex trafficking survivor.

Lynda writes:

In the current global landscape, the question is not if a child will be targeted for exploitation but when. We must ask ourselves: are our protocols robust enough to prevent them from becoming victims, and if they do, to ensure justice is served?

Every night, I lay my head on my pillow, tormented by the knowledge that my naivety led to my daughter's trafficking. Can you, as policymakers and leaders, rest easy without feeling shame and guilt, knowing that justice remains out of reach for her due to a lack of “proof” for her suffering?

Was she expected to photograph the moment she was being waterboarded for not complying with a client's demands? Should she have documented her trafficker threatening her son's life as retribution for her refusal to allow further abuse?

In a household of three women, two have endured repeated sexual assault, yet these incidents remain unreported. Why? Because we are painfully aware that current laws will re-victimize us without delivering justice. My daughter would willingly face revictimization if there were any hope that justice would prevail.

While local organizations excel at addressing victims' basic needs, they fall short in securing justice. The solution is straightforward: punish those who exploit our children and the perpetrators who buy from them, not the victims. It is imperative that we strengthen our legal frameworks to protect and deliver justice for the most vulnerable among us.

I thank Lynda for her work and for her advocacy. I thank all of the people who stood up in support of victims of violent crime, including the member for Oshawa, who has been a tireless advocate.

Members of the House have an important decision to make. Will they support Bill S-224 in its original form, or will they allow a Liberal amendment to continue promoting chaos and disorder across our country? It should be a no-brainer. It should be very obvious that change is needed and that the course correction of this country is in the hands of its leaders to listen to the people of Canada. I leave that on the conscience of all members of the House, and I am thankful for the chance to speak in support of victims' rights.

• (1740)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Resuming debate.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 2.

[*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.

• (1745)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: We request a recorded vote, Madam Speaker.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to Standing Order 98, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, June 19, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I suspect if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent to see the clock at 6:30 p.m. so we can get to Government Orders.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[Translation]***BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2024, NO. 1**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-69, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 16, 2024, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, after that 15-minute break to discuss Bill S-224, I am going to return to my speech on Bill C-69. I want to focus on the division that creates the federal framework for the open banking system and centralizes powers.

As I said before the break, under this bill, banks under federal jurisdiction would have only one set of regulations to follow, whereas an institution under provincial jurisdiction, 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. The fact that these institutions will be subject to two uncoordinated regulatory bodies could be downright dysfunctional and give banks an egregious advantage over co-ops, trust companies, credit unions, Alberta Treasury Branch Financial, and so on. Why always favour Bay Street? This is unacceptable.

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, which is unacceptable, especially with the Civil Code, consumer protection laws and so forth.

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. That is what is at issue in Bill C-69.

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. It could have worked on common regulations on accreditation rules for fintech companies, security standards, clarification of financial liability, and consumer and data protection.

We asked the government to take out the division on open banking that centralizes the sector exclusively at the federal level, 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. This government rejected our proposal, so now we are going to have to build this new system on a very bad foundation.

Another concern is that, 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 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.

● (1750)

Did the government obtain the consent of the provinces, particularly Quebec, which has its own civil laws, before introducing this bill? They are unable to answer.

During the briefing on the notice of ways and means preceding the bill, it was my understanding that provincially regulated financial institutions could opt in to the federal framework provided that the province consents and declines to regulate those activities involving the open banking system. Is that the case? They do not know. They are unable to answer.

Which provincial laws will have to take a back seat to federal laws? They cannot answer this, either.

Who will be tasked with certifying the technology companies? Will it be Ottawa or the Autorité des marchés financiers? They are unable to answer.

Will Quebec's Consumer Protection Act apply to the activities of the open banking system? They are unable to answer. In the event of fraud or damages, will it be possible to launch a lawsuit or class action under the Civil Code or the Consumer Protection Act against a fintech company? Once again, they are unable to answer that question.

Government Orders

Will the sharing of financial liability 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? Again, they are unable to answer.

None of this is surprising. The Financial Consumer Agency of Canada is not well placed to administer this framework. It learned it would be receiving this role the day before the budget was tabled. When it comes to behaving like amateurs and making things up on the fly, this government takes the cake.

To avoid a disaster or some risky backpedalling, we asked the government to remove this division from Bill C-69. We suggested reworking it this summer and coming back with a good bill this fall. The government refused.

We are opposing this bad bill that sets this entire sector up on a terrible foundation. It is unacceptable.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciated a number of the comments the member made. I can understand why, through technological changes and advancements in web design, consumers rely more and more on Internet banking.

The member gave the impression that the reason he is voting against the budget bill is that specific issue. Is my interpretation right, or are there other aspects to the legislation the member opposes?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, that is a big problem for us with this bill.

The bill is 660 pages long and amends or creates 67 laws. Some of it is good, and some is not so good.

One example of something good is that it changes the rules so that companies that declare their profits in tax havens are taxed more effectively. That is a step forward. That is good. We applaud that.

The \$11 billion being given to the gas industry to make hydrogen is a subsidy, a program tailor-made for the gas industry. It is not a plan to fight climate change. Therefore, we oppose it.

I spent all my allotted time talking about open banking for a reason. It is a big deal. It is a big deal for Quebec, for Montreal's status as a financial hub, and for our financial institutions, like Desjardins. It is unacceptable. Once again, I condemn the government's failure to listen. As soon as there is a chance to favour Bay Street over its competitors in the financial sector, the government seems to kowtow to the big Bay Street banks. That is unacceptable. That needs to change.

The framework will not be put in place until next fall. Why not take the summer to coordinate and build on a solid foundation rather than on such a shaky, poorly managed framework?

It is a disaster waiting to happen.

• (1755)

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, honestly, I have lost count of how many attempts this government has made to impoverish people, to make them feel insignificant. It is interfering in our most fundamental jurisdictions, in the areas that are the most important to us. In 2021, I realized just how important securities are to Quebec and how symbolic they are. I would like my colleague to expand on that.

When it comes to finance, the government and even the opposition present themselves as champions of the economy, but they forget that there is so much room for improvement. I am referring here to the securities framework, but also to capital gains. We made some intelligent proposals, but once again, we have not heard anything from the government. I would also like my colleague to comment on that.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the member for Shefford, for her comments.

First, the capital gains tax comes into effect on June 25, but the bill does not yet exist. We are told that there will be a draft bill at the end of July and that it will not be introduced, debated and studied in the House until this fall. We certainly intend to make amendments to improve it. We will make sure that millionaires pay a higher tax rate than middle-class working people. That is not currently the case. We will also make sure that collateral victims get better protection than we expect to see in the bill.

Symbolism matters when it comes to Quebec's model for financial institutions, for securities, for the open banking system we are talking about here. The government symbolically recognizes the Quebec nation, but the more than 100,000 well-paid jobs at the Montreal Exchange and all the associated expertise, plus everything to do with insurance, is more than just a symbol to us. We do not want to be at the mercy of companies like Power Corporation, Sun Life or Canada Life. We see how badly that is working.

Quebec has expertise when it comes to the financial sector and insurance. We want to maintain that expertise. The federal framework allows it, but the pursuit of excessive centralization we see with this government and other governments we have here is hurting us. It is a constant struggle just to protect our turf.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am really privileged to serve on the finance committee with my hon. colleague, and I want to thank him for all of his excellent contributions at committee. My question to him is on the capital gains exclusion issue, which is not covered by this bill, but, as he points out, will be in legislation coming to this House soon.

Government Orders

He heard evidence today suggesting that when the Conservatives raised the capital gains inclusion rate in Canada in 1988 and 1990 from 50% to 66.6% to 75%, there was no material effect on investments by businesses. It did not have any negative effect on their investments in machines or equipment. Nor has there been an increase in investments as capital gains have come down since the year 2000. In other words, he heard evidence that there is no real relationship between the capital gains inclusion rate and investments by businesses.

Can the member tell the House what his thoughts were after hearing that evidence?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague. I am also pleased and privileged to work with him at the Standing Committee on Finance. We sit next to each other and I think we are learning to work well together, which is a great privilege.

I raised this question, this thought earlier today in committee. The irony is that it was the Conservatives who increased the capital gains inclusion rate to 75%. It is the Liberals who lowered it to 50%. Now, the roles are reversed. The Liberals want to increase it to two-thirds and the Conservatives are getting all worked up.

As for the economic consequences of this, I am no expert. The International Monetary Fund just said that the impact, if there is one, would be quite marginal. I do believe, however, that for the principle of tax fairness, it is something that would be important to implement.

However, we have a lot of concerns for people who are not part of the wealthiest 1%, but could get caught up in this when selling a home for their retirement. This happens a lot in Quebec. We want to properly study the upcoming bill to determine what it is all about and to better protect any potential collateral victims.

• (1800)

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague on his excellent speech. Personally, I think this is a case of major interference in Quebec's businesses and financial services. How does my colleague think the financial community in Quebec will react? What dynamic can we expect to see?

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from La Pointe-de-l'Île for his intervention.

Yes, it is interference, and yes, it is a concern for provincially regulated financial institutions. Desjardins is subject to Quebec regulations. Representatives of Desjardins appeared before the committee and raised many serious concerns in their testimony. Federal governments of every political stripe always work for the big Bay Street banks at the expense of other players, such as credit unions or Desjardins.

If the government had any respect for the federative nature of the country we are currently in, it would never dream of interfering like this. First, it should negotiate, and then it should coordinate. That is all we are asking the government to do, but it refuses to do it. It always comes down to John A. Macdonald's great dream of a legislative union rather than a federation. That had no support back then,

and it has none today either. The compromise was a federation where each government, each assembly, was sovereign in its own jurisdictions.

Rather than properly managing problems within its own jurisdictions, this government is trying to encroach on the jurisdictions of Quebec and the provinces. It is trying to boss them around and tell them what to do. It is trying to steal powers so it can turn the federation into a legislative union. It seems that Quebec, Quebec's specificity, no longer counts, even though the House has officially recognized Quebec as a nation. The government does not seem to be listening. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I heard my colleague talk about capital gains earlier. I heard the Leader of the Opposition say earlier this week that this bill could not be amended in committee.

I was confused. The leader of the official opposition has been a member for 20 years. Is it possible that the leader of the official opposition does not know how a bill works?

I would like my colleague to elaborate on that.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I served with the current Conservative leader on the Standing Committee on Finance. He knows perfectly well how it works.

When he says that the forthcoming bill cannot be amended or modified, that amendments cannot be brought forward, he is lying shamelessly. He is lying through his teeth.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to stand and speak to the budget bill, Bill C-69, here in the House today.

I think budgets are an opportunity for us to examine the values that we have as a nation. To many people in this House, government can be a force for good, but others, and I am thinking of my Conservative colleagues, view government as something to be feared, something to be shrunk and something to be incapacitated. We, on the New Democrat side, believe that government plays a vital role in Canadian society to deliver services that Canadians individually cannot and that the market is also unable to provide. Others in this House, and again, I think of my Conservative colleagues, believe that individuals ought to be left to fend largely for themselves, to sink or swim as they may.

On this side of the House, in the New Democrat caucus, we believe that government can be a force to build a fairer, more equal society. Others in this House do not share that value. They believe that politics is a dynamic that exacerbates division or that aggrandizes differences. In the New Democratic Party, we believe that good politics focuses on what is working well in society, and we look for ways in which we can harness optimism and collective strength to make things better. Others in this House, and again I look across the way to my Conservative colleagues, sell a line to Canadians that everything is broken, exploiting fear and insecurity.

Government Orders

I am reminded of President Joe Biden's famous dictum, which he actually stated well before he was ever president, where he said, "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget, and I'll tell you what you value." I think this budget provides a great opportunity to show Canadians what the various values are of the various parties in this House.

New Democrats know that millions of Canadians are really struggling right now from coast to coast to coast. The cost of living is up dramatically. It is getting much harder to pay the rent or the mortgage, if one is lucky enough to own a house, to buy food and to pay one's bills. At the same time, we know that large corporations and the well-off in this country are doing better than ever in some cases. There are certain sectors, like the oil and gas sector and the grocery sector, that are making record profits, profits higher than they have ever made in the history of their operating in this country, while at the same time often gouging Canadians with sky-high prices, either at the pumps or in the grocery aisles. Even with corporate profits soaring, the investment of the business community in this country in Canadian workers, in machinery and equipment, in technology, and in the Canadian economy is declining. Major shareholders and top executives are often reaping enormous benefits without the promised trickle-down to workers, communities and consumers that right-wing economists promised us some 30 to 40 years ago.

The New Democrat caucus has used our power in this minority Parliament to deliver results for people. In this budget alone, we have compelled our partners in the Liberal government to build more homes, to preserve existing affordable housing and to protect renters. We used our power to bring in universal single-payer pharmacare, setting the stage for the biggest expansion of our health care system in a generation, starting with contraception and diabetes medication and devices. We pushed to establish a groundbreaking national school food program. We are the only country in the G7, and one of only a handful of countries in the industrialized world, that does not have some form of universal access to school nutrition, something that hurts our kids and puts an added cost on families that are struggling to pay their bills. This budget reverses damaging cuts to indigenous services. It invests in accessible, high-quality, non-profit child care. It establishes a dedicated youth mental health fund.

• (1805)

This is the work of New Democrats, who used our values to try to bring in policies and programs and to allocate resources to Canadians in need in this country. We did not sit and just tell Canadians that we think everything is broken. We rolled up our sleeves and came up with policies that would make things better for Canadians. My colleagues on the Conservative side of the House have done none of this, but instead just preach a narrative that everything is broken and that nothing can be done about it. That is not a value that we share.

While these achievements illustrate in part what a New Democrat government could accomplish, the 2024 budget does not fully reflect our party's vision. This is not an NDP budget, but it is a budget that was influenced by the NDP. Likewise, Bill C-69, the budget implementation act, includes many positive measures that the NDP was able to compel the Liberals to implement. However, we want

to underscore that this legislation does have several shortcomings. There is much, much more, in our view, that the federal government can do to make life easier for people and to provide opportunities for generations to come. New Democrats will not stop working to deliver results for people.

I just want to talk briefly about some of these positive aspects. The national school food program would be in place as early as this fall and would help some 400,000 children access food that they need to grow up healthy. This is an important first step toward establishing a national program that we hope and envision will provide universal access to nutritious food for all elementary students, some 2.8 million kids in this country in grades 1 to 8.

