



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 386
Tuesday, December 10, 2024

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, December 10, 2024

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

• (1000)

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: Colleagues, I am now ready to rule on a point of order raised by the leader of the government in the House on December 3, regarding the handling of certain oral questions.

During question period that day, the Chair ruled a number of questions out of order after determining that they did not relate to the government's administrative responsibility. After the question from the member for Davenport, the Chair recognized another member without letting the government respond. A similar situation arose on November 27, involving the member for Kingston and the Islands. In contrast, the Chair did allow the government to answer the questions of that kind when they were asked by the opposition.

[*Translation*]

According to the government House leader, this practice enables the government to respond to any question, if it so wishes, whether or not the question pertains to the government's responsibilities and regardless of whether it was asked by the opposition or the governing party.

After the point of order, the Chair stated that a question that was not about the government's responsibilities but was an attack on the government could give rise to a response from a minister, but that the opposite—that is, allowing a minister to respond to criticisms of the opposition parties—is problematic. The Chair would like to expand on the reasoning behind this interpretation.

As the member for Kingston and the Islands rightly noted when he spoke to the matter, question period is not reserved for opposition members alone. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, explains on page 498, and I quote:

Any Member can ask a question, although the time is set aside almost exclusively for the opposition parties to confront the government and hold it accountable for its actions, and to highlight the perceived inadequacies of the government.

[*English*]

Accountability, through question period, is one of the means to the ends sought through the principle of responsible government, which is itself one of the cornerstones of our system of government. Therefore, the purpose of question period is to hold the government to account, not the opposition, within its areas of responsibility.

The Chair is mindful of wanting to preserve the nature and purposes of question period. The roles of opposition and government in this exercise should not be inverted. The opposition does not have to answer to the government.

Moreover, when the opposition asks a question, the government has an opportunity to respond and defend its position. It can also decide not to answer. However, when members of the governing party ask questions about the opposition, the latter does not have the same opportunity to defend its point of view.

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

A similar logic must also apply to questions one opposition party asks about another. This type of question is not normally in order, based on the above logic. As Speaker Milliken said in a decision rendered on June 14, 2010, at page 3778 of the Debates, and I quote:

the use of members' [...] preambles to questions to attack other members does not provide those targeted with an opportunity to respond or deal directly with such attacks.

In addition, I would encourage members to reread the Chair's ruling of November 20, 2023. In that ruling, I addressed the need to draw a link to the government's administrative responsibility. I also reminded members of the limited exceptions to the rule, which concern questions addressed to committee chairs or a representative of the Board of Internal Economy.

If members want to ensure their questions are in order and to get an answer from the government, they need to phrase them clearly and to quickly make a direct connection to the government's administrative responsibility.

Routine Proceedings

Finally, there is an obvious trend, on both sides of the House, of asking questions that have little or no connection with the government's responsibilities. These questions often consist of attacks on the opposition parties. While a desire to question and criticize the other parties' positions is natural, our proceedings offer other opportunities to do so. If we want question period to continue serving its fundamental purpose—namely, government accountability—we must ensure the questions are formulated with that purpose in mind.

As one of my predecessors, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, remarked in a ruling delivered on January 28, 2014, on page 2203 of the Debates, and I quote:

...the Speaker, as the servant of the House, can enforce only those practices and guidelines the House is willing to have enforced. Very often the particular circumstances of the moment dictate how far the Speaker can go without unduly limiting the freedom of speech of members.

But when content causes disorder, the Speaker must step in, all the while acting within the confines of our rules and practices.

[English]

Since poorly worded questions, at times, elicit rather intense reactions from all corners of the House, the Chair will be especially vigilant in ensuring that the preamble to questions and the questions themselves are linked to the government's administrative responsibility. It is much easier for the Chair when this link is clearly established with as few deviations as possible. This will enable members to eliminate the risk of being interrupted. I am convinced that members can make their arguments without breaching this vital principle. If members need advice on this, they can consult the table officers.

I thank all members for their attention.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the “2023-2024 Reports by Federal Authorities with Obligations under Section 71 of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012”.

* * *

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 23rd report of the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, the mighty OGGO, entitled “Indigenous Procurement”.

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

• (1010)

SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

Ms. Valerie Bradford (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 13th report of the Standing Committee on Science and Research, entitled “Science and Research in Canada's Arctic in Relation to Climate Change”.

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

Mr. Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Conservative Party has submitted a dissenting report on this study of the Arctic and the research therein. As a couple of highlights, from our perspective, one is the potential lack of coordination across all the research projects there. Of course, we want to make sure that there is top value for taxpayers, knowing that there is no duplication. In addition to this, there should be spending effectiveness.

We have submitted that.

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. René Arseneault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Official Languages, entitled “Establishing Language Requirements for Governor in Council Appointments”.

This study was conducted in response to a recommendation from the Commissioner of Official Languages. In his 2021-22 report, he looked into language obligations in the staffing process for senior management positions in the federal public service and Governor in Council appointments. Despite the passage of Bill C-13 and the modernization of the Official Languages Act, it seems that a significant number of positions filled by Governor in Council appointments still do not have a language requirement.

This report and these recommendations will be of interest to the reader wishing to address these gaps. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

[English]

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Lena Metlege Diab (Halifax West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 26th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human rights, entitled “Islamophobia on the Rise: Taking Action, Confronting Hate and Protecting Civil Liberties Together”, and the 27th report, entitled “Heightened Antisemitism in Canada and How to Confront It”.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Tako Van Popta (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a dissenting report by the Conservative Party on the study on Islamophobia. The study was undertaken at a time of conflict in the Middle East between Israel and the Palestinian people of Gaza. As one witness noticed, the committee suffered from a fundamental category error by confusing Islamophobia and anti-Palestinian racism. We agreed with that assessment. Indeed, nine of the 13 recommendations make reference to anti-Palestinian racism. We do not think that this shift in attention away from the main topic of Islamophobia was helpful in identifying the challenges that Canadians face with the rise of Islamophobia. Our dissenting report reflects that.

I have a second dissenting report, on the study of anti-Semitism. Multiple witnesses testified that diversity, equity and inclusion programs on their campuses have discriminated against Jewish people. In response, the majority of the committee proposed addressing this issue by expanding these diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives to ensure that Jewish voices are heard. Conversely, the Conservative members of the committee viewed this testimony as evidence that, despite good intentions, these programs are ineffective. Our dissenting report reflects that sentiment.

● (1015)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Madam Speaker, I move that the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented on Tuesday, February 8, 2022, be concurred in.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Conservatives blocked their own opposition day yesterday. They seem to be doing the same thing today. They do not even take their own opposition motions seriously. It is important to point out that the Conservatives are blocking their own opposition day—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): That is not a point of order. I would ask members to please state the Standing Order they are rising on. That way, it will be a lot easier for us to determine the point of order from the beginning.

Debate, the hon. member for Calgary Shepard.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, as we were so rudely interrupted by the member for New Westminster—Burnaby, allow me the opportunity to rise and speak on behalf of the residents of the riding of Calgary Shepard on the eighth report of the public accounts committee, for which I was briefly the chair. The report is entitled “Pandemic Preparedness, Surveillance—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would ask members who are having conversations to please take their conversations outside so that we can really hear what the hon. member has to say.

The hon. member for Calgary Shepard.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, as I was saying, I am talking about report 8: “Pandemic Preparedness, Surveillance, and Border Control Measures”. The border control measures are the most important and are of great interest to me, because today is an opposition supply day.

We now know, both from public media reports and from statements by the incoming U.S. administration that will be swearing its oath next month, that border measures in Canada are of great interest to the incoming administration, especially with respect to the fact that we have such lax border measures. It is concerned about border measures on two primary issues.

I want to demonstrate to the House how this is connected to the important report I mentioned, because in the previous situation where border measures were found to be lacking by the Auditor General, when she reviewed the conduct of the Public Health Agency of Canada and the conduct of the CBSA, she found it was lacking in a different national emergency at the time, related to the pandemic, with respect to what was done at the time, including the government response to that particular event.

I have a Yiddish proverb, as I always do: “Time is the best doctor.” In the situation in question, it has not been so. If the government proceeds to do the same thing it did with the pandemic response, in order to train up the CBSA officers responsible for border enforcement, then we will likely have a multi-year disaster at our borders. The border disorder will continue.

Madam Speaker, I want to say that I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Sturgeon River—Parkland.

I want to draw the attention of the House to recommendation 7 of the committee: “The Canada Border Services Agency should provide the Committee with a progress report regarding the training tool for border services officers.”

With respect to the report and the response that the government presented to the House, I again want to draw the attention of the House to the progress report. It said at the time that CBSA had established a process to monitor decisions made by border services officers as they relate to the application of public health policies. It goes on and on to talk about a case management system, an Order in Council system, developing training tools and developing all types of interesting policy health guidelines that were supposed to make it easier at the border for CBSA officers to monitor and apply the rules for people entering the country.

I draw the attention of the House to a few of the points. The report said that CBSA college in Rigaud, Quebec, had updated its training modules on legislation and resources to include teaching points specific to the Orders in Council and application to the job. It had a part on additional training tools for officers, having created a form of job aids that provide scenarios regarding various quarantine exemptions of non-discretionary travel that officers could reference when making a decision.

We know from public reporting and from the incoming American administration that the two primary issues the administration is worried about, with the border disorder caused by the Liberal government, are fentanyl and other opioid trafficking across our border, the smuggling that is going on seemingly almost unabated; and the immigration visa disorder that the Liberals have created as well over the past nine years.

Routine Proceedings

This is important because we know that 47,000 Canadians have now died from the radical liberalization of hard drugs that the Liberal government has conducted, the experiment over the past nine years. That is a 200% increase of such deaths compared to 2016.

The media is not in a vacuum. Information and facts do not exist in a vacuum. The incoming U.S. administration has been paying attention; it has seen the same numbers. America has an opioid crisis in its country and is looking to its neighbours on both sides, as it is going to increase enforcement and wants our government to increase enforcement at the border. At the previous time when there was a major crisis, the government was slow to react. If all it is going to do is offer training modules and have pieces of paper informing officers at the border what they should be looking at, then we are going to be far behind what our neighbours expect us to do.

We know that since 2024, over 80% of accidental opioid deaths primarily involve fentanyl. We also know that the reduced sentences for drug kingpins and lax borders contribute to the deaths. The situation threatens our trade relationship with our biggest trading partner.

I know that in my riding, there are a lot of businesses that are completely dependent on trade with America for the products and services they provide, which run the gambit. One would think it would be mostly oil and gas, which of course it is, but there are also companies in my riding that do things that would be considered to be on the higher end, such as the refurbishment of small aircraft. Small Cessna aircraft are refurbished for the American market by companies in my riding.

• (1020)

Recently, a major new construction centre opened just east of my riding of Bow River, which will now be making new firefighting equipment. Firefighting aircraft in the DHC series of aircraft will again be made by De Havilland right in Calgary. Some of the parts companies are located in the industrial areas of my riding. They are dependent on the American market in order to ensure that they will have future contracts. A lot of European countries have purchased these aircraft, but the American market is also incredibly important.

If our trade relationship with the U.S. continues to sour because the government is not capable of cutting down on the fentanyl trafficking across the border, if all it does is similar to what it did during the pandemic with little training modules, then I am sorry to say that the border disorder will continue. It will not be enough and will not assuage the concerns of the American administration, and in its crosshairs would be regular, everyday Canadians who would pay the price for the NDP-Liberal government's incompetence.

We have seen over the past few years what can happen. Hundreds of thousands of Albertans lost their job through the radical policies the Liberals have introduced targeting energy workers and their families. We cannot risk losing tens of thousands more jobs in my riding and also throughout Calgary, in Edmonton, all across western Canada and in fact anywhere in Canada because the NDP-Liberals are simply too slow to act when they hear serious, logical concerns over what is going on with fentanyl trafficking in Canada.

We know that CSIS has also found that synthetic drugs are increasingly being produced in Canada, using precursor chemicals

largely sourced from the People's Republic of China. CSIS has identified more than 350 organized crime groups actively involved in the domestic illegal fentanyl market. I mention that because I also happen to be the vice-chair of the Canada-China committee. That committee, at the call of the chair, twice now has not met.

As far as I know, there is no meeting of the China-Canada committee set for next week, which means three meetings are now cancelled where we could be looking at issues like fentanyl. The committee's mandate is to look at the Canada-China relationship and the fact that precursor chemicals are coming from the PRC and entering our country, seemingly without a lot of border controls being applied.

This is not to blame the CBSA. The agents are doing the best job they possibly can under their circumstances, but if all they are being offered are training modules and little OICs, their hands are really tied. I am sure that if we go to see rank-and-file members, we would see that they are just as frustrated as we are on this side that we have such lax border controls for precursor chemicals.

The Liberals have kept cancelling the meeting of the Canada-China committee, which should be meeting to talk about issues like fentanyl smuggling across the border and like precursor chemicals coming into Canada. We know that the incoming American administration is concerned, but we should also be concerned. Tens of thousands of Canadians have died because of the opioid crisis and especially the fentanyl crisis, so why should we not be concerned?

We are not the only ones saying it. There are also police chiefs across Canada, like the London police chief, who has said that thousands of deaths have happened and “confirmed that taxpayer-funded hard drugs” that the NDP-Liberals have supported “are being diverted to communities across Canada. In fact, over 30,000 hydromorphone pills were seized in 2023, with most being diverted from so-called ‘safe supply’ programs. He later went on to say that Canadians ‘are being targeted by criminals who exchange these prescriptions for fentanyl, exacerbating addiction and community harm.’”

A lot of this is related to the original report. The government lurches from one crisis to the next. There is border disorder today. There is a crisis at the border and we know this. There is an incoming American administration that is now, in the wrong way, focused on and interested in what the NDP-Liberals have done over the past years and how they have exacerbated the problem.

If we look at past conduct as future conduct, what we see now is that things are going to get worse next year for the residents of my riding and the residents of all our ridings. That is why I have moved concurrence on the report today. It is important and substantive. We need to debate the issue; we need to get to the bottom of it and have a better way of ending the border disorder that the NDP-Liberals have caused.

• (1025)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is truly amazing. The member talks about “border disorder”, when in fact today’s leader of the Conservative Party was a member of the Stephen Harper cabinet when it made drastic cuts to staff and significant financial resources of Canada’s border control agency.

Again, what we are witnessing is a Conservative Party that is loaded with hypocrisy. The Conservatives are complaining about the lack of support going to the Canada Border Services Agency, when in fact the government not only redressed the financial cuts and burdens that the Harper regime put on Canada’s border controls but has also since enhanced the controls. Does the member not see the hypocrisy?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, the member needs to understand that between 2006 and 2015 there was a 45% increase to CBSA’s budget. There were 1,000 more full-time equivalent employees at the agency and 26% more border agents assigned at the agency. Those are the numbers.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to hear my colleague’s opinion on the fact that the Government of Quebec, until quite recently, had to deploy resources to patrol the border even though border surveillance is a federal responsibility.

What does he think of that?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, I thank the member from Quebec for that great question.

That is exactly what the Premier of Alberta did. She said that Alberta’s provincial police forces were ready to step in and ensure border control, since the federal government seemed incapable of enforcing the law, exercising its power or resolving threats along our border. It has also failed to stop organized criminals from bringing people into our country or smuggling immigrants out of Canada and across the border in return for thousands of dollars.

We now have to deal with an American administration that is threatening our country precisely because of the policies of this NDP-Liberal government.

[English]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, yesterday was an opposition day, and the Conservatives put forward a motion and then blocked their own motion because they obviously did not take it seriously. Today is an opposition day where the Conservatives are again procedurally blocking their own motion. They are trying to break Parliament. It is the most bizarre and childish approach on an issue like the one before

Routine Proceedings

us the issue of border security. The Conservatives are responsible for killing 1,200 positions with CBSA on the border. They slashed those positions, and tragically, the Liberals have not made up for the damage the Conservatives did to the border.

However, it is not just that. Conservative provincial governments have the fastest-rising rate of tragic opioid overdose deaths. In Alberta and Saskatchewan, the rates are skyrocketing through the roof. This is the irresponsibility of Conservative governments, and the tragedy is that the federal Conservatives fundraise from it rather than try to get their provinces to actually make sense.

How does the member respond to the fact that the Conservatives killed 1,200 border positions, creating the border crisis, and how does the member respond to the skyrocketing and tragic opioid deaths in Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, there were 26% more border guards between 2006 and 2015. There were 1,000 more FTE employees; the member did not hear that. There was a 45% higher budget between 2006 and 2015. Most importantly, it is the New Democrat member and his party, which kept supporting the Liberal government, that have led to the crisis of today.

What really breaks Parliament is when an opposition party loses itself, ignores the fact that it is an opposition party and keeps providing confidence to the government in a coalition deal. That is what breaks Parliament: not standing up for our constituents but basically behaving like an extra annex to the Liberal caucus.

• (1030)

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise in the House. I have always been proud to stand behind my colleague, the member for Calgary Shepard, and today I am quite literally standing behind the member for Calgary Shepard as I give my speech.

After nine years of the Prime Minister’s reckless policies, Canada’s border is broken. Drugs, stolen cars and even terrorists are now evading detection at our border, and the Prime Minister’s border incompetence is threatening our international reputation, particularly our reputation with our closest ally and most important trading partner.

One example of the Prime Minister’s recklessness in the past was his infamous “#WelcomeToCanada” tweet, which led to a large influx of irregular migrants who came through Roxham Road for years. This was a problem that took the Liberal government years to get under control, and it is a broad problem for which we are still facing the consequences of today.

Routine Proceedings

One of the largest beneficiaries of the Prime Minister's policies on crime has been the organized crime linked to drugs, stolen cars and terrorism. Organized criminals are specifically targeting Canada because it is a low-risk, high-reward environment. We have heard this consistently at the public safety committee in relation to the issue of auto theft. Criminals will look around the world to find the path of least resistance, and Canada's policies under the Liberal government have made it far easier for organized crime to take root in our country. The government's bail policies, lax border policies, criminal justice policies and inattention to our border have led to organized crime taking root in our country.

We know that Canada has become a manufacturing hub for the deadly fentanyl drug, and the strict border provisions that were introduced during the pandemic saw the Canadian fentanyl market shift from being an importer of fentanyl to becoming a massive domestic producer of fentanyl. CSIS has found that synthetic drugs are increasingly being produced in Canada using precursor chemicals largely sourced from China. That is the quote. However, 80% of the chemicals used in fentanyl production are completely unregulated, meaning that criminals can easily import them from China. We know that there are over 350 organized crime groups that are actively involved in our domestic fentanyl market. CBC has even reported that violent cartels are attempting to establish a foothold in western Canada.

We need to stop the deadly flow of drugs coming into our country and the deadly flow of drugs leaving our country. It has become an international embarrassment that our country is now being seen as a drug provider for the world. In fiscal year 2022, the Canada Border Services Agency claimed that it intercepted a total of 563 grams of fentanyl throughout the year leaving Canada. However, in just one shipment, the Australian Border Force intercepted 11,000 grams of pure, powdered fentanyl entering from a shipment that came from Canada. Therefore, CBSA caught 563 grams in all of fiscal year 2022, yet in just one shipment, the Australians intercepted 11,000 grams coming from Canada.

The Vancouver Police Department has reported that approximately 50% of all hydromorphone, the drug that the Liberal government has funded with taxpayer dollars as the so-called threat-reduction measure, is being diverted from the government's so-called safe-supply program for hard drugs. On July 15, the chief of the London Police Service stated, "Diverted [so-called] safe supply is being resold into our community. It's being trafficked into other communities, and it is being used as currency in exchange for fentanyl, fuelling the drug trade".

This Prime Minister's reckless drug experiments are now threatening our closest trading relationship. In the 12 months up to September 2024, the U.S. border agency seized 11,600 pounds of drugs entering the United States from Canada. Now, there are some who might say that we should not be talking about this issue because it is making us look worse. However, we cannot deal with the problem until we acknowledge the problem, and when we acknowledge the problem, we can finally take action on solving the problem. The United States is not going to be satisfied with our silence on this issue. It will be satisfied when we take action on this issue.

• (1035)

The seizures of fentanyl doses have more than tripled from 2023 and 2024, rising from 239,000 doses to 839,000 doses. In fact, in Langley, British Columbia, there was a recent lab bust of a mega lab, and there was enough fentanyl captured at that lab to kill 90 million people. That is more than two times the population of Canada. That was just at one drug lab that was busted in British Columbia. We must fix this. This is costing Canadians their lives. We must fix this, not just because it is a threat to our trading relationship, with our closest trading partner, but also because we need to save Canadian lives and the lives of all the people who are suffering around the world from these drugs that are leaving Canada.

Under the Prime Minister, 47,000 Canadians have died from drug overdoses. That is more people than we lost in the Second World War. It represents a 200% annual increase in drug overdose deaths after the Prime Minister's radical drug experiments. Drugs, crime, disorder and a broken border, sadly, are a consequence of the Liberal government's radical policies. It threatens our relationships with our closest partners.

After nine years of the Prime Minister, there has been a 632% increase in U.S. border patrol encounters with people illegally attempting to enter the United States from Canada. Tariff-screening data shows that, in 2023, there were 484 matches on a U.S. tariffs watch list at land ports of entry along the Canada-U.S. border. Since 2017, these numbers have gone up 123%. These are individuals who are known to the U.S. government for their links with terrorist organizations. The only reason they were apprehended was that they attempted to cross into the U.S. Just this summer, we saw that three ISIS fighters who were operating on Canadian soil were apprehended just before they were able to carry out attacks on innocent civilians both here and in the United States.

Responsibility for the broken border falls squarely at the feet of the Liberal government. The brave men and women of the CBSA do not have the resources and support to do the job that they need to do. The previous Conservative government increased the budget of the CBSA by 45% from 2006 to 2015. There were 26% more personnel at our border from 2006 to 2015, and there were a total of 1,000 more full-time equivalents from 2006 to 2015. We will never apologize for our Conservative record.

Routine Proceedings

Canada has the largest undefended border in the world. It is a beautiful thing that we can have a border with closest trading partner that is open. I know there are so many strong relationships across the border, strong relationships that we need. The fact that we have had this for so many decades is a wonderful thing, but the Liberal government has taken that for granted. It has underfunded our border, and we have seen a rise in crime in this country because of its radical criminal policies and its radical drug liberalization policies. Now we see that that border that we have, that privilege that we have as a country, is coming under threat under the new U.S. administration. We cannot take it for granted. This is an existential crisis.

I have farmers in my riding who are texting me to talk about the stress they are under. We know that farmers do face a lot of mental health challenges. They have to face drought. They have to face a volatile commodities market. Now, they are facing the threat of a 25% tariff from the U.S. administration. We cannot afford the Liberal government taking our trading relationship and our borders for granted anymore. We need it to take strong action to ensure our safety, the safety of our allies and our economic opportunities.

We had the CBSA union at the public safety committee, which said that “Canada’s ability to prevent smuggling lacking, but its capacity to gather reliable and sound data [about smuggling] is also inadequate,” while going on to say “there’s almost a zero per cent chance that any illegal weapons entering the country via rail will ever be found.”

We know that the vast majority of gun violence in Canada is committed with illegally smuggled firearms coming in from the United States. Last week, we saw that the Liberal government continued its attack on law-abiding, responsible, licensed firearm owners. The Prime Minister is desperate to distract from his miserable record of a 116% rise in gun violence since he took office in 2015. Rather than waste money on a flawed confiscation scheme that would only affect legal, law-abiding, licensed gun owners, maybe the Liberal government should be spending that money on the border and increasing the confidence of our trading partners that we are taking action on the drug trade and on illegal people crossing the borders. That is the kind of action that our trading partners want to see, yet these Liberals want to play divisive politics.

● (1040)

A Conservative government would fix our broken border. We would increase border patrols, work with provincial law enforcement, tighten visa rules, crack down on illegal drug production, secure our ports with increased boots on the ground and expand the mandate of the CBSA so that it can do the job we need it to do.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is simply amazing that a Conservative member stands and gives a false narrative, as if the Conservative government under Stephen Harper did anything to make Canada’s borders secure. It not only divested of people at the borders, but also made cuts. Let us contrast that with an investment of nearly \$1.5 billion since 2018 to strengthen Canada’s border controls. There is a litany of information the members opposite will no doubt put on the record that is just not true.

Why should Canadians believe the Conservative Party and, in particular, its leader, when he is the absolute opposite of the types of things he is preaching today?

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Madam Speaker, the member should have stopped at “amazing”. That is what I took from his comments.

The proof is really in the pudding. Obviously, things were not perfect before 2015, but they certainly were not the disaster we see today under the Liberal government. I just quoted a litany of statistics about how bad things have gotten, and now an incoming U.S. administration wants to penalize Canada for taking the border and our trading relationship for granted. Canadians can see that very clearly. It has been reflected in the numbers we are seeing that they no longer believe the Liberal government and want a Conservative government to clean up the mess that it made.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is important for Canadians to know the Conservatives have erased their own opposition day motion to amplify the falsehoods of Donald Trump. There was a time when, if Canadians were threatened by a foreign power, Canadians stood up with backbone, but not under the pusillanimous and predatory member who lives in Stornoway.

Donald Trump threatens 25% tariffs, and the Conservatives say, “Damn straight, let’s do that.” They falsely claim that our border is leaking fentanyl. Why is it leaking fentanyl? The Conservatives claim it because the leader of Canada created a fentanyl crisis. They will say and do anything to burn our house to the ground, but what they will not talk about are the thousands of CBSA employees who Stephen Harper fired while Jean-Pierre Fortin, the national president of customs, was calling out the Conservatives and saying, “More child pornography entering the country, more weapons, illegal drugs, will pass through our borders, not to mention terrorists and sexual predators and hardened criminals.”