Across Canada, nearly one in four children does not get enough food, and more than one-third of food bank users are children. These are shocking statistics in a G7 country. According to Children First Canada, there has been a 29% increase in food insecurity in children in the last year alone. A national school food program would not only give students in Canada access to nutritious food, helping them learn better, but it would also make healthy eating a daily lesson for our kids. Countries with national school food programs have documented better academic performance, improved short- and long-term health for children, help for family budgets and improved efficiency in the health care system. This is something that Conservatives are voting no to.

Bill C-69 includes measures to make housing more affordable. I want to touch on a few of the measures. It would enhance the homebuyers' plan by increasing the withdrawal limit from \$35,000 to \$60,000 and temporarily adding three years to the grace period before repayments to that RRSP are required. It would crack down on short-term rentals, hopefully to unlock more homes for Canadians to live in, by denying income tax deductions on income earned from short-term rentals that do not comply with provincial or local restrictions. The bill would continue the ban on foreign buyers of Canadian homes for an additional two years to ensure that homes are used for Canadians to live in and not as a speculative asset class for foreign investors.

Government Orders

I am always struck by my colleagues in the Conservative Party, who tell us to just wait until they are in government and then they will fix housing. The New Democrats are not waiting for that day, which we hope will not come. We are working now, because we know that Canadians need help with decent housing now, not a year or two or three from now. We also, by the way, are mindful of the Conservative record. When the Conservatives were in government, they did not build any affordable housing in this country at all. In fact, it was the Mulroney government in 1992 that took the federal government out of social housing for a generation, leading, in large part, to the crisis that we experience today.

Bill C-69 has a myriad of other measures that would make life more affordable for Canadians in important ways. It would make it easier to find better deals on Internet, home phone and cellphone plans by amending the Telecommunications Act to better allow Canadians to renew or switch between plans and to increase consumer choice to help them better find a deal that works for them. We know that Internet use and cellphone use now are consumer staples. They are really essential utilities that every Canadian needs to stay connected and function in their communities, in their homes and at work.

This budget would crack down on predatory lending by strengthening enforcement against criminal rates of interest to help protect vulnerable Canadians from harmful illegal lenders.

It would make it easier to save for children's education by introducing automatic enrolment in the Canada learning bond, to ensure that all low-income families receive the support they need for their children's future.

• (1810)

It would also launch Canada's consumer-driven banking framework to provide Canadians and small businesses with better, secure access to more financial services and products. Again, these are measures that the Conservatives are voting against.

Finally, Bill C-69 includes measures to support workers by protecting gig workers and by strengthening prohibitions against employee misclassifications in federally regulated industries. It would establish an important first historic right to disconnect to help restore work-life balance for workers. It would extend additional weeks of employment insurance for seasonal workers in 13 targeted regions. It would advance employee ownership trusts to enable employees to share in the success of their work by encouraging more business owners to sell to an employee ownership trust.

Before I leave the positives, I just want to comment that there are disappointments in the budget. One of the primary ones, for me, is the Canada disability benefit. The Liberal government promised to bring in a Canada disability benefit for which the New Democrats have been pushing for years. The Liberals said the benefit would lift people living with disabilities out of poverty; that is what they promised.

However, the Liberal government's plan announced in the budget is to provide a maximum of \$200 a month. That is based on holding a disability tax credit certificate, which applies to only a fraction of the Canadians who need such assistance. At present, a single adult with a disability will live below the poverty line if they receive

funding from any of the provincial programs across Canada, and an additional \$200 a month is not enough to bring them above the poverty line. Over 1.5 million people with disabilities currently live in poverty across Canada, yet the plan would be accessible only to an estimated 600,000 people. It will not lift even them out of poverty.

New Democrats are deeply disappointed to see the lack of investment and, frankly, a colossally broken promise to people who need it the most. A \$200-a-month maximum benefit going to fewer than half of those who need it is simply unacceptable in this country. We will continue to push the government to significantly increase the benefit to make sure that all Canadians living with disabilities receive the money they need to truly lift them out of poverty.

Now I want to talk a little about tax fairness. In the 1960s, the Carter commission spent four years looking at Canada's tax situation. It came to some very important conclusions, one of them famously summarized by the phrase, "A buck is a buck [is a buck]". That means that no matter how people receive their income, it should be taxed the same. Now, unfortunately, through successive Liberal and Conservative governments, we have built a tax system where that principle has not been respected at all.

We heard today at the finance committee from the Canadian Labour Congress economist who authored a report entitled "Canada's shift to a more regressive tax system, 2004 to 2022", which found that overall, Canada's tax system is only moderately progressive through the bottom half of the income distribution and is regressive at the top of the distribution, due to several sources of untaxed or lightly taxed income, such as capital gains, inheritances and bequests and employer-provided benefits, which predominantly go to top earners.

The report found that in 2022, the total tax rate for the lowest household income decile, that is the bottom 10% in Canada, was 35%, whereas the total tax rate for the top 1% in Canada is 24%. In other words, the top 1% pay taxes at a rate 11% lower than the poorest 10% in this country. Moreover, the report found that the top 5% paid a lower rate in 2022 than the bottom 95%, with the top 1% paying an even lower rate.

Government Orders

Canadians should ask themselves why Canada's tax system imposes a higher total rate on the lowest-income households, versus the top 5%. Can anybody in the House go back in their communities this summer and explain why, in Canada's tax system, the top 1% of households pay the lowest total tax rate of any income group? I cannot explain that.

● (1815)

According to the report, a comprehensive tax review in the United Kingdom concluded that a good tax system must be both progressive and neutral. That is to say that it can raise the revenue government needs to achieve its spending and distributional ambitions while minimizing economic and administrative inefficiency, keeping the system as simple and transparent as possible and avoiding arbitrary tax differentiation across people and forms of economic activity. It reads, "A fair tax system should be based on... 'horizontal equity': the principle that two people with the same amount of income in a given year pay the same rate of tax regardless of the source of that income."

Bay Street accountant Kenneth Carter, who headed the important Royal Commission on Taxation in the mid-1960s, captured that notion, yet since the 1960s, we have built a tax system in this country, again, through Conservative and Liberal governments, that fails to achieve a tax system based on horizontal equity, despite the recommendations of the Carter commission.

I will turn back to the issue of the capital gains matter, which the Conservatives have raised with such furor in the House. The capital gains tax was first brought into this country in 1972, and it was brought in by a Liberal government at the rate of 50%. However, it was the Conservatives who raised the capital gains inclusion rate, in 1988, to 66.6%. They then raised it again in 1990, to 75%.

Therefore it is really something to hear the Conservatives rail against a measure today that would set the capital gains inclusion rate in this country at 50%, the lowest it has ever been, for the first \$250,000 of capital gains, and then to 66.6%, a moderate amount, which they themselves raised all capital gains to in 1988.

I will read from a couple of very important witnesses who appeared at the Finance Committee today. Dr. Jim Stanford from the Centre for Future Work said this: "A capital gain results not from producing and selling a product or service, but rather from acquiring and reselling an asset. It reflects speculation, not production. Other forms of income (like wages) must be fully declared. Granting asset traders this unique preference is morally unfair, and fiscally wasteful."

I cannot say it any better than Bea Bruske, the president of the Canadian Labour Congress, who asked why we tax a worker who flips burgers for a living at 100% of her income, but someone who flips stocks for a living, who is wealthy, we tax at only 50% of their income.

That is the principle that faces Canadians today, and it is something that I challenge Conservatives to explain to Canadians. Why do they believe that workers like mechanics, teachers, servers and cleaners have to pay tax on 100% of their income because they get it in the form of wages, but wealthy people, or people who are declaring a capital gain of over a quarter of a million dollars, have

to pay on only 66.6%? By the way, the measure that is being announced in the budget would still permit one-third of all capital gains that anybody has in this country to be tax-free, and still the Conservatives are apoplectic.

As well, there is zero evidence that the rise of the capital gains inclusion rate through the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s had any negative effect on business investments in this country, nor is there evidence that the reduction of it in the year 2000, back to 50%, had any positive influence on investments in this country. There is zero evidence, but of course my Conservative colleagues are more interested in rhetoric than facts. I think Canadians will understand this when we come to talk to them in the summer about fair taxation and why the wealthy should pay their fair share of tax in this country, just like the working people of this country have always done.

● (1820)

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member once again gave us a lot to think about. It is interesting, because we often do not hear about some of the history and what decisions different governments made. What I find interesting is that he brought up the late Right Hon. Brian Mulroney, because it definitely demonstrates really what a Progressive Conservative government is like versus what the neo-con Reform-Conservative government is like.

What I also found interesting was that Prime Minister Brian Mulroney brought forward the GST and that it was Prime Minister Stephen Harper's government that lowered it by 2%. How it tried to recoup that was by making seniors work two extra years. The same people, seniors who have built the foundation of our country and have given so much, were told by Conservatives that they were going to have to work harder, for two extra years, so the Conservatives could lower the GST for everyone, which is a consumption tax.

My question really involves what the member believes is the vision of the Conservative Party, which today is against increasing capital gains on the wealthiest 1% of Canadians, yet whose history demonstrates it had no problem increasing taxes or having some of the most vulnerable in our communities contribute more, whether they were youth or seniors. I would love to hear the member's comments on that.

● (1825)

Mr. Don Davies: Madam Speaker, there is a lot to that question. I would say to Canadians that this is not their fathers' Conservative Party, but a mean-spirited, fact-free, Donald Trump-influenced party that has reduced politics to slogans. I call it "nursery rhyme politics" or "bumper sticker politics", where Conservatives take complex, serious issues in this country and reduce them to a jingle. That is not going to work.

Government Orders

I think the Mulroney government may have had different policy ideas than my party, but it was serious about the issues of the day, which is why it increased the capital gains inclusion rate in this country. I have not heard my Conservative colleagues say a word about that. They look down at their shoes as soon as I raise the issue, because they cannot explain why their party raised the capital gains inclusion rate.

Of course, the reason it did that back then was that in the 1980s, I think all parties in the House were concerned about tax fairness because we paid attention to the Carter commission and the facts as established by a royal commission; we were not whipping up division and making up false numbers that do not make any sense. However, Canadians know the answer; most Canadians know that they are not going to be selling buildings and making capital gains over a quarter of a million dollars every year, like the Conservative colleagues' wealthy benefactors do, so we will know which party will support good tax policy in this country.

[Translation]

Mrs. Julie Vignola (Beauport—Limoilou, BQ): Madam Speaker, Quebec has a model that can also be found elsewhere in Canada, but it really is unique to Quebec. For example, a mechanic, a teacher or anyone, really, can invest in a duplex, triplex or fourplex that they will then often live in. The purpose of this investment is to cover their retirement costs. For 30 or 40 years, the person pays for the building, the investment, pays the taxes, does repairs and then, when the time comes to retire, sells it. The intention is to fund their retirement. Obviously, someone like that is not the same as an investor who flips real estate every year or someone who hides their money somewhere.

Does my colleague agree that these small investors, who would see their life's work reduced to almost nothing, should be better protected by the capital gains measures?

[English]

Mr. Don Davies: Madam Speaker, I think it is important for us to remember some basic facts. The first is that the capital gains exemption for principal residences is maintained in the budget, so Canadians can purchase their own principal residence and sell it tax-free. That remains.

I know that people are worried about how the change might affect gains on the sale of a property such as a rental property or a second home. I think something that is very important to remember is that the \$250,000 inclusion rate, which stays the same as it always was, at 50%, can be stacked. That means that if two people, a couple, own a second home or a vacation property and sell it, they can add their \$250,000 capital gains inclusion rates together to make it half a million dollars.

I will also take a moment to talk quickly about family farms. They benefit from a lifetime capital gains exemption that is going to be raised in the budget from \$1 million to \$1.25 million, plus family farms also benefit from the principal residence deduction, which is the value of their house, and 1.24 acres is also totally exempt from capital gains.

There are provisions in the budget that protect family farms, cottages and second residences; therefore I think the people my hon.

colleague is concerned about will be well taken care of with the budget.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, in my riding of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford on beautiful Vancouver Island, search and rescue and fire-fighting services are largely staffed by hard-working volunteers, members of our community who put their lives on the line to act as first responders. One measure in this bill would increase the search and rescue and volunteer firefighter tax credit from \$3,000 to \$6,000. I want to recognize my colleague, the member for Courtenay—Alberni, for his private member's bill and the efforts he has made to campaign for this. We successfully used our leverage in this House of Commons to push the Liberals to do this on behalf of volunteers.

I am wondering if my colleague can comment on this particular aspect of the bill and maybe reflect on it as yet another example of how we have used our leverage in this place to help hard-working volunteers in ridings throughout Canada.

● (1830)

Mr. Don Davies: Madam Speaker, there are a lot of issues in this budget that we do not have time to touch on, but I am very grateful he raised that one because the spirit of volunteerism in this country and the things that bind communities together, particularly in rural Canada, deserve to be recognized. This budget would do that by doubling the search and rescue and volunteer firefighter tax credit from \$3,000 to \$6,000 in recognition of the essential role and sacrifices of these volunteers in keeping Canadians safe.

I hear a lot of rhetoric from the Conservatives about public safety. They are going to vote against a budget that would put money in the hands of the people in our communities, the men and women who volunteer in their communities to help keep their neighbours safe in times of strife. That goes back to what I said at the beginning of my speech about values. The New Democrats believe that government can pool resources and use them to help make communities better in this country, to make Canadians safer, more secure and healthier and to give them greater opportunities. The Conservatives do not share that view of government. They think government needs to shrink, get out of the way and cut taxes and services. Where will that leave people in rural communities? I wonder. It will leave them less safe, less secure, less healthy and with fewer opportunities. That is not the Canada that I want for my children.

Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, to build off that, when my hon. colleague talked about values, he spoke about the disability benefit. I too am very disappointed. A lot of people in my riding were counting on the Liberals to come through on that promise and unfortunately they are not.

Government Orders

Could the member talk about the value-based system through which consecutive governments legislate poverty, what it means to ensure that people have a livable income they can rely upon and what they give back to society when that occurs?

Mr. Don Davies: Madam Speaker, I yearn for the day when we can bring in an authentic New Democrat federal budget in this country to deliver those values. We do not share the values of the other parties in this House. We believe that no Canadian should live in poverty and that positive measures and policies can realistically achieve that. For instance, my hon. colleague from Winnipeg Centre has a bill in this House for a guaranteed livable income. That is a creative idea.

Frankly, the New Democrats have been the driving force for creative ideas in this country since 1960. Health care was a system we created. Pharmacare was a system we created. Dental care is a system we created, along with guaranteed livable incomes and social welfare supports. Everybody in society should be able to get a public post-secondary education and free education in universities, colleges and trades.