That is the Conservatives’ record, but they do not give a damn because it is about burning the house to the ground to get to the Prime Minister. They will burn the country to the ground and inflict 25% tariffs on us while imitating anything Donald Trump says. They are sock puppets and traitors.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Madam Speaker, it is very unparliamentary that any member would accuse another hon. member of being a traitor to our country.

Routine Proceedings

The member for Timmins—James Bay is simply putting his head in the sand when he claims there is not a fentanyl issue in our country. We know that the majority of our ally Australia's fentanyl supply is coming from Canada. We cannot ignore this fact. We need to take action to save Australian lives, Canadian lives and American lives, and to save our borders with the other country. Ignoring that fact is not taking responsibility on behalf of Canadians. Taking responsibility on behalf of Canadians means looking at it squarely in the eye and taking action on the real issues, not burying our heads in the sand like the NDP member is doing.

• (1045)

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, an initial catalyst to the current extreme and growing drug crisis that Canada is facing at its borders was the government removing mandatory minimum penalties for drug dealers. How incredibly inappropriate is it for the government to signal more leniency on drug dealers right now? With premeditation, they are benefiting more than ever from the addiction and death of Canadians.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Madam Speaker, we know that, when mandatory minimum penalties are removed, the instances of repeat criminals, not just people who commit one crime and are rehabilitated, increase on our streets. When I talk to law enforcement, they tell me that they are apprehending the same people over and over again.

We need tough penalties to get tough on drug dealers who are peddling death in our communities. We can no longer let the Liberal government stand idly by and let that happen.

Mr. Adam Chambers: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am just curious. Is it parliamentary language to claim that someone is a “traitor?” I am just looking for clarification on the rules and bounds.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member did not indicate a specific person was a traitor. He did not say it was a specific individual. However, the word is raising an issue, and I would just ask members to please be judicial with the words they use in the House.

Resume debate, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is interesting how sensitive the Conservatives are about the word “traitor.” It might be fair to say that many within the Canadian community see that the Conservatives are attempting to be puppets for Donald Trump and wanting to raise issues that are ultimately to the detriment of any potential trade discussions that take place. After all, in many cases, they like to amplify issues that are nowhere near as severe as they try to portray.

For example, Conservatives are talking about fentanyl. When we think about the amount of fentanyl going into the United States from Canada, do people realize it is less than 0.2% that comes in from Canada? Anyone listening to the debate from the Conservatives this morning would think there is a huge problem with fentanyl going into the States from Canada, a lot more than 0.2%. If the Conservatives want to, both inside and outside the chamber, try to give the false narrative that there is fentanyl flooding the United

States from Canada, it is just not true. It does not help with any sort of negotiations taking place, because it portrays a false narrative.

We see the same issue when it comes to migrants. Less than 1% of illegal migrants, if I can put it that way, come from Canada into the United States. When we listen to the Conservatives, we would think that Canada is the problem for migrants going into the United States.

The Conservatives are not being kind to Canada's negotiators when they amplify misinformation. I had the opportunity to meet with Sara and some of our trade commissioners last week, as we had a fantastic trade mission to the Philippines. In fact, we have now begun exploratory discussions about a potential future trade agreement with the Philippines. We had the largest-ever trade mission to the Philippines, and President Marcos indicated it might have been the largest in decades of any country.

We should be talking about trade in a positive way and encouraging the Government of Canada and other governments to look at Canada as a country that has the ability to trade. Our negotiators are the best in the world. When Conservatives are inside the chamber voting against the Canada-Ukraine trade agreement or espousing a false narrative, it does not help our negotiators. That is why what the Conservatives are doing thus far this morning is nothing more than just puppeting Donald Trump's concerns about border controls.

Yes, there is a need for us to monitor, do our job and play an important role in beefing up, where we can, the Canada-U.S. border. We take that seriously. Our actions have clearly shown that. We hear the numbers. Let me give a number when it comes to Conservatives and misinformation.

If we take a look at the 2011-12 federal budget, when the current leader of the Conservative Party sat around the cabinet table, the number of border control officers we had was 14,833 full-time equivalents. That is when the leader of the Conservative Party was sitting around the cabinet table. In 2015-2016, four years later, there were 13,774 full-time equivalents. That is a drop of over 1,000 full-time positions.

• (1050)

The Conservatives can say whatever they want, but the bottom line is that the leader of the Conservative Party, when he sat around the cabinet table, saw one of the most significant cuts to Canadian border control in the history of Canada. Now, he wants to come out and say that we are going to have a healthier border control agency. If there had been no change in government, the cuts would have continued. In fact, according to their projections, there would have been an additional loss of 371 jobs by 2017-18 if the leader of the Conservative Party had been allowed to stay around the cabinet table with Stephen Harper.

Routine Proceedings

The reality is that there was no sense of urgency or commitment to protect our borders under the Conservative Party. Why should we believe Conservatives today when they go around saying that they are going to cut? Are they not going to cut this area? Are they actually going to give more? Have I got a car to sell them.

At the end of the day, we cannot trust the Conservative hidden agenda. I call it that because they are not honest with Canadians. When Canadians see the reality of a Conservative administration 10 years from now, they will see that it is true to the far right. The far right is what drives the Conservative Party today. Let us not kid ourselves. Many people thought the Reformers were far right. I can say that the Leader of the Opposition is genuinely as far right as they come.

The Conservatives say their fancy slogans, and every one of them will talk about them because they get gold stars every time they repeat the Conservative slogans and bumper stickers; we know that. That is what they are going to talk about, but it is about cuts. It is not giving more. That is what is going to happen with border control. Let us hear the leader of the Conservative Party stand in this place and say that they are going to increase, as the Liberals did.

Not only did we restore the cuts that Stephen Harper and the current leader of the Conservative Party put in place, but we also added several hundred new positions. We recognized the real need there. We understand there is a sensitivity in regard to what takes place on the border, both coming from the United States into Canada and vice versa, and we have seen very impressive results.

From January 2022 to December 2023, CBSA had over 37,000 seizures of guns and drugs. That is some 7,000 illegal firearms entering the country. Whereas the Conservatives turn their heads and neglect border controls, this is a government that ensures our border control agents have the necessary resources and staffing to make a positive difference.

It is interesting why the Conservatives wanted to talk about this specific issue, when history will show they have done a poor job of protecting Canadians' interests. That is the bottom line. We are a government that has recognized the importance of our border, and we are talking about billions of dollars every day of two-way trade that goes through the Canada-U.S. border.

• (1055)

There are tens of thousands of people in different regions of our country who cross the border every day. It is a border in which we all have a vested interest. As a government, we have recognized that, going back to our first day in office, when we were looking at ways we could restore many of the cuts the Conservatives put in place, because we know that Canadians and Americans need to have confidence in our borders. Canada is absolutely dependent on having that free flow of materials, supplies, services and products. That is critical to our economy, as it is critical to many American states and the entire United States.

It is not a one-way thing, where Canada is the only benefactor. Both Canada and the United States benefit by the traffic flow that takes place between Canada and the United States. I only wish that the Conservative Party of Canada would recognize that fact. I only

wish that the Conservative Party had actually invested in our border controls and in protecting Canada's interests. Rather, what we see is a leader of the Conservative Party who has dictated to his caucus what they need to say. Even if it is not true, they still need to say it because the leader of the Conservative Party dictates it.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, some members laugh at that, but it is true. Let us look at national news that was reported about the leader of the Conservative Party. The interesting thing about this story is that it is what Conservatives, members from the Conservative Party, are saying about the leader of the Conservative Party today. This was national news on November 20. The article says, "After two years of [the leader of the Conservative Party] as their leader, many Conservative MPs say they are much less free now than they were before his arrival."

Imagine that. The leader goes around promising Canadians they are going to have freedom, yet the Conservative members of Parliament are "much less free". That is not me saying it; that is Conservatives who are saying it.

An hon. member: Name someone.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, they are too scared to put their name to it. Someone is saying "Name someone". Seriously—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1100)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order.

I think a lot of people ate their Wheaties this morning. I just want to ask members to please wait. They will have 10 minutes of questions and comments, so there will be opportunities to ask those questions or make comments then.

The hon. parliamentary secretary has six and a half minutes left.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, members say, "Name someone". I look at what happened to the member for Abbotsford. When the member for Abbotsford spoke out and criticized his leader, what happened to him—

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I just indicated that there will be an opportunity to ask questions and make comments. I would appreciate it if the member did not scream across the room.

The hon. parliamentary secretary—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order.

What did people eat this morning? The clock is always stopped, so this just lengthens the day.

The hon. parliamentary secretary has six minutes and 10 seconds now.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I should get a 15-second bonus for that interruption.

Routine Proceedings

The article says, “The man who promised during his leadership run to make Canada “the freest country in the world” maintains tight control over the actions of his caucus members.”

I do not have enough time to read it all but there are some delights in the article, such as “Conservative MPs' words and actions are closely scrutinized by the leader's office. Partisanship is encouraged. Fraternizing with elected officials from other parties is a no-no.” That means they do not come over here to talk to me because they will lose gold stars if they do that. It continues, “Those who follow these rules are rewarded. Those who don't often have to suffer consequences.”

Members were saying to give them a name. Look at what happened to the member for Abbotsford. When the leader of the Conservative Party said that he would fire the Governor of the Bank of Canada, the member for Abbotsford, much like every other member on the government benches, said that we needed to recognize that the Bank of Canada was arms length and that we should respect that fact. What happened? The member for Abbotsford was demoted. Where does he sit nowadays? What does he do? There is a message, and that is to stick with what the leader tells them or they could be in trouble.

Here is another good one from the article, “If the leader invents a new slogan, “we know we'll have to use it.” That is why we see these slogans and bumper stickers pop up in every speech the Conservatives give. Why? Because the leader loves it when they do that. A conservative source said, “If you repeat the slogans, you get rewarded.” Another source said, “You are celebrated in front of the entire caucus for being a good cheerleader.” Imagine that. If they say those slogans and bumper stickers and they get applauded in a national Conservative caucus.

This is really interesting, “Sources told Radio-Canada that Conservative Party staffers keep a close eye on MPs' activities.” That means they are being stalked, by the way. Who is talking to reporters? Who is deviating from the party line? Who is fraternizing with MPs? That is why I warn them not to not talk to me. I do not mind if they talk to me, but their leader does.

The article goes on to say, “Journalists have spotted party staffers taking notes and sources say these activities are reported to the leader's office. Everybody is being watched. What we say, what we do, who we talk to. We're told not to fraternize with MPs from the other parties. And that's not normal.”

When we stop and think about it, the Conservative Party wants to echo what it is being told. The Conservatives are rewarded, and they are being stalked to ensure that they stick to the script. The leader of the Conservative Party goes around talking about freedom. What about his own caucus members?

The Prime Minister has always said, even when we were in third party status, that he wants and expects his members of Parliament to bring the issues of their constituents to Ottawa. That is why we will see budgets and throne speeches based on what Canadians are talking about in their communities. What we present in Ottawa, if we look at the actions that we have taken, is a true reflection of what Canadians are thinking, because Liberal MPs are bringing that to Ottawa. We get the absolute opposite from the Conservatives.

The Conservatives are telling their constituents what their leader is telling them to say. We have proof of that, and it is so sad.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

● (1105)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The member is not to hold up the paper he is referencing. He can talk from the paper, but I want to ensure that the hon. member knows he cannot use certain documents as props.

The hon. parliamentary secretary has a minute and half.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, it was a rookie mistake. If we look at Canada's border and at the issue of trade, no government in the history of Canada has signed off on more trade agreements than the Prime Minister and this government. This government not only beefed up our border controls, we restored what the Conservatives had cut and we added to it.

On that note, I move:

That the question be now put.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Madam Speaker, that has to be the worst speech ever by the member for Winnipeg North. It was tough to listen to and completely irrelevant. Of course, it will be irrelevant because he is spreading misinformation. He is making use of the state broadcaster to push out the Liberal narrative without any actual evidence in it.

We know he does not want to talk about how the Conservatives increased the number of border guards by 26%, and we armed them so they could do their jobs better. We took away from the backroom and put less tail and more tooth. This is what we did as government, ensuring they were armed, equipped and our borders were more secure.

We also know that he does not want to talk about what the motion is actually about, and that is how fentanyl use and illegal illicit drugs continue to increase.

Why will he not talk about how, under the Liberal government, we have witnessed 22 Canadians dying every day because of fentanyl overdoses?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, it is because I ran out of time. If I had been provided more time, I could have talked about the serious nature of the fentanyl problem. More than one level of government is responsible that. This is why we will find that across the country different provinces have different levels of issues and severity. The provinces and the federal government need to work together.

It is not appropriate to say that it is all Ottawa's fault, but the member likes to do that because that is all they are focused on. It is just criticizing and criticizing the federal government, even using misinformation, like the member just said. There were cuts by the Conservatives. In 2011-12, 14,833 border control officers were cut. In 2015-16, 13,774 were cut.

The members of the Conservative Party can say whatever they want, but those were real cuts. They cannot change history. The member would be better off sticking with the facts as opposed to the false narrative the Conservatives try to express both inside and outside the House. Shame on them.

• (1110)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis-Philippe Sauvé (LaSalle—Émard—Verdun, BQ): Madam Speaker, I must admit that I am getting a bit confused as I listen to the speeches. I thought we were debating a report on Canada's response to and preparedness for COVID-19, with a particular focus on border control measures. What we are talking about now, however, is fentanyl and Donald Trump. I am at a loss.

Let us return to the debate. The border issue is becoming more and more of an irritant between the Canadian government and the incoming U.S. administration. A family of migrants drowned in Akwesasne, casualties of the well established migrant smuggling networks.

What does the government plan to do to improve our border controls? This is necessary to ensure migrant safety, because we have a moral duty to them. It is also needed for health reasons and to ensure the control of drugs at our borders.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, my comments were very much reflective of the individuals who introduced the concurrence report. Their emphasis was on what was taking place between Canada and the United States, specifically in regard to the border and some of the issues related to it. This is what I was talking about and amplifying with respect to the misinformation that the Conservative Party continuously puts on the record, both inside and outside the House, through things such as social media.

Obviously, the government is very concerned, whether it is the situation that the member described of someone attempting to cross the Canadian border, or a death that occurs in my home province of Manitoba, an individual who had frozen to death. The sad reality is that smugglers caused a great deal of harm to the individuals in question—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Members need to look at me so they know when they are being prompted to wrap it up to allow for more questions.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, when Putin launched his horrific invasion of Ukraine, I took it for a given that everyone in the Canadian Parliament would stand up and defend Ukraine. However, time and again, the member who lives in Stornoway sent all his members in to vote against military support and trade for Ukraine. We were very shocked. We thought that perhaps it was because of the Putin disinformation out there. However, I never thought we would see Conservatives standing in the House to undermine Canada to benefit Donald Trump, a convicted predator who has lied about our nation time and time again. At stake is a 25% tariff that will hit our nation while Americans amplify this disinformation.

Routine Proceedings

I have been in the House 20 years and I have never seen any party, other than the Bloc, openly undermine our nation's interest. I am very concerned at this time that they are playing into Trump's hand, because they are acting like his happy little sock puppets.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, it is a fair assessment to say “Puppets for Trump.”

What many of the Conservatives are echoing as a narrative both inside and outside the chamber is just not true. It is grossly exaggerated and ultimately feeds into what President-elect Trump is raising concerns about. I do not think that is good for our Canadian negotiators who are going to be sitting at the table.

The Conservatives have been cautioned on that. I would like to see them behave in a more responsible fashion on this issue. Their behaviour in voting against the Ukraine trade agreement, and I wish I had more time to expand on that, was a disgrace.

• (1115)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, on the heckling that the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader was responding to, “Name one”, I would like to name the hon. member for Elgin—Middlesex—London. It was widely reported that she was removed as chair of a committee because she got along too well with members of other parties.

I would also like to mention that this business of tracking how MPs behave is repeated on the Liberal benches. I was very disturbed to read in Jody Wilson-Raybould's book that PMO now extends its reach into saying that members of cabinet cannot meet with each other without people who report to PMO, such as a meeting when the former member of this place, Ralph Goodale, was a minister and he wanted to meet with Jane Philpott when she was a minister. They were scolded for meeting without spies in the room.

We have to stand up for the rights of individual MPs to be friends with whomever they want to be friends with and to meet with whomever they want to meet with.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I have never experienced any form of constraints. As I have indicated, my speeches are not necessarily written. I am not told what to say or anything of that nature. I like to think that I have more freedom, in terms of expression and in the sharing of my thoughts with members, than virtually every member of the Conservative caucus, with the exception of the leader of the Conservative Party, possibly.

There is a great deal of freedom within the Liberal national caucus. That is what my first-hand experience has been through my years.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I know we are supposed to be speaking to an opposition day motion, but the con party has decided to speak to this concurrence motion.

I was appreciative of the member's speech. There is one reason why I ran for office, and it was to ensure that the voices of constituents of the riding of Waterloo were represented in this chamber. Oftentimes I hear many perspectives that I personally might not agree with, but my role as an MP is to have them represented.

Routine Proceedings

My question for the member is this. What are his thoughts on the fact that today the Conservative Party is more concerned about the incoming president of the United States? However, when it comes to 18 con members representing their municipalities, asking for housing accelerator funding, they are told that they cannot not do that. When it comes to representing voices within those Conservative benches that support a woman's right to choose, they are not allowed to do that. What are the member's thoughts about democracy and representation in the House of Commons, because they remind us—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): We are running out of time.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the question.

The member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman made reference to state-owned television. However, whether it is CBC or CTV, the Conservatives have boycotted it. The Conservative Party is very dependent on social media for spreading misinformation, and it discredits mainstream media.

Having said that, I would encourage every Canadian to read the article from CBC News that was posted on November 20, 2024. If they do that, they will get a very good sense of who the leader of the Conservative Party really is, and if they know, then it is a lot of trouble for the Conservative Party.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné (Terrebonne, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak today about the eighth report of the Auditor General that we studied in the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. This report was tabled nearly three years ago, but a great many of its observations remain very problematic. Border management is still a serious problem, and that is what I would like to address today in the House.

As we learn in grade 10 at age 15 or 16, Canada was founded on the basis of certain broad principles. One of them is the separation of powers, established at the Charlottetown Conference of 1864. It was decided at the time that there would be a separation of powers, with a view to forming a confederation. Powers over services often delivered by the clergy or women, such as education and health, were left to the provinces, while it was incumbent on the federal government to deliver some of the most important public services, especially at the time, including border control and defence.

During my three and a half years as a member, I have had to rise in the House to criticize the work of the Canada Border Services Agency too many times, work that comes under federal jurisdiction. I feel it behooves us, therefore, to discuss some of these failures today. Let us begin by considering the report at hand, entitled “Report 8: Pandemic Preparedness, Surveillance, and Border Control Measures”. According to this report, border management was rather chaotic, and quarantine management perhaps even more so.

Here is an example. The rollout of border management measures was very slow. The federal government is so out of touch, that the City of Montreal had to dispatch its own personnel to manage the Montréal-Trudeau airport. This is an outrage. I recall watching tele-

vision and wondering what the government was doing. It was doing absolutely nothing, so the cities had to send their own personnel to handle passengers. If passengers exhibited symptoms, staff tried to ensure they at least had masks to protect themselves and the people around them.

Here is another example. At that point, Quebec Premier Legault had repeatedly called on the federal government to restrict the entry of non-essential travellers. It is not known what happened, but once again Ottawa was slow off the mark, failing to grasp what was going on. The border was not closed to non-essential travel in time. When, at long last, thanks to pressure from the opposition parties and the public, the government woke up and began imposing border restrictions, it was not a pretty sight. My colleagues remember it as well as I do, no doubt. It is as though the government wanted to showcase its mismanagement.

The Auditor General has released a number of reports on the government's management during the pandemic, and the most recent one addresses how the Canada Emergency Business Account was administered. I will come back to this later, but in her first report, released in 2021, the Auditor General stated that in 37% of cases, Ottawa was unable to tell whether people had complied with their quarantine orders or not. Still, this failure is an improvement over the 66% of cases in the 2020 report. This means that the government put a quarantine management system in place to avoid a situation where travellers arriving from other countries would bring the virus with them and spread it upon their arrival. In 66% of cases, no one knew whether people had followed quarantine orders in 2020. By 2021, some progress had been made: No one knew whether people had followed quarantine orders in nearly 40% of cases.

According to the 2021 report, 30% of border screening test results were either missing or could not be matched to a case file. Ottawa had no automated registry to track those who had to quarantine in a hotel, and it was unknown whether they had done so. The records that the agency had to verify hotel stays covered only 25% of travellers arriving by air. Once again, I say bravo. Priority follow-ups received no response for 59% of the people who needed them, despite the referrals to law enforcement. In addition, 14% of people who had tested positive for COVID-19 were not contacted by the Public Health Agency of Canada. Even people who showed a positive result upon arrival were not contacted by the Public Health Agency of Canada. Once again, these are only a few examples of the government's mismanagement.

● (1120)

There were also problems related to our official languages. Every time there is a problem concerning the official languages, that means that there are no services available in French. Several of the companies charged with screening did not offer services in French. It is amazing: Once again it is obvious that our official languages are very low on the list of priorities. French comes after absolutely everything else. That is how committed the government really is.

We could also talk about the ArriveCAN app, which was the subject of a hefty Auditor General's report. Let us start with how it worked. The ArriveCAN app erroneously told people they needed to follow quarantine orders when that was not the case. There was unequal access for people who did not have a cell phone or a cell data plan. There was an endless number of bugs that prevented people from accessing the app. Also, as we all know, this app cost far too much, some \$60 million, instead of the \$800,000 it should have cost—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I must interrupt the hon. member to ask her to put her phone away, since we can hear it vibrate and that can cause difficulties.

The hon. member for Terrebonne.

● (1125)

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Madam Speaker, I put my phone away, but I do not know whether that will change anything.

As I was saying, the ArriveCAN case was a blatant failure from beginning to end. When the Auditor General released her report on that fiasco almost a year ago, the first thing we asked was that it place the Canada Border Services Agency under administrative supervision. In fact, we were tired of seeing that nothing had been working right at the Canada Border Services Agency for years. My colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot made the same request yesterday for another program, the CBSA assessment and revenue management system, or CARM, which is supposed to provide a service. However, we know that, despite the more than \$500 million this program cost, it is almost completely inoperative at this stage. How can we put half a billion dollars into a system managed by an agency and not see any positive results? It is scandalous. This leads to huge losses for companies trying to get access through the portal. It is another fiasco. Is it a future Phoenix? Only time will tell. I hope not, however, since I hope that by then the government will have listened to us to finally impose some order in the Canada Border Services Agency.

I will continue, because there is still a lot to be said.

The Auditor General tabled numerous reports on the government's management during the pandemic, and the last one is pretty interesting. To help businesses, the government created the Canada emergency business account. The aim of the program was to help 900,000 businesses by giving them funding, some of it in the form of loans and some in the form of grants. A lot of businesses benefited from the program with some being kept on life support. We know that the program failed on a number of levels.

The most interesting thing is once again how the government managed the program. Someone in cabinet decided to implement the program, which we were fine with, since we supported it. Then, the Department of Finance, which appeared before the committee yesterday, was mandated to manage it, but it instead decided to delegate it to a Crown corporation. We all know that Crown corporations do not have to follow the same rules and are not subject to the same accountability requirements as government departments. In this case, the Department of Finance washed its hands of the program. The Crown corporation in question was Export Development Canada, or EDC, which told the Department of Finance that it did not have the ability to manage the program. The Department of Fi-

Routine Proceedings

nance said not to worry and to go ahead anyway. Then, in a non-competitive process, EDC subcontracted the management of the program to a company in exchange for \$300 million. In the end, all of the businesses that benefited from the program were served, often very poorly, by Accenture.

There is one small detail that is nonetheless important. My colleague from Trois-Rivières told me about it, because I was a little young at the time. In 2000, during the infamous Enron scandal, Andersen, which was both performing and transforming the audits, was to advise the company. It had therefore hidden certain information, because it was acting unethically. We now know that that is fortunately no longer the case, because regulations were put in place. When the company split from its audit branch, Andersen Consulting became Accenture. Yes, it is the same company. Obviously, some of the people who were there at the time have since left, but it is the same company that simply changed its name to change its brand and its image. Accenture managed the program.

The Auditor General's report once again showed extremely poor management of public funds. This is not only poor management during a pandemic, because a lot of people were left in limbo. I will give an example. A lot of companies that were deemed eligible at first received a loan and a subsidy, then almost a year later, a few weeks before they were to repay the loan, they were told that, in fact, they were not eligible. They had to pay everything back, including the subsidy, which the vast majority of these companies had already spent because they needed the money. That was the first failure.

● (1130)

The second failure was the call centre created by Accenture. In some cases, Accenture invoiced 14 hours per agent, despite the fact that the call centre was only open for nine hours. It was overbilling. We also know that the call centre was created much too late and that 19,000 calls were answered by the banks, and even by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, even though that is definitely not their role. Evidently, there was a bit of a problem with the call centre, which cost almost \$30 million.

Routine Proceedings

They are proud of their call centre, but many businesses never actually received a response to their messages. Either they got an automated message telling them to call back because there were 900 other businesses in line ahead of them, or they finally got through to an agent after calling for days, only for the agent to say sorry, but they did not have the answer. What fantastic service \$30 million buys.