These are the ideas of the New Democrats. They will share the bounty of this country and make sure that the wealth created by Canadians from coast to coast to coast is shared equally so that everybody has a fair chance to get ahead. I would like—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member's time is up.

Resuming debate, the hon. Minister of Northern Affairs, Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada and Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency.

Hon. Dan Vandal (Minister of Northern Affairs, Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada and Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a great honour to rise in this chamber to talk about Bill C-69, the budget implementation act, which is focused on strengthening the foundations for a good middle-class life, especially for young people so they do as well as or even better than their parents. This is our commitment to Canadians, and we are committed to doing it in a fiscally responsible way.

I will get into a bit about the structure of Canada's economy, the bones of our economy.

The economy in Canada is resilient, and we will deliver the strongest economic growth in the G7 next year. Despite everything we have been through, with almost four years of the pandemic and the disruptions it has caused, like supply chain disruptions and inflation, Canada will continue to lead the G7 in growth.

Our debt-to-GDP ratio is among the best within the G7, and more than 1.1 million more Canadians are employed today than before the pandemic. If we let that sink in, we realize that it is an incredible statistic. Our unemployment rate remains at record lows, and with our fiscally responsible approach to the budget, our AAA credit rating is assured.

At the same time, too many Canadians are not feeling this growth. Too many Canadians are struggling with inflation, the high cost of everything, like groceries, and the lack of housing, which they cannot afford.

• (1835)

[*Translation*]

Our growth is undoubtedly a strength, but we need to follow a responsible path to ensure that everyone benefits from this growth and that young people can get ahead and find their place in the world.

[*English*]

As I mentioned, one of our biggest challenges is the housing crisis. Most people will agree that the best way to bring home prices back down within reach is to focus on increasing supply and to do it quickly. That is exactly what we are doing. This budget would enable significantly more apartment blocks to be built across Canada. In fact, our caucus was in Winnipeg recently to announce \$120 million for the City of Winnipeg from the housing accelerator fund. We are cutting red tape to help homeowners get shovels in the ground quicker, and we are unlocking public lands for residential housing.

Budget 2024 has a long list of targeted relief to make housing more affordable. By collaborating with builders and leveraging the resources of the federal government, in partnership with provinces and municipalities, we will build close to four million new homes by 2031. We are addressing the housing crisis head-on, with solutions to build homes faster, while continuing our commitment to Canada's middle class.

Inflation has fallen dramatically over the last two years. In fact, inflation went down several weeks ago, the Bank of Canada announced. Two years ago, remember, it was 9%, and the Bank of Canada predicts that we will return to the target rate of 2% by 2025.

While the numbers on paper are positive, our government knows that affordability is still a real issue for Canadians. To lower costs for families, we have expanded our social safety net.

Our \$10-a-day child care will save Manitoba families over \$2,600 a month per child this year alone. Also, we are bringing in dental care. It will save families hundreds of dollars every year. In fact, in Manitoba alone, in 2023, 28,300 children benefited from the Canadian dental care program. The next time the Leader of the Opposition says this program is not real, that it does not do anything, we have to call him out on that. By the summer, people aged 65 and up and those under 18 will be covered by the dental plan. By 2025, nine million uninsured Canadians will be covered.

Government Orders

We also know that too many kids go hungry at school, which is a barrier to their success. Our government is launching the national school food program, which will help 400,000 more children have the food they need to succeed in school. This is how we support fairness for every generation. The Conservatives have already voted against this. They will continue to vote against this. Our government understands that we need to look ahead to the future and keep supporting families.

I want to focus on the Prairies, as minister of PrairiesCan. We know that the \$23 million of direct funding from budget 2024 to the department of PrairiesCan will support completion of the world-leading research infrastructure at the University of Saskatchewan's centre for pandemic research, the Vaccine and Infectious Disease Organization, in the great city of Saskatoon. VIDO is getting \$23 million. The result will be better preparedness to tackle the next pandemic, with expertise from Saskatchewan.

Budget 2024 will also invest \$20 million over three years to support performing arts organizations in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and it proposes another \$3 million over two years for the operations of the RCMP Heritage Centre in Regina. The Conservatives, of course, will vote against all of this, but the result will be a more vibrant cultural industry in communities all across western Canada.

The regional development agencies, including PrairiesCan, would share over \$200 million over five years to build on Canada's AI advantage. The result will be more real support to help start-ups across the Prairies to bring new technologies to market, something that will benefit key sectors like agriculture, the clean-tech economy and manufacturing.

We also have critical investments for innovative housing solutions, such as the design and upscale of modular homes, the use of 3-D printing, mass timber construction and panelized construction. The result will be more targeted funding for PrairiesCan to invest in more innovative homebuilding in communities big and small in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. This all means new possibilities.

Our government is also empowering entrepreneurs to take their space in Canada's economic success. I am particularly proud of the work PrairiesCan is doing with regard to inclusion in the small business sector, ensuring that no one is left behind as we move forward.

• (1840)

[*Translation*]

Take our Franco-Manitoban community, for example, which is a major contributor to Manitoba's prosperity. PrairiesCan is actively engaged with 15 bilingual communities in Manitoba, building strong relationships and helping them develop their economic opportunities. In Manitoba, it pays to be bilingual.

With the support of our government, PrairiesCan helps develop and implement funding programs and develops projects that have an impact on Franco-Manitobans. Part of PrairiesCan's role as an investor and facilitator is to create opportunities and provide financial support to for-profit and not-for-profit organizations facing economic challenges in Manitoba. For example, the Economic De-

velopment Council for Manitoba Bilingual Municipalities received funding to provide services that help with training, access to capital, mentoring or information services, networking and marketing advice.

Another important project is the \$1.2 million in funding that PrairiesCan is giving to the Association of Manitoba Bilingual Municipalities to strengthen the labour market in Manitoba's rural municipalities.

[*English*]

There is much for the north as well. Budget 2024 would provide \$23.2 million this year for the nutrition north subsidy program to lower the cost of healthy food and other essential items that people use every day. Food security is key in the north and the Arctic. That is why we are committing over \$100 million to support the harvesters support grant and the community food programs fund to promote indigenous communities in implementing locally led solutions to food insecurity. Nutrition north will be further expanded to include the market food component, called the community food programs fund, with an additional \$20 million per year over three years.

Based on feedback from indigenous partners, recent improvements have transformed nutrition north into a broader and more inclusive program that respects and responds to the unique food security issues of indigenous and northern communities. By the way, indigenous and northern communities co-developed the harvesters support grant, something that provides country food and traditional food to Inuit and northerners in the Arctic. We know nutrition north alone will not solve food insecurity in northern communities, but it is constantly evolving with feedback from northerners from across the region, and we are committed to making it more efficient and effective.

Another one of my priorities for the north, which is covered by budget 2024, includes measures to help clarify and reduce timelines for major projects by advancing the principle of one project, one review. It commits to engagement with partners, northern premiers and indigenous governments. The budget is about how government can do great things for the people it serves.

To me, the bottom line is that we are driving economic growth across the country, including for northerners and people living and working on the Prairies, to ensure that every generation of Canadians can reach their full potential. That is why we must pass Bill C-69 and continue the momentum.

Government Orders

• (1845)

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Madam Speaker, I know the member opposite, my colleague from Manitoba, was talking about how great the economy is. In front of me, I have a document showing data published by the International Monetary Fund in April. It is a table entitled “The U.S. Economy is Outperforming Those of Other G7 Countries.” The United States, from 2019 to 2024, is up 8%. Second is Italy, third is Japan, fourth is France, fifth is the U.K. and sixth is Germany. Madam Speaker, guess which one is dead last. Canada's GDP per capita shrank by 2%.

Where is all the economic growth the member spent the last 10 minutes talking about?

Hon. Dan Vandal: Madam Speaker, the simple facts are that there are 1,100,000 more people working in Canada now than there were before the pandemic. Our unemployment rate has been and is at record lows. That is really something that is unheard of during these times of disruption and difficulty.

Liberals know inflation is too high. I believe we have turned the corner on the rate of inflation. The Bank of Canada predicts that, within another year, or another year plus a few months, inflation will be near 2%. We will continue the growth. It is well known that our debt to GDP is the lowest in the G7. We are proud to roll out programs that help Canadians, such as dental care, pharmacare and \$10-a-day day care. They are all programs the Conservative government, and my colleague from Winnipeg, voted against.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, in his speech, my colleague referred to investments in clean energy. We know that, in Alberta and western Canada, those investments are mainly being made in carbon capture and storage strategies. However, many experts have said that these strategies are a big waste of money. What is more, a Deloitte report commissioned by the Alberta government was just published today, and it found that, if we want to meet our greenhouse gas emissions cap targets, the best solution is not to invest in carbon storage strategies, which are far too costly, but to reduce oil production.

Does my colleague not think that the investments in the budget for carbon capture and storage are just an exercise in futility and a waste of money?

Hon. Dan Vandal: Madam Speaker, that is a very important question for the future of Canada. We know that the three prairie provinces are very strong in energy development and always will be. The question is what sort of energy they will develop. Obviously, the transition to a green economy will require a lot of technology and different approaches.

What matters to us the most is ensuring that people keep their jobs in their own industry. We are going to make a transition that makes sense.

• (1850)

[English]

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague across the way talked about the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio, but that only matters if the government is including the

assets of the CPP, the Canada Pension Plan, but excluding the liabilities for future payout. When one looks at the gross debt, we are actually the 22nd worst out of 29 in the entire OECD, and we are near the bottom of the G7.

Could the member across the way commit to using the real numbers instead of the dodgy fact or the dodgy misinformation he is using today?

Hon. Dan Vandal: Madam Speaker, with all due respect, that is a bunch of baloney. The member talked about the Canada Pension Plan; let us talk about the Canada Pension Plan, old age security and the benefits they bring to Canadians. Let us talk about medicare and dental care.

Our government is investing in Canadians. If one factors in all those benefits in the economic formulas, however one wants to organize them, one will realize that Canada is the best country in the world to live in.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, I congratulate my colleague on his French, and I salute all Franco-Manitobans.

We have heard several Liberal ministers say that they are going to take action to protect French in Quebec and that they recognize that French is in decline in Quebec. However, an analysis of the public accounts reveals that 94% of official language funding programs in Quebec are used to strengthen English and are paid to anglophone institutions and lobby groups. Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed in the action plan for official languages 2023-28.

Does my colleague think that continuing to contribute to the anglicization of Quebec will strengthen French outside Quebec?

Hon. Dan Vandal: Madam Speaker, Canada is undeniably a bilingual country. I am proud to represent francophone and Franco-Métis communities in Saint-Boniface and Saint-Vital.

That said, it is hard to make sure that the French language progresses in Manitoba. We need schools and early childhood education. We need more investments to ensure that the francophone community can continue to grow and contribute to our society.

I am not very familiar with the reality in Quebec, but I do know that the French language is under threat across Canada and that we need to make a concerted effort to expand the francophone space.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wonder if my colleague could provide his thoughts on an important issue. The Prime Minister came to Winnipeg on three different occasions. He came to visit a north end school; we talked about the national nutritional food program for children. We had the Prime Minister come and work on the issue of housing in the Transcona area. We also had the Prime Minister come to talk at the Grace Hospital about the investment in generations of health care.

Could the member just provide his thoughts in terms of how the different levels of government came together, working in co-operation, to deal with those types of issues?

Hon. Dan Vandal: Madam Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North is absolutely right. The Prime Minister has been to Winnipeg several times over the last few months to make incredible announcements about investments in Canadians, such as a new health care agreement with the Province of Manitoba, as well as investments in nurses, doctors and the many hospitals that serve Manitobans and Winnipeggers. Fortunately, we have a provincial government in Manitoba that was at the table, that was not fighting us. It was contributing its own dollars to keep Winnipeggers and Manitobans healthy. The school food program is an incredibly positive program that was launched, at least in Manitoba, in Winnipeg, in a school with hundreds of kids who were energetic and enjoyed the nourishment.

We know that Canadians are feeling the struggle. Inflation is affecting Canadians. That is why we are investing in Canadians on so many fronts. For the life of me, I do not understand why the other side, the Conservative opposition, continues to vote against everything we are doing.

• (1855)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, to start, I will mention that I am sharing my time with my colleague from Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

I am pleased to rise to talk to budget 2024, which the government has labelled “Fairness for Every Generation”. We can quite easily say the government is inflicting its Liberal version of fairness on every generation. I am sure Liberals are sitting there on the other side saying, “Why let just boomers suffer through high rent, high food inflation and high crime?” Under the Liberals, the idea is to be fair and make gen X and millennials suffer as well.

Churchill commented, “The inherent vice of capitalism is the unequal sharing of blessings. The inherent virtue of socialism is the equal sharing of miseries.” That is what Canadians are suffering under the Liberal government: the equal sharing of miseries.

Now, I want to look at some of the sharing of miseries under the Liberal-NDP government. We will start with rent. We have a crisis across the country of skyrocketing rent. Rentals.ca reported, “Average asking rents for all residential property types in Canada hit an all-time high of \$2,202 in May, surpassing the \$2,200 level for the first time.”

That is up 9% from last year. In 2015, when the Liberal government took over, the average rent in Canada was \$966. That is a

128% increase in rent. I do not think any Canadians have been receiving a 128% increase in their family income since 2015. Now, even adjusting for the out-of-control Liberal inflation, that is still 28% higher than the inflation-adjusted total compared with 2015.

I want to talk about a couple of examples across the country: In Burnaby, B.C., the average is \$2,500, up 8%. In North York, it is \$2,300, up 4%; that is the average rent for a one bedroom, by the way. In Ottawa, it is \$1,884 for a one bedroom, up 7%; and in Kingston, it is \$1,800, up 8.4% from last year for a one bedroom.

Now, luckily for the people in the prairie provinces, those provinces had been spared the high rent increases. However, this is the case no more, thanks to the Liberal government.

In Calgary, a one bedroom is up 6% from last year; Winnipeg is up 9%. Edmonton, my own hometown, is up 16% from last year; Regina is up 16.7% from last year. Saskatoon is up 13% from last year for a one bedroom. Finally, Fort McMurray is up 13%.

That is the reality and the so-called fairness under the Liberal government. Fairness of access to misery is basically what the government has delivered. Mortgage payments have doubled since the government took over. Housing prices have doubled.