Since EDC could not handle things, it left everything in the hands of the consulting firm, Accenture. We know that EDC even asked Accenture to manage a call for tenders. On the pretext of being more competitive, it asked Accenture to manage this call for tenders. Accenture accepted and proceeded to award itself the \$36-million contract. That is what Accenture did. It awarded itself a public contract worth \$36 million. Is that acceptable? Absolutely not. It is totally unacceptable. When questions were asked, EDC and the Department of Finance said they had no intention of asking Accenture for any money back, even though we know that it was overbilling and that taxpayers paid far too much.

Actually, I have my doubts about whether it was malicious because, having been a consultant myself, I know that when people invoice things, they pay close attention to the amount being invoiced. Usually, clients look at what is in the invoice. People are very careful about invoicing the fewest things possible. In cases of overbilling, questions arise as to whether this was done intentionally to make more money. Here again, the responsibility does not lie with Accenture. It lies with the government, to whom we entrust part of our salary. That is what it comes down to. Someone who works does not even have access to their full pay because they trust the government to manage that portion of it and of their hours worked and to provide them with appropriate services. This is not what we are seeing and it is not what we saw during the pandemic.

The Auditor General's many reports on the government's pandemic management left no doubt: There was catastrophic mismanagement. This is not the case either when it comes to the management of public funds. The Liberal government's management of public funds is a catastrophe. I cannot wait for Monday, when we will likely hear the bad news that the deficit is even higher than expected. That is what we get from the Liberal government: gifts and goodies that no one wants, and meanwhile the deficit keeps ballooning. This is hardly sound management of public funds.

I could go on and on about this, but what I am basically trying to say is that, looking at the pandemic management as a whole, there are certain recurring themes. I named two: the Canada Border Services Agency's mismanagement of our borders, and inventory mismanagement. How many times have we heard the Liberal government say that it was a pandemic, that no one knew quite what to do and that it was unprecedented? All right, but as the Auditor General said numerous times when the question was put to her, there is no justification, during the crisis, for all the systems and all the protections put in place to prevent abuse to disappear all of a sudden. Suddenly, sound management of public funds went out the window. Suddenly, sound management of the various policies, either for public health or border management, went out the window. How is it that everything got tainted? Why did that happen? It is as though the government was caught like a wide-eyed deer in the headlights,

with no response for weeks in certain cases, including border management.

Let us face it, this is truly shameful.

• (1135)

What I find very surprising about the Canada emergency business account, or CEBA, is that the federal government, the finance department, disagreed with one recommendation. It was the recommendation inviting it to reflect on what had happened, to share in the responsibility and to establish an accountability process for CEBA. However, the finance department said that it was washing its hands of it and that it was up to the Crown corporation to take responsibility. That is odd, because the Crown corporation says that it is the departments that are directly accountable, along with the company. That is because departmental accountability also means the minister is accountable for the Crown corporations that the minister has mandated. This case is very clear. The Department of Finance and Global Affairs Canada mandated Export Development Canada to manage CEBA.

Why is the government still unwilling to take responsibility? Last week, Quebec's auditor general tabled a report showing that a government corporation had been badly mismanaged. What happened that very day? The CEO was fired. That is how a government with a modicum of responsibility toward its taxpayers operates. In this case, the government took action.

Does anyone know how many people were fired after the infamous ArriveCAN saga? Two people are on leave as of now, and an investigation is under way. That is all. We know full well, however, that the chain of command extends far beyond that. Why has no one taken responsibility? Why was the former CBSA president, who appeared before the committee, able to then bill the CBSA for the time he spent testifying? Yes, taxpayers paid for questions to be put to the government and to the former CBSA president. This CBSA president is now employed by PricewaterhouseCoopers, so he is receiving a full salary from that company, and on top of that, he is billing the CBSA for the time he spent preparing for his appearance before the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. That is how the former president of the CBSA, who was there during the ArriveCAN saga, shows his respect and sense of responsibility toward taxpayers, who paid far too much for an app that we know was defective.

I would like to conclude by addressing something important. If the Liberal government wants to take responsibility, it will have to do something. We know that it is a government on its last legs, but that does not mean that it does not have to take responsibility, at least when it comes to the Auditor General's report. We are seeing things now that we have never seen before. Departments are rejecting the Auditor General's recommendations.

Routine Proceedings

The government should at least do something about the Canada Border Services Agency. Everyone knows that there is a cultural problem with the CBSA bureaucrats. The CBSA really needs some attention and really needs the government to take it in hand. We will continue to try to hammer that message home. We will continue to ask questions until the problem is resolved. We firmly believe that the Canada Border Services Agency should be put under administrative supervision.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the government spent billions and billions of dollars during the worldwide pandemic that was having an effect on Canadians in every region. There were going to be some problem areas; there is no doubt about that, but there were also many more success stories. The member made reference to gifts, saying that we gave gifts. Supports to seniors and Canadian workers during the pandemic were not gifts. That is something we did because it was the right thing to do. I am wondering if the member would at least acknowledge that those were not gifts; that, in fact, it was important that the government step up and support Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Madam Speaker, of course my Liberal colleague can quote me entirely out of context, but I will give him an example of a gift: his GST holiday. Tens of thousands of businesses are still wondering how they are going to implement this so-called gift.

Some gift. It will cost businesses more to adjust their cash registers to accommodate the GST holiday than they will make in additional sales. According to a CFIB survey, only 4% of business owners think they will have stronger sales as a result. Meanwhile, it will cost them \$4,000 to \$6,000 to reprogram their cash registers.

Is this really a gift? No one wanted the Liberals' GST holiday.

● (1140)

[*English*]

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague is a well-versed member of the public accounts committee and has done great work there on behalf of many Canadians, and I thank her for that.

One of the issues we dealt with in the public accounts committee was hearing from companies, particularly from pharmaceutical companies during the time of COVID. We have seen that these pharmaceutical companies were malicious not only to Canadians, but they were malicious right across the globe. They sought to withhold consent to release documents and contracts. We saw that operators of these companies were hedging their bets. They were taking advantage of people because they had control over critical vaccine supply and critical vaccine patents and they used that to abuse countries right across the globe. In that public accounts committee, we reviewed those contracts, in the very first instance of that across the globe. Can the member please speak to the importance of transparency for these companies that would take advantage of a crisis?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his question, since it is always a pleasure for me to address this issue.

I originated the motion asking that the government provide us with the contracts for purchasing COVID-19 vaccines during the pandemic. As a matter of fact, I would like to thank my colleague for his support, because it certainly was not easy. The government was extremely reluctant to give us the contracts. It even called the pharmaceutical companies.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts had quite a meeting. We heard Pfizer, Medicago, Sanofi and Moderna explain why it would not be a good idea for parliamentarians to see the vaccine contracts, even though that is our role.

What we did see was in camera, so we cannot share the details. I can only corroborate what my colleague just said. Certain pharmaceutical companies took advantage of Canada's vulnerability and severely overbilled us so they could increase their profit margins, all while people were dying because they did not have access to vaccines yet.

That is contemptible.

[*English*]

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to say that, of all the speeches I have had the opportunity to listen to in the House, this one has been remarkable. I see the member's depth of understanding and appreciation for what she sees happening with the government, which is something I share her frustration with. Even more importantly, the vast majority of Canadians and Quebeckers are also frustrated to extreme limits.

We are talking about the border and the issues around drugs coming into our country. The member knows that the government decided to remove mandatory minimum penalties for drug dealers. I would like to know what her perspective is on whether this was appropriate in any way; I really think we give the Liberals more benefit of the doubt than we should. Is it appropriate that they signalled more leniency for drug dealers who, even right now, with premeditation, are benefiting from the addictions and deaths of Canadians because of what the government has done?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question and comments, which are much appreciated.

Of course, anyone who has served for several years on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts and has seen how hard it is to get the government to do anything will be feeling frustrated. I hope I will be forgiven. As for the message the government is sending, I would have to go back and speak with my colleagues who are more familiar with legal matters.

Routine Proceedings

However, the fundamental problem here is border management. My colleague is absolutely right. The border has become a real sieve. People come and go as they please, sometimes even with firearms. We also know that a cartel is stealing vehicles. We know that there are huge problems at the border and that the Canada Border Services Agency is not fulfilling its responsibilities. That is why we are calling for the agency to be put under administrative supervision.

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, once again, my colleague delivered a very clear speech.

As she just mentioned, our borders are porous. The government is not taking this seriously or responding appropriately. I would like my colleague to comment on the fact that the Quebec government has deployed resources at the border, even though the border is a federal responsibility. I would also like her to talk about what that might mean for the future.

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Madam Speaker, this gives me a wonderful opportunity to say that I think the Sûreté du Québec may often be more competent at managing our borders than the Government of Canada, together with the RCMP or the CBSA.

This also gives me a wonderful opportunity to say how much better Quebec would be if we could control our borders ourselves.

Vive le Québec libre.

• (1145)

[English]

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Madam Speaker, during the pandemic, we saw not only an instance of a very large national crisis but also an instance of a global crisis. During these kinds of global crises, there is a tendency for polarization and distrust to grow in relation to the crisis. This particularly happens in democratic nations. Of course, there was a lot of distrust in the government predating the pandemic. Going into the pandemic, there was even more distrust.

There are two kinds of Canadians now, those who were united before the pandemic and those who were divided after it. It is a difficult and sad thing to realize. Does the member think that distrust has played a role in the lack of civility or decorum across our country, especially during that time? Would the member please comment on the level of distrust and how it has eroded our democracy?

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Madam Speaker, that is an excellent question. That is why I really enjoyed sitting on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts with this member. We see the government's mistakes. We also see the good things, at times, but mostly we see the government's mistakes.

What is eroding the public's trust in the government is its lack of accountability, its lack of responsibility. I gave an example from Quebec. When Quebec's auditor general tabled a report on a poorly managed public corporation, the government fired the CEO that same day.

That is how the government can show that it takes the Auditor General of Canada seriously, that it takes public money and its management seriously. Even more fundamentally, as my colleague rightly said, this is how the government should show that it takes

the public's trust in our institutions seriously. This trust is being eroded all over the world, and Canada is no exception. This can largely be blamed on the Liberal government.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, there are ample examples of the government often taking necessary actions in order to show transparency and accountability. We saw that during the pandemic. Because of inappropriate behaviour by companies or individuals, there were attempts to recover finances and allow the RCMP to do the work that needed to be done when there was criminal involvement. Would the member not see that as a positive thing?

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Madam Speaker, I agree.

The RCMP finally decided to open an investigation into Arrive-CAN long after parliamentarians started asking for and demanding one. As we know, the RCMP is independent. Nonetheless, I would like to see the results of that investigation. I would like to know more, because we have seen many cases of mismanaged funds.

Just look at the misappropriation of funds at Sustainable Development Technology Canada, or SDTC. It is another example of the government's bad management. Obviously, that is not what we are talking about today, but I want to take this opportunity to talk about the CEO of SDTC who gave \$5 million in funding to a company owned by her friend when that company did not meet any of the program's eligibility criteria. Again, we have not seen anyone pay for the mismanagement at SDTC. It is just a routine matter for the government. No one pays; there is no accountability.

[English]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning, I want to say that I will be sharing my time with the member for Edmonton Griesbach.

Routine Proceedings

It is really important to make clear what is happening today for those who are watching. I do not normally get into all the procedural rigmarole. It is in-house fighting. However, the Conservatives had a day to bring forward any opposition motion to fight the government, which is one of the fundamental principles we have. They decided to upend their own opportunity to speak to something that they had previously committed to in order to use the House of Commons to amplify the distortions that are coming out of Mar-a-Lago from Donald Trump, primarily his falsehood that Canada is this fentanyl trafficking system causing deaths in the United States. What he has put on the table is the threat of a 25% tariff that would cause economic havoc for families, workers and businesses across Canada. There was a time when parliamentarians would have stood up for Canada and responded to these falsehoods, but that is not how Canada's Parliament operates under the member who lives in the 19-room mansion at Stornoway. It is to burn the House to the ground at all costs. That is a dangerous position for democracy to be in.

I would like to start just by talking about how we have the world's longest undefended border. Other than in 1812, when they attacked us and tried to take us over, we have maintained that border and we have maintained good-natured relations. However, we have not gone along with the Americans when they have tried to bully us. We have not embraced their wide open and dangerous death-cult gun culture, even though many Canadians are registered gun owners. We accept the principle of having responsible gun ownership as opposed to the reckless guns that are killing people across the United States. We have not supported their belief that health care should belong to those who have money. We took a different tack, even when we were being undermined as being communists and socialists at the time. When the United States insisted that young Canadian men go and die in the rice paddies of Vietnam, we said no, we would not send our young men to Vietnam. It was a wrong war. We opened our borders to many great young Americans who were not going to go die needlessly in Vietnam.

When the United States tried to pressure us to go into the false attack on Iraq, we said no; we were under enormous pressure then. In the 1980s, when Ronald Reagan was launching horrific violence in Latin America, in El Salvador and Guatemala, and then the United States was deporting thousands of people who were trying to escape the genocide that was happening in the hills of Guatemala, they put enormous pressure on us to close our border. People who could not go back to the death squads in El Salvador and Guatemala were trying to cross the border at Buffalo to get into Canada and be safe. At that time, Brian Mulroney said we had to have the same border principles as the United States, but Canadians stood up and said no, those were not our values. We pushed back because we could not send people back to the death squads.

Yes, the United States is our neighbour, but we have stood up to it. We are in a different situation with Donald Trump, a convicted predator who is seriously undermining the democratic process in the United States. He thinks he can just push us around. He insults us. The Conservatives seem to like it because he is insulting our Prime Minister, but he is not really insulting the Prime Minister. He is insulting Canadians, calling us the 51st state.

Once there was a Canada that had a flag that did not need to be waved, a flag that represented who we are. We did not boast about it. It was not until our flag was appropriated by conspiracy haters that it was stuck on pickup trucks, promoting all kinds of disinformation. Our flag was something that just said it was about values. It was something we all understood. We did not have to brag about that when we were a country of 11 million people and the Americans were saying they did not want to go to war. When Hitler invaded Poland, on the very first day, 11 million Canadians stood up and created the fourth-largest air force in the world, the fourth-largest navy in the world. We sent our young people all across the world to defend the notion of freedom and parliamentary democracy. We paid an enormous price. When we came back, we did not wave the flag; we just came back and did what we did because we were Canadians.

● (1150)

Now here we are with this falsehood being perpetrated by the member who lives in Stornoway, and whatever Donald Trump says, he will use it to burn the House down to get to the Prime Minister. He is using this falsehood on fentanyl, which is an absolute falsehood. I have the Drug Enforcement Administration's unclassified reports on fentanyl. It writes about China, India, Mexico, but there is just one very tiny thing about a small amount coming from Canada, so that is not the issue. Fentanyl is not the issue, but the Conservatives will use that falsehood, threatening a 25% tariff.

We can bet these dumbed-down speeches claiming Canada has a broken border and is a fentanyl-trafficking area are going to be used on every right-wing blogcast and on Fox News to further undermine our country. The Conservatives would do that. They would burn our House to the ground because they do not care about truth. They would not know what truth was if Lady Truth came down naked, painted purple, and danced all over Stornoway for weeks. The member would not notice.

I say that jokingly, but it is not a joke, because what Trump is really after is our water. He has made it clear. He said there is a "giant faucet" in Canada and one can just turn it on. There was a time we would have defended those resources, but one can bet that if Donald Trump says, "I want Canada's water," the Conservatives will use the House of Commons to promote his attack on our resources, to take what he can take, because the Americans do not take us seriously. They think they can push us around, but they can only push us around if we have fifth columnists, which is what they called Franco's people who undermined the defence of democracy in Spain, people who would undermine their own country to score a point. Another term is "quislings".

Routine Proceedings

We need to stand up to Donald Trump, and not to be boasting like he boasts, not to be threatening like he threatens, but to stand for Canadian values: that we will counter falsehood with truth, be a good neighbour, protect our border. We will not be pushed around. The member who lives in Stornoway will amplify falsehoods and misuse the House of Commons, knowing it is putting Canadian jobs and families directly at risk, because the Conservatives do not care. They do not care, because it is about burning the House to the ground to get to the Prime Minister.

I am not going to go down into the gutter with the Conservatives where they make these falsehoods about the Prime Minister, who I do not agree with on hardly anything, but that he somehow created the fentanyl crisis that caused thousands of deaths is an ugly falsehood. It is just a straight-up lie, but they use that all the time.

The Conservatives come into the House of Commons and talk about defending the border when, under Stephen Harper, they trashed border security. Members will remember when Tony Clement took \$50 million out of border security and spent it on bogus projects in his riding, like the gazebos, the sunken boats and the fake lakes. They took money that would have protected our borders and used it so shamelessly. They cut 1,100 jobs from the Canada Border Services Agency, and they were told about the threats that would follow. They got rid of the dog sniffer teams. Maybe Stephen Harper did not know what a dog sniffer team is; a dog sniffer team is what we use to sniff out drugs, and it was the Harper government that got rid of that. They got rid of the intelligence agency at the border. They got rid of the teams who went undercover to take on the smuggling gangs. That is the record of Stephen Harper.

So, when Conservatives come in the House and pretend they stand for Canada, we know they do not stand for Canada. When they come in the House and say they will stand up on the world stage, we know they supported Putin in undermining the votes for Ukraine. When they say they will defend the border, they are only defending the interests of Donald Trump and they would sell us down the river, but not on my watch, not on our watch, not ever. We will stand up for Canada.

• (1155)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, according to CBC in April 2012, “Jean-Pierre Fortin, national president of the Customs and Immigration Union, said 1,026 jobs will be eliminated within three years, and that represents a ‘direct attack to our national security and public safety.’”

The issue of cuts under the Conservative regime was, in fact, very serious. On the one hand, Conservatives are critical, yet when they were in government, in particular when the leader of the Conservative Party was sitting around the cabinet table, there were serious cuts to Canada's border control: well over 1,000 jobs and other financial resources.

The member makes reference to sidestepping and how the Conservative Party today does a disservice to Canadians by, in essence, amplifying a false narrative that often we hear coming from the United States. Could he expand on that thought?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, it is a very serious situation we are facing with Donald Trump. We certainly know that

President Zelenskyy is doing everything he can to defend Ukraine, while Donald Trump is putting in a Putin troll as his director of national intelligence. The world order is disintegrating around us and we need to know that Canada stands for something.

Canada was a founder of the International Criminal Court, yet we have criminal court indictments against Putin and Benjamin Netanyahu, and what does the member in Stornoway say? He said defending the International Criminal Court, which Canada helped build, is “woke” and “harebrained”.

The Conservatives do not believe in the rule of law. They are not worried about what is happening with Zelenskyy and they will support Trump in undermining Canada, forcing tariffs on us and destroying our economy, all to get at the Prime Minister.

Surely to God they have to rise a little higher out of the gutter if they are going to represent Canadians.

• (1200)

Mr. Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member opposite for Timmins—James Bay talked a lot about the fentanyl situation here in Canada. Recently, a memo drafted by CSIS for the Prime Minister stated, “CSIS identifies more than 350 organized crime groups actively involved in the domestic illegal fentanyl market”.

We are now producing much more fentanyl here in Canada, and we have become a net exporter of fentanyl rather than an importer of this product. Can the member sit back and say this is not a Canada-created problem? We are now exporting more of this drug than we are importing, and we are sending it to other countries. We have an overabundance of it and it is obviously a problem. What has the member got to say about that issue?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, it is fascinating for a member whose party cut the border intelligence unit in half to then have the gall to say Conservatives are worried about illegal gangs in our country. They did not care at all when his party and the member who lives in Stornoway sat around the cabinet table and got rid of the sniffer dogs on the intelligence units that were stopping the gangs from shipping fentanyl one way or the other. They did not care at all when they cut the teams that were trained for years to go undercover.

Now, undercover is mostly the member in Stornoway on any given night when we are voting in the House on all his dumb motions, and he keeps them going all night long, but he is always undercover. The undercover teams, though, the Conservatives cut them. That was years and years of work to protect us and international allies from these gangs and from fentanyl. The Conservatives did not care then and they do not care now. They are just Trump's little sock puppets.

Routine Proceedings

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis-Philippe Sauvé (LaSalle-Émard-Verdun, BQ): Madam Speaker, I cannot help but feel bad for the member for Timmins—James Bay when I hear him lamenting about how Canada used to be. Canada demonstrated it was independent from the United States in 2003 and 1975.

Now that his country has become a zombie country, now that the Prime Minister is running down to Florida to be humiliated, does he understand that it was not worth sending the army into the streets of Quebec in 1970, that it was not worth repatriating the Constitution in 1982, and that it was not worth cheating in 1995? Does he now understand the value of independence?

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I remember when we had to send in the army to help old people who were dying in old folks homes in Quebec during COVID, because the province called on Canada to come in there. As the member collects his paycheque from Canada, and eventually his pension, he should at least apologize to the old people who were left to die, under Quebec's competence, in the seniors homes in Quebec during COVID, because that was an absolute disgrace that was allowed to happen. Thank God Canadian soldiers stepped in.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Madam Speaker, if you would indulge me, I would like to thank my hon. colleagues for this year in particular. It was a difficult year for my family as the matriarch of the Fishing Lake Métis Settlement, my late mother, Mary Grace Desjarlais, passed away. She passed away surrounded by loved ones and family, and she went the way that she always wanted to, surrounded by her grandchildren. I want to thank my hon. colleagues, my constituents and of course all members of the House for their immense support during this difficult time for me and my family.

I also want to thank the member for Timmins—James Bay. His stalwartness, kindness and demeanour have often shone on this place an ability for us to rise to a better kind of standard, a kind of standard that asks us to think of each and every one of us as part of a larger and greater path that, in many ways, would, hopefully, result in Canadians being even more united. Crisis after crisis, and in particular during COVID-19, as the report suggests, or in dealing with the tariffs being threatened by President-elect Trump, we must find ways to come together.

These are serious issues that can impact every single one of our constituents, every single one of our families and every single part of our lives. When these kinds of issues threaten, we should go beyond being simply political opponents and rise to becoming allies, as Canadians. However, the opposite is so often taking place, where being political enemies for the ability to score cheap electoral points becomes the primary objective.

When the United States threatens 25% tariffs, my goodness, across the board on all goods, we have the Conservatives speaking to the talking points of Trump and gaslighting Canadians, suggesting in some way, shape or form that Canada controls the imports on the American border, which is ridiculous. Every country is responsible for protecting its sovereign borders, its sovereign boundaries, including the United States.

What have we seen from the United States? I have said this in the House before, but watching President-elect Trump is like watching a scary movie twice. We have had to experience and witness his administration in the past. We know the kinds of tactics this guy uses. This guy is bashing Canada, our workers and our economy. We, as a country, must unite against that kind of bullying tactic. Unfortunately, time and time again we see that the Conservatives often take the points of the conservatives south of us in order to attack Canadian interests here at home. That is of incredible concern.

It should be of incredible concern to all Canadians. When the next crisis happens, who will stand with us? Canadians must know that when a crisis impacts every single one of us, we will unite. I am deeply concerned about the changing tradition and consensus in this place. At one point, we would never have been political enemies; political opponents, yes, but not political enemies. That future is now more relevant to us than ever before as we question the interests of the Conservative Party, which consistently uses American talking points to attack Canada's industry, Canadian border officers and the very values we stand for.

Canada is not the 51st state. I am ashamed to have to say that, especially to remind my Conservative colleagues. It is an attack on sovereignty, on our interests and on our values. It is an attack on the kinds of values that suggest no matter where someone lives, who they love and how much they make, they will be at home here in Canada. Those values are being undermined consistently in this place by Conservatives, who continuously seek to gain partisan advantage at the expense of working Canadians. This is a troubling fact that I hope we can rise above. It is one we need to rise above to directly combat the very real interests of Donald Trump's America.

● (1205)

What we saw during COVID-19 was a deadly combination of a government that was out of touch with Canadians, an international pandemic and the age of Internet and misinformation. These three things together are now coalescing in an organized fashion to attack our very democratic tradition. Western democracies across the globe are under attack. It is imperative that we understand the threat, come together to unite against it and speak to the better values of Canadians.

In this place, we should always imagine the kind of Canada that would benefit each and every one of us. It was consistently said by New Democratic leaders to dream big dreams of our country. We should not dream tiny dreams like becoming the sock puppet of America, but dream of becoming a country that stands for justice, truth, peace and prosperity for all human life and that when those values are threatened, we would come together and combat that threat because we know the risk it runs.

Routine Proceedings

The member for Timmins—James Bay gave us a very good history lesson on this. During World War II we saw what these divisive politics can do, and it cost millions of lives. When we start to turn on our neighbours and on one another, it has deadly consequences. At that time, Canadians did not fall at the crisis. We did not fall to the misinformation by Nazi Germany or to the crumbling economy that war presented; we stood up, joined hands, some picked up a rifle while others picked up a hammer and we went to work and to war. Canadians raised the largest merchant navy in the world. The war employed millions of Canadians here at home and created hundreds of Crown corporations. We invented new things right here in Canada. What a great memory for each and every one of us to touch a stone and remember that we have this legacy within ourselves as Canadians. We must find a way to rise to that occasion that would do those who fell in war proud. They fell for peace, freedom and justice. We must stand for those same values today, especially against the immense threat the Americans present.

When we speak of team Canada, we mean a kind of Canada where each and every one of us, although we may disagree on the approach to ensure our country is well-defended economically, would come together against all odds to protect our values and interests. I am deeply concerned by the immense misinformation by Conservatives to destroy the very reputation of our country, polarize each and every one of us, and attack the very integrity of our institutions. Our independent journalists, who risk their lives overseas, are now risking their lives here at home simply for telling the truth.

Here in this chamber, it is with great honour and privilege that I rise and speak to this on behalf of the good people of Edmonton Griesbach, who have exercised their democratic rights to elect a member to speak to these critical issues facing our nation. They expect each and every one of us who knows the threat of what American tariffs present to unite, even amongst our differences, and protect jobs, livelihoods, incomes and the ways we put bread on the table. That is the conversation we are ultimately having.

Trump has said that his number one objective in his threats against Canadians is to balance the American budget. It has nothing to do with the border or drugs; it has everything to do with the very narrow objective of a billionaire president-elect who wants to pad the bank accounts of other billionaires and make Canadian workers pay for it. Worst of all, the Conservatives are applauding him and gaslighting Canadians by saying it is our fault. It has to be Canadians' fault because who else's could it be? What a shame that our workers do so much every single day just to be cast down with a very derogatory comment like that.

I call on all of my colleagues to unite toward a better tomorrow and that big Canada, to dream big dreams and overcome the things that threaten us. Let us defeat these tariffs and stand for Canadian values and Canadian workers.

• (1210)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. Conservatives proposed this motion. They are not even in the House. I call quorum.

The Deputy Speaker: There is a quorum call.

And the bells having rung:

The Deputy Speaker: We now have quorum.

Questions and comments, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

• (1215)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate many of the comments that the member has put on the record. One of the things that I think is so important for us all to recognize is just how the trade between Canada and the U.S. is so essential, not only for Canada but also for the United States. Canada has, I have argued, some of the very best negotiators in the world. We are in a great position to ultimately renegotiate if the need is there. We should be united in terms of taking and promoting Canada's advantages. The official opposition today, under the leadership of the Conservative Party, has taken an opposite approach, as if they are puppets of the Trump administration.

I am wondering if my friend could provide further comment on how the Conservatives playing down Canada's interests is hurtful for all of us in Canada.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Mr. Speaker, if we do not all stand for Canada at a time of a threat, when will we stand together? That is the deep concern I have, that Conservatives would be willing to toss out our industry, willing to cast down and gaslight Canadians, willing to even suggest that our government is attacking or destabilizing the border. These are wild accusations that are parroted by Conservatives here and mentioned on a social media platform by Trump.

We know that Trump's interests are, narrowly, to balance his budget, and that he wants Canadian workers to pay for it. We say no to that. We do need to see that coming together. We need to see labour, especially, at the table, and that is why I would encourage the member. We need a war room that includes labour representatives, because they know the workers, they know the skills, they know our industry and they know exactly how to get it to market. If it is not the United States, it will be elsewhere.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague was quick to take on the international trade file. In fact, although he joined that committee only recently, he is already well versed on the issues.

Does he agree or disagree with me regarding negotiations between Canada and the United States or Mexico, more specifically, under the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement? When international agreements are being negotiated, Quebec is often left out in the cold. It is often treated as the expendable province.

Routine Proceedings

Did his committee look into that? As a member of that committee, will he ensure that such situations do not occur again during future negotiations?

[*English*]

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague is right. I have spoken to Bloc members about this issue. We are united in the fact that we must protect Quebec industries, most particularly the dairy industry. It is one of the best industries in the world, and one of the healthiest and safest products in the world. When Canadians have products of value and quality, it is incumbent upon this chamber to make certain that those products are protected and exported in the highest value that can possibly be attained for that product.

We are seeing malicious attacks by Conservatives south of the border, within CUSMA, to derail softwood lumber industries in my part of the country and the agricultural sector. We need to see, in the renegotiation of CUSMA and the annual review that is coming up, a strong principle that would ensure that trade disputes are met fairly and equitably for Canadians, not just for the highest bidder.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate, so much, the strong, powerful voice of the member for Edmonton Griesbach. I wanted to just raise with him what is obvious to all of us. The Conservatives wrecked the border when they were in power, devastating the supports, including the CBSA. Sadly, the Liberals have not fixed what the Conservatives wrecked. An NDP government is going to actually show respect for our partners and, of course, for the border.

How would that be different from the wreckage that we have seen from Conservatives and the inaction from Liberals?

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague is right. New Democrats are the only ones willing to defend not only Canada's interests but also Canada's values. That is an important part to a lot of this question. In Canada, we value not just our sovereignty but also, above all else, the safety and security of Canadians. Even if a billionaire threatens us, we will not gaslight Canadians. That is a promise; it is unfortunate that we have to make such a promise in this place, but it is real. We will not sell out the values of Canadians just because a billionaire south of the border says he wants more money and wants to charge Canadian workers for it.

The Conservatives cut 1,100 border service officers and dog sniffers, the units that find drugs. They cancelled the very real and important security measures that are present at our borders, the checks and balances that make certain the imports coming into this country and those coming in are safe. We need to do more, and an NDP government will do it.

• (1220)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is a very unusual circumstance today because the Conservatives are sabotaging not just the country or the border, but their very own opposition day motion, as they did yesterday. As we know, the practice is that, in supply, each party gets opposition days. The reality is we had an opposition day yesterday that the Conservatives sabotaged. They obviously did not take the day seriously at all and their motion was not serious at all, as usual. They sabotaged it by stopping debate on their own motion.

Today, they have proposed something that again stops debate on whatever motion they want to bring forward. It points to the lack of seriousness of this modern Conservative Party. Since the member for Carleton took over, this party is less serious than it has ever been, more childish than it has ever been and more disrespectful of the Standing Orders. We have had two consecutive question periods where the Standing Orders were basically ripped up and thrown out the window. As the Speaker knows, Conservatives asked questions that had nothing to do with government administration time after time, with a profound and unbelievable disrespect for Canadian democracy.

They show the same disrespect for Canadian democracy, wanting to be the wrecking crew of Canadian democracy, that they have shown on the border. I will come back to the motion that they presented and then, as usual, Conservatives will flee the scene. They will take off, like the member from Carleton did yesterday when the NDP's important motion on—

The Deputy Speaker: I know the hon. member knows that we are not to say whether somebody was here, is here or is going to be here.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, the words stand. The reality is that a motion was presented and we just had a quorum call as there were no Conservatives in the House because they were not even prepared to—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I know I am being tested, but the hon. member knows full well that he is not supposed to say that.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I will move on.

The wreckage of Canadian democracy is quite obvious to anybody watching. By the fact that the Conservatives are sabotaging their own opposition day, what they are saying to Canadians is that they do not take their opposition day seriously. Why should they? They are saying, “We are just going to do whatever the heck we want to do with this day”, which is supposed to be a day when they bring forward, potentially, some solutions that go beyond three-word slogans. That is the limitation the member for Carleton has; three-word slogans are the only thing he seems able to do. A three-word slogan does not resolve more complex issues.

Let us get back to the issue of the border, because it is something the Conservatives should take seriously but have not; their record proves that. We will go back to the dismal, dark years of the most corrupt government in Canadian history, the Harper regime, which was the most disrespectful of Canadian democracy and of Canadians. I have mentioned before in the House the fact that Conservatives slashed veterans' benefits, forcing veterans out onto the street. The Conservatives told seniors that they could not retire anymore, saying, “We are going to add years to your working life.”

Routine Proceedings

I remember standing in the House after the incredibly catastrophic 2012 budget that the Harper regime put forward, reading and getting information from emails, from texts and from people's posts on social media about what that meant for people who had given their entire working life to this country. The Harper regime snatched pensions away in a moment, without any reflection at all. The Conservatives were terrible to Canadians, and they were thrown out of office in 2015 because we all remembered how awful the Harper regime and the Harper Conservatives were.

However, the Harper Conservatives were not awful to one group of people: the billionaires. They loved licking their boots. The billionaires got a number of things from the Harper Conservatives. First were massive liquidity supports to Canada's big banks, so the CEOs of Canada's big banks were sitting pretty. Where did they take the money from? The Harper Conservatives took it from CMHC, helping to create the housing crisis we have today. The housing crisis is thanks to the Harper Conservatives; of that there is no doubt.

The Conservatives also put in place the infamous Harper tax haven treaties. Our PBO, the Parliamentary Budget Officer, who is the impartial, non-partisan arbiter of what makes sense financially and what does not, indicates that the Harper tax haven treaties cost us \$30 billion each and every year. The biggest shame of the Liberal government is that it did not end the practice the Conservatives put into place, because there is no doubt that it is very germane to the discussion we are having today.

The Harper regime broke everything: health care, the border and pensions. It even broke veterans' support, showing profound disrespect for the people who laid their life on the line. However, the Harper regime gave a ton of money to the rich. Canada's few dozen billionaires are sitting pretty thanks to the Harper Conservatives, because that is the only thing they did that benefited anybody. The Harper regime benefited only Canada's billionaires.

While the Harper Conservatives were cutting, slicing and dicing all the services Canadians depend on, they came up with the brilliant scheme that, to protect our border, they would slash the Canada Border Services Agency. At CBSA, 1,100 positions were eliminated, and the flow of illegal guns started at that moment thanks to the Harper Conservatives. Thanks to the Conservative Party and Conservative MPs, a flow of illegal guns came across the border. Again, the Liberals should have fixed that immediately when they came to power, but they chose not to, so that shame is something the Liberals carry in part, because they did not fix what the Harper Conservatives broke.

It gets worse, because it is not just what the Conservatives did when in power that imperils the border and the insurance of an undefended border where there is border security in place and where we can ensure that illegal guns and illegal drugs do not come across the border. What the Harper Conservatives did was put all of that in peril. However, then Conservatives decided they would do even better as official opposition. As members know, it is the most inept official opposition we have had in Canada's history. The Conservative party sabotaged its own opposition day. It is a party that increasingly is incompetent and that does not even understand the rule book.

• (1225)

We would think that a member of Parliament, who gets a good salary and a good pension from the people of Canada, would at least take the effort to read the rule book and at least respect the rules and procedures that govern us: the Standing Orders. However, as we have seen over the last few days, the book has not been read by a single Conservative MP, as they disregard it completely. We would think with all of those things in place, Conservative MPs would do that work, and we would think they would come to work with some understanding of what they actually should be doing as members of Parliament.

A great example I can give is that a year ago this week, Conservative MPs came up with the brilliant idea that they would systematically cut services, not as government, but as official opposition. They proposed to cut massively in services. If the votes had passed, all the services in question would have been cut. It is really important and germane, when we talk about the border, to talk about what Conservatives as the official opposition proposed to cut, on December 7, 2023, and December 8, 2023.

We are not talking about the Harper regime. Conservatives stand up and say, "Oh, that was a long time ago. We have changed. We are better now. We are not as bad as we were." We then look at what they actually moved in the House, what each and every Conservative voted for a year ago, not ten years ago.

Let us start with the border. The Conservatives proposed to cut, to eliminate, the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority. The bridge, of course, is the key transfer point between Canada and the United States. This is where much of Canada's trade goes. The Conservatives had already supported the convoy of hate that was blocking the bridge and cost thousands of Canadians their jobs. They supported the convoy of hate here in Ottawa that deprived senior citizens of groceries and people with disabilities of their medication, and that closed 600 businesses in Ottawa.

The convoy of hate, of course, Conservatives all supported. They thought it was just a great thing for people with disabilities to be denied basic fundamental rights, like the right to medication and the right to food, in the same way that they denied services to veterans in slashing all the veterans services. The convoy of hate did real damage.

Conservatives decided to do even more damage by slashing, eliminating, the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority. With respect to things like fentanyl, a year ago this week, Conservatives proposed three votes that would slash RCMP funding, three votes to slash on capital expenditures, on operational expenditures and on grants. It is unbelievable. Every single Conservative MP voted to slash the RCMP. Today the Conservatives say they are concerned about fentanyl; however, a year ago, they wanted to cut all the agencies that actually provide that support.

Routine Proceedings

Let us go on. There were 120 votes, including cutting, slashing and eliminating in the Department of National Defence. There is a huge slash there in terms of supplementary benefits. The Conservatives wanted to slash health care. They wanted to slash and eliminate food safety in this country. Who does that? Who, as a member of Parliament, shows up in the House of Commons and says, "I propose to eliminate food safety in Canada"? Yes, we can imagine that. I can see it.

Members around the House were aghast a year ago when that is what the Conservatives proposed. A year later, the memory is still fresh. Not a single Conservative stood up and said, "Hey, look, we were wrong to eliminate food safety. Actually, it makes sense that when we eat something in Canada, it should be safe." They have not apologized since then. They have had a year to think about it, but no, they have not apologized. They wanted to slash health care and affordable housing.

Yes, my colleague, the member for Winnipeg Centre, remembers. She says it is crazy. It is absolutely crazy.

● (1230)

Conservatives, who have never read the rule book and have never understood what it is like to be an MP, obviously have no understanding of the dramatic cuts they are proposing, not as government. Thank God they are not government, and thank God we are going to do everything on the NDP side to make sure they never form government.

As the official opposition, the Conservatives could not wait to cut, slash and eliminate services. They were just drooling, thinking of all the services that they could eliminate, like food safety and air safety. We can just imagine how Conservatives were chomping at the bit, saying, "Let's give more money to billionaires and let's cut, slash and eliminate everything that benefits everybody else."

The Conservatives wanted to slash and eliminate the Department of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs. Indigenous communities are still struggling to get clean water and to get adequate housing. Well, the Conservatives had a solution: just completely eliminate all funding for indigenous communities.

Curiously, and the Speaker will remember this, the Conservatives said that they were concerned about crime. What they wanted to do was eliminate all funding to correctional services. What they basically wanted to do was open the doors of Canada's prisons because, of course, if the funding is eliminated, the prisons cannot operate. Every single Conservative MP, just a year ago, on December 7, 2023, and December 8, 2023, proposed to eliminate correctional services, courts administration services, capital expenditures and operating expenditures.

Basically, I guess the prisons would be self-managed, or they would just open the doors. The Conservatives never really explained how they were going to manage, but if the vote had passed, presented by the member for Carleton, the nation's prisons no longer would have had any correctional officers. It is unbelievable to me and, I think, to every member of the House that Conservatives would do that.

The Conservatives also wanted to eliminate the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. They wanted to cut the Communications Security Establishment. They wanted, and members will remember the vote on it, to cut the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority. I guess the Conservatives thought that air transport security would just kind of go on its own as sort of a self-managed system where I guess people would declare if they have any weapons or bombs before they get on the plane. I do not know what Conservatives were thinking about that, but they proposed it. They had the seriousness of intent to propose it, and they expected us all to vote to cut.

I think the real kicker, and I could go through the 120 votes, is that the Conservatives basically wanted to slash every single service except support for billionaires. It is not on the list. Conservatives did not want to cut support handouts for billionaires. They did not want to cut the infamous Harper tax haven treaties and the \$30 billion we lose every year thanks to Conservatives, who never apologized for this.

Vote number three is relevant to how the Conservatives acted when they were in power. It was the worst government in Canadian history, the most corrupt government in history. There was scandal after scandal. Mr. Speaker, you will recall, because it was a Harper Conservative majority, that they shut down every single committee. We were not allowed to get information. Canadians were not given information about the ETS scandal, the G8 scandal and the Phoenix pay scandal, nor about the missing anti-terrorism funding. There were billions of dollars that the Harper Conservatives basically hid in their scandal-ridden, corrupt government.

The Conservatives did all that when they were in power. They slashed the CBSA. Then a year ago, on December 7, 2023, was vote three: slashing the Canada Border Services Agency, voila. It is not just that they slashed the CBSA and wrecked the border; it is also that they tried to do it again a year ago.

● (1235)

The Conservatives will not stand up and say that they apologize for doing that, that it was dumb and a really stupid thing to not read the rule book, that they promise to at least do their homework before they show up in the House and that they promise not to slash the CBSA again. They did it when they were in power. A year ago, they wanted to do it again; a year later, they say they are concerned about the border. They have zero credibility in this. They will never have an ounce of credibility, because they wanted to slash the CBSA again a year ago.

Routine Proceedings

I want to mention one more thing. The opioid crisis is serious. It is true that thousands of Canadians have died. However, the highest rates in this country, tragically, are in Alberta and Saskatchewan. These are two conservative-governed provinces in which the governments have simply not put into place any sort of adequate protections to save lives. In British Columbia, at least, the death rate has plateaued. In Alberta and Saskatchewan, it is skyrocketing. If Conservatives are sincere, they should apologize for how they have let the people in Alberta and Saskatchewan down, with a death rate that continues to skyrocket.

We remember those victims and those families today.

• (1240)

The Deputy Speaker: Before going to questions and comments, I want to make a quick comment on the use of props. We just need to refer to page 617 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* on the use of props in the House of Commons.

I would also remind members that, when we chuck those props onto the desk, it has an impact on the microphone. There was quite a thump when the hon. member did that. Therefore, I warn him not to do it again, please, for our interpreters.

Questions and comments, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the reminder of how the Conservatives voted against the many different priorities of Canadians last year. It is really quite unfortunate. One of the ways we lift the veil of the Conservatives' hidden agenda is, in fact, by raising issues, as the member has just done.

My question relates to what seems to be the thirst of the Conservative leader to try to demonstrate that the House of Commons is dysfunctional. At the end of the day, whether it is the never-ending filibustering we are witnessing or the fact that the Conservatives introduced a concurrence motion during their own opposition day with a subject matter that is very similar, it is beyond me. It makes no sense, other than if they want to try to be sneaky on something.

Being in the chamber seems to be more about playing a game for the Conservative Party than about wanting to work for Canadians. Could the member provide his thoughts on that?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, it is not that the Conservatives proposed to vote against each of these expenditure lines; they actually did vote against them. They voted to cut those budgets in 120 areas, including the important area of CBSA. They should never be let off the hook for this.

Conservatives think Canadians are gullible. Certainly, the disapproval rates for the member for Carleton are also going up very steadily, because the more they know of him, the more they know that he has nothing to offer beyond three-word slogans and the less they like him. Therefore, we will see, over the course of the next few months, those negative results continue to climb and, as we have already seen, the support for the Conservative Party to soften. Its members do not walk the talk. They propose all of these massive cuts. They have nothing to propose that is positive except massive

handouts to billionaires; quite frankly, as a party, they have failed Canadians.

Mr. Clifford Small (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable to sit here in this place and listen to the House leader of a supposed opposition party give a speech lambasting the official opposition party as if he were a member of the government. Of course, he is a member of the government; the NDP is still a part of the costly coalition. How much gorilla tape did it take to put that agreement back together?

That is one of my questions for him; another question I have is one that I get from folks when I travel in Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, all over Newfoundland and Labrador, and even to Ottawa in the airport. When I talk to people, they ask when we are going to have an election. I tell them that they are going to have to ask the NDP, whose members continue to prop up the government. They voted against our motion, which used their leader's own words to condemn the government. It blows my mind. The Canadian people are wondering what is going on with the New Democrats. What happened to them? Even hard-working trade union members are feeling let down by the NDP-Liberal coalition.

Why will it not support Canadians and call for a carbon tax election?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, that is pretty rich. Conservatives have spent their last two question periods illegally in violation of the Standing Orders, not questioning the government but questioning the NDP. That is a laughable pretense, showing how childish the Conservative Party is under the member for Carleton. However, my colleague did ask a legitimate question: What is up with the NDP?

There is dental care, including for 3,000 people in his riding. There is pharmacare, which will benefit 10,000 people in his riding. There is anti-scab legislation, which we have tried to acquire for decades and which is now in place. It is the law of the land in this country now. For the first time, there are affordable housing investments, including by indigenous, for indigenous investments that we have not seen in decades. What is up with the NDP? We work on behalf of Canadians.

Conservatives should learn from that, be inspired by that and do something to help their constituents.

• (1245)

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his speech. As always, it was remarkable. I would like to ask him a question.

If the Conservatives want to defund CSIS, does my colleague see a connection between that and the Leader of the Opposition's refusal to get his security clearance?

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question. Here in Canada, we have a political leader who is refusing to get his security clearance. That has never happened in the past because every political leader, regardless of their party, has always put the interests of Canada ahead of the interests of foreign powers.

Now, we have a Conservative Party that seems to be influenced by the Russian government, the Modi regime and the MAGA movement. The Conservative Party does not seem prepared to really put Canada first. The fact that the member for Carleton is refusing to get his security clearance is proof of that. He will be a threat to Canada's security.

[*English*]

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the NDP House leader, raised a lot of really excellent points. Most of them actually highlight the fact that the Conservatives consistently say one thing and then do another. Persistently, they vote against critical services for the community, in support of the community. Even though they make the argument that they are there to support ensuring that border security is in place, to ensure that drugs do not cross the border, they made cuts to the CBSA. In Vancouver East, we have a port. A lot of the drugs are, in fact, brought in through the port right in the Downtown Eastside, to my community. However, it was the Conservatives who made those cuts to the CBSA services at the port.

Could the member share with us what one would call a party leader who consistently says one thing and does another?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the member for Vancouver East, who has been consistently defending the interests of her constituents at the municipal, provincial and federal levels. She has always been an inspiration to many people across the country. She is one of the most effective and experienced members of Parliament in our country.

I appreciated her question; the reality is that she saw first-hand the devastating effects of the massive and irresponsible cuts by the Conservatives. They were indiscriminate cuts, including to border security. Conservatives are just incredibly dull-witted when it comes to the simple mechanism of government. Tragically, as she pointed out, the Liberals have not restored the cuts that the Conservatives put in place. This has now led us to a situation in which only an NDP government will make the kinds of investments that are important.

Yes, I know the Conservatives are saying that means billionaires will get less money. That is true. We want to be very clear about that. What this means is that we will be able to make the investments that count in such things as health care, affordable housing and simple border security to ensure that we do not have this influx of drugs into this country.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, one thing I find strange about this debate is that we are discussing a border between two sovereign nations. Such a border is required to be defended by both sovereign nations. We know that illegal handguns have been flooding into Canadian society from the weakness of the U.S. border. We know that we must fortify our own border. We know that drugs, and so on, come across the border from the U.S. into Canada. However, why is this focus, in the opinion of the

member for New Westminster—Burnaby, solely on what CBSA is able to do? What about what the U.S. side of the border is doing to protect Canada from the illegal migration of harmful substances and dangerous weapons to our country?

• (1250)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, the member makes a good point, but the reality is that this flood of illegal weapons and drugs started when the Conservatives wrecked border security. They walked in, as a government, and destroyed the infrastructure that actually provided support for Canadians. To this day, not a single Conservative MP has apologized for wrecking border security.

Mr. Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to this important motion on behalf of the great people of Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, and I just want to remind the Speaker that I will be splitting my time with the great member for Chilliwack—Hope.

I am always happy to discuss the issue of border security and how we can maintain and improve our relationship with the United States. Given that Canada and the United States share the longest undefended border in the world, addressing the very real and very serious public safety issues we are facing at home are of the utmost importance to managing our relationship with our biggest trading partner and greatest ally.

U.S. President-elect Trump has made it very clear that he will impose a crippling 25% tariff on all Canadian products if Canada does not fix our chaos at the border and get a handle on the fentanyl crisis that is plaguing our country. While Conservatives agree that these issues must be addressed, we do not want to address these issues for the sake of the United States but for the sake of Canadians.

For far too long, the Liberal government has taken a soft-on-crime approach to drugs at our borders, and as a result, Canadians are suffering. The Prime Minister made a deal with the British Columbia NDP to decriminalize fentanyl, crack and heroin. He lowered jail sentences for drug kingpins and did nothing to prevent the import of the deadly precursor chemicals that are cooked into poison in drug superlabs and sold on our streets.

The Prime Minister has also broken our border. Since the Prime Minister came to power, there has been a 632% increase in U.S. border patrol encounters with people illegally attempting to enter the United States from Canada. In the first 10 months of 2024 alone, the U.S. border patrol has intercepted more than 21,000 people illegally crossing the border from Canada into the U.S.

Routine Proceedings

The NDP-Liberal government sat back and watched as the backlog of the number of asylum claims in Canada skyrocketed from 10,000 to 250,000 over the past nine years. There are as many as 500,000 people in Canada who are here illegally. Statistics from the U.S. Customs and Border Protection show that roughly twice as many suspected terrorists have tried to cross from Canada into the U.S. as from Mexico into the U.S. in recent years. Additionally, in the 12 months leading up to September 2024, U.S. border agents seized about 11,600 pounds of drugs entering the United States from Canada. Seizures of fentanyl doses more than tripled between 2023 and 2024, rising from 239,000 doses to 839,000 doses.

The issue of fentanyl production in Canada has skyrocketed under the Prime Minister. Drug kingpins and gangsters are allowed to operate with impunity, and if they are caught, many of these criminals can serve their sentences in the comfort of their own homes under his soft-on-crime policies. A memo drafted by CSIS to the Prime Minister recently stated that CSIS identified more than 350 organized crime groups actively involved in the domestic illegal fentanyl market, and “China continues to be listed as the main source country for a variety of precursor chemicals intended for the illegal production of drugs in Canada and some illegal drugs smuggled into Canada.”

We are producing so much fentanyl here in Canada that we have become a net exporter of fentanyl rather than an importer of the product. According to the RCMP, the fentanyl threat in Canada has shifted from one of importation to one of domestic production. Almost all of the fentanyl consumed in Canada is now “produced in Canada”, according to a criminology professor at the Université de Montréal, and there is actually a production surplus.