I want to read a quote from Bloomberg, the business magazine: “Canada [is] likely sitting on the largest housing bubble of all time”. It is not the largest housing bubble in Canadian history, but of all time. The article argues that “inflated home prices in Canada are a result of...easy money supplied under the [government's] monetary policy.... At the present moment, [there is] risk in mortgage rates climbing”, which we are seeing, “as Canadian bond yields are dragged up, particularly at a time when debt-to-income ratios are sky high.” Canadians, as we are aware, probably have the highest consumer debt-to-income ratio in the world.

The article goes on to say, “The worst part for a housing bubble is when you have [a] credit bubble underneath it”. Again, we have such a high debt-to-income ratio right now. It continues, “The amount of Canadian leverage into the system versus incomes is pretty astronomical — and we’ve seen debt servicing going up dramatically.”

In addition, “There is definitely a risk here that if mortgage rates go higher or unemployment were to rise or we hit the next recession, then this thing does end up in a deleveraging cycle.”

Government Orders

What does the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation have to say on this topic? It says that, this year and next, 2.2 million mortgages, worth over \$675 billion, will be facing interest rate shock as they come due for renewal. That 2.2 million households is 45% of all households in Canada, and they have mortgage rates coming up for renewal shortly.

• (1900)

CMHC continues, “Most of these borrowers contracted their...mortgages at record-low interest rates and, most likely, at or near the peak of housing prices”. In this country, 45% of mortgages are probably at about the 1.5% to 2% mark, and they are going to have to renew at 5% or 6%. Mortgage “shock”, as CMHC calls it, is hopefully not leading up to what Bloomberg is forecasting, which is a collapse in the housing bubble.

If we remember back to July 2020, the Governor of the Bank of Canada said, “Our message to Canadians is that interest rates are very low and they're going to be there for a long time”. He then said, “If you've got a mortgage or if you're considering making a major purchase, or you're a business or you're considering making an investment, you can be confident rates will be low for a long time.” Maybe Webster's dictionary needs to update its definition of a “long time” to say that it is less than four years.

Of course, we all remember the Prime Minister trotting out in front of his cottage for an interview. When asked about the risks of this massive borrowing and perhaps rising costs to service it, he said, of course condescendingly, “Interest rates are at historic lows, Glen.” Guess what? They are not at historic lows.

If one wishes to have an example of how out of control things are, how fast things can change and how poor the government is at planning and how it hurts Canadians, the supplementary (A)s, which we debated just recently, showed an added \$1.9 billion of needed taxpayers' dollars to pay for interest on the debt. This is \$1.9 billion more than the calculations the government did just in February when it was doing the main estimates.

The main estimates are of course the cash authorizations required for the entire year. That was done in February. Between February and May, when the supplementary (A)s came out, interest rates were up, resulting in needing \$1.9 billion more than the government thought it would have to ask for in February.

We often hear the government talk about the pharmacare plan. Of the 9,000 different available drugs in Canada, it would only cover birth control and diabetes medication. That plan is \$1.9 billion for five years. If we think about that, just the government's mistake in February on what interest would cost Canadians on the national debt was off equal to the value of its so-called pharmacare plan for five years.

On taxes, in this budget there is \$498 billion projected to be raised in taxes. That is up \$166 billion from 2019, which the government is taking from Canadian taxpayers. That is \$216 billion more in taxpayers' money being taken by the government since 2015, or 76%. That is up \$50 billion from just two years ago, yet somehow we have the government telling doctors, small businesses and farmers that they need to cough up a little more, less Canada slips into some dystopian hell. Again, it is \$216 billion more than

when the government took over. That is 76%, yet if we do not get a bit more, Canada will fall into dystopian hell.

The Deputy Prime Minister said, “What kind of Canada do you want to live in [without this extra few billion dollars]? Do you want to live in a country where a teenage girl gets pregnant just because she doesn't have the money to buy birth control?” Apparently, over the last nine years they did have money to buy birth control, but somehow, after \$216 billion more in tax hikes against Canadians, now teenage girls are facing this.

Interest on the debt is \$291 billion for the next five years. That is equal to an entire tax haul when the Liberals came to power. If one thinks about that, just the interest for five years will be equal to our entire tax haul in the year 2015.

I will end with another quote from Churchill: “Socialism is the philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy.” I think we can very easily substitute the word “socialism” with “Liberal government” when we look at this budget.

• (1905)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my question is on the capital gains tax. I am wondering if my colleague from across the way could explain to Canadians why, when the Liberal government makes the decision to have a fairer sense of taxation, the Conservative-Reform party say no, it is a bad idea, yet Brian Mulroney, the former Progressive Conservative prime minister, not only raised it but raised it to a higher level than we are raising it. If the Conservative Party today is arguing that it is going to cause so many problems, what does it think happened when Brian Mulroney, the then Progressive Conservative prime minister, raised it? There seems to be a double standard, and maybe there is not a double standard. Maybe it is because it is really and truly a Conservative-Reform party being given direction from the far right.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Madam Speaker, my colleague for Winnipeg North has, as usual, a nonsensical question. I was disappointed last week when we were debating the estimates that I was not able to take a question from him.

However, now he is talking about something that happened 40 years ago. I suggest that he perhaps get into his probably government-subsidized DeLorean to go back to the future to today's date.

The member talks about the capital gains tax. This government has increased taxes on Canadians by over \$200 billion per year since it took over, yet somehow that \$200 billion will not pay for this added little bit it is calling for. It is ridiculous to think that somehow, after raising taxes by \$200 billion, now the real secret to success would be to get an extra couple billion from the capital gains. It is clearly not needed if the Liberals were able to raise taxes \$200 billion just since they came to power.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Madam Speaker, in the Harper days, there was a recession in 2008, but \$150 billion was put into the economy, and the budget was balanced in seven years. The Liberal government has had nine years.

I wonder if the member could elaborate on the fiscal failure of the doubling of the debt and the tripling of the carbon tax, as well as what the carbon tax has done to initiate the cost of inflation that Canadians are seeing in their rents, mortgages and grocery bills today.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Madam Speaker, that is a valid question.

Something that we do not often talk about in the House is how the government has increased the tax load on Canadians so much, with a 76% increase since 2015, which is 76% more taxes being taken in by the government, yet somehow the Liberals still missed balancing the budget by \$50 billion last year. The money is coming in, and it is amazing that the money is going out at a faster rate. However, all we have from the government is failures to serve Canadians, failures to get passports done, failures to provide to the military, failures to provide housing and failures to work on the inflation front. The government is clearly a failure, which is why I will not be supporting this budget.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have appreciated the member's work on the mighty OGO committee and his chairing of that esteemed committee.

My question is about housing, and the member did run through some of the really startling increases in rent across the country, but the communities I represent are rural communities. I read his party's proposed housing legislation with interest, and I found that it was silent on the needs of rural communities when it comes to getting housing built. A lot of the strategies in there do not speak to communities of 10,000 people or 5,000 people.

I wonder what the Conservatives have to offer when it comes to building housing in rural communities where the problem is not the municipality, and it is not density near transit stops. The need is core infrastructure funding from the federal government.

• (1910)

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Madam Speaker, probably the best thing this country can do for all housing, or all homeowners and those seeking housing, would be to get inflation down so that we can bring interest rates down to make housing more affordable.

I would suggest that the member vote with this party, the opposition, to get rid of the Liberals so that we can actually attack inflation, get spending down and, therefore, get interest rates and mortgage rates down.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the

Government Orders

health-conscious constituents in the riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

For anyone tuning in tonight, one may be wondering why we are talking about health products, even though the bottom of one's screen says this is a debate on Bill C-69, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget.

The short answer is that the Prime Minister broke his promise to end the use of omnibus bills. Like a living, breathing “hold my beer” meme, these Liberals clearly thought the last government was not omnibusing hard enough. This bill is so obese, it is even cornering the market in Ozempic.

Ironically, this budget implementation bill would give the Minister of Health, and of anti-tourism, brand new powers to make Ozempic illegal for weight loss for everyone else. Since the Liberals started bragging about taking away people's drug plans and forcing everyone into a one-size-fits-all, Ottawa-knows-best, Soviet-style drug plan, I have had one question.

When Canada finds itself in the next drug shortage, how will the Liberals decide who lives and who dies? Not a single member from the socialist coalition has been willing to address the question, but the budget implementation bill's division 31 provides a sinister answer. The government will do whatever it wants.

Here is what the weighty omnibus bill says:

the Governor in Council may make any regulations that the Governor in Council considers necessary for the purpose of preventing shortages of therapeutic products or foods for a special dietary purpose in Canada or alleviating those shortages or their effects, in order to protect human health.

If one takes the word of the officials from Health Canada, all they are seeking is the power to import baby formula without bilingual labelling. If that were true, if the government's real intent was for a temporary emergency measure, the amendment would have been limited in scope and time. Instead, the government went with the kind of language, which maximizes power and minimizes oversight.

Here is the language the government originally sought for the therapeutic products:

if the Minister believes that the use of a therapeutic product, other than the intended use, may present a risk of injury to health, the Minister may, by order, establish rules in respect of the importation, sale, conditions of sale, advertising, manufacture, preparation, preservation, packaging, labelling, storage or testing of the therapeutic product for the purpose of preventing, managing or controlling the risk of injury to health.

Government Orders

Credit goes to the members of the finance committee for adding an amendment to insert the words “on reasonable grounds” into that section, but it does not matter.

The bill also says, “The Minister may make the order despite any uncertainty respecting the risk of injury to health that the use of the therapeutic product, other than the intended use, may present.”

That is quite a power grab. The NDP-Liberal government is literally saying that it does not need evidence to support its radical policy. In fact, the Liberals are saying that any evidence that contradicts their policy can be ignored. This is not the Liberal government gagging scientists. This is the Liberal government gagging science, handcuffing science, taking science out back and executing it gangland-style.

If we take the word of the bureaucrats from Health Canada, the minister needs these extraordinary powers to prevent teenagers from consuming nicotine pods. If that were true, if this were only about preventing nicotine addiction amongst youth, what explains the very next section? It reads, “An order made under subsection 30.01(1) or 30.02(1) that applies to only one person is not a statutory instrument within the meaning of the Statutory Instruments Act.”

The “minister of unhealthy road trips” will have the power to pass a regulation to prevent a single person from promoting a health product, and not just promoting. The minister could regulate a single person with respect to “importation, sale, conditions of sale, advertising, manufacture, preparation, preservation, packaging, labelling, storage or testing” of the drug.

Even more concerning is that these regulations targeting a single individual would not be considered regulations under the Statutory Instruments Act. Between this section and the section on uncertainty, the government has essentially neutralized the rights of Canadians to appeal these regulations to the federal court. This is an unprecedented power grab by the technocrats at Health Canada.

• (1915)

Given the arrogance on regular display by the car-phobic Minister of Health, it would not take much to convince me that he is the one seeking the radical, non-reviewable powers. Whether his lust for power is rooted in the repeated childhood traumas of station wagon vacations with his parents is not for me to say, but if this language were included in a Conservative bill, the minister would be among the first to accuse us of having a hidden agenda.

With just the flick of a wrist, the current Minister of Health or the next one could ban any drug based on some vague concern about health. As a parliamentarian, I oppose giving any government, Liberal or Conservative, that level of unchecked power. Health Canada's technocrats will claim that this is the same as the regulations limiting alcohol and tobacco advertisements. It is not. This law would give the Minister of Health the power to shut down a single podcaster or TikToker who advertises health products. It could shut down an Instagram influencer who talks about Chinese herbal remedies.

The government has not gone so far as to give itself the power to issue secret orders. Instead, it just gave itself the power to issue an order against a single person, not disclose the person's identity, not

disclose the actual health risk and not have to publish it in the Gazette. Health Canada could destroy a person's livelihood by publishing a single sentence in an obscure web page buried deep in some government website. If anyone doubts that the socialist coalition is capable of that, let us remember that these amendments to the Food and Drugs Act are buried deep in the budget implementation bill.

The changes were not even given a mention in the budget. Instead, the government promised it would spend \$3.2 million to update Health Canada's supply management capacity over the next three years. It takes a special kind of Liberal arrogance to believe the government can manage a supply of drugs for over 40 million people. The Liberals cannot manage passports. They cannot manage to recruit anyone into the military. They cannot manage an app for collecting travellers' information. They cannot manage the graft at Sustainable Development Technology Canada. They cannot manage the self-dealing within the local journalism initiative. The Prime Minister cannot even manage a cabinet. As a former Liberal cabinet minister said last week, the government has been drinking from a fountain of “socialist bafflegab”.

The technocrats who have been advising the finance minister believe Canadians would be happier if Canadians were taxed at over 50%. The only thing socialists can manage are breadlines. With the median age around 40, that means nearly half of Canadians were born after the collapse of the last socialist empire. They do not know about breadlines. They do not know that Soviet-style socialist drug plans mean Canadians would have to line up for life-saving medicines. The well connected and the wealthy could pay people in line to wait for them. The poor and the marginalized would have to take a day or two off work and wait in line at the government pharmacy.

Just as in the Soviet Union, when reality fails to conform to Communist ideology, the government will ratchet up repression. If rebellious reporters speak up about the drug shortages, the government can accuse them of putting the health of Canadians at risk and issue an order silencing them. The reporters could take the minister to court, but when the judge asks the government lawyers how certain they are that the censorship will protect public health, the government can reply, “Not certain at all, Your Honour”, and the judge will have no choice but to rule in the government's favour.

If members think this sounds unconstitutional, they would be right, but it would not matter. The Liberals would use their favourite notwithstanding clause, called section 1. We saw it time and time again during the pandemic. Governments issued unconstitutional orders, citizens took the government to court and judges ruled that they were not health experts and would defer to the government's experts.

With the precedent set, the technocrats at Health Canada saw it as a green light to seek more power. The Department of Health already has the power to ban a drug, recall it or place any number of conditions on its sale. It already has that power, but it was not enough. Like our Prime Minister, who admires the Communists who control China, the technocrats want the kind of power that only Communism can grant them.

• (1920)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, there is no tin hat over there.

My question for the member is in regard to misinformation. I am very interested in her thoughts on it. The far right, in particular the leader of the Conservative-Reform party, is very good at disinformation through social media on issues such as cutting the carbon tax and missing out on rebates. It is misleading Canadians and feeding into the extreme right.

I wonder if the member could provide her thoughts on that. Does she think her leader is doing a good job by representing the extreme right?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. Before I give the floor to the hon. member, I just want to remind members that if they want to contribute to the discussion, they should wait until the appropriate time.

The hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, maybe you can grant me more time for questions and answers so that everyone can ask a question.