While we are certainly exporting fentanyl to the U.S. and distributing it in the domestic market here in Canada, the RCMP's federal serious and organized crime program has stated that the fentanyl that is produced in Canada is also destined for export to southeast Asia, Australia and New Zealand, where drug users pay considerably higher prices for fentanyl than in Canada and the U.S.

How did we get here? Why have we become a net exporter of fentanyl? Before 2019, fentanyl was effectively legal in China. We could go on the Internet and find legitimate Chinese companies selling fentanyl online. This Chinese-made fentanyl flooded Canadian streets throughout the mid-2010s.

In 2019, Beijing finally caved to pressure, primarily from the United States, and blanket-banned the production and sale of all fentanyl analogues. However, it continued to fuel the fentanyl crisis by directly subsidizing the manufacturing of the precursor chemicals and materials that are used to make the drugs by traffickers.

In April 2024, U.S. investigators discovered a Chinese government website that revealed tax rebates for the production of specific fentanyl precursors as well as other synthetic drugs, as long as those companies sold them outside of China. We know this had a significant impact on the Canadian production of fentanyl, because seizures of precursor chemicals increased dramatically between 2020 and 2021.

• (1255)

In the first half of 2021, our border officers seized 5,000 kilograms of precursor chemicals, up from 500 kilograms the year before. Last year, the U.S. sanctioned several Chinese companies and individuals who have profited from the trade of precursor chemicals without facing consequences in China. So far, Canada has not sanctioned any of these individuals.

The enforcement of both exports and imports at our west coast ports is also dismal. The public safety committee recently did a study on auto theft and learned just how little we are searching and seizing at our ports. In 2023, the mayor of Delta, British Columbia, called out the Liberal government for its failure to address the rampant crime at the port of Vancouver.

He stated, “We're witnessing a relentless flow of illegal drugs, weapons and contraband into Canada through our ports and that threatens our national security... They need to recognize this. We have a fentanyl crisis going through our community here in Delta, through Metro Vancouver, through the province, across the nation”.

Just recently, Mark Weber, the CBSA union head, was on Global News and stated, “We search less than 1% of what comes into Canada”. It is clear that something must be done. We must act to fix our borders and stop the rampant production of fentanyl within our borders.

Many constituents have been writing and calling to ask the following: Why did it take so long to address these very real issues? Why did it take the United States president-elect threatening crippling tariffs for the Prime Minister to take any meaningful steps to address the chaos at our borders and the scourge of fentanyl on our streets? Was it not enough that parents were seeing their children overdose on fentanyl in homeless encampments, that Jewish communities faced threats from ISIS sympathizers who came to the country on student visas or that Canadians were being gunned down by gangsters with illegal guns that had been smuggled over our borders?

All these terrible realities that Canadians are facing should have been enough for the Prime Minister to act. Instead, he stood by and told Canadians over and over again that they have never had it so good. Only Conservatives have a real plan to address the crime and chaos at our borders and to bring our loved ones home drug-free. Today, we are asking all parties to support our common-sense plan calling on the Liberal government to address the illegal importation of fentanyl precursors and the illegal production and export of fentanyl here at home.

Routine Proceedings

Conservatives are calling on the government today to reverse Liberal Bill C-5, to reinstate longer jail sentences for drug kingpins, to ban the importation of fentanyl precursors, to buy high-powered scanners, to put more boots on the ground at our ports to stop fentanyl and its ingredients from coming into our country and to stop buying unsafe supply of opioids.

Conservatives want to stop drug overdoses so that not one more parent has to bury their son or daughter, after 47,000 other Canadians have died. That is more than we lost in the Second World War, and it represents a 200% annual increase in drug overdose deaths since the Prime Minister's radical liberalization of drugs.

The Liberal government and everyone in this place must put partisanship aside, not just for the sake of team Canada but for the sake of the families who are suffering, and support our common-sense Conservative plan. We must secure our borders and bring our loved ones home drug-free.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party's approach of giving the false narrative that it supports Canada's borders is disappointing, when, in reality, well over 1,000 jobs were cut. Significant other cuts were made while the leader of the Conservative Party today sat around the cabinet table and made those decisions, and now there are consequences. We, as a government, have restored those cuts and added an additional 300 staff, yet the Conservative Party seems to believe that its actions previously had no consequences. How silly is that?

Can the member opposite stand in his place today and guarantee that the Conservative Party will never cut border control services again?

• (1300)

Mr. Doug Shipley: Mr. Speaker, I have heard this banter quite a bit, so I have some facts and figures. There were the exact numbers of full-time employees in the CBSA. In 2006-07, there were 12,383 employees and in 2015-16, which is the period the member opposite is talking about, there were 13,774 full-time employees. That is a net increase, so we have proven that one wrong today. The budget itself, in 2005-06, for CBSA, when Stephen Harper took over, was \$1.236 million. In 2015-16, when Stephen Harper left, it was almost \$1.8 million. Those are the facts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I do not often have a chance to put a question to this colleague, whom I truly appreciate. I have two questions for him.

I asked the first question a few times this morning, but I did not get an answer from the Conservatives. Quebec felt it was necessary to deploy resources to protect the border, even though that is a federal responsibility, not a provincial one. Is that a sign of complacency and incompetence on the part of the federal government?

I also have a supplementary question, if my colleague wishes to answer it. I heard him repeat a few slogans that we hear quite often. Can he tell me how many points he earned with this speech?

[*English*]

Mr. Doug Shipley: Mr. Speaker, I think those are good questions, although I am not sure about the last one. I will mention that he is talking about the border. The border is a problem right across Canada. We heard that in the public safety committee. We have been talking about the border and how porous it is. We know that there is not a lot of security going on at a lot of points.

We have been hearing, lately, in our committee that CBSA has had no jurisdiction, since 1932, between border points. There is talk about putting them in place over that. We need to do some stuff. We need to not just be getting threatened with tariffs to finally take action. This has been going on for a long time, for far too long, and it is a shame that it has taken a president-elect to bring this to our Prime Minister's attention.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a delight to hear from my hon. colleague as he represents his constituents. I would love to hear him share some stories of what the opioid crisis and what fentanyl has done, in particular, to his community.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Mr. Speaker, it has been absolutely terrible what this nasty drug has done in Canada. I would just like to mention a couple of the statistics. Since the Prime Minister was first elected, over 47,000 Canadians have died from drug overdoses. Just last year, 8,049 Canadians were killed by opioids. That is a 184% increase since he became Prime Minister. One of these was Brianna MacDonald, who died of an overdose in a homeless encampment in Abbotsford, British Columbia. She died only a month after her 13th birthday.

Greg Sword lost his 14-year-old daughter Kamilah to a drug overdose in 2022. It has been absolutely horrific and painful to hear what has been going on. We need to deal with this. We need to get our border under control, and we need to make sure good, healthy, all-age Canadians can live a healthy, good lifestyle without fentanyl in it.

Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in response to the Conservatives continuing to talk about the drug epidemic, which is an epidemic, absolutely, there is, seemingly, no conversation as to its connection to poverty. The opposition has not really spoken about those impacts and how they are actually going to deal with the fact that we have billionaires in this country who take billions out of the economy as opposed to reinvesting it. A lot of what is linked to people turning to escapes, to drugs, to illegal drugs, to violence, to crime and theft, is actually poverty.

How would he explain how his in-the-pockets-of-billionaires party is going to deal with poverty?

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Doug Shipley: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to draw to our attention to something that just came out from York Regional Police. It was Project Skyfall. This is amazing. This is what is going on in Canada. These are facts. This is truth. This morning, York Regional Police announced that they arrested 17 individuals, all on robberies and drug trafficking. They said it was a multi-faceted criminal organization. There have been 83 charges laid. They seized over 14.4 million dollars' worth of drugs and weapons.

This is going to be the part that is not shocking. Of those 17 who were arrested this morning, seven were currently out on bail. We have a serious problem in Canada. Let us deal with it.

• (1305)

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as always, it is a pleasure to rise in the House of Commons on behalf of my constituents of Chilliwack—Hope.

I have listened to the debate this morning, in which we are talking about a committee report on the pandemic preparedness and border issues. It has been very interesting to watch how the NDP has taken this opportunity and this debate to essentially cheerlead for the government by saying that there is nothing wrong, that there are no issues.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mark Strahl: The NDP House leader, who talks about breaking the rules, heckles as I am in the opening paragraph of my speech. He breaks the rules all the time and lectures others. As we saw yesterday, what the NDP says and does are two different things. We can even put together a motion with the NDP leader's own words and the New Democrats will vote against that, because nothing is more important to them than supporting the Liberal government. That is all that matters. To use a phrase from the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader, at the end of the day, they will always support the Liberal government. It does not matter what the issue is, how important it is or how grave the situation is, they will be there to support their master in the PMO. We have seen it time and again, and we have certainly seen it in the debate this morning.

I remember being a newly elected member in 2011, when Stephen Harper won his strong, stable, national Conservative majority government. There were 101 NDP MPs at that time.

An hon. member: 103.

Mr. Mark Strahl: One hundred and three, he says. I do not think they ended the session with that many, but there were more than 100 NDP MPs, with Jack Layton as the leader of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened in every single election since then? They have cratered with Canadians, because when Canadians see how the New Democrats act and when they are given the choice to support what the NDP does in Ottawa, every election, more and more Canadians have rejected them.

The NDP moved from the official opposition, and I do not know if they even made it to the third party, and now it has been upgraded to the window seats in the House of Commons. After the next election, the way the NDP is going, it likely will not retain party status. What is the point of the NDP? Canadians might as well vote

Liberal if they are going to vote NDP because they get the same thing in Ottawa. The same policies are promoted, the same rhetoric is spewed and the same tired talking points are issued in debate.

For 19 minutes, we heard the NDP House leader make a joke out of the estimates process and say that because the Conservatives did not support the estimates, we would empty out all the jails. What a bunch of nonsense. That is what passes for clever debate in the NDP. Of course, when he was in the opposition, I do not recall that member supporting the estimates for the Canada Border Services Agency or the Correctional Service of Canada. I guess he wanted to free all the prisoners, open up the borders and eliminate air security—

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We never proposed cutting those programs like Conservatives—

The Deputy Speaker: That is debate.

The hon member for Chilliwack—Hope.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I would think that after 20 minutes the member would have gotten his point across, but I guess he needs more time, just like he wants to give the Liberal government more time. Every time he gets the opportunity to cause an election, he signals his confidence in the Liberal government.

I know that the member does not want to talk about the NDP record in our home province of British Columbia when it comes to the opioid crisis, because the B.C. NDP has been on the leading edge of making things worse. We have the most drug overdoses in the country, not the least, as he tried to say in his remarks. We saw the NDP giving out drug paraphernalia in candy dispensing machines outside of hospitals. We saw soccer fields that could not be used in Abbotsford because of the drug paraphernalia. We saw parks completely shut down in British Columbia because of the drug paraphernalia and the open drug use in our communities. However, that member wants to celebrate the record of the B.C. NDP, which saw its majority reduced to a single seat after the last election. That is the record of the NDP, but its members do not seem to care.

On the border, when Roxham Road was an open, unofficial crossing, the NDP thought that was just fine and that any attempt to shut that down was somehow an affront to the democratic process. Those members stood for a completely unregulated border crossing and fought every attempt of the official opposition to draw attention to the matter. They are not serious when it comes to border security.

The member for Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte gave the statistics, which unlike some members in this place, are in black and white and are true. They say that after the Harper government, there were more CBSA full-time equivalents. After the Harper government, more money was spent on the border. Even if that were not the case, the Liberal government has been in power for nine and a half years and its members hearken back to the Harper era as though they have not had any time to make changes. The only thing the Liberals have done is make change for the worse. They have increased the size of the public service by 40%.

As the member from the NDP said, when Stephen Harper cut some back-office positions in the CBSA, that was when the guns started flowing across and we had all this unregulated immigration. What a load of nonsense. We have seen the statistics. There is a 200% increase in the number of Canadians who have died of overdoses since the government took office in 2015, 47,000 Canadians. At the border, seizures of fentanyl doses have more than tripled between 2023 and 2024, rising from 239,000 doses to 839,000 doses. That is the record of the government.

Because the Liberals have been so incompetent in managing the border, now the provinces are feeling compelled, right across the political spectrum, to step up and do things on their own to patrol the border, even though that is not their mandate. They have said that if the NDP-Liberals will not do it, they will have to do it themselves. Wab Kinew has said that he will be looking at conservation officers to help patrol the border, because he recognizes it is so bad. Danielle Smith has said that she might have to use Alberta sheriffs. The Quebec government has proposed measures to bolster border security, because it is a disaster.

The numbers have shown exactly how this is trending, and it is trending in a direction, where U.S. border patrol is encountering more and more people coming from Canada trying to get into the U.S. illegally. Now we have President-elect Trump saying that we better fix it. Instead of saying that this is as serious as a heart attack, that he proposing 25% tariffs and what should we do about it, NDP members are saying that we should ignore him, that he is just blowing smoke, that there is nothing wrong with our border and that if we address the border, we are somehow kowtowing to the president-elect.

• (1310)

Canadians had better get serious about what has been proposed. A 25% tariff would be devastating to our economy, so we had better come up with a Canada-first plan that addresses things like the fentanyl crisis and the border crisis. We had better come up with a plan—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1315)

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I am getting chirps from the Liberals. Their own Minister of Public Safety has admitted that they need to do better.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I apologize if the member feels I was interrupting. I was really fascinated to hear that the Conservatives actually do want to take—

The Deputy Speaker: That is again falling into debate.

Routine Proceedings

The hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope has less than a minutes to finish up.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we saw the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Safety roll on down to Mar-a-Lago.

Regarding our pointing out that there are issues, the Leader of the Opposition has been raising the issue of fentanyl and illegal drugs for over a year. It has nothing to do with Donald Trump. The Liberals can talk about Donald Trump and chirp all they want, but their leader, the Prime Minister, and the public safety minister went down to Mar-a-Lago because they knew that they had to take this matter seriously. It is time that they start taking the issue of fentanyl and the border seriously right now.

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion that is now before the House.

The question is on the motion that the question be now put. If a member participating in person wishes 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 invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until later this day at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

INDUSTRY AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology that, during its consideration of C-27, An Act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act, the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act and the Artificial Intelligence and Data Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts, the committee be granted the power to divide the bill into two pieces of legislation:

(a) Bill C-27A, An Act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act and An Act to enact the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act, containing Part 1, Part 2 and the schedule to section 2; and

(b) Bill C-27B, An Act to enact the Artificial Intelligence and Data Act, containing Part 3.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as New Democrats, we are taking this opportunity to try to rescue part of a bill to protect Canadians' privacy as the Conservatives and Liberals have been warring over a number of different things. We have an important piece of legislation that has been drafted poorly but can be recovered. We are going to focus on this Parliament being able to rescue tens of thousands of dollars, having multiple meetings with witnesses and a variety of organizations, including the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and others, that would not seem to be naturally in the NDP camp, but are on this issue.

Routine Proceedings

It is important to note that the petty politics going on by the Liberals and Conservatives on this are at the expense of the privacy of Canadians. Specifically, I am talking about Bill C-27, which goes back to 2020 with regards to Bill C-11. It re-emerged in 2022 in this chamber, in November, when the Liberals tabled an act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act, the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act and the Artificial Intelligence and Data Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts.

The Liberals drafted a bill that was so encompassing and so problematic because they were willing to compromise personal privacy rights for the consumer industry, big tech and other businesses at the expense of individual Canadians' privacy. However, we called them out on that. We have this motion in front of us today because the member for New Westminster—Burnaby stood in this chamber and helped separate the actual bill to make sure that the privacy component of this, which should have been done separately, can still get done.

As Parliament winds down, not only this session but potentially a future session, we still have time to protect Canadians' privacy. The Liberals and Conservatives have no interest in this whatsoever. They would rather play their own games and sacrifice the privacy of Canadians.

The bill was so poorly drafted that when I first saw it, I went to the minister back in 2022 and asked him to separate the bill, saying that he did not have to compromise Canadians' privacy for consumer interests. The Liberals knew that, because their lobbyists, their friends, their CEOs and the big tech, all those elements were chirping in the minister's ear, basically giving him the political support to go ahead with this. When I said to the minister, "Separate the bill, and let's do the privacy component first", the Liberals basically said that they could not do it, they did not want to do it. We proved that wrong in this chamber by separating the bill in a previous debate.

Here we are now, as New Democrats, understanding there are dozens of organizations calling for the personal protection of privacy, including the Privacy Commissioner, to get this done and to not waste the work that is now being compromised by the games going on by the official opposition and the Liberals.

Again, this bill was drafted so poorly. When bills go to committee, they usually have maybe a dozen, at the most, amendments. Of those amendments, there are usually a few that are very significant to the bill and others that could be on language. I believe this bill had over 240 amendments to correct the problems with the bill.

We had debates here in the House of Commons and we referred the bill to committee. The minister showed up, after doing a lot of prancing around Canada about how great the legislation was, talking about the importance of artificial intelligence and how Canada has to deal with it, which we do agree with. However, the reality is that he did not care at all, and neither did the Liberals, about the privacy element.

In fact, we saw elements of the bill do the same thing to the Privacy Commissioner. This has been taking place in the Competition Bureau. I am referring to the Shaw-Rogers takeover. We saw the

debacle that played out, because New Democrats were the ones that opposed that. We have seen that it has not lowered prices, only laid off workers. It has led to non-disclosure clauses from the people who got fired from Rogers. The Liberals did not care at all and created a tribunal over the top of the Privacy Commissioner.

• (1320)

That is important, because the tribunal, for doing its job, was actually sued by Rogers. Rogers took it to court to do due diligence, but the tribunal, which has people appointed from Liberals and Conservatives, then taxed our own Competition Bureau \$10 million to pay for the legal costs for Rogers for just doing its job.

We did not want the same thing, we do not want the Privacy Commissioner being overridden by political appointees of Liberals and Conservatives. The history that I have seen here in this place, over the two decades I have been here, is one of constant appointments of either the blue or the red team to different positions of power, with no oversight and no accountability, leading to decisions against the public.

The bill came back to committee. I do not even know how many witnesses we had, off the top of my head, but we went for a long period of time and heard how badly the legislation was drafted. Some were so desperate to have anything that they would take anything, and they admitted that the bill was basically a piece of garbage. They basically said they would just take anything other than nothing, but most of those times, that was from the interests tied to businesses and consumer rights for industries versus those concerned with Canadians' personal privacy and protection. We heard that constantly, as the committee wound through all the different witnesses.

The minister came to us at the very beginning of all those witnesses and said he had some amendments, but it turned out those amendments were just ideas. They were not in any legislative format that we could deal with. They were not in any legal terms. He did not have the House of Commons or his department draft them. They were basically a set of ideas and propositions that did not even make any sense, in terms of the legislation. I do not think the minister even understood, and probably does not to this day, the amendments.

We got through the entire process. We fought over these amendments and what the minister really meant. Was he willing to compromise on the Privacy Commissioner and trying not to neuter it? Was he willing to do the right things to fix some of the elements of AI that people are concerned about? I kept on asking witness after witness whether they thought we should split this bill, and the resounding answer was "yes," even from those who want to get the AI stuff done, and that there was no need to put the Privacy Commissioner in there.

Routine Proceedings

Again, I go back to the roots of this legislation. The roots of this were to address the undermining of personal privacy of Canadians at the expense of businesses being able to access their data information and not be updated. We have an open hole right now. We have all this work that has been done, but we are going to propose to send it back to committee with this motion to try to deal with it and see if this House can actually get something done for Canadians. We spent a lot of time and money on this. There are some really significant issues here, and we are doing this because we have been in consultation with many groups and organizations that still want to see our privacy protected.

We got to clause-by-clause, and we went through over 200 amendments, as I mentioned. We found that there are some elements there that we could actually work with, at least as the opposition members. To give credit to the Conservatives, the Bloc and ourselves, there were some elements that we could actually agree upon and work with, and the government altered some of its stuff, too, but we were still stuck in a myriad of problems.

The situation became so bad that the Liberals began to filibuster their own bill in committee, because they did not know what to do. The minister then said he would come back with further amendments, and we have not seen them to date. I raised this most recently a couple of weeks ago as we tried to plan out our session, and we still have not had the Liberals bring back any of those amendments. They are on the record promising them. They said that they were going to happen, but we still have not been able to get over this tribunal issue. The tribunal issue is something important that we can get done.

Hence, we are going to split this bill, or see if there is interest in the House to do it, to see if we can rescue part of this legislation. I think it is important to note that, when we look at some of the issues here, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association has raised concerns about this. It has some of the best capabilities of understanding legislation and it understands that we must protect the privacy component. Unlike the United States, we do have a Privacy Commissioner, and that is very important when dealing with artificial intelligence. It cannot actually be different.

The Privacy Commissioner of Canada also expressed misgivings and reservations about the bill's structuring and proposed measures for digital privacy in AI. Governments could benefit from them being addressed separately, as these are distinct areas that require separate attention.

● (1325)

Again, we have that component that can go forward with support from the Privacy Commissioner. It is indifferent to how legislation should be brought through the House of Commons, but at the same time it recognizes this is not the only way to do this. The minister did not have to throw everything he could into a bill to diminish privacy rights to distract Canadians, and that is really what this was about.

We should never even have started on the AI component without finishing the privacy component. This could have been done ages ago, and it should have been done ages ago. The Canadian Internet Policy and Public Interest Clinic is calling for separation of the bill, emphasizing the importance of ensuring that privacy laws and AI

regulations receive individual, dedicated scrutiny, especially given their different implications for society and households. These organizations, among others, are also very much interested in moving it forward.

I mentioned the Canadian Chamber of Commerce as well. It sent in support, believing that the legislation has to be separated. I had a chance to meet with the members recently on a number of different issues, including border issues. They are really well aware. I know the previous debate was partially about CBSA officers. I am on the front line; I have 40% of Canada's daily trade go through my riding to the United States. The New Democratic Party has been supporting getting the training centre and improving the mandate of CBSA officers. This includes being able to seize illegal and counterfeit goods and materials, which they cannot do so readily right now, as well as ensuring that the 1932 order in council has been rescinded and, most importantly, giving the push to get 1,100 frontline border officers and sniffer dogs.

Those who were doing the examination are hired back by the Liberals after they were cut by the Conservatives. Under COVID, we had two tranches of not hiring workers. They are short 2,000 to 3,000 workers right now. The Conservatives and Liberals pushed for apps like ArriveCAN to take over the workers on the border. They went to more automation.

We believe the solution is right in front of us, and that is workers on the front line. Bring back the sniffer dogs. Bring back the workers who were fired and put them on the border where they should be. This is also a way to help stop drugs, paraphernalia, car smuggling and all that from coming into Canada.

We can look at a number of different things. I want to go back to and talk about how the Canadian Chamber of Commerce is actually calling for this bill because it understands there is a difference when it comes to artificial intelligence and the privacy elements.

It is important, not only to individuals but also to companies to understand how to protect Canadians' rules. There are many Canadian companies that want to follow rules, protect privacy and do the right thing. Those companies should be rewarded versus some of the larger ones we have seen, like Meta, Facebook and so forth. These companies have used loopholes to expose people in their privacy or use it to their advantage to manipulate them, and are getting rewarded for it and do not have to pay the consequences of not respecting privacy or the provisions under data protection.

Routine Proceedings

In fact, it was the New Democratic Party that put forth the first legislation on a digital bill of rights. We did this several years ago on everything from net neutrality to the right to be forgotten with regard to getting information scrubbed from the Internet, as well as a series of things to protect personal privacy. I know this very well coming from the automotive capital of Canada because we saw what took place with vehicles. They now gain information about drivers and how that is sold, how it is distributed and so forth, versus even actually selling the cars at times. This data can be more valuable than making the vehicle. This is one of the reasons we have had a focus on this for a long period of time, and we believe the privacy element should not be abandoned by the misfortune in the House.

There are a number of different organizations that are also concerned with this. In an article for The Hill Times, Andrew Clement says, “the Artificial Intelligence and Data Act needs a reset.” The author states that AIDA was written “too hastily”, noting that it “skipped...the normal public consultation” process and was introduced alongside the digital charter implementation act, whereas it should have been “separated from the rest of Bill C-27 for substantial reworking.”

● (1330)

The author suggested redrafting AIDA, which should include genuine public consultation; looking to the European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act; and engaging community advocates, researchers, lawyers, and representatives of at-risk populations. The reason I gave that reference is that this was the due diligence and why the minister laid an egg with this bill. It was basically broken upon delivery as well because he did not do the work that was necessary beforehand, consulting all the different organizations. What we had is what Ottawa loves. Ottawa loves this so much. Ottawa has the back room scurrying with all the lobbyists who go to the Conservatives and Liberals. They all get paid for this. They are lawyers or representatives, who are getting the meetings and all those different things. Can we guess who the mass majority of them are? They are Liberals and Conservatives. They get all these appointments. They get all this lobbying going on; then, instead of having public consultations, which we think would have been important, they start to steer their influence if they can.

Canadians care about privacy. Members can look at the B.C. civil liberties union and others across the country, including some good protection in Quebec, which is better than in other parts of Canada. We need to give them credit for that. On top of that, that interest is well respected, not only here but also across the world.

Interestingly enough, on April 24, a joint letter was sent to the minister; it was also sent to the rest of us in turn, as well as to the official opposition. It was a joint call for AIDA to be sent back for meaningful public consultations and redrafting. Nothing has happened since then, aside from more debacle. These groups and organizations are calling for something the NDP has been asking about for a long period of time, in terms of why the government is putting privacy rights at the expense of artificial intelligence rights for businesses and corporations. I asked about that, especially when I had the first meeting with the minister.

These organizations include Amnesty International, the Canadian section; the BC Civil Liberties Association; the Canadian Arab Federation; the Canadian Civil Liberties Association; the Canadian Muslim Public Affairs Council; the Centre for Digital Rights; the Centre for Free Expression; the communications program of Glendon College, York University; Digital Public; Fédération nationale des enseignantes et enseignants du Québec; the Firearms Institute for Rational Education; International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group; Inter Pares; Just Peace Advocates; Macdonald-Laurier Institute; Mines Action Canada; the National Union of Public and General Employees; NSTP Consulting corporation; OpenMedia; the Privacy and Access Council of Canada; Response Marketing Association; Rideau Institute of International Affairs; and Tech Reset Canada.

Then there is a whole series of other individuals who would add another 34 names that I could actually put down here. I will not read them all because there are just too many. However, reading out the names of those different organizations tells us that there is a general consensus that the legislation is a complete and utter disaster the way it is. What we can do now is what New Democrats have called for in a motion, which is to separate them as follows:

(a) Bill C-27A, An Act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act and An Act to enact the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act, containing Part 1, Part 2 and the schedule to section 2; and

(b) Bill C-27B, An Act to enact the Artificial Intelligence and Data Act, containing Part 3.

That way, we can actually do the job that is necessary.

This is crucial because Canada has fallen farther behind. I know that the Liberals are all excited about creating another digital group and committee, which the minister announced, because we cannot get this through committee if there is no interest. Again, I remind the chamber that, the last we saw of this, the Liberals were in committee filibustering to talk out the clock before we broke session. They would not even come with their own committee recommendations or amendments. They talked the clock out on themselves for the last two meetings that we had because they did not know what to do. We are still waiting, to this day, for those amendments to come forward.

As I wrap up my speech, I want to thank all the interested parties out there. Canada has an opportunity with artificial intelligence; Canada could actually be a leading component for good on this in the world. However, we have to do this with the right protections in place and the right way of doing things. The first thing is to protect our privacy elements with the Privacy Commissioner and update, and the second part is to get it on to the business of order.

Routine Proceedings

• (1335)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the member is raising an issue on which, I would suggest, the government has been fairly aggressive. It has addressed a number of different issues related to the Internet, cybersecurity, protecting Canadians' data, AI and so forth.

He is referring to one piece of legislation. I think that there is a great deal of merit in terms of looking at it with a holistic approach. Given what we have witnessed over the last number of months, in terms of the House, we have an opportunity to at least make headway in areas that Bill C-27 is proposing. If we were to split the bill, it could ultimately prevent one aspect from being able to pass, even if it is just setting a framework.

Does he believe that this would be advantageous for Canadians?

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, it is not advantageous for Canadians for the Liberals to flush all of this down the toilet just because they really cannot get their way at committee and because they want to neuter our Privacy Commissioner's office with a tribunal that will overreach and overstretch the Privacy Commissioner.

The alternative that the Liberals have in place right now is basically to stumble around committee, waiting for their amendments to come, which we do not even know and do not have. I do not know who else supports this. Otherwise, we move ahead without them, and then we actually have a stalemate. We then try to get it to the other place, where they have to deal with the bill in a matter of months, when it has taken us two-plus years and is ongoing.

I say that it is worth the effort. The test of mettle was done when the Speaker ruled to separate the bills. The member does not have expertise as a Speaker, but the Speaker allowed us to separate the bills because they are different. They could be different, and I read all the names of the groups and organizations that said that this should be done. Apparently, they are different from that, but I will respect the idea of trying to create an opportunity to fix the legislation that should never have been crafted this way in the first place.

• (1340)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the member for Windsor West, for raising this issue in the House. I want to acknowledge how very patient he has been.

When I was on the Standing Committee on Industry a year ago, we were talking about this issue. We were working on it. We could already see the bill's shortcomings. Basically, the bill was outdated as soon as it was introduced. Why? It is because ChatGPT showed up right afterward.

Here is my question for my colleague. Why did the government not introduce a new version of the digital charter bill, Bill C-27, since it was already obsolete when we studied it?

[*English*]

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, the member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue actually did really excellent work on this. We worked together, trying to see if we could fix the bill. That was the intent. We

found ourselves in a situation in which the government was particularly stubborn and did not want to change. We worked quite well together to try to find escape clauses and hatches. We talked about this particular idea at the time, as basically a backstop or a fail-safe to not waste, basically, two years of legislative work.

I agree with him that it really should have been done at that time. If we went back in time, maybe we should have been more forceful instead of trying to co-operate. The minister just took advantage of that, going to the public and, basically, blaming us for his failures.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Clearview AI should have been the red flag, when we read in *The New York Times* about this company that was stealing vast amounts of personal data to create photo databases of people's faces and then selling to whatever bidders came online. There was no interest in dealing with this from the federal government. I wrote to the Privacy Commissioner and asked him to launch an investigation, and he found that Clearview AI broke Canadian law.

This was the moment when the Liberal government came forward to bring new privacy legislation. We actually thought it would strengthen the Privacy Commissioner in this time of very troubling mass data theft of people's identities. The Privacy Commissioner told us that the changes to the law, by putting this tribunal over him to undermine his work, would make it impossible for him to find a ruling against Clearview AI today.

It is shocking that, in the face of the data thefts that we have seen with Cambridge Analytica, the rise of AI and the rise of facial recognition technology, the government actually undermined the privacy rights of Canadians to help out corporate interests. What are my hon. colleague's thoughts on this?

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Timmins—James Bay for the question, which really gets into the political ideological difference of the New Democrats. I do not know where the Bloc is on this, but I think its members are on the same page as us. I do not know where the Conservatives and Liberals are going.

We believe in a strong, independent privacy commissioner that can take on big business, that can take on those who are abusing Canadian privacy and that is not beholden to the Conservative and Liberal political appointments that they put on these boards and tribunals. They can basically put the thumb down on the Privacy Commissioner, as we have seen for the competition commissioner. That is the ideological difference between these things. They want their political appointments to actually rue the day, whereas we believe in a strong, independent privacy commissioner who answers to Canadians.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-27 proposes industry self-regulation. That is like asking a fox to guard the henhouse. Bill C-27 also calls for as much alignment with European legislation as possible, which is not happening even though it is the gold standard.

To me, this bill looks like a rough draft cobbled together by novices. It does not seem up to the task of protecting the basic right to privacy, which is what matters most right now.

What are my colleague's thoughts on that?

[English]

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, that is a great question, and I did not talk too much about what was taking place in Europe and other places.

The United States has referred it to a presidential commission, and after going through its debacle. The European Union actually has some better practices that we can be and should be looking towards, which is why having a strong privacy commissioner also matters in this debate. I would say to the member that, yes, there are some great lessons that we can learn from there. However, we cannot get anywhere under the current context that has been created.

More and more, every single day, I believe that the context that we are in was cleverly drafted by the Liberals to get just that. However, we pushed back right away when we saw that the Privacy Commissioner would be compromised on artificial intelligence by big business and data collection by big business against Canadians, which is simply wrong. That is why they married the two processes together when they should not be at all, ever.

• (1345)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I really want to underscore how important the work of the member for Windsor West is. He is the dean of the NDP caucus, but he is also somebody who brings vast intelligence and experience to these kinds of issues.

The reality is that the Conservatives never dealt adequately with any of this; they were just a terrible government, the worst in Canadian history. In addition, the Liberals have been ragging the puck.

What would an NDP government do that is better than the failed Conservative policies, which were absolutely abysmal, and those of the Liberals, who basically will not do anything unless the NDP pushes them and forces them to get it done?

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, first and foremost on this particular element is the protection of the Privacy Commissioner and a digital charter of rights. Not only would this be a complement to individual privacy in this world and this country as well, but, more importantly, it would also help clarify this to small and medium-sized businesses that want to do the right thing, which is to protect privacy. They have to compete against the unruly and the ones that want to abuse Canadian privacy. We have seen this from major chains, such as Tim Hortons and others; we have also seen a lot of different, spectacular digital and privacy breaches that have taken place where there is actually a black market for this.

We would empower the Privacy Commissioner and make sure that he or she has the proper types of tools and necessary resources to do things. We would have a digital charter of rights to protect Canadians. We would also give those businesses that are actually doing the right thing the proper credit and support; they are often small and medium-sized businesses. One of the reasons we believe in pharmacare and dental care so much is that it takes the pressure off them financially to help their employees. This, on top of that, would provide them with rules on how to cover themselves and how to do the right thing for their customers. Often, our neighbours, friends and family are the ones running those businesses; they just want to do the right thing, as opposed to the exploitation by Meta and others.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member raises a very important issue about the Internet, and threats on the Internet, in a number of ways. He spent a great deal of his time focused on Bill C-27, and understandably so since that is what the motion is about. The government has taken a very holistic approach in dealing with all aspects of the Internet in the form of legislation and regulations.

Quite often in legislation, we see a framework that is absolutely essential to support healthy and strong regulations that, ultimately, protect the interests of Canadians. It has been somewhat frustrating, as the member was frustrated when talking about what is taking place in committees; on the floor of the House of Commons, it has also been frustrating. The member referred to Bill C-27 being held up in committee, but he tried to put the blame on the government.

One of the biggest differences between the government today and the government while Stephen Harper was prime minister is that we are very open to ideas, constructive criticism, and looking at ways we can improve legislation. That means we have been open to amendments and changes. There have been a number of recommendations, but there was also an extensive filibuster on Bill C-27. It was not just government members but opposition members, much like we see filibusters taking place now on other aspects of the safety of Canadians.

For seven or eight weeks now, there has been a Conservative filibuster on the floor of the House of Commons, and there are other pieces of legislation dealing with the Internet that the Conservatives continue to filibuster. I am referring to Bill C-63, which deals with things such as intimate images being spread on the Internet without consent and child exploitation. We are talking about serious issues facing Canadians, including Bill C-63, that we cannot even get to committee because the Conservative Party has made the decision to filibuster on the floor of the House of Commons.

Routine Proceedings

When the member opposite talks about Bill C-27, I can assure the member that the government is very keen on the legislation. We do not see how Canadians would benefit by splitting the legislation because both aspects are really important to Canadians. We should look at where it can be improved and we are open to that. We have clearly demonstrated that, but we need a higher sense of co-operation, whether dealing with Bill C-63 in the chamber or Bill C-27 at committee. Bill C-26 deals with cybersecurity. As I said, the government is very aware of what is happening on the Internet and our responsibility as legislators to advance legislation that helps establish a framework that will protect the interests of Canadians.

● (1350)

Earlier, I referred to a trip I took to the Philippines in the last five days. One of the companies we visited was a Canadian company, Open Text, that employs 1,500-plus people. We sat in a room that had this huge monitor of the world, and Open Text talked about how threats to infrastructure and to individuals occur every second. We are talking about a trillion type of number when it comes to computer threats occurring on a monthly basis. Open Text can tell where they are coming from and where they are going. It was a very interesting presentation.

No government has invested more in issues around AI than this government has, recognizing the potential good but also the extreme harm out there. We can think about different types of data banks. There are government data banks, such as Canada Revenue at the national level and health care records at the provincial level. There are the Tim Hortons, the private companies, and the data they acquire in their applications. The amount of information about Canadian individuals on the Internet is incredible. Technology has changed the lives of each and every one of us, whether we know it or not.

We can take a look at the number of cameras on our public streets, in malls and so on. We can think of the number of interactions we have on a daily or weekly basis, whether that is banking, which contains very sensitive information, or medical reports—

The Deputy Speaker: On a point of order, the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay is rising.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, it is almost Christmas, and the hon. member has already given us 20-some minutes this morning. Now we have to listen to him again. Could you maybe consider a way of giving a Christmas gift to all of us and—

The Deputy Speaker: That falls into debate. Every hon. member has the right to speak.

Even though we are really happy to hear the hon. member for Winnipeg North speak before us, I would remind him that I will be interrupting him in about five minutes.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North has the floor.

● (1355)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I take advantage of what the Prime Minister has said to me, which is that he wants me to reflect the ideas, thoughts and concerns of the people of Winnipeg North. Whether it is here on the floor of the House of Commons, at the national Liberal caucus or even, very rarely but at times, at the standing committees, Liberal members of the caucus really believe

it is important that we take the ideas and thoughts of our constituents to Ottawa. Then, when we present legislation or budgets, or when discussions take place at our standing committees or within our caucus, they are a true reflection of what Canadians, as a whole, are thinking and want the government to take action on. That is why we see legislation like Bill C-27.

I can tell the members opposite that Canadians are very much concerned about identity theft through the Internet. They are very much concerned about privacy. They want to know that the government is going to protect their privacy. That is why we are enhancing the Privacy Commissioner's abilities, with respect to the amounts of fines or the types of things the Privacy Commissioner would be able to conduct. This would provide assurance to Canadians that, even if the Conservatives are more concerned about playing games and filibustering, whether on the floor of the House or at our standing committees, we will continue to take actions to support Canadians.

Just last week, the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry announced the launch of the Canadian Artificial Intelligence Safety Institute. That is to bolster Canada's capacity to address AI safety risks, further positioning the country as a leader in the safe, responsible development and adoption of AI technology. Although we have a legislative responsibility we are advancing, we are also prepared to put in budgetary dollars to ensure the interests of Canadians, first and foremost, are being protected. While the Conservative Party is more focused on being obstructionist and making character assassinations, we have consistently supported Canadians, whether through budgetary or legislative measures, and ensured that issues of concern to them are, in fact, being reflected in Ottawa.

If we look at the advancement in the Internet and the issues that have come out of that, that is why, as a government, we have brought forward not one but several pieces of legislation to protect children and protect our economy. I think of the business transactions that take place every day. Protecting the interests of Canadians is a priority with this government, such as advancing the issue of AI and its use in a positive way, looking at ways we can ensure a heightened sense of safety on the Internet and looking at Internet security as a priority. By providing the funds and the legislative measures that establish a framework, it will make a difference. We want Canadians to know that, as a government, we are there to protect their interests when it comes to the information that is gathered on the Internet and the very real cyber threats out there. We will be there, today and tomorrow, to protect those—

● (1400)

The Speaker: This ends the daily routine of business.

Statements by Members

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, on Human Rights Day, we celebrate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a commitment to the dignity, equality and freedom of every person. However, women's rights are under attack, from the actions of the morality police in Iran to the silencing of women in Afghanistan and the restrictive abortion laws in the US. These injustices remind us that women's rights are human rights.

Canada's commitment to human rights extends beyond our borders. At the UN this year, we announced initiatives to protect the sexual and reproductive health and rights of women and girls. We continue to empower Afghan women through education, while sanctioning Taliban and Iranian officials responsible for gender apartheid. At home, Canada must continue to uphold our Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The notwithstanding clause must only be used in exceptional circumstances, not at the whim of a populist leader. As Liberals, we stand firmly for our charter and for equal rights for all. By joining with others to stand up for our rights and our future right now, we can make the vision of dignity, equality and freedom for all people, including women, a reality.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ORGANIZATIONS IN CHARLESBOURG—HAUTE-SAINT-CHARLES

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the holiday season is the perfect time to take a moment to express our gratitude to those who make our community a better place to live. Today, I would like to sincerely thank all the organizations in Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles for their commitment, generosity and unwavering dedication.

Their actions make a real difference in the lives of many families and individuals. Whether they are supporting the less fortunate, organizing celebrations or creating spaces for sharing and helping others, these organizations are the heart of our community. Thanks to them, smiles abound, connections are made and the spirit of the season is on full display. Their work involves so much more than the visible, tangible things they do. Their work warms our hearts and creates a profound sense of solidarity. They are artisans of hope, and their impact is immeasurable.

On behalf of all the residents of Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, I want to say a huge thank you. Together, let us continue to make our community a place where no one is forgotten.

I wish everyone a very merry Christmas filled with joy, peace and precious time with their loved ones.

[*English*]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Shafqat Ali (Brampton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada voted yes on the UN General Assembly resolution entitled “Peaceful settlement of the question of Palestine”. Canada joined 156 other nations calling for Israel's complete withdrawal from the Palestinian territories. The resolution demanded that Israel comply with international law, cease all settlement activities and evacuate settlers from the occupied Palestinian territory. Canada's vote reaffirmed our long-standing policy calling for the realization of the rights of the Palestinian people, primarily the right to self-determination and the right to their independent state. Consistent with that policy, and to demonstrate support for the resolution, it is now time for Canada to recognize the state of Palestine.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SERGE GODON

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Serge Godon, an outstanding citizen of Trois-Rivières.

Mr. Godon is what I would call a super-volunteer. He has been involved in numerous community activities in the Mauricie region since the early 1980s, including the Asterix soccer club in Trois-Rivières, the Notre-Dame-du-Cap sanctuary, the St-Louis-de-France and Ste-Bernadette scout associations, the Roland-Leclerc centre, and Artisans de la paix. However, the commitment that impresses me the most is his dedication to Noël du cœur, formerly known as Noël du pauvre, a cause he has been involved with for 44 years.

He is still working to create positive change in the community today with his children and grandchildren by his side. All of them were introduced to volunteering at a young age.

We need people like Mr. Godon all over Quebec, people who make a difference in the everyday lives of others.

I want to thank him for his exceptional volunteer work.

* * *

[*English*]

ELEVATION TO CARDINAL

Ms. Patricia Lattanzio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, as part of the Canadian delegation for Vatican City, I had the honour and privilege to attend the induction of His Eminence Frank Cardinal Leo into the College of Cardinals, presided by His Holiness Pope Francis at St. Peter's Basilica.

Cardinal Leo is the 18th Canadian to be inducted into the College of Cardinals. Among his many accomplishments and important positions held, I am particularly proud to say that he taught religion at Collège Reine-Marie, located in my riding. A Montreal-born shepherd of Italian descent, he faithfully served the Montreal Catholic community for over a decade before being appointed as Archbishop of Toronto. His elevation to Cardinal is a testament to his years of dedication and leadership in both local and global faith communities. Our delegation, led by the Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, played a key role in representing Canada, our communities and all Italian Canadians in this important and historic event.

I send my congratulations to Cardinal Leo.

* * *

● (1405)

ELEVATION TO CARDINAL

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, the Archbishop for Toronto was inducted into the College of Cardinals by Pope Francis at St. Peter's Basilica. I was honoured to attend the ceremony with the Canadian delegation on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition. Witnessing this historic ritual was a deeply spiritual experience and a moment of profound inspiration, hope and promise.

Born in Montreal to immigrant parents, Cardinal Leo was ordained a priest for the Archdiocese of Montreal. He also served in the Holy See's diplomatic service, and taught theology and spirituality. Appointed Archbishop of Toronto in 2023, he oversaw major ecclesiastical institutions and Catholic organizations. As one of the youngest Cardinals, he said that Church outreach must start from the heart and the Church must be a guide, but it must listen to what young people are saying.

This is a proud moment for Canadians. I send my congratulations to Cardinal Leo. *Viva Cristo Rey.*

* * *

HOUSING IN RICHMOND HILL

Mr. Majid Jowhari (Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Richmond Hill is making important progress in affordable housing.

The Richmond Hill council recently adopted a community improvement plan for affordable housing and sustainable design, one of the nine initiatives that are part of the \$31-million housing accelerator fund agreement the city has with the federal government.

This new program addresses housing affordability and environmental sustainability by providing incentives for developers to kick-start affordable rental housing projects, ensuring such housing is designed and operated to reduce greenhouse gas emissions over the long term.

This underscores how our housing accelerator fund is empowering municipalities, such as Richmond Hill, to meet local housing needs. I am proud my city is moving forward with key housing initiatives such as this one. Together, we are building a Richmond Hill where everyone and every family has a place to call home.

Statements by Members

I wish a merry Christmas and happy holiday to all.

* * *

OMAR ZIA

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a heavy heart to recognize the passing of Omar Zia.

Omar Zia was a loving father, husband, son and brother. He dedicated his career to service in our community as a teacher in Peel School and, most recently, as principal of The Woodlands Secondary School. Omar was a mentor to so many young people in our community. He was breaking barriers, and he was an unwavering advocate for special education, anti-racism, volunteerism and youth. I had the privilege of working with him over the years and could see the compassion that he brought to work every single day.

Last week, he sadly passed away at the age of 49. This weekend, we gather to mourn, share stories and say goodbye to our friend and brother. I will leave members with Omar Zia's signature question, which guided his life's work: "How will you make a positive impact today?"

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberals, crime and chaos have taken over our streets and communities.

This past Sunday, Alisha Brooks was tragically gunned down by her boyfriend, a known serial abuser. As she was taking her final breath, this monster stood over her dead body and yelled at her. The accused, despite a history of gun possession, breaking and entering, weapon prohibition orders, and assaulting other women, was allowed to live in a halfway house.

This devastating loss is yet another glaring example of the NDP-Liberal government's failure to protect Canadians by prioritizing criminals over victims. This criminal should have never been free to harm anyone. Canadians are urgently calling for bail reform to allow law enforcement to do their job and protect communities, yet the justice minister ignores these claims and claims reform has already been achieved.

How many more lives must be lost before the government finally takes action? Only a Conservative government would keep violent criminals behind bars and bring home safe streets.

Statements by Members

● (1410)

SURREY POLICE SERVICE

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey—Newton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, November 29 marked a significant milestone in Surrey's history as the Surrey Police Service officially took command from the RCMP. The transition reflects the community's evolving needs for public safety. I extend my congratulations to the Surrey Police Service as it assumes this critical responsibility.

At the same time, I want to express my deepest gratitude to the RCMP for their dedicated service to the city of Surrey. Their unwavering commitment to the safety and well-being of the residents has been exemplary and appreciated by all. As we move forward, let us honour the legacy of the RCMP while supporting Surrey's journey into a new era of community policing.

* * *

ETHICS

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I stand before the House to address an issue that undermines public trust and accountability, namely the member for Edmonton Centre's involvement with Global Health Imports, a company he co-owned and falsely presented as indigenous-owned to exploit government procurement programs designed to benefit indigenous communities.

More troubling is that the Minister of Indigenous Services ignored clear warnings from her own auditors of rampant fraud and abuse. In the typical Ottawa-knows-best fashion, the minister prevented auditors from contacting businesses directly during verification investigations. Instead, they were forced to submit their inquiries to the department, which would then respond to the companies.

Despite the weakened audit process, the minister has been forced to remove 1,100 businesses from the indigenous business directory, highlighting the extent to which the Liberals have allowed things to spiral out of control. Canadians have had enough. It is time to allow voters to put an end to the incompetent government.

* * *

LEADER OF THE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when we think about it, Parliament resembles Charles Dickens's *A Christmas Carol*.

First, Canadians were visited by the ghost of the NDP past. It was the current NDP leader who made such a ruckus and tore up his costly NDP-Liberal coalition agreement, declaring that the Prime Minister was "too weak, too selfish and too beholden to corporate interests to fight for people".

Last night, the ghost of NDP present appeared. After vowing to defend workers' rights, even if that meant toppling the government, the NDP leader humiliated himself and his caucus by standing with the Prime Minister. So much for having the courage of their convictions.

We all know that the ghost of NDP future is busy securing his own pension at the expense of all Canadians. I say, bah humbug. Canadians want to put an end to the NDP-Liberal fiscal nightmare. Only a carbon tax election and a common-sense Conservative government would bring home lower prices and better results for Canadian workers. As Tiny Tim observed, "God bless us, everyone", except, perhaps, this costly coalition.

I wish everyone a merry Christmas.

* * *

SCHOLARS AT RISK

Mr. Yasir Naqvi (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, on Human Rights Day, I am pleased to recognize the important work of the Scholars at Risk at Carleton University, the University of Ottawa and around the country. This is a vital initiative that champions academic freedom, human rights and the protection of scholars facing threats worldwide. This program provides a safe haven at Canadian universities for hundreds of academics forced to flee their countries due to conflict, censorship or persecution.

The Scholars at Risk program exemplifies Canada's commitment to education, equity and global solidarity. By offering displaced scholars a chance to continue their work in a secure and supportive environment, this program contributes to the exchange of knowledge and ideas that strengthens both our academic institutions and our democracy. We must continue to support initiatives, such as Scholars at Risk, that uphold Canada's values on human rights on the global stage.

* * *

● (1415)

JOHN HORGAN

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to honour one of Canada's finest public servants, our ambassador to Germany and former premier of British Columbia, the late John Horgan.

Raised by a single mom, John overcame great challenges to rise to the highest levels of public office. His political career actually started in this place, staffing NDP MPs. In 1991, he left to assume important roles in the B.C. NDP government, ending as chief of staff to the premier. John entered elected office as an MLA in 2005 and ultimately became leader of the party, the official opposition, and then a very popular premier.

Throughout, John carved a deeply impactful path. He had an uncommon common touch. He had that rare ability to rise above partisanship and win the respect of his opponents. He was witty, kind and positive. In my view, John was the best off-the-cuff speaker in Canadian politics.

We extend our deepest condolences to John's beloved Ellie and their two sons. I thank John. His kind shall not pass this way again.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC FILM INDUSTRY

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Iris gala, the grand celebration of the Quebec film industry, shone brightly again this year.

The biggest winner of the night was Gatineau director Ariane Louis-Seize, whose film *Humanist Vampire Seeking Consenting Suicidal Person* has more than just a catchy title to recommend it. This black comedy won best picture, best first film, and best screenplay for the director and her co-writer Christine Doyon.

Monia Chokri won best director for *The Nature of Love*, while Théodore Pellerin and Ariane Castellanos were named best actors of the year.