As far as the member opposite goes, my greatest fan in the chamber, the Liberals have gone so far left, together with the other radically left parties, that anything in the centre seems far right to them.

As for our effective leader, I believe all Canadians are served well by him. He is interested in them, and he will do a good job for Canada in controlling spending, bringing down debt and making Canada the kind of country everyone is proud to live in and can prosper in.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech. I have the pleasure of serving with her on the Standing Committee on National Defence.

She began her speech by talking about the fact that we are having to debate an omnibus bill. By definition, an omnibus bill contains anything and everything. This one includes 23 tax measures and 44 non-tax measures.

Government Orders

We are going to vote against it because some of it is completely unacceptable. However, we can still see our way clear to agree that some other measures are acceptable and even good. One example is having the Canada child benefit continue for six months after a child's death.

I would simply like to hear her speak to any measure in the bill she considers worthwhile, or to know whether she thinks Bill C-69 is a total write-off.

[*English*]

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, the member mentioned that we sit on the defence committee together. Tomorrow, the Secretary General of NATO, who has served us well for a decade, will be coming to visit. What is truly an embarrassment for all of Canada is that we are not doing what we should to protect North America. The budget is devoid of funding for the protection of our nation. The Prime Minister has no pride or concern over the security of those living in Canada, cutting a billion dollars out of the budget of the military.

People across the ocean in Ukraine are fighting the fight that we might get drawn into. One witness even said that we are at war, so it is only a matter of time. We need to control spending for a day when we really need it. We should put more money into giving equipment to the women and men who serve us in the Canadian military.

• (1925)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I always like to hear from my comrade from Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke. That being said, she railed against the NDP's dental care program. It is important to note that 200,000 seniors have had dental care so far, including hundreds in Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke. In fact, as we speak, in Pembroke, dentists are advertising the NDP's dental care program. The reality is that many people in her riding are benefiting from the NDP's work.

Could my comrade and colleague please tell us why she is opposing a dental care program that her constituents—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke can give a brief answer.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, I am not a comrade yet.

I know the dental community in Renfrew, Nipissing and especially Pembroke well, and I can tell members that I get nothing but complaints across the valley about this so-called dental program. The Liberals did not plan anything. It is not a plan. They just threw money out there and signed people up. There is not a single dentist in Pembroke signing up to this Soviet-style dental plan, and not 200 people have received service. If the member can show us otherwise, I would be pleased to speak to it further.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Government Orders

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. If members want to contribute, want to try to answer or want to make comments, they need to wait until the appropriate time.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek.

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to rise today and speak to the budget implementation act, even though we are in the eleventh hour of this session. I am looking forward to the House rising at the end of this week for the summer recess.

It has been nine years of the costly Prime Minister, and each successive budget creates a bleaker outlook for Canadians' futures. The guise of fiscal restraint has been cast away, and the Prime Minister and his finance minister have put the pedal to the metal. They have decided to spend Canadians' money at an alarming rate, with no plan to balance the budget, to pay off the debt or to even rein in deficits to a modest level. They are literally going for broke. They believe they can tax their way out of the problems that their out-of-control spending has created. While inflation has reached record levels, the government continues to pour fuel on the inflationary fire with tens of billions of dollars in new spending.

I will be splitting my time with my colleague, the member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

In fact, Tiff Macklem, the Governor of the Bank of Canada, stated that the Prime Minister's \$61 billion in new spending was “not helpful” in bringing down inflation. It costs the average Canadian family an extra \$3,867, but the Prime Minister refuses to learn from his mistakes and continues to double down on his failed policies, which means more inflationary deficits driving up inflation and interest rates, doubling our national debt and, thus, endangering our social programs and jobs across the country.

More to the point, doubling the national debt means that the federal government will now be spending more on interest on its debt than it will send to the provinces for health care. There will be \$54.1 billion spent on servicing our national debt, half of which the Prime Minister is responsible for. The high-spending addiction of the government has endangered Canadians' livelihoods. It has led to a record high of two million visits to food banks in a single month, and now we have a report from Food Banks Canada that one in four Canadians is living in poverty.

After nine years of the Prime Minister's disastrous policies, 25% of Canadians are living in poverty. Every party in the House had the chance to vote on giving Canadians a break and to help them keep more of their money in their pockets when Conservatives proposed giving Canadians a break from the carbon tax for the summer. Instead of giving Canadians the relief they are looking for from the oppressive Liberal carbon tax regime just for the summer, Liberals have doubled down and have introduced a new capital gains tax increase.

Despite Canadians struggling paycheque to paycheque, the Liberals have decided to endanger their retirements, which have taken decades of prudent planning, saving and investing to build. According to the government, it is unfair for a plumber to sell their business they built over decades to fund their retirement. It is unfair for

an electrician to sell the company they built to fund their retirement. It is unfair for a doctor to sell their shares in their practice to fund their retirement. It is unfair for the Liberals to take more of Canadians' hard-earned, self-made retirement funds so that they can continue to indulge in spending billions of dollars on their failed policies, yet the Prime Minister continues to squeeze Canadians for every last dollar with tax increases, while showing no signs of fiscal restraint.

If the Prime Minister is worried about the richest in Canada, he should look in the mirror. While life has gotten worse for Canadians, the Prime Minister and his friends have never had it so good, with tens of billions of dollars going out the door each year to his high-priced consultants. Hundreds of millions of dollars in favourable contracts went to his friends at McKinsey, which was led by the Prime Minister's close friend, Dominic Barton. There was \$222 million given to Rio Tinto just months after Dominic Barton became the chairman. The billion-dollar green slush fund funnels hundreds of millions of dollars to Liberal insiders with no oversight. Canadians suffer and Liberal insiders prosper.

● (1930)

After nine years of the Prime Minister, Canada is on track for its worst decline in living standards in 40 years, with more than nine in 10 middle-class families paying more in income taxes. Struggling families cannot afford the Prime Minister's higher taxes and out-of-control spending, which is driving up the cost of everything. The Liberal government has doubled rent, mortgage payments and down payments, and the number of tent cities is growing across this country. It is no wonder that Canadians are fed up with the NDP-Liberal coalition.

The Prime Minister is trying to trick Canadians into believing that he will fix what he broke by doubling down on his failed policies, issues that were created by nine years of methodically disastrous policies and that have made life more expensive for Canadians. They are policies that have stolen the dream of home ownership from young Canadians, policies that have forced Canadians to live paycheque to paycheque and policies that have endangered Canadians through a steep increase in violent crime.

Now that these policies have caused crises in housing, immigration, crime, inflation and other areas, the government feigns interest in fairness. It is not fair to Canadians to jeopardize their retirements with a punitive capital gains tax increase. It is not fair to double housing prices and rent. It is not fair to drive up inflation, drastically increasing the prices of everyday necessities, including basic food items. It is not fair to push 25% of Canadians into poverty and to force millions to visit food banks in a single month. The government does not care about fairness. It cares about spending as many taxpayer dollars as it can in its short-time left in government and setting the Liberal government members and their insider friends up for comfortable retirements.

In conclusion, it will come as no surprise that I cannot support this budget implementation act. It is more of the same failed policies from the NDP-Liberal coalition, which refuses to acknowledge its failures. If any member in this place truly believes in fairness, they cannot vote in favour of this bill. No member can look around Canada today, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal coalition, and truly believe that the government has served Canadians well.

It borders on the absurd that Liberal members can stand in this place, claim that this budget, which is more of the same policies that got us into this current mess, will somehow now get us out of it. The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. Unfortunately, Canadians are the ones paying the price for this madness. I will repeat what I said when speaking to the budget. Canadians are losing hope. They are hanging on by a thread, and this bill will be the scissors that severs it.

This bill should not be passed. Canadians are depending on all opposition members to stop the government's harmful policies and its out-of-control spending, and vote non-confidence.

• (1935)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, allow me to pick up on the issue of caring. If the member opposite and members of the Conservative Party truly cared, they should do some self-reflection in terms of why they do not believe that fixed-income seniors who do not have a dental plan should not be allowed to have access to dental services and be supported by the Government of Canada. Even Pembroke has dental services, I think a half-dozen or more, being made available to their constituents.

I would ask the member this: Why will Conservative after Conservative-Reform member across the way, all those reformers and former Alliance members, not support fixed-income seniors in getting dental care in the ridings they represent? Is it that they do not care?

Mrs. Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the question because, at the end of the day, Conservatives have a simple plan, and I know that the member could probably repeat it verbatim: We will axe the tax. We will build the homes. We will fix the budget and stop the crime.

The government has a housing accelerator fund that is not building houses. It has a school lunch program that is not serving lunches. It has a national dental program with a handful of dentists who

Government Orders

have signed up. We are going to cut the waste and mismanagement of the government, and we are going to restore common sense for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Caroline Desbiens (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her faith.

I would like to bring her back to familiar territory: common sense. Back home, growing up, my father often talked to us about common sense. Common sense relates to a set of elements that everyone, or almost everyone, agrees on.

Is my colleague's party seeking unanimity? After all, there is a part of the population that is worried about climate change and the astronomical contribution of billions of dollars in taxpayer money that is invested in oil companies that are already worth many billions of dollars since they make a lot of money.

Since my colleague is for common sense, I would like to know if her potential government will stop investing in oil companies that already have billions of dollars. I would also like to know if she is going to increase health transfers to the provinces so that they can use them how they want and breathe a bit of life back into their health care networks.

[*English*]

Mrs. Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, one thing Canadians can count on is that Conservatives are the party of common sense. We are consistent in our approach when it comes to reducing taxes. We are consistent when it comes to making life more prosperous for Canadians. We are consistent when it comes to how we vote in this place, which is something that member should actually talk to her leadership about.

• (1940)

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek for those comments. I enjoy sitting on committee with her.

I was thinking back to another minority Parliament that saw a tremendous amount of progress when it comes to iconic policies that are now an integral part of the fabric of our country. They are things like the Canada pension plan, Canada student loans, the 40-hour work week and two weeks of vacation time, and a new minimum wage. Many of these things were put in place despite the opposition from the Conservative Party.

Is the member not worried that she is on the wrong side of history when she rails against things like a national dental care plan and universal pharmacare for people who need prescription medication? Is it not clear that these things will make our country stronger?

Government Orders

Mrs. Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, the member is right. We do serve on the government operations and estimates committee together, and one thing we have been dealing with is the absolute out-of-control spending of the current Liberal government when it comes to outside consultants, and when it comes to lining the pockets of Liberal insiders and their friends.

What I would put back to the member is this question: When is he finally going to start standing up for Canadians and be an opposition member who is looking out for their interests?

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have been around this place long enough to see a clear pattern of what a Liberal budget is, as well as the Liberals' omnibus budget implementation acts, which, of course, they promised not to use.

One might ask what exactly is the pattern of a Liberal budget. We have to go back to 2015 for a moment. What happened in 2015 is that the Prime Minister promised three years of so-called "modest" deficit spending budgets before he made a cast-in-stone promise to return to a balanced budget in 2019. One might ask what happened to that promise. In every one of those three years, the Prime Minister spent considerably more than he promised he would.

In 2019, he did not even attempt to honour his so-called cast-in-stone promise to return Canada to a balanced budget. In other words, the Liberal Prime Minister did not even try to do what he promised he would. Why even make the promise at all to return to a balanced budget if he had zero intention of doing so? It is because, of course, making promises on things he has no intention of ever honouring is basically a hallmark character trait of the Prime Minister.

Where are we today with this latest Liberal 2024 budget? We are now at a total spending of \$535 billion for the 2024-25 fiscal year. Let us pause for a moment to recap.

The 2022 so-called "return to fiscal responsibility" budget was \$434 billion. Here we are in the 2024 budget, and the proposed spending is up to \$535 billion. This means that this latest Liberal budget proposes to spend \$100 billion more than what the Liberals themselves labelled as a "return to fiscal responsibility" budget just a short time ago. Let us not forget that before the pandemic began in 2019-20, the Liberals were spending around \$338 billion. We went from \$338 billion to now \$535 billion. That is an increase of almost \$200 billion in annual spending. Let us not kid ourselves. Everyone knows the Liberals will spend more than the \$535 billion they are proposing, more so given that next year is an election year.

Now we can all see the pattern to Liberal budgets that I mentioned earlier. Every year we are told what will happen, but it never actually comes to pass. The forecasts, the promises, everything the Liberals promise ends up being completely false. They do not even try to live within the fiscal limits they propose for themselves. Most offensive of all is that the Prime Minister's Office has the audacity to label this budget as the "fairness for every generation" budget. I am literally aghast by this.

The 2024 "fairness for every generation" budget proposes a \$40-billion deficit for this fiscal year alone. We know that this is not the

case. The finance department has said that the government is billions over that particular projection already. This is noteworthy because the Liberals' previous debt forecasts were at \$35 billion for 2024-25 and \$26.8 billion for 2025-26. That is a big difference we see between \$40 billion and the \$27 billion or so they had previously said for 2025.

We all know that the cost of servicing the national debt has exceeded the federal spending on health care. This is what the Liberals call fairness for everyone. It is not unlike the capital gains increase. The Liberals will tell us that this tax impacts only Canada's most wealthy, yet we have heard from many everyday Canadians who, through a divorce, a health crisis, retirement or otherwise, are in a one-time situation where they might be looking at paying a once-in-a-lifetime capital gains tax. These are doctors, small business owners, people in the trades. Larry the plumber from Winnipeg was brought up today, who is working hard. None of these people are so-called ultrawealthy, but they will all be hit hard by this latest Liberal tax grab. The Liberals know that these people exist and also know that the Liberal tax grab will hit them hard. However, they would still look them in the eye and say that only the ultrawealthy would be impacted by this.

I do not know if anyone on the Liberal or NDP side of the House realizes how angry people become when they believe they are being deceived and misled by their own government. Make no mistake: They are not happy with the Prime Minister. He needs that extra tax grab for fairness, he says. Let us talk about fairness for a moment.

There is now an entire generation of young Canadians who are left out despite all the Liberal spending. Literally, this problem is so bad that even the Prime Minister himself openly admits that young people now feel like they cannot get ahead in the same way their parents or grandparents could. However, it is much worse than that. The Prime Minister is leaving future generations of Canadians with record levels of debt and no plan whatsoever to return to a balanced budget, ever. The Prime Minister has failed in every single budget to do what he promised he would do in the budget the year previous. He just spends more, and we go further into debt. That is not fairness.