The highlight of the evening was the tribute to director Denis Villeneuve. His talent makes us so proud, and it was moving to see him get so emotional at this gala.

The Iris gala reminded us that Quebec produces, per capita, some of the best filmmakers and actors in the world. Above all, it reminded us of the importance of ensuring that our public institutions provide adequate ongoing funding for the film industry, as this government has promised many times.

Long live the Quebec film industry.

* * *

[English]

LEADER OF THE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Eric Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians now know that all of the NDP's tough talk is worthless. Yesterday the New Democrats voted against a non-confidence motion in the Liberals that used the NDP leader's very own words against him. It meant nothing when he said he had ripped up his coalition deal with the Prime Minister. It meant nothing when he said, "the Liberals are too weak, too selfish and too beholden to corporate interests to fight for people".

It meant nothing when the NDP leader looked striking union workers in the eye and told them, just last month, "If there is any vote in Parliament that in any way impacts your rights, we are going to vote no.... Whether that vote is a confidence vote or not, whether it triggers an election or not, I'm telling...the Liberals right now, 'You're never going to count on us if you're going to take away the rights of workers'."

Well, the NDP did exactly the opposite yesterday, and Canadians know why: Just minutes ago, the Liberals and New Democrats teamed up to cancel the idea of the election's happening before the NDP leader gets his \$2.3-million pension. Here is the deal: The NDP leader gets his pension, the Prime Minister gets power and Canadians get the bill.

Oral Questions

LEADER OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Mike Kelloway (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for years the Conservative leader has lectured Canadians about the virtue of tax cuts, yet when our government introduced a GST tax break to help Canadians, what did the Conservatives do? They voted against a tax break. It is like having a doctor who would not accept their own medical advice. The Conservative leader calls himself a champion for affordability, but when the time comes, he turns his back on giving Canadians a real break.

For whom does the Conservative leader want a tax break? Well, that would be his rich corporate donors. Time and time again in the House, when it is about supporting Canadians, we hear silly slogans and bumper sticker solutions. On this side of the House, we are absolutely, 100%, here for Canadians.

ORAL QUESTIONS

• (1420)

[Translation]

FINANCE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is weak and has lost control. He has lost control of the borders, lost control of immigration, lost control of the public purse and lost control of his own cabinet.

We have learned that he is squabbling with the Minister of Finance, who wants a large deficit of \$40 billion, while he wants an even larger deficit on steroids, bigger than \$40 billion.

Who is going to win?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when a government offers a dental care plan to seniors across the country, Canadians win. When the government offers Canadians a tax break for the next two months, Canadians win. When we are there to invest in a school food program, Canadian children and parents win.

Canadians are not winning when the Leader of the Opposition chooses to vote against all of these measures, when he refuses to help Canadians and when he cares only about his own future, not that of Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance disagrees. She promised that the deficit would not exceed \$40 billion. She opposed the \$6-billion vote-buying Christmas gimmick, but the Prime Minister forced this inflationary policy on her anyway.

He admits that deficits fuel inflation, and that is why they promised to keep the deficit at \$40 billion.

Will he keep his promise, yes or no?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is only one person in this room who objects to helping Canadians, and it is the Leader of the Opposition. He voted against a tax break for Canadians. He voted against dental care, against school food, against investments in the electric battery sector, and against our current investments in creating clean energy and more jobs across the country.

The Leader of the Opposition opposes measures that help Canadians because he is only in it for himself, not for Canadians.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the weak Prime Minister has lost control of the border, lost control of immigration and lost control of spending, debt and inflation. Now he has lost control of his own cabinet.

We have learned in the *Globe and Mail* today that the Prime Minister's finance minister is having her people speak out against him. She wants a large deficit of \$40 billion. He, on the other hand, wants an even larger deficit on steroids, bigger than \$40 billion.

We know that Canadians are going to lose from all the inflation, but which one of the two is going to win?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians lose when the Conservative leader votes against a dental plan for seniors. Canadians lose when he stands against a tax break for all Canadians over the next few months. Canadians lose when he blocks a school food program that is going to save parents \$800 on groceries while putting more food in kids' bellies.

Every single time the Leader of the Opposition gets up in the House, he stands against supports for Canadians, against growing the economy and against supporting a better future for all Canadians, because he is only in it for himself.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is not clear that the finance minister is actually in it with the Prime Minister. According to the *Globe and Mail*, the Prime Minister's office "has given internal direction for an aggressive and possibly costly policy agenda" that threatens to "[blow] past the spending targets she has already...publicly [stated] for the government".

The finance minister promised the deficit would be capped at \$40 billion, acknowledging that if it went over it would cause even more inflation. That means hungry Canadians lined up at food banks.

Once again, will the government meet the minister's promise to keep the deficit under \$40 billion?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while we once again hear the Leader of the Opposition talking down Canada's economy and talking down Canadians, it looks like the Bank of Canada will be decreasing interest rates once again because inflation is back down within the target range.

The Leader of the Opposition is also perplexed, because he does not let his own MPs speak out on anything he does not stamp and approve. He has people follow him around with tape recorders so

they do not speak to media about anything he does not pre-approve. That is not being Canadians' voices in this place.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: We were doing so very well for the first number of questions in terms of members' respecting that only one of their colleagues at a time had the floor. I will ask members to please withhold their comments and let one member speak and one member answer.

The hon. leader of the opposition has the floor.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has admitted that deficits drive inflation. His minister admitted the same thing. That is why she said the deficit would not go above \$40 billion. That was her guardrail. They were not going to smash into that guardrail.

The minister is like a bus driver saying she is going to come just short of hitting the \$40-billion guardrail, and then some crazy lunatic comes in, grabs the steering wheel and jerks it sharply to the left through the guardrail. Does the Prime Minister realize there are 41 million Canadians who are going to go off the cliff in that bus?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. Colleagues, the longer I take to get order in this place, the shorter question period will be in terms of the number of questions members will be able to ask. I ask members to please exercise discipline.

The right hon. Prime Minister has the floor.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the Leader of the Opposition continues to talk down Canadians, the Canadian economy and indeed Canada, let me once again put it on the record: Canada is the best country in the world.

We as Canadians are stepping up. Canadians got us through the pandemic. Canadians got us through the challenge of high inflation. Canadians will keep building a positive future for themselves by being there and showing up for each other, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, who has voted against every measure that has been put on the table to support Canadians over the past years and who continues to be in it only for himself.

[Translation]

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, against a backdrop of religious practices, bullying in Quebec schools and people literally being asked to move to make space for people to pray, the Minister of Immigration says that Quebec's premier is always picking on Muslims. He talks about freedom of religion, but it looks like the minister has a hard time telling a cathedral in Paris from a park in Montreal.

Does the Prime Minister condemn his minister's constant attacks on the Premier of Quebec, or does he condone them?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we will always stand up for individual freedom and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Freedom of thought, freedom of belief and freedom of expression are rights that our government will always defend. We will certainly continue to protect those rights across the country.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, just to clarify, we are not talking about secularism with regard to a single religion, but all religions. The vast majority of Quebec Muslims are perfectly happy, integrated and welcome in Quebec. Furthermore, the secularism of government institutions, and, to a certain extent, the public sphere, is necessary for all forms of equality, including gender equality.

Could the Prime Minister at least ask his minister to wait and see what the Quebec government does before expressing such righteous indignation?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Quebecers, like all Canadians, cherish individual rights, including freedom of expression, freedom of belief and freedom of assembly. We all have fundamental individual freedoms, and we will always defend them. I understand that, while some people like to play political games here and across the country, various communities are being attacked. On this side, in the federal Liberal government, we will always stand up for individual freedoms.

* * *

• (1430)

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, get this. The Conservatives bring in a tax cut for the richest CEOs and corporations, costing Canadians \$60 billion, but they vote against taking the GST off home heating and diapers, and the Prime Minister sided with them.

Why does the Prime Minister side with the Conservatives and big corporations against working people?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we were equally puzzled when the Conservatives voted against a tax break for Canadians for the next few months.

People are facing challenges right now, counting their pennies at the grocery store as they try to make ends meet. This Parliament stepped up to deliver a tax break for all Canadians, but the Conser-

Oral Questions

vative leader forced his MPs to vote against a tax break for Canadians. Even though he wanders around the country talking about taxes, hanging out with certain questionable Diagonol folks, he continues to vote against the interests of Canadians.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, maybe we should tax the Prime Minister's excuses instead.

[Translation]

It is outrageous. The health care system is collapsing and the Prime Minister stands idly by. Currently, seven times out of 10 François Legault encourages Quebecers to pay for health care.

Why is this acceptable to the Prime Minister? Why is he abandoning people?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we always respect provincial jurisdictions. However, we have invested \$200 million. We are going to invest \$200 billion in the coming years in health care across the country to have more family doctors, a better public health care system and more support for our health care workers.

We are there to defend our public health care system. We are there to work hand in hand with the provinces that want to offer a better public system.

* * *

[English]

FINANCE

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know that the Prime Minister has lost control of spending, and now we see that he has lost control of his own minister. We have a finance minister who will not tell us what the deficit is and a prime minister who does not think about monetary policy. That seems like a match made in heaven, but then again, maybe not. The Globe and Mail reports that “tensions have risen” between the Prime Minister's office and the finance minister's department, saying that the current dynamic appears to be similar to what happened with Bill Morneau before he quit.

The Prime Minister bullies females and he bullies finance ministers, and now he is bullying a female finance minister. How much longer is she going to put up with that?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

[Translation]

The Speaker: Order.

[English]

I invite all members to take their seats.

Oral Questions

I would ask the hon. member for Lakeland to please not take the floor unless recognized.

The hon. Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance.

• (1435)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we are united in working for Canada and Canadians—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Colleagues, the Chair has stood up for longer than a minute, which would be one question. I am going to ask members to control themselves.

The hon. Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, from the top please.

Hon. Chrystia Freeland: Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we are united in working hard for Canada and Canadians. In fact, the only would-be bullies in the House are directly opposite, but I am very comfortable standing up to them. I look forward, together with my colleagues, to tabling the fall economic statement on Monday in the House.

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is so awkward. I do not know why the finance minister takes all of this abuse from the Prime Minister. She told Canadians that the deficit would not go past \$40 billion. That was her own self-imposed guardrail. Now she says everything is fine, as her political career collapses and so does her credibility, all because of the Prime Minister. Five senior Liberal veterans and three political staffers confirmed to the Globe that tensions have risen between her office and the PMO over spending. These are the same people who last summer said that she could not communicate.

We know what the Prime Minister thinks of her, but why does she still have confidence in him?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we are united, and on this side of the House, we recognize what a privilege it is every single day to work hard for Canada and Canadians and to defend the national interest. That is what we are focused on every single day. I would urge the MPs opposite to remember this is a challenging time in Canada and the world. It is not a time for cheap, partisan games.

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is the finance minister who said over and over again that she would not go over her self-imposed guardrail of a \$40-billion deficit. Now the Parliamentary Budget Officer says that is yet another broken Liberal promise. We have no idea who is in the driver's seat anymore, driving Canadians through that \$40-billion guardrail and off a cliff as they pay more in inflationary spending on the backs of struggling Canadians. What we do know is that Canadians ought to take her driver's licence away.

I can give her another opportunity to prove that she can communicate. She can stand up here and tell us what the deficit is at the moment.

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I look forward to tabling the

fall economic statement in the House on Monday. In the fall economic statement, we will show that the government is maintaining its fiscal anchor, specifically reducing the federal debt as a share of the economy over the medium term. In addition, I expect the debt-to-GDP ratio we projected in the spring budget for fiscal year 2023-24 will be met. Canada has the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, the lowest deficit in the G7. This is good news for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has failed to table a single balanced budget in nine years, failed to live up to her promise of keeping the deficit below \$40 billion and, above all, failed to persuade her leader to abandon his inflationary spending. Incidentally, tensions are rising between the two of them, according to The Globe and Mail. The Prime Minister is losing control of government finances, the borders, his caucus and cabinet.

Can he do something useful and tell us how much higher than \$40 billion the deficit is?

• (1440)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be tabling the fall economic statement in this House on Monday.

In the fall economic statement, we will show that the government is maintaining its fiscal anchor. More specifically, it is reducing the federal debt as a share of the economy over the medium term. In addition, I expect that the debt-to-GDP ratio we projected in the spring budget for the years 2023-24 will be met.

Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has waited until the day before the House wraps up for the holidays to table her economic update. That is not very courageous. Bad news is coming.

According to The Globe and Mail, the Prime Minister wants to drastically increase spending, and his finance minister cannot get him to listen to reason. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has already said that the deficit will be a lot higher than the \$40 billion that was announced.

How much will the deficit be?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased that the member opposite quoted the Parliamentary Budget Officer because, according to his analysis, the “current fiscal policy in Canada is sustainable over the long term.” That is the finding of an objective analysis that was referred to by the member opposite. That is the reality.

Oral Questions

Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the reality looks like this: public finances in disarray, tensions at the border, frustration in cabinet, dissent in caucus and public fatigue of this worn-out, inefficient, spend-happy government. Not even the finance minister is getting along with the Prime Minister, according to *The Globe and Mail*. It is time for him to ask himself that important question. There is plenty of snow if he needs to go take a walk.

How big is the deficit?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be tabling the fall economic statement next Monday, here in the House of Commons.

The fall economic statement will show that the government is maintaining its fiscal anchor. More specifically, it is a question of reducing the federal debt as a share of the economy over the medium term. In addition, I expect the debt-to-GDP ratio we projected in the spring budget for fiscal year 2023-24 will be met.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP.

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, three Chilean asylum seekers escaped from the Laval immigration holding centre.

These are people with ties to international organized crime who were subject to a removal order. The three escapees are just the latest in a long line of nearly 750 asylum seekers in Quebec who are inadmissible for security reasons, yet the federal government is not deporting them. These people are a threat to the public.

How can the government justify such massive failures to hold and deport asylum seekers with criminal pasts?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we certainly share our colleague's concerns about the circumstances of what happened at the Laval centre on the weekend.

I have asked border services to conduct an immediate review of the facility's security systems. We have tripled the number of guards on site. We have changed protocols for certain people to access certain parts of the facility.

We will keep working to ensure that this kind of thing does not happen again.

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal government cannot deport the 750 foreign nationals with criminal records from Quebec, and they are just the tip of the iceberg.

In 2020, the Auditor General denounced the fact that the Canada Border Services Agency was not conducting investigations to find individuals who were supposed to be deported. Ms. Hogan said, "at least 70% of all criminal cases were not reviewed annually, and 75% of all failed asylum cases were not reviewed every 3 years as required." Clearly, the agency is incapable of taking action.

Is this because of a lack of resources or a lack of political will?

• (1445)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it will come as no surprise to my colleague that the answer is neither. Many countries around the world are experiencing similar situations as the number of asylum seekers is increasing.

However, we accept that we have a responsibility, by law, and in accordance with the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada, to ensure that certain individuals who pose a threat to Canada's public safety are detained before being removed from Canada. That is exactly what we are investing in now, and we will continue to keep everyone safe.

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is the matter of political will. Last winter, *The Globe and Mail* reported that, since 2016, just one month after the new Liberal government took office, 14,609 people had been issued deportation orders. In May 2023, 9,317 of those people were still in Canada.

Let us think about that. During almost the entire Liberal reign, 64% of those who are inadmissible to Canada were never deported. At this point, it seems as though the deportation of criminals is basically voluntary.

Why have there been no consequences for violating a deportation order, even for years, under the Liberals?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our colleague is well aware that deporting people who do not have legal status in Canada and who have violated our criminal law is a serious responsibility that we accept.

It goes without saying that it is a serious responsibility to work with our police forces and the CBSA. We are also working with our partners in some provinces to ensure that we can detain anyone who poses a real threat to public safety and deport them from Canada.

I have full confidence that we will be able to continue this work.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the spending spree spat between the finance minister and the Prime Minister has spilled into the public, according to *The Globe and Mail*.

Oral Questions

The PBO confirmed that the Prime Minister forced the finance minister to blow through her \$40-billion fiscal guardrail promise, taking Canada's finances off a cliff. Now he wants her to bury the bad news of their deficits in the dark days of December next Monday.

How bad is the deficit?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was actually about to ask if the Conservatives are giving out Christmas presents for alliteration? We are supposed to be talking about serious issues here.

I am glad, though, that the member opposite has spoken about the Parliamentary Budget Officer, because, just a few weeks ago, in his independent analysis, the Parliamentary Budget Officer concluded, "current fiscal policy in Canada is sustainable over the long term." That is the conclusion of the PBO who was just cited by the member opposite, and it is good news for Canadians.

• (1450)

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians cannot have Christmas because she cannot do math.

The Prime Minister lost control of Canada's finances and forced the finance minister cover their devastating deficit. The spending tensions between her and the Prime Minister will have her getting the bill no more treatment, and Canadians have to foot the bill for the spending spree separation.

We know that she already blew through her \$40-billion fiscal guardrail promise, but what is the deficit number?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do really look forward to tabling the fall economic statement in the House on Monday. In the fall economic statement on Monday, we will show that the government is maintaining its fiscal anchor, specifically reducing the federal debt as a share of the economy over the medium term. In addition, I expect that the debt-to-GDP ratio we projected in the spring budget for fiscal year 2023-24 will be met.

Canada has the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, we have the lowest deficit, and this is good news for Canada and Canadians.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of this Bloc Québécois-backed Prime Minister, the Liberal government is a shambles. The Prime Minister and his Minister of Finance are at loggerheads. Both of them have lost control of the country's public spending.

The Minister of Finance promised that the Liberal government's massive deficit would not exceed \$40 billion. The Prime Minister could not care less about spending or how it affects Canadian families. While he is still here, I have an easy question for him.

What is the deficit? Who won?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are going to win because our government is united. Our government is working in uni-

son to deliver results for Canadians, whether that means dental care, child care or doctors for Canadians.

We are there for Canadians. We are proud to do it, and we do it as a team.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister does not even want to hear the finance minister's explanations any more. There is some bickering going on across the way. Some unhappy Liberals have been talking to The Globe and Mail. It reported that five senior Liberal Party veterans and three political staffers confirmed that tensions have risen between the Minister of Finance's office and the Prime Minister's Office over spending.

The Minister of Finance is standing firm on her enormous \$40-billion deficit. The Prime Minister wants an even more monstrous deficit. Will the Minister of Finance keep her word and reassure Canadians, who are paying the bill, that a \$40-billion deficit is big enough?

How much is the deficit?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be tabling the fall economic statement in this House on Monday.

In next week's fall economic statement, we will show that the government is maintaining its fiscal anchor, specifically reducing the federal debt as a share of the economy over the medium term. In addition, I expect that the debt-to-GDP ratio we projected in the spring budget for fiscal year 2023-24 will be met.

* * *

[English]

HOUSING

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are hurting, and we saw it expressed in the gallery today. Renters in Canada are facing exploitation and eviction because of corporate greed.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Colleagues, I am having difficulty hearing the question. It is not for the Chair to agree or disagree with the content of the question, but to make sure that it does follow the rules. I am asking members to please restrain themselves.

The hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam from the top, please.

• (1455)

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo: Mr. Speaker, Canadians are hurting, and we saw it expressed in the gallery today. Renters in Canada are facing exploitation and eviction because of corporate greed.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Oral Questions

The Speaker: I am going to invite the hon. member to rephrase her question. I want to remind the member that we should not make reference to what has or has not happened in the galleries today to ensure that this behaviour is not repeated.

The hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo: Mr. Speaker, Canadians are hurting. We saw it expressed in the gallery today—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. I hope the hon. member can understand and can hear my voice when I say that we should not make reference to what has happened or has not happened in the gallery.

I will invite the hon. member to rephrase her question for the last time before I move on.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo: Mr. Speaker, Canadians are hurting, and we saw in Ottawa today that it was expressed around homelessness. Renters in Canada are facing exploitation and eviction because of corporate greed. It is so bad that a class-action lawsuit has started against corporate landlords, accusing them of price fixing using the AI program, YieldStar.

For months, the New Democrats have called on the Liberals to protect renters, but the Liberals and Conservatives chose to protect corporate profits over people.

Why is the Prime Minister letting down renters and caving to corporate landlord CEOs?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no one in the country is choosing to be homeless and no one is choosing to live in an encampment. We know that the cost of housing has gotten too high. That is why we are putting billions of dollars of investments on the table to help build out more affordable housing and help community entities provide services to people who do not have a roof over their head.

What is fascinating is that the Conservatives seek to make a joke out of a very serious issue such as homelessness. We are going to be willing to do the hard work to build more homes, including for the most vulnerable.

As the jeering continues, Canadians should be ashamed of the behaviour of the Conservative Party, which uses homeless people as props.

AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in January, Air Canada will become the latest big airline to charge junk fees for basic services like checked baggage. What is the minister's reaction to this? She is taking a page from the industry minister's playbook and is going to sit down with the CEOs and ask very nicely if they would please change their ways. It did not work for grocery prices and it is not going to work for these airlines' junk fees.

It turns out, the minister has the regulatory power she needs to stand up for Canadians who are tired of being gouged. Will she use it?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite actually has it inaccurate. If I could clarify, we are extremely concerned with airlines putting forward junk fees, and the Minister of Finance has specified this in successive budgets.

I will be speaking with the airline executives. I will be calling them out for charging these extra fees. Canadians want excellent service, not excellent fees, and our government will be standing for passengers and Canadians every step of the way.

● (1500)

TAXATION

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians received great news last week about a temporary tax break that we would be implementing for all Canadians. Our government is exempting essentials like groceries, snacks, children's clothing and gifts from the GST, starting December 14. This will deliver tangible and immediate support to Canadians struggling with the cost of living.

Could the minister share why all members of the House should support this tax break?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my neighbour, the hon. member for Davenport, for her very hard work on behalf of her constituents.

It is expensive to raise a family, especially around the holidays, so our government is stepping up to support Canadians by giving them a tax break. This includes children's clothing, diapers and car seats. With the holidays coming up, we are also making children's toys, puzzles, books and board games tax free.

For a party that claims to want to lower taxes, the Conservatives sure seem keen on taxing Canadians' holidays. Why will the Conservatives not support—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Wellington—Halton Hills.

FINANCE

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister said that the government would not crash through the deficit guardrail. The Globe and Mail reports today that all the Prime Minister's new spending is upending the deficit target and that finance officials view it as “unwise” and “making little sense.”

Tonight, we vote on \$24.8 billion in new spending. Will the Finance Minister tell us why we should vote for something that upends the deficit target, that is unwise and that makes little sense?

Oral Questions

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do look forward to tabling the fall economic statement in the House on Monday. In next week's fall economic statement, we will show that the government is maintaining its fiscal anchor. Specifically, it is reducing the federal debt as a share of the economy over the medium term. In addition, I expect that the debt-to-GDP ratio we projected in the spring budget for fiscal year 2023-2024 will be met.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Globe also reports that the finance minister and the Prime Minister are “at odds” over all this new spending. It reports that the Prime Minister's Office has viewed the finance minister as “ineffective” at communicating. It also stated that a senior Liberal said that the current dynamic appears to be similar to what happened to Bill Morneau before he resigned in 2020.

John Turner resigned as finance minister in 1975, when he was at odds with the then prime minister. I have a simple question: Does the finance minister still have confidence in the Prime Minister?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC): Mr. Speaker, according to The Globe and Mail, the finance minister herself said that radical Liberal spending risks blowing past her promised fiscal guardrails. She has a choice. She can break rank and join the Liberal minister graveyard, like former finance minister Bill Morneau, or she can abide by the weak Prime Minister and drive Canadians off of a fiscal cliff.

Which one?

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing from the Conservatives is an attempt to distract from the fact that, when they had an opportunity to support a tax reduction for Canadians, they actually voted against it. They talk out of one side of their mouths and do the absolute opposite all of the time.

On this side of the House, we are absolutely united in our support for Canadians. Over the holidays, we are proud to offer them a GST holiday to make sure they can have toys, clothing, car seats and diapers at a reduced price for their children. That is what matters to us.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

• (1505)

The Speaker: I am going to ask the hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil to please not take the floor.

The hon. member for Peterborough—Kawartha.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we cannot spend our way out of debt. The fact that Conservatives have to say that to the finance minister speaks volumes as to why we have record-high usage of food banks in this country. She has a choice today. Everyone knows there is tension. She promised a guardrail of \$40 billion, which in itself is outrageous. Bill Morneau, the former finance minister, was in the same position. He would not abide by the weak Prime Minister and quit.

The question is, will she have the courage to do the same and stand up for Canadians, not the Prime Minister?

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the only people who are engaging in bullying tactics in the House are the members of the Conservative Party. If they truly cared about supporting Canadians through these tough times, they would have voted in favour of the GST tax break over the holidays. This is par for the course with the members opposite. They cry crocodile tears, but whenever it comes to helping Canadians, they oppose it. Whether it is the school food program that is already supporting 200,000 kids across this country or the Canada child benefit that puts over \$7,000 a year in the pockets of Canadian families, they oppose it.

We are united in our support for Canadians and we will continue to stand up against those bullies.

* * *

[Translation]

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first it was the ArriveCAN fiasco, and now the CBSA assessment and revenue management, or CARM, fiasco is taking down the Canada Border Services Agency.

This app for clearing goods at the border crashed 22 times in its first 30 days, paralyzing imports. It is a complete failure with a 50% cost overrun, inconclusive testing and documentation being hidden from parliamentarians. Clearly there is a reason why the Standing Committee on International Trade unanimously asked the Auditor General to investigate. Even the Liberal members agreed.