Government Orders

• (1945)

Before I close, I would like to share something with this place. We, of course, spend a portion of our time in this place debating budgets and budget implementation acts. A sitting government hopes to table a budget that resonates with Canadians. As all experienced parliamentarians will know, some budgets resonate more than others, and some, very little at all. This particular budget has not been like most. I do not recall at any time so many different citizens coming forward in opposition to a budget as they are for this budget, and by extension the budget implementation act. I make a point of reading every email, returning every phone call and scheduling as many meeting requests as I can. I can tell every member of this place that this particular budget is not impacting many Canadians the way the Liberal government would have us believe. The Liberals may call this a “fairness for every generation” budget, but many I hear from see this budget as being anything but fair to them.

I am not one to follow polls, so it does not surprise me at all that so many different polls show this budget, like the Liberal government, as falling down so badly. I would submit that this is without a doubt an unfair budget for many Canadians. I will be joining with those Canadians who now say “enough is enough” in rejecting the Prime Minister, his desperation budgets and this flawed budget implementation act.

I have one final point before I conclude my comments this evening. Earlier today, I read a report from the National Post, and the headline said it all: “Airplane food cost more than \$220K on [the Prime Minister]’s Indo-Pacific trip: Meals included beef brisket with mashed parsley potatoes with truffle oil, braised lamb shanks and baked cheesecake with pistachio brittle”.

When the Prime Minister and his finance minister lecture others about fairness and needing people to do a little more, why is it that the Prime Minister never does his part? The reason is that the Prime Minister is always above these rules. Why does the Prime Minister consistently make demands upon others that he himself fails to follow? Canadians are tired of this. In my riding, as I am sure in many other members’ in this place, people want an election and they do not want this budget or this budget implementation act. That is why I will be opposing it.

I would like to thank all members of this place for taking the time to hear my comments today.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member made reference to aircraft and expenses. I was in opposition when Stephen Harper flew to India and then made the decision to fly his car to India at a cost of \$1 million for the taxpayer. At the end of the day, we value all tax dollars. We also value the services that tax dollars can provide. There is the difference between Conservatives and Liberals: Liberals care; Conservative-Reformers cut.

My question to the member is related to the cuts. We talk about disability benefits. We talk about pharmacare. We can talk about dental care. These are the types of programs that this government is getting behind, providing literally hundreds, if not thousands, of his constituents supports. Why has the Reform Party of Canada, or the

Conservative Party, as they are the same thing, made the determination that they are going to cut those services?

• (1950)

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, I will let Canadians judge the content and the conduct of that member. He cannot even get the parties’ correct names in this room, so I do not know if they will trust him with details. When it comes to a prime minister’s security detail, it is the RCMP that makes the decision on what security is appropriate. I believe that it is important for a prime minister to remain safe and secure, particularly when we are doing international travel, so I will leave the RCMP to manage those concerns, but what is 100% under the conduct of the Prime Minister is his penchant for expensive hotels and for the \$220,000 on meals and alcohol. That is what I am contesting here, not the security detail.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague began his speech—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): We cannot hear what the hon. member is saying because there are people who are participating in the debate when they should not be. I hope that people will follow the rules of the House and refrain from talking when someone else has the floor.

The hon. member for Saint-Jean.

Ms. Christine Normandin: Madam Speaker, my colleague began his speech by talking about the importance of balancing the budget and cutting the government’s unnecessary spending.

Bill C-69 includes a nice oil subsidy for so-called green hydrogen. It is a tax credit of 15% to 40%. Last year, the federal deficit was about \$40 billion. The subsidies and tax credits for oil companies totalled about \$30 billion. We could reduce the federal deficit by 75% in one fell swoop.

Is that not something interesting for my colleague to think about?

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, it is important to know whether the Bloc Québécois plans to vote for or against the government and the bill. The Bloc Québécois member has a choice. She must decide whether the budget and the Prime Minister are acceptable and balanced for Canadians.

It is important to note that the Conservative Party is voting against the government. We do not trust the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance. I will never support the bill we are currently discussing.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I like my colleague, but he said that he has never seen a budget with such a negative response. I remember the terrible, horrible, no-good, very bad Harper budget of 2012, and my colleague should too. It gutted veteran services, gutted health care, forced seniors to work years longer in their lives and gave tens of billions of dollars in handouts to banks, billionaires, and oil and gas CEOs. Conservative financial management is an oxymoron.

I like my colleague a lot, but how could he possibly not apologize for that extraordinarily bad budget and the terrible financial management of the Harper years?

• (1955)

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, I am happy the member from the NDP raised the subject of choices and what is worthy of support. I spoke to a constituent who could not believe that the NDP supported the budget implementation act last year, because it made big changes to natural health products and their regulations. They cannot understand why the NDP would support the Minister of Health to put in place a regime that is going to see less consumer choice and more expensive natural health products.

I would love for the member to start looking through the budget implementation act as he probably did with Mr. Harper's budget. I would also like to see the NDP start standing up to the Prime Minister and the government's terrible bills.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on the motion.

[English]

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.

Mr. Alex Ruff: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, June 19, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

ELECTORAL PARTICIPATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-65, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Mr. Vance Badawey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to Bill C-65 this evening in the House, the electoral participation act. As the title of this bill suggests, one of its key priorities is to encourage participation in the electoral process. We know that democratic engagement rests on trust in our electoral system, and

that is why Bill C-65 proposes to enhance safeguarding measures in the Canada Elections Act.

As we all know, Canada's democracy is among the strongest and most stable in the world thanks in large part to the Canada Elections Act, which is the fundamental legislative framework that regulates our elections in this great nation. We have every reason to be proud of this legislation, but we are not immune to the global challenges that modernized democracies face. The integrity of the electoral process in the lead-up to, during and after elections is a prerequisite for trust in our democracy. This is why it is essential that we continue to address evolving threats to our democracy through regular improvements to the Canada Elections Act. This helps ensure that our system remains robust, resilient and equipped to keep pace with the issues of our time.

It should come as no surprise that safeguarding our elections includes measures to mitigate foreign interference. Foreign interference can take many forms, including social media campaigns designed to sow disinformation. The Communications Security Establishment's latest report highlights that online foreign influence activities have become a new normal, with adversaries increasingly seeking to influence our elections. We and all Canadians have a right to be concerned about these threats. This is why the government has been proactive in taking steps to counter foreign interference.

Our government's work to protect our democracy began as early as 2016, when we tabled Bill C-22. It led to the creation of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians, a committee that assembles members from both chambers of Parliament to review matters concerning national security and intelligence.

In 2018, the government put forward Bill C-59, which enacted the National Security and Intelligence Review Agency Act, giving the agency the mandate to review and investigate all Government of Canada national security and intelligence activities. That same year, we also introduced Bill C-76, which modernized the Canada Elections Act and introduced a number of prohibitions, including a prohibition preventing foreigners from unduly influencing electors, a prohibition against foreign third parties from spending on election-related activities and a prohibition against third parties from using any foreign funds.

In 2019, we put in place the plan to protect Canada's democracy, which included the security and intelligence threats to elections, or SITE, task force. The plan was subsequently updated in advance of the 2021 general election.

Government Orders

Most recently, we introduced Bill C-70, the countering foreign interference act, which complements measures to further safeguard our federal elections and mitigate foreign influence in Bill C-65, which I am speaking to today. Finally, last September, our government launched the public inquiry into foreign interference. We look forward to receiving the commissioner's final report as well as recommendations.

These substantial government-wide initiatives demonstrate this government's commitment to remaining vigilant in our efforts to protect our electoral system. This commitment is further reflected in the safeguarding measures proposed through Bill C-65. I would like to highlight how this bill proposes to better protect our elections from foreign influence, disinformation campaigns and the misuse of technology, all of which seek to erode trust in our institutions. We do this so that Canadians can feel safe and confident when participating in our democracy.

- (2000)

First, we know that election interference can happen at all times and not just during elections. This is why Bill C-65 proposes to extend the application of the existing ban on undue foreign influence at all times, rather than being limited to the election period. This means, for example, that the ban on foreign entities unduly influencing voters to vote a certain way or influencing them to refrain from voting would extend to all times.

Second, Bill C-65 would create a clearer and more consistent definition of foreign entity activities under the act to close any and all gaps. For example, currently foreign entities can circumvent the law by having more than one purpose, where the ban on undue influence is limited to a foreign entity whose only purpose is to unduly influence voters. That would no longer be possible under Bill C-65. The bill proposes that foreign entities who have even just one of their primary activities as unduly influencing electors would be captured.

Third, Bill C-65 proposes important new financing rules to increase transparency and prevent anonymous foreign and dark money from entering our elections. This includes banning the use of crypto asset contributions, money orders and prepaid instruments such as prepaid credit cards or store gift cards for regulated activities by third parties and political actors.

Bill C-65 would introduce important new financing rules for third parties. Allow me to explain. Bill C-65 would allow third parties to use only contributions they have received from Canadian citizens and permanent residents to pay for regulated election expenses. This includes partisan activities, partisan advertising, election advertising and election surveys. This means that third parties would no longer be able to use funds received from any other third parties, such as corporations or businesses, for regulated expenses. For greater transparency, third parties would also need to report on the details of the individuals who contributed in total over \$200, including names, addresses and amounts of each contribution.

We understand that third parties may not all receive contributions and may have their own revenue they wish to use for regulated expenses. In those instances, third parties who meet the threshold of 10% or less of their overall annual revenue and contributions would also be able to use their own revenues to pay for regulated activi-

ties. In addition, third parties would be required to provide financial statements to Elections Canada proving the revenue is their own.

The amendments to enhance transparency on the source of third party funding are important. Under the current rules, third parties are required to report only on contributions given to them for election purposes. Contributions received for other purposes may be mixed into the third party's general revenue, leaving a transparency gap as to where the funds came from.

The Chief Electoral Officer spoke to this concern in his June 2022 recommendations report tabled here in Parliament. He noted that the proportion of third party reporting on the use of their own funds for regulated expenses increased significantly, from 8% in 2011 to 37% in 2019 and 63% in 2021. This increasing trend in third party financing is concerning, which is why the government is taking action through Bill C-65. Let me reiterate, however, that third parties who do not meet the threshold would still be able to participate in regulated activities, but they would have to do so with the contributions they received as donations from Canadian citizens and permanent residents.

The next element I would like to speak on is disinformation. Disinformation, a key tactic by malign actors, aims to fuel discord and erode public trust in the electoral process. It seeks to manipulate voters and electoral processes through intentional falsehoods, often spread online, as well as, quite frankly, intimidation at times.

- (2005)

In 2022, the Chief Electoral Officer called disinformation about the electoral process the most important threat to Canada's election mandate. Security agencies have noted that disinformation is a persistent threat to election integrity. In the 2021 national electors study conducted by Elections Canada following the 44th general election, 71% of electors were concerned that the spread of false information online could have a moderate or major impact on the electoral outcome. This included 37% who thought it could have a major impact. As noted by the Chief Electoral Officer, intelligence officials and leading academics, the use and impact of disinformation is not limited to the election period.

Government Orders

Bill C-65 aims to build confidence in our electoral process and our democratic institutions through new and expanded prohibitions to address these threats. In particular, the bill would introduce a ban on false statements about the voting process that are deliberately made to disrupt the conduct or the results of an election, all while respecting the principles of free expression and open dialogue.

Amendments provide clear guidance on the type of intentional false statements that could be made or published to ensure that contraventions of the act are clear and enforceable. This includes making or publishing false or misleading statements relating to who may vote in an election; the voting registration process; when, where and how to vote; whom to vote for; the process to become a candidate; how votes are validated or counted; or the results of an election.

Another element I would like to address is the potential misuse of technology. Technology, as we all know, has helped revolutionize democracy, but it also gives rise to risks. For example, content generated by artificial intelligence is becoming harder to distinguish from reality. When paired with disinformation, artificial intelligence such as deepfakes poses a significant threat. Today, with a computer and a few keystrokes, malicious actors can generate highly realistic videos, audio and text content that can depict people saying or doing things they never said or did.

To address this emerging issue, Bill C-65 would amend existing prohibitions in the act that can lend themselves to the misuse of artificial intelligence, namely false statements, impersonation and misleading publications, to provide clarity that they apply regardless of the means used. This would mean, for example, that the prohibition on impersonating the Chief Electoral Officer, an election official, or a candidate would apply regardless of the technology that might be used now, to include deepfakes or other technologies that may evolve in the future.

Bill C-65 would also extend the scope of the existing ban on using a computer to affect the results of an election, to now apply to the use of a computer to disrupt the conduct of an election.

The last element I would like to speak about and highlight is the importance of the personal safety of those people who participate in our electoral process. As my hon. colleagues know well, the threat environment continues to evolve. There has, sadly, been a surge in vandalism at constituency offices, increasingly violent online discourse and threats made against party leaders, candidates and election officials, as witnessed during the 2021 general election.

Bill C-65 therefore seeks to address some of these concerns by providing increased privacy and safety to electoral participants. For example, returning officers' personal information would be better protected by removing the requirement for them to publish their home address in the Canada Gazette; rather, only their municipality and province of residence would be published.

We have also seen reports of or have personally experienced a growing uncivil discourse and behaviour targeting members of Parliament, including me. Members from all parties have spoken out against unacceptable harassment and threats, as well as intimidation.

• (2010)

Indeed, the Sergeant-at-Arms and Corporate Security Officer of the House of Commons recently noted that harassment of people elected to serve this very institution has skyrocketed, increasing 800% in the last five years. To respond to this alarming trend, Bill C-65 proposes two changes to the disclosure of requirements for regulated fundraising events over \$200 that include a prominent attendee, such as a party leader. To ensure the safety of all participants, the requirement to provide five days' advance public notice of such regulated fundraising events would be repealed. To ensure ongoing transparency, precise location details for events would continue to be provided to the Chief Electoral Officer as part of the party's postevent reporting requirements under the act.

However, to protect the security of hosts of events who engage in politics or book a political event, the requirement for a public-facing postevent report 30 days later would only include the municipality and the province of the event. This approach aims to prevent bad actors from undermining the safety of participants and hosts at these events. It aims to strike an appropriate balance between the very real security threats faced and the ongoing need for transparency.

In closing, I know that safeguarding our democracy is a priority shared by all of my hon. colleagues in this House. The amendments to the Canada Elections Act proposed in Bill C-65 build on existing safeguards and propose a number of targeted but critical improvements to continue to build trust in our democratic processes.

I am confident that all members of Parliament can work together to ensure that Bill C-65 is studied and passed in time for all measures to come into force before the next fixed-date general election.

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Madam Speaker, a key problem with Bill C-65 is that clauses 40 and 41 would amend sections 269 and 279 of the Elections Canada Act to allow voters to write in the name of a political party rather than a candidate. Does the member opposite agree that this is a dereliction of our historical practice of electing individual members to the House of Commons and not political parties?

Mr. Vance Badawey: Madam Speaker, I really appreciate the question because that is some of the discussion that I actually have in my own riding. It is discussion that my colleagues and I are having, not just here on this side of the House but on all sides of the House.

This being the second reading stage of the bill, I look forward, when it reaches committee, to having those very discussions so that a lot of what we expect to be in the bill is in the bill, once again, for democracy. Equally important is to ensure the protection of the candidates, as well as the MPs who may, in fact, be elected.

• (2015)

[Translation]

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, Bill C-65 moves the election date from October 20 to October 27. They say that the reason is Diwali, a religious holiday held on October 20.

Considering existing provisions of the Canada Elections Act and amendments introduced through Bill C-65, however, voters have ample opportunities to vote. People can vote for seven days at a returning officer's office, on election day and six other days. They can vote at any time during the election at the returning officer's office. They can vote using special mail-in ballots. Students can vote in academic institutions, and voting stations are available in long-term care facilities. In short, there are tons of opportunities to vote.

That is generally why these options were created in the first place. The idea was to prevent people from being unable to vote on a specific day because of a specific event. What, therefore, is the real reason for moving the date of the election, especially to a date within just six days of municipal elections in Quebec?

[English]

Mr. Vance Badawey: Madam Speaker, as I am sure the member knows, and what has been articulated and brought forward by the folks who are looking at this recommendation, it is the religious and cultural observations that are going to be taking place in that time frame. That is the reason for the decision.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, on that same point, in the bill, the date is moved from October 20 to October 27. However, there is a perception out there that this is going to allow for some MPs in this place to personally benefit. Therefore, I think it is incumbent upon us to show leadership in this area.

The NDP has publicly committed that, when the bill gets to committee, we are going to move an amendment to bring the date back to the original date of October 20. Will my colleague be joining the NDP in supporting that amendment?

Mr. Vance Badawey: Madam Speaker, one thing I really appreciate about the House is that we have the opportunity to bring bills to committee after second reading and have discussions. I look forward, as the member stated, to having a discussion on that very issue. I am sure that folks not only on that side of the floor but on this side will participate in the discussion and make the appropriate decision on that issue.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the Bloc Québécois, in opposition to the legislation, is very much concerned about the municipal election taking place in Quebec. October 20, the date currently set for it, is the same day on which Alberta has its municipal elections. Well over three million people will have to vote on October 20 in Alberta. I say that so that

Government Orders

members are aware of it and so that when the bill goes to committee, committee members at least give some consideration to Alberta, as the Bloc is giving consideration to Quebec.

Would my colleague not agree that Canada as a whole is recognized as a democracy that works exceptionally well in good part because of Elections Canada and our laws? The changes that are being proposed would give more strength to Canadian election laws. Therefore, the principles of the bill are something we should all get behind, and maybe we should look at some fine-tuning.

Mr. Vance Badawey: Madam Speaker, that opens up a huge answer to a large question.

As many members know, I was one of the MPs who—

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. Some members are talking amongst themselves. We can hear them very clearly. I would ask them to leave the chamber if they wish to continue their discussion.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

[English]

Mr. Vance Badawey: Madam Speaker, as many members know, I was one of the members of Parliament who had an unfortunate circumstance happen at home. As I stated publicly, how it affected me is how it affected others because of me. I can look at the effect it has had on my family, in particular my spouse, who still has a hard time sleeping, and my neighbours. I believe this bill would at least contribute a bit to resolving a lot of the challenges and toxicity we see out there in the public that is reflected by individuals and taken out on many members of Parliament and even our teams at our constituency offices.

The party on this side of the floor cares. Unlike the folks on the Conservative side, we take into consideration and respect what we hear from our constituents and residents. When we enter the process at committee, the intent is to take what we hear and the concerns people have with this bill, bring them forward, put them on the floor, discuss them and have a dialogue, and address some of the issues that concern the NDP and others in this House with respect to when the election is to take place. Equally as important are the individual components of this bill and ensuring that it provides what it is supposed to provide.

• (2020)

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, the government has been shovelling money to third party influencers since 2015. It refuses to put any frameworks or limitations on artificial intelligence. We know for sure that during the 2019 and 2021 elections, the Prime Minister knew about foreign interference against the official opposition and did nothing about it.

How can the Liberals be trusted? How can we trust them to avoid putting in any loopholes that they will be able to exploit in the next election?

Government Orders

Mr. Vance Badawey: Madam Speaker, I have witnessed in this House for the past nine years an attitude, and most recently a very large attitude by the Leader of the Opposition, that fans the flames of hate and misinformation. We are here now with Bill C-65 speaking about misinformation and that is a perfect example of it.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member opposite says that there is the fanning of flames, or whatnot, or disinformation, but I think this is a chamber where we hold each other in some esteem. If he wants to note a particular subject and to make an allegation against the leader of the official opposition, we are all here to debate the actual bill and to not cast aspersions on each other's character. If he wants to make a claim, extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. I would like to see the member make some evidence in this chamber.

Mr. Vance Badawey: Madam Speaker, I would ask the member, frankly, to pay attention during question period. There is his evidence.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would ask the member, in regard to the overall legislation that is being presented and the commitment from the minister responsible, who brought forward the legislation, to look at reasonable amendments that would give more strength and would make the bill better. I am wondering if the member could provide his thoughts in regard to why it is important to allow the bill to get to committee.

Mr. Vance Badawey: Madam Speaker, the reason I think it is important to get the bill to committee, quite frankly, based on some questions we had here today, is to have that dialogue. Part of that dialogue would be exactly to answer questions, some of which the Conservative Party is asking today. I very much look forward to that dialogue, to get right to the crux of where the problems exist: the who, the why and the how.

As well, as I said earlier, we have, on this side of the House, a party that cares. We have, on that side of the House, a party that does not care. The Liberals are continuing to put forward regulations and legislation based on the best interests of the public, and we are doing that with a great deal of respect, versus the disrespect that the Reform Party of Canada continues to put forward, almost on a daily basis.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There is still some debate going on, and I would ask members, if they want to continue to have their conversation, to take it out. They may not be in agreement with what is said in the House, but I would hope that they still respect each other.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby has the floor.

• (2025)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am going to start with a little rebuttal to my colleague who just spoke from the Liberal Party. He said that the Liberals care and the Conservatives do not. I agree with the latter part; I do not agree with the former because for everything that Canadians care about, the New Democrats accomplished in this Parliament, whether we are talking about dental care, pharmacare, anti-

scab legislation or affordable housing, and I can go on and on. However, when it comes to electoral law, the reality is that we heard the Prime Minister, when he was campaigning in 2015, saying it was going to be the last election that is first past the post, and we know how much the Liberals cared about keeping that commitment.

That being said, we support the bill because, first off, we know that the member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith will be bringing forward an amendment to ensure that the election date is held on the election date as committed to, on October 20. That is an amendment the NDP is bringing forward. We have heard that other opposition parties—

Mr. Warren Steinley: Oh, oh!

Mr. Peter Julian:—support that amendment, even the member for Regina—Lewvan, who is shouting in the House right now—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The member should exit the chamber, if he prefers to yell out.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby has the floor.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, it is an unruly, motley crew over there on the Conservative benches. We will see how unruly they get as the evening rolls on.

The reality is that all Conservatives should be supporting the bill with the NDP amendment, and here is why: The Conservatives have not spoken one iota about this throughout this debate. They always talk about having more debating time. They never seem to actually read the bills that we are debating. Not a single one, not a single Conservative commented on these facts in any of their speeches. What the bill does is to add two additional days of advance polling, which includes a total of seven advance days and polling days, including election day. That is a good thing, to have more access for elections. In addition, it enshrines in legislation the vote on campus program for post-secondary students. We want to have young people voting. Not a single Conservative talked about that. Why would Conservatives oppose having post-secondary students and people on campus actually voting?

The bill also makes voting easier in long-term care facilities across the country. The elders of our nation, those who have given so much for this country, often have difficulty voting. Why would Conservatives oppose ensuring that long-term care residents actually have the right to vote? One would expect that this would be the first thing that would lead them to support the bill. I imagine that not a single Conservative has even read the bill, because if they had read it, one would expect them to mention that it increases protections against election interference and foreign financing during election campaigns. With all of those provisions, things that the NDP pushed for and that we have in Bill C-65, why would Conservatives oppose the legislation?

Government Orders

I believe that Conservatives are taking their lead from what we are seeing happening with the deplorable Republican Party south of the border. What Republicans have noticed is that they cannot win a free and fair election. We have seen the extent to which MAGA Republicans are actually willing to usurp democracy. It has shades of what we saw a century ago, in Europe, when the far right movement basically threw out elections and destroyed democracy in one country after another. MAGA Republicans, knowing that they cannot win a free election, have decided that they are going to exclude wide swaths of the population from actually having the right to vote. They are trying to limit voting, in the way that we saw in the 19th century, when large groups in the population could not vote.

This, as well, comes back to the deplorable record of the Harper government. What the Harper government did, when the member for Carleton had the lead in that file, was to try to restrict and limit voting, to try to make it more difficult for groups of Canadian citizens to actually vote. They succeeded in putting up so many roadblocks and obstacles that it made it harder for poor Canadians, for younger Canadians, for racialized Canadians and for indigenous peoples to vote. They put restrictions on that sacred right to vote in democracy.

When colleagues hear the Conservative opposition say that they are not going to pass the legislation, that they are going to fight it tooth and nail, it is because this is a tradition in the far right. We see this with the MAGA Republicans, who cannot win a free and fair election. The MAGA Republicans are trying to cheat to win victory, to usurp democracy, to try to ensure that they can win, regardless of the cost to our institutions and to our democracy. We have seen the foreign interference that is writ large.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Peter Julian: I am hoping that means the Oilers have just scored, but I am sure somebody will rise on a point of order and perhaps update the House. If anybody is aware, if anybody has any information, I would be more than pleased to be interrupted.

Does somebody know what is going on, even you, Madam Speaker?

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

• (2030)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I think the hon. member just got his answer.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, that is the sweetest point of order I have ever heard from a Conservative in the House. I thank my colleague for raising that point.

Madam Speaker, getting back to more serious matters, our democracy is not to be trifled with. We all think back to the days in 2015 when the current Prime Minister promised to overhaul our electoral systems and make them even more democratic. With proportional representation, we would have a much different House, as members know. There would not be 24 or 25 NDP MPs, but nearly 70. There would be fewer Liberal MPs, Conservative MPs and Bloc MPs. There would be more Green Party MPs.

What it would do is change the composition of the House. That is why so many countries around the world have adopted proportional representation. The idea would be to have a fair electoral system where votes count and where there is, through mixed member proportional, the ability to cast one's ballot both for local candidates and also for a larger percentage that is divided up. It would reflect, in the House of Commons, more faithfully how Canadians actually vote.

The Prime Minister, at the time, in 2015, undertook that solemn commitment. He said that it was the last election that was first past the post. We saw the results: He reneged on that when it suited him. We know that if in the next election, whenever that comes, the New Democrats become the governing party in this country, we will bring in proportional representation. We will make sure that it truly is the last first-past-the-post election, because that would be in the interest of Canada. That is why we and our leaders have campaigned over the years to make sure that we have a fair electoral system.

However, it is not just about the system itself; it is also about giving people access to voting. This is why the bill is important. The NDP pushed hard to make sure there were provisions in place in the bill that would actually ensure that the next election has the greatest participation possible of Canadians of all ages, all backgrounds and all colours and creeds, to make sure that every Canadian has a right to vote.

That is why we pushed so hard for additional days of advance polling. Canadians are working hard. As Conservatives have said, the New Democrats are the worker bees in Parliament. We work hard on behalf of our constituents and we know that they are sometimes working 12-hour and 16-hour shifts. On an election day, even though they do have the right to go to vote, it sometimes is impossible for them to do so. Therefore having additional days of advance polling would ensure that we do have in place the ability for every Canadian to vote.

In post-secondary institutions and apprenticeship and trade schools there are sometimes real challenges for the youth of this country to get out to vote. That is why we pushed hard to ensure that the vote on campus program for post-secondary students would be put into place. That, again, would be vitally important for the next election, to ensure that every Canadian has that right.

Making voting easier in long-term care facilities is something I feel particularly strongly about, because the last election, in 2021, was the last election that my father and mother voted in. They were in a long-term care facility. I took them to vote in that election. They both passed away shortly thereafter. A few weeks after the election, my father passed away. It was a year later that my mother passed away. I was able to take them to the polls to vote, but there were other residents of that long-term care facility who could not vote that day.

Adjournment Proceedings

We need to make sure that long-term care residents who have contributed their lives to this country, to building this country and to ensuring that this country is the free and fair democracy that is the envy of the world, can vote. For long-term care facilities to not have special voting provisions to ensure that every resident could vote does a disservice to those incredible sacrifices that long-term care residents have made over the course of decades to our country, so we pushed hard for that to make sure it was in place.

• (2035)

That is why we are proud to see that in the legislation. We also need to ensure that we do not have the election interference and foreign interference that has been reflected in the NSICOP report. They are profoundly worrisome allegations of foreign interference, particularly around the Conservative leadership conventions and particularly in 2021. We need to find out about the extent of that foreign interference.

We have seen other democracies suffering under foreign interference, whether it was the Brexit referendum in the United Kingdom or the election of Donald Trump in 2016. These are cases of documented foreign interference that had profound impacts on those democracies.

We need to make sure that this does not happen in Canada. That is why we pressed for these provisions in Bill C-65, to ensure that we increase protections against election interference and that we stop the ability of foreign financing of third-party campaigns or of the parties or candidates themselves. We all need to take that threat to our democracy seriously because this foreign interference does not come from countries that have a democratic tradition. This comes from foreign dictators who have control over their countries and who want to extend that control to Canada.

We need to ensure that we have full access for all Canadians in the next election campaign, that we open those ballots for advance polling early, and that we ensure that we have a free and fair election. That is why the NDP is supporting this bill.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It being 8:38 p.m., pursuant to order made Monday, June 17, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill now before the House.

[*Translation*]

The question is on the amendment.

[*English*]

Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of amendment to House*]

• (2040)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): If a member present in the House wishes that the amendment be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party present

in the House wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*English*]

Mr. Brad Redekopp: Madam Speaker, I would ask for a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, June 19, at the expiry for the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill, to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-244, an act to amend the Department of Employment and Social Development Act and the Employment Insurance Act with regard to the Employment Insurance Council.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, there have been consultation between the House leadership, and I suspect if you were to ask for unanimous consent to call it midnight so we could get to the late show, that it would be approved.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I have received notice from all recognized parties that they are in agreement with this request.

[*Translation*]

Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

CARBON PRICING

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Liberal government refuses to acknowledge that Canadians pay more into the carbon tax than they get back. However, over a year ago, the Parliamentary Budget Officer published his report, which showed that, taking into account the full economic impact of the government's carbon tax regime, most Canadians were worse off.

On top of this, the government has a secret report, which shows that the carbon tax regime also has a costly impact on our GDP, lowering future GDP growth by tens of billions of dollars. After it was revealed at committee that the Liberals had put a gag order on the Parliamentary Budget Officer in a desperate attempt to protect their false narrative and prop up their failed carbon tax, Conservatives put the pressure on, and the report was made public.

Adjournment Proceedings

What is even worse is that they have hidden this number for years. Let us stop to think about that. The Liberal government has been hiding the fact that the carbon tax will cost Canadians \$30 billion by 2030. This works out to \$1,824 per family in extra annual costs. Despite both of these reports showing that Canadians are worse off with the carbon tax, the Liberals are doubling down, to the detriment of Canadians and our economy.

Their claims are false. Canadians are not better off paying a carbon tax. The carbon tax has proved to be ineffective in reducing Canada's carbon emissions to targeted levels. The government has missed every target it has set. In fact, the environment commissioner has reported that the government will miss its targets for 2030. However, even if we reduced our emissions to zero, the natural disasters would not suddenly cease to happen.

We are not in a bubble protected by the government's carbon tax. In fact, the effects attributed to climate change would even continue to happen if Canada reduced its emissions to zero. Despite all these factors, the government continues to push its disastrous carbon tax, making Canadians poorer and tanking our future economic prospects.

Can the government explain why it refuses to accept the fact that its carbon tax has done nothing but cause misery for Canadians?

• (2045)

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Madam Speaker, sometimes it is hard to know where to begin after hearing a speech like that, but let me begin with the part about the secret report. There is no secret report. The Parliamentary Budget Officer himself said today at committee that the government is not muzzling him. He specifically stated that. It makes no sense to say that documents are being hidden when all of the data, that information, was specifically provided to an independent costing officer to inform them as they prepared their public reports.

Environment and Climate Change Canada, like all departments of this government, routinely gives the PBO access to large datasets to support it in the creation of high-quality analysis. There is co-operation in preparing those reports. Just last week, Environment and Climate Change Canada published the data that was provided to the Parliamentary Budget Officer on carbon pollution pricing in relation to national and provincial gross domestic product for the 2022-30 period. That is the dataset we have been talking about.

We have disclosed the information, and the PBO has specifically said that he is not muzzled. He said there may have been a misunderstanding because he was speaking in his second language. It is very clear that everybody has the data now.

Let us talk a bit more about these pieces. I am so tired of hearing about carbon pricing costing more. Over 300 economists from right across our country have signed a letter to us parliamentarians specifically telling us that this is not true and that it works. Let us talk about both of those things.

First of all, pricing carbon pollution does work. It is simply incorrect to say that we are not meeting targets. We are on track to

meeting our 2026 target. That was stated by the environment commissioner.

Let us go a few steps further. We put in a national inventory report with the UN last year for the 2023 inventory of our greenhouse gases. That report showed that last year, we had the lowest emissions in over three decades, except for the pandemic years. We are showing amazing progress in turning that ship around. It was a big ship to turn around because the Conservative government that preceded us did absolutely nothing. It did not have a plan to curb Canada's emissions.

We have put in place a plan. Our emissions are coming down. We are doing the hard work, and it is being done in a very efficient way with carbon pricing.

Let me talk briefly about the fact that carbon pricing includes a rebate. I am going to highlight that because I think we do not talk about it enough.

Most Canadians, eight out of 10 families, get back more through the carbon rebate than they pay in carbon pricing. As of April 15, 2024, a family of four will receive quarterly payments, which I am going to list here. It is \$450 four times a year in Alberta; \$300 four times a year in Manitoba; \$280 four times a year in Ontario; \$376 four times a year in Saskatchewan; \$190 four times a year in New Brunswick; \$206 four times a year in Nova Scotia; \$220 in P.E.I.; and \$298 in Newfoundland and Labrador. That is four times a year, plus a rural top-up to make it even more.

Mrs. Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, the Liberal government has lost itself in its own ideological mess of narratives. Its insistence on misleading Canadians, despite their own lived experience dealing with the carbon tax, reminds me of a famous quote: "The Party told you to reject the evidence of your eyes and ears. It was their final, most essential command."

Canadians are not buying what the government is selling. After nine years of the Prime Minister, life has never been so expensive. His inflationary taxes have driven up the cost of everything. Mortgages have doubled. Rent has doubled. Food prices are up, forcing families to pay \$700 more for groceries this year, while millions of Canadians are lined up outside food banks.

Canadians are tired of the government and its broken promises and failed policies. They are ready for change and a government that will actually take action for Canadians.

When will the government call a carbon tax election and allow Canadians to decide whether or not they want to axe the tax?

Adjournment Proceedings

• (2050)

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, once again, over 300 economists and people from universities right across our country wrote to parliamentarians and said that carbon pricing does not cost Canadians more. They get more back through the rebate than they pay. Yes, it is effective. It is a market mechanism. It is effective and it works.

More to the point, climate change costs Canadians, and that cost is going to continue to go up if we do not tackle it now. That is

what the Conservatives are going to do. They are going to let the planet burn, and they are going to force us to pay for it.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 8:51 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 18, 2024

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Information Commissioner

The Speaker 25117

Law Commission of Canada

Mr. Maloney 25117

Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime

Mr. Maloney 25117

Women, Peace and Security

Mr. Oliphant 25117

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux 25117

Motion agreed to 25119

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Electoral Participation Act

Bill C-65. Second reading 25119

Mr. Genuis 25119

Mr. McDonald 25122

Mr. Thériault 25122

Ms. Barron 25122

Mr. Morrice 25123

Ms. Sahota 25123

Mr. Julian 25123

Mr. Coteau 25124

Mr. Aboultaif 25125

Mr. Fortin 25125

Ms. Barron 25125

Mr. Dhaliwal 25126

Mr. Thériault 25127

Ms. Zarrillo 25127

Mr. Lamoureux 25127

Mr. Fast 25127

Mr. Gerretsen 25129

Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe 25130

Ms. Barron 25130

Mr. Nater 25130

Mr. Lamoureux 25131

Ms. Barron 25131

Ms. Chabot 25133

Mr. Gerretsen 25134

Mr. Boulerice 25134

Mr. Lamoureux 25134

Mr. Thériault 25135

Mr. Lamoureux 25136

Mr. Gourde 25136

Mr. Boulerice 25137

Mr. Lamoureux 25137

Mr. Kmiec 25137

Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe 25137

Mr. Julian 25137

Mr. Arya 25138

Ms. Michaud 25140

Ms. Zarrillo 25141

Mr. Lamoureux 25141

Mr. Desjarlais 25141

Mr. Trudel 25141

Mr. Aboultaif 25142

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

National Day of Remembrance for Victims of Terrorism

Mr. Arya 25143

Edmonton Oilers

Mr. Aboultaif 25143

Diversity and Inclusion

Ms. Taylor Roy 25143

Maison des Cagex du fleuve Saint-Laurent

Mr. Perron 25143

Japanese Canadians

Mr. Carr 25144

Quebec's National Holiday

Mr. Paul-Hus 25144

Canada's National Hockey Teams

Ms. Gainey 25144

National Indigenous Peoples Month

Mr. Sheehan 25144

Ethics

Mr. Leslie 25145

Children's Literature

Ms. Vandenberg 25145

Taxation

Mr. Williams 25145

Carbon Tax

Mr. Motz 25145

Eid al-Adha

Mr. Duguid 25145

Indigenous Affairs

Ms. Idlout 25146

Érik Canuel

Mr. Champoux 25146

Leader of the New Democratic Party

Mrs. Kusie 25146

John Murphy

Mr. Blois 25146

ORAL QUESTIONS

Forestry Industry

Mr. Poilievre	25147
Mr. Trudeau	25147
Mr. Poilievre	25147
Mr. Trudeau	25147

Taxation

Mr. Poilievre	25147
Mr. Trudeau	25147

The Economy

Mr. Poilievre	25147
Mr. Trudeau	25147
Mr. Poilievre	25147
Mr. Trudeau	25148

Democratic Institutions

Ms. Normandin	25148
Mr. Trudeau	25148
Ms. Normandin	25148
Mr. Trudeau	25148
Mr. Singh	25148
Mr. Trudeau	25148
Mr. Singh	25148
Mr. Trudeau	25149

Diversity and Inclusion

Mr. Poilievre	25149
Mr. Virani	25149

Foreign Affairs

Ms. Lantsman	25149
Mr. LeBlanc	25149

Forestry Industry

Mr. Martel	25149
Mr. Guilbeault	25149
Mr. Martel	25149
Mr. Champagne	25150
Mr. Généreux	25150
Mr. Champagne	25150
Mr. Généreux	25150
Mr. Champagne	25150

Seniors

Ms. Larouche	25150
Ms. Martinez Ferrada	25150
Ms. Larouche	25150
Ms. Martinez Ferrada	25151

Employment

Ms. Chabot	25151
Mr. Boissonnault	25151

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Barlow	25151
Ms. Freeland	25151
Mr. Barlow	25151
Ms. Freeland	25151
Mr. Mazier	25151
Mr. Guilbeault	25151

Mr. Small	25152
Mr. O'Regan	25152

Grocery Industry

Mr. MacGregor	25152
Mr. Champagne	25152

Air Transportation

Mr. Bachrach	25152
Mr. Rodriguez	25152

Indigenous Affairs

Ms. Sidhu (Brampton South)	25152
Ms. Hajdu	25152

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Hallan	25153
Ms. Freeland	25153
Mr. Hallan	25153
Ms. Freeland	25153
Mr. Doherty	25153
Ms. Freeland	25153
Mr. Doherty	25153
Ms. Freeland	25153

Official Languages

Mrs. Vignola	25153
Mr. Duclos	25154
Mr. Beaulieu	25154
Mr. Duclos	25154

Taxation

Mr. Morantz	25154
Ms. Freeland	25154

Forestry Industry

Mr. Paul-Hus	25154
Mr. Champagne	25154

Taxation

Mr. Lehoux	25155
Ms. Freeland	25155

Dental Care

Ms. Lattanzio	25155
Mr. Duclos	25155

Taxation

Mr. Vis	25155
Ms. Freeland	25155
Mrs. Block	25155
Ms. Freeland	25155

Ethics

Mr. Perkins	25156
Mr. Champagne	25156

Dental Care

Mr. Van Bynen	25156
Mr. Holland	25156

National Defence

Ms. Mathysen	25156
Mr. Blair	25156

Veterans Affairs	
Ms. Blaney	25156
Ms. Petitpas Taylor	25157
Hardeep Singh Nijjar	
The Speaker	25157

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2024, No. 1

Bill C-69. Report stage	25157
Motion No. 1 negatived	25158
Motion No. 32 negatived	25160
Motion No. 34 negatived	25161
Motion No. 38 negatived	25163
Motion No. 39 negatived	25164
Motion No. 42 negatived	25165
Motion No. 44 negatived	25167
Motion No. 46 negatived	25168
Motion No. 49 negatived	25170
Motion No. 79 negatived	25171
Motion No. 130 negatived	25173
Motion No. 142 negatived	25174
Motion No. 146 negatived	25176
Motion No. 148 negatived	25177
Motion No. 154 negatived	25179
Mrs. Valdez (for the Minister of Finance)	25179
Motion for concurrence	25179
Motion agreed to	25180

Privilege

Foreign Interference and Alleged Reputational Harm to Members of Parliament

Ms. Kwan	25180
Mr. Berthold	25182
Mrs. Vignola	25182
Mr. Lamoureux	25182
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	25182

Budget Implementation Act, 2024, No. 1

Mrs. Valdez (for the Minister of Finance)	25182
Bill C-69. Third reading	25182
Mr. Lamoureux	25182

Business of the House

Mr. MacKinnon	25184
---------------------	-------

Budget Implementation Act, 2024, No. 1

Bill C-69. Third reading	25185
Mr. Lamoureux	25185
Mr. Kmiec	25185
Mrs. Vignola	25185
Mr. Davies	25186
Mr. Samson	25186
Mr. Hallan	25186
Mr. Samson	25189
Mr. Beaulieu	25190
Mr. Davies	25190
Mr. Perkins	25190

Mr. Lamoureux	25190
Ms. Larouche	25191
Mr. Ste-Marie	25191

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code

Bill S-224. Report stage	25192
Mr. Fortin	25192
Mr. Jivani	25193
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	25194

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2024, No. 1

Bill C-69. Third reading	25195
Mr. Ste-Marie	25195
Mr. Lamoureux	25196
Ms. Larouche	25196
Mr. Davies	25196
Mr. Beaulieu	25197
Mr. Simard	25197
Mr. Davies	25197
Ms. Chagger	25200
Mrs. Vignola	25201
Mr. MacGregor	25201
Ms. Mathysen	25201
Mr. Vandal	25202
Mr. Morantz	25204
Mr. Simard	25204
Mr. McCauley	25204
Mr. Beaulieu	25204
Mr. Lamoureux	25205
Mr. McCauley	25205
Mr. Lamoureux	25206
Mr. Maguire	25207
Mr. Bachrach	25207
Mrs. Gallant	25207
Mr. Lamoureux	25209
Ms. Normandin	25209
Mr. Julian	25209
Mrs. Block	25210
Mr. Lamoureux	25211
Mrs. Desbiens	25211
Mr. Bachrach	25211
Mr. Albas	25212
Mr. Lamoureux	25213
Ms. Normandin	25213
Mr. Julian	25214
Division on motion deferred	25214

Electoral Participation Act

Bill C-65. Second reading	25214
Mr. Badawey	25214
Mr. Vis	25216
Ms. Normandin	25217
Mr. MacGregor	25217

Mr. Lamoureux	25217
Mrs. Gallant	25217
Mr. Albas	25218
Mr. Lamoureux	25218
Mr. Julian	25218
Division on amendment deferred	25220
Message from the Senate	
The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes)	25220

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Carbon Pricing

Mrs. Block	25220
Ms. Dabrusin	25221

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>