Will the minister listen to his colleagues and agree to an investigation by the Auditor General of Canada?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to correct my colleague, but he said that the committee adopted a motion unanimously, implying that our Liberal colleagues also adopted it. This confirms our desire to see parliamentary committees fulfill their responsibilities while respecting the independence of the Auditor General.

If the Auditor General decides to investigate, the government will obviously be very happy to co-operate. We expect her to do her job well. That is what she always does.

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister responded yesterday by praising the work of border officers. We too salute their work. It is their bosses in the offices we are not so sure about.

The CBSA was already in the hot seat because of ArriveCAN. Now the CARM app is creating another fiasco, with its irregularities and cost overruns. At least ArriveCAN worked. CARM does not even work. If Ottawa fixes this as quickly as it fixed the Phoenix pay system, we still have a long way to go, and businesses will suffer terribly.

Will the minister put the agency under administrative supervision and switch to problem-solving mode?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are always in problem-solving mode. As my colleague knows, this system replaced a 36-year-old system that was at risk of failing across the board. It is used for assessing \$40 billion in duties and taxes every year.

A responsible government always tries to secure such an important system for the Canadian economy. We are addressing all the problems quickly to guarantee quick responses for importers. We will continue to do this work.

* * *

• (1510)

[English]

FINANCE

Ms. Lianne Rood (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the NDP-Liberal government recklessly pushed through its costly temporary GST tax trick that is going to hurt our small businesses, and it is trying to buy votes with a \$250 cheque. However, the finance minister's own department called this over \$6-billion spend “fiscally unwise” and described it as making no fiscal economic sense.

Because of spending like this, we know that the finance minister is going to blow through her \$40.1-billion fiscal guardrail. Will she confirm that her deficit will not be a penny over \$46 billion?

Hon. Rechie Valdez (Minister of Small Business, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is coming from a member whose leader calls our government supports big, fat government spending. When it is time to step up, the Conservative Party never steps up to support small businesses.

We have cut taxes for small businesses from 11% to 9%, saving small businesses \$6.3 billion every single year. We are putting more money back into the pockets of small businesses through our Canada carbon rebate. That is \$2.5 billion going out to 600,000 small businesses across the country. We will always be there to support them.

Ms. Lianne Rood (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know Canada is about to be sent over a fiscal cliff when the Liberals cannot even do basic math. That is why tensions are rising in the Liberal caucus. The finance minister is as unfit to lead as her boss. Maybe that is why the Prime Minister is making unilateral financial decisions.

Will the finance minister continue to blindly decimate our economy, or will she actually show some leadership and stick to her \$40-billion fiscal guardrail?

Oral Questions

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, on this side of the House, we are putting Canadians first. That is what we have done for the last nine years, understanding that, when times are tough, we are there for Canadians.

What we hear from Conservative members of Parliament is that, when times are tough, they look to take supports away from Canadians, not to be there for them. We will not allow that to happen. We are going to continue to be there for Canadians every step of the way.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, according to The Globe and Mail, tensions are growing between the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance over spending measures such as the election gimmick of cutting the GST for Christmas. Even their own officials say that this \$6.28-billion expense is fiscally unwise.

We all know that the Prime Minister has lost control and that the Minister of Finance is going to break her promise of keeping the deficit below \$40 billion.

Does the minister understand that she has a responsibility and that she has to say stop when the Prime Minister makes ridiculous demands?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Finance has said many times, it is a question of fiscal responsibility. Canada has the best fiscal record of any G7 country in terms of debt-to-GDP ratio, deficit-to-GDP ratio, interest rates and interest paid on debt. On top of that, interest rates are falling, inflation is dropping and employment is on the rise.

What would be irresponsible is to do what the Conservatives are doing. Canadians are having had a hard time making ends meet in 2024, but the Conservatives are doing everything they can to make life even harder for them.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government made a great announcement to support Canadians over this holiday season, because the holidays should be a stress-free period for Canadians—

The Speaker: I am going to ask the hon. member to start again.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

This is a good time to remind all members to be very careful about objects that they put on their microphones as it hurts the ears, which are the tools of our interpreters.

The hon. member for Fleetwood—Port Kells, from the top.

Oral Questions

Mr. Ken Hardie: Mr. Speaker, the government did make that great announcement to support Canadians over the holiday season. Holidays should be a stress-free period for all Canadians, but for some, this is not the case, as spending can be a source of difficulty for some families. We have a plan for that, but that would be the plan that the Conservatives voted against.

Could the minister share more details about our government's plan to put more money in the pockets of Canadians?

Hon. Ya'ara Saks (Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his question and also for the hard work that he does on behalf of his constituents and Canadians.

We will always be there for Canadians, for families and businesses, in the good times and in the hard times. Twice we have offered tax cuts to the middle class and twice the Conservative leader has voted against them.

Today, with the GST cut, we are providing even greater support for families and businesses. One would think, with all the slogans and the childish shouting, this would be a no-brainer for the Conservatives, but they voted against this tax cut and they voted against Canadians. We are here for Canadians.

* * *

● (1515)

FINANCE

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, The Globe and Mail is reporting a big fight between the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance. They have blown through every deficit target every year but, apparently, we “ain't seen nothing yet”. Just like what happened to the last finance minister, the Prime Minister does not care about this finance minister breaking her promise that the deficit would not be more than \$40 billion. Who cares when the Prime Minister fears for his political life?

I have a simple question. Is the deficit more than \$40 billion, yes or no?

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, what we see from Conservative members of Parliament is their attempt to distract from the fact that when given the opportunity to vote for a tax break for Canadians, they voted against it. They are travelling across the country saying that they are going to cut taxes, but at the very first opportunity to do that, they say “no.” This is actually a pattern of behaviour because, over the past nine years when we have brought forward other tax cuts for the middle class or benefits for Canadians, they vote against them.

On this side of the House, we are going to stay focused on Canadians and delivering for them in their time of need.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there we have it, a real-life Thelma and Louise. The Prime Minister is driving Canadians through the finance minister's deficit guardrail into the abyss. The Prime Minister is throwing the finance minister under the bus. Now, in The Globe and Mail, senior Liberals are throwing the Prime Minister's vote-buying under the bus.

It truly is hard to imagine a deficit number so bad that even senior Liberals are complaining. What is the deficit number that is so large that even leaking Liberals are appalled?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening patiently during this entire question period, and I have heard a lot of attacks on the Minister of Finance. I will tell Canadians why we support that incredible female leader. It is because she empowers women around this country. How does she do that? She puts in place programs like the Canada child care program.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The Speaker stood up because the hon. member for Peterborough—Kawartha was—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I am going to ask the hon. member for Peterborough—Kawartha, please, to withhold herself while we listen to the hon. minister.

The hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada can start from the top.

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, I have been listening patiently through all of question period to attacks on the current finance minister. I am going to say what a strong female leader looks like.

A strong female finance minister empowers women to participate in our economy. How does she do that? She puts in place, and has the courage to put in place, something like a Canada child care program, which has resulted in an 85% women's labour force participation rate in this country. That is an all-time high. That is what a feminist looks like. That is what a great woman leader looks like. That is what a great finance minister looks like, and that is somebody who I will stand by every single day in this chamber.

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, The Globe and Mail has reported that tensions are on the rise and that the weak Prime Minister is forcing the Minister of Finance to spend even more. The minister promised Canadians, out of her own mouth, the deficit would not exceed \$40 billion. Now it is clear she has crashed right through that guardrail. Canadians deserve to know how much the deficit is. Do not make them wait until Monday; tell us the number now.

● (1520)

The Speaker: Once again I will remind all members to point their questions through the Chair. Order, please.

The hon. Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.

Oral Questions

Hon. Karina Gould (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member knows very well that we are bringing forward the fall economic statement next Monday. We are very much looking forward to the finance minister presenting that to the House, and we are exceptionally proud of the record of this government, of which the finance minister has been an incredible leader. Whether it comes to the Canada child benefit, child care for Canadians, a national school food program or supporting Canadians and businesses through the worst pandemic in our lives, she was at the helm of it and led us through those difficult times. We know that together we will continue to support Canadians and lead them through these tough times.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Michael McLeod (Northwest Territories, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Foreign Affairs announced a new Arctic foreign policy. It reflects the reality of our region and was developed in partnership with indigenous governments as well as Arctic and territorial partners. It strengthens our work here at home and our engagement with other northern nations like Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and the United States. They are Canada's like-minded Arctic partners and they are all, apparently, countries that Conservatives have never heard of. For northerners and indigenous people who call the Arctic home, and to all Canadians, can the minister tell us why she launched the foreign—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs has the floor.

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the world is getting tougher, we need to get tougher. This Arctic foreign policy builds on the biggest investments in our defence in generations, more than the Conservatives ever did. It puts people in the north first, allowing indigenous peoples, particularly Inuit and northerners, to be at the centre of international relations affecting them. Russia and China are working together against our interests in the Arctic. This is something we take seriously, contrary to the Leader of the Opposition, who is not serious about defending our north and is trivializing northerners.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. member for Foothills, please. I would ask members not to have a conversation unless they want to take it behind the table.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Kidd Mine in Timmins has been an economic driver in the north for the last 60 years, but the end is near and we need to prepare for what comes next. Northern Ontario is no stranger to heartbreak, and mine and mill closures, but it does not have to be this way in Timmins. We have a huge opportunity to shift investment to the Timmins nickel project. That is a project that ticks all the boxes: critical minerals, job creation and supportive infrastructure.

Will the minister commit to work with the city now to ensure there are no delays in transitioning Timmins to a stronger and more sustainable future?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, certainly critical minerals, including very much the Crawford mine, offer enormous opportunities across this country. That is certainly true in northern Ontario. The Crawford mine is something that is a very important project moving forward. We just announced an investment of the critical minerals infrastructure fund in the Crawford mine, and I am certainly very happy to sit down with the folks in Timmins to have that conversation.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, late on Friday, we learned that the Vista thermal coal mine expansion in the Rocky Mountains is going ahead without an impact assessment, despite the fact that the former minister promised me twice over the past four years that the government would do that. Albertans do not want coal mining in the Rocky Mountains. The current government pretends to care about our environment even while making false promises to stop mining thermal coal and stop polluters in our beloved Rocky Mountains.

When will the minister protect our Rocky Mountains, instead of protecting the profits of billionaire—

• (1525)

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague is well aware, the Supreme Court last year directed the government to review some of the elements under the Impact Assessment Act of Canada, which is what we have done. We still have a commitment to phase out thermal coal export by 2030 and she also knows that 10 indigenous—

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I am going to ask the hon. member who had the opportunity to ask the question to please extend that same opportunity for the person to answer it.

The hon. minister can take it from the top.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague is well aware, the Supreme Court of Canada directed the government to make some changes to the Impact Assessment Act of Canada last year, which is what we have done. We still have a commitment to ban the export of thermal coal by 2030. My colleague also knows that 10 indigenous communities are supporting this project, which is why, in the end, the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada decided that an evaluation was not necessary.

Oral Questions

The Speaker: Colleagues, during Statements by Members, the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway was making a statement when a member unwittingly walked in front of the camera. As is normal in our tradition, we allow the hon. member to make a statement again.

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I rise to honour one of Canada's finest public servants, our ambassador to Germany and former premier of British Columbia, the late John Horgan. Raised by a single mom, John overcame great challenges to rise to the highest levels of public office. His political career actually started in this place, staffing NDP MPs. In 1991, he left to assume important roles in the B.C. NDP government, ending as chief of staff to the premier.

John entered elected office as an MLA in 2005 and ultimately became leader of the party, leader of the the official opposition and a very popular premier. Throughout, John carved a deeply impactful path. He had an uncommon common touch. He had that rare ability to rise above partisanship and win the respect of his opponents. He was witty, kind and positive. In my view, John was the best off-the-cuff speaker in Canadian politics. We extend our deepest condolences to John's beloved Ellie and their two sons.

We are thankful for John. His kind shall not pass this way again.

* * *

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That the House a) recognize that today, on the International Day for Human Rights, the Nobel Committee has awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for 2024 to Nihon Hidankyo, the Japanese grassroots organization of atomic bomb survivors from Hiroshima and Nagasaki, also know as Hibakusha; b) acknowledge that Hibakusha has worked tirelessly for decades to raise awareness of the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapon use; c) recognize the ongoing relevance of their message in a world where the threat of nuclear weapons remains a pressing concern; d) affirm that nuclear disarmament is a crucial step toward ensuring global peace and security; and e) encourage the government to take concrete steps to honour this award, including enhanced engagement with the TPNW, participation in international disarmament efforts, and collaboration with civil society to advance the cause of nuclear abolition.

The Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay. Hearing none, it is agreed.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During question period, there was a disturbance in the gallery, and it was very alarming to see the NDP member for Port Moody—Coquitlam almost immediately not just reference it, but incorporate it, it seemed, into her question.

It was a prepared question. We could tell it was prepared because even after you admonished her for pointing out the disturbance in

the gallery, she could not adapt and repeated it three times. It seems like this was a coordinated event, and that someone was invited into the chamber and the member knew there would be such a disturbance. I would ask you look into the matter and report back to the House as to how this individual gained entry into the gallery and on whose behalf this person was invited.

This comes on the heels of a security scare today in the Wellington Building and a protest in the Confederation Building last week, where members of Parliament were impeded access to their offices, threatened and forced to face toxic behaviour. This is a pattern of behaviour we are seeing from the NDP. As we come to the end of this session, it is incumbent upon all members to respect the security and safety of this place.

● (1530)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising to me that the Conservatives, who allowed for three weeks the occupation of downtown Ottawa, including impeding MPs coming to the West Block consistently, would raise this. The reality is the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam properly corrected her question. I would suggest Conservatives, who are repetitive not only with one member but their entire question period lineup, often violate the Standing Orders and are very repetitive, should actually walk the talk and should try to offer something more to Canadians during question period.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo: Mr. Speaker, since the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle has decided to be a mind reader, I just wanted to clarify that although the Conservatives are used to being told what to do, I am not. If the Speaker would so kindly check the notes I gave to the pages, he will see that I have handwritten notes about the very important interventions in Ottawa today from people around homelessness in this country and how desperate folks are. I would just raise that I do have a mind of my own, unlike the Conservatives.

The Speaker: I thank hon. members for their interventions. The Chair will come back to this matter, if necessary.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—FEDERAL SALES TAX ON NEW HOMES

The House resumed from December 9 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3:33 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion of the member for Thornhill related to the business of supply.

Call in the members.

The question is on the motion. May I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

● (1545)

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

(*Division No. 915*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Angus	Arnold
Bachrach	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barron	Berthold
Bezan	Blaney
Block	Boulerice
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Cannings	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Collins (Victoria)
Cooper	Dalton
Dance	Dancho
Davidson	Davies
Deltell	d'Entremont
Desjarlais	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Garrison
Gazan	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Green	Hallan
Hoback	Hughes
Idlout	Jeneroux
Jivani	Johns
Julian	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert

Lloyd	Lobb
MacGregor	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Masse	Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
McPherson	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrice	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzner
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shiple	Singh
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)
Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Williamson
Zarrillo	Zimmer — 146

Business of Supply

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Atwin	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Gaudreau	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Guilbeault	Hajdu

Routine Proceedings

Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Ien	Jaczek
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
May (Cambridge)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
Mendès	Miao
Michaud	Miller
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
Sauvé	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
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	Zuberi — 186

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

The House resumed consideration of the motion, and of the motion that the question be now put.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the previous question to the motion for concurrence in the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

● (1555)

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

(*Division No. 916*)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Dance	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
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

Routine Proceedings

Iacono	Idlout	Dalton	Dancho
Ien	Jaczek	Davidson	Deltell
Johns	Joly	d'Entremont	Doherty
Jones	Jowhari	Dowdall	Dreeshen
Julian	Kayabaga	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Kelloway	Khalid	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Khera	Koutrakis	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Ferri	Findlay
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Gallant	Généreux
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Genuis	Gladu
Larouche	Lattanzio	Godin	Goodridge
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Gourde	Gray
Lebouthillier	Lemire	Hallan	Hoback
Lightbound	Long	Jeneroux	Jivani
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Kelly	Khanna
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Kitchen	Kmiec
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	Kurek	Kusie
Masse	Mathysen	Lake	Lantsman
May (Cambridge)	May (Saenich—Gulf Islands)	Lawrence	Lehoux
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
McLeod	McPherson	Lloyd	Lobb
Mendès	Medicino	Maguire	Majumdar
Miao	Michaud	Martel	Mazier
Miller	Morrice	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Morrissey	Murray	Melillo	Moore
Naqvi	Ng	Morantz	Morrison
Noormohamed	Normandin	Motz	Muys
O'Connell	Oliphant	Nater	Patzer
O'Regan	Pauzé	Paul-Hus	Perkins
Perron	Petitpas Taylor	Poilievre	Redekopp
Plamondon	Powlowski	Reid	Rempel Garner
Qualtrough	Robillard	Richards	Roberts
Rodriguez	Rogers	Rood	Ruff
Romanado	Rota	Scheer	Schmale
Sahota	Sajjan	Seeback	Shields
Saks	Samson	Shiple	Small
Sarai	Sauvé	Soroka	Steinley
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia	Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)	Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Schieffke	Serré	Strahl	Stubbs
Sgro	Shanahan	Thomas	Tochor
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Tolmie	Uppal
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard	Van Popta	Vecchio
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh	Vidal	Vien
Sorbara	Sousa	Viersen	Vis
Ste-Marie	St-Onge	Wagantall	Warkentin
Sudds	Tassi	Waugh	Webber
Taylor Roy	Thériault	Williams	Williamson
Therrien	Thompson	Zimmer—119	
Trudeau	Trudel		
Turnbull	Valdez		
Van Bynen	van Koeverden		
Vandal	Vandenbeld		
Vignola	Villemure		
Virani	Weiler		
Wilkinson	Yip		
Zahid	Zarrillo		
Zuberi—213			

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

The next question is on the motion to concur in the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

[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. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded vote, please.

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper

Routine Proceedings

● (1610)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 917)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison	Godin	Goodridge
Albas	Alghabra	Gould	Gourde
Ali	Allison	Gray	Green
Anand	Anandasangaree	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Angus	Arnold	Hallan	Hanley
Arseneault	Arya	Hardie	Hepfner
Ashton	Atwin	Hoback	Holland
Bachrach	Badawey	Housefather	Hughes
Bains	Baker	Hussen	Hutchings
Baldinelli	Barlow	lacono	Idlout
Barrett	Barron	Ien	Jaczek
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste	Jeneroux	Jivani
Beaulieu	Beech	Johns	Joly
Bendayan	Bergeron	Jones	Jowhari
Berthold	Bérubé	Julian	Kayabaga
Bezan	Bibeau	Kelloway	Kelly
Bittle	Blair	Khalid	Khanna
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas	Khera	Kitchen
Blaney	Block	Kmiec	Koutrakis
Blois	Boissonnault	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Boulerice	Bradford	Kurek	Kusie
Bragdon	Brassard	Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Brière	Brock	Lake	Lalonde
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Cannings	Caputo	Lantsman	Lapointe
Carr	Carrie	Larouche	Lattanzio
Casey	Chabot	Lauzon	Lawrence
Chagger	Chahal	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Chambers	Champagne	Lehoux	Lemire
Champoux	Chatel	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Chen	Chiang	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Chong	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Lightbound	Lloyd
Collins (Victoria)	Cooper	Lobb	Long
Cormier	Coteau	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Dabrusin	Dalton	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Damoff	Dance	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Dancho	Davidson	Maguire	Majumdar
Davies	DeBellefeuille	Maloney	Martel
Deltell	d'Entremont	Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Desbiens	Desilets	Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier
Dhillon	Diab	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)
Doherty	Dong	McGuinty	McKay
Dowdall	Dreeshen	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean
Drouin	Dubourg	McLeod	McPherson
Duclos	Duguid	Melillo	Mendès
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Dzerowicz	Mendicino	Miao
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Michaud	Miller
Ellis	Epp	Moore	Morantz
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Morrice	Morrison
Falk (Provencher)	Fast	Morrissey	Motz
Ferreri	Findlay	Murray	Muys
Fisher	Fonseca	Naqvi	Nater
Fortier	Fortin	Ng	Noormohamed
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Normandin	O'Connell
Freeland	Fry	Oliphant	O'Regan
Gaheer	Gainey	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Gallant	Garon	Pauzé	Perkins
Garrison	Gaudreau	Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Gazan	Généreux	Plamondon	Poilievre
Genuis	Gerretsen	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Gill	Gladu	Rayes	Redekopp
		Reid	Rempel Garner
		Richards	Roberts
		Robillard	Rodriguez
		Rogers	Romanado
		Rood	Rota
		Ruff	Sahota
		Sajjan	Saks
		Samson	Sarai
		Sauvé	Savard-Tremblay
		Scarpaleggia	Scheer
		Schiefke	Schmale

Seeback
Sgro
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Small
Soroka
Steinley
Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)
St-Onge
Stubbs
Tassi
Thériault
Thomas
Tochr
Trudeau
Turnbull
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Virani
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Williamson
Zahid
Zimmer

Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sorbara
Sousa
Ste-Marie
Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Strahl
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Thompson
Tolmie
Trudel
Uppal
Van Bynen
Van Popta
Vandenbeld
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Weiler
Williams
Yip
Zarrillo
Zuberi — 334

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded divisions, the time provided for Government Orders will be extended by 37 minutes.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

ACCESS TO PARLIAMENTARY PRECINCT

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am rising because I was named by the Conservative member of Parliament for Thornhill in her question of privilege on Friday, and I would like to set the record straight.

The member for Thornhill's characterization of my involvement in the event is wildly inaccurate and misleading. In her speech, she alleged that I organized the event and that the intention was to shut down Parliament. This is an outright fabrication. On Tuesday morning, I was at the gym. In fact I was exercising with my personal trainer when the member for Thornhill alleges I was occupying the lobby. When I finished my exercise, I left the gym.

Outside the Confederation Building, I did encounter members of the Jews Against Genocide group, and I tweeted, "I was so happy to see @JewsSayNo telling politicians in Ottawa they will not support genocide." After being gifted with a T-shirt from the group, as

Privilege

a fellow Jew who is against genocide, and posing for a photo outside, I came to the House.

That is the extent of my involvement. For that to be misconstrued as an attempt to block the member's privilege is not only unacceptable but also laughable. All I did was pose for a picture outside after the demonstrators had been removed from the building.

Why should I not express my support for the demonstrators' cause? They are a group of fellow Jews who have expressed serious concerns about the Netanyahu government's violation of international law. Let us remember that the International Criminal Court has issued an arrest warrant for members of that government as a result of crimes in Gaza, and last week, in a landmark finding, Amnesty International concluded that Israel has committed genocide in Gaza.

With all due respect, I understand that the member for Thornhill does not agree with the findings, but to try to shut down the demonstrators' right to express their views and to try to shut me down for expressing solidarity for the group is not acceptable. To liken the group to "unhinged mobs that think that their petty grievances allow them to target Jewish neighbourhoods, firebomb Jewish schools, obstruct synagogues and wreak havoc on our Canadian values, while abiding and abetting groups that are designated as terrorists in this country", as the member did, is completely unacceptable.

The Jewish community is not a monolith. To accuse members of our community in this manner is beyond the pale. Not all members of the Jewish community think the same way, have the same political opinions, have the same lived experience and share the exact same values.

I would like to remind the member that part of the reason I support Jews Against Genocide is that my whole family was killed in the Holocaust. When my grandmother, the only person to survive the concentration camps on both sides of my family, got out, she said she loves everybody. She was a Jew against genocide. My father, who survived the Holocaust as a child in hiding, came out of the war and became a lifelong peace activist and pacifist.

Therefore I feel very compelled today to set the record straight, not just for myself but also for the Jewish community, in honour of my father and in honour of the members of my family who died as a result of war and genocide. I am deeply insulted by the accusations.

● (1615)

Individuals who were at the demonstration have had to face real anti-Semitism, like my family did. They have fought against tropes and memes, including the rise of far-right anti-Semitism online, some of which I experience. They have family members who fled Nazi Germany, like my family did, and who were not so lucky, like my family. Some were denied entry into Canada or were denied services when they did come.

Business of Supply

For the demonstrators to face accusations that their demonstration was not only a contempt of the House but was also anti-Semitic is disgusting and borders on anti-Semitism itself. Nobody, including the Conservative member in question, holds the power to tell us what their actions are and whether they are a betrayal of their Judaism.

Speaking for myself, like I said, I am a Jew against genocide. I absolutely support other people in my community who have protested the Netanyahu regime, and I will not be silenced by the Conservative deputy leader just because she does not like those views. As members well know, matters of privilege are very serious things. They ought not to be brought to the House frivolously or lightly, and accusing other members of Parliament of breaching their privilege is very serious—

The Speaker: I regret interrupting the hon. member, but a point of order is being raised.

The member will have the full time to present her question of privilege. I am going to entertain the point of order for a minute to hear what the member for Mégantic—L'Érable has to say, and then we will go right back to the question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the House that the member had all day yesterday to stand up and make her comments.

Her colleague, the NDP House leader and member for New Westminster—Burnaby, has even stated that comments should be made after you read out your ruling on the question of privilege. I therefore invite my colleague to—

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his intervention. However, it is traditional for a member facing accusations to rise to speak on a question of privilege before the Speaker makes a ruling on the matter.

I invite the member for Winnipeg Centre to continue her intervention.

• (1620)

[*English*]

Ms. Leah Gazan: Mr. Speaker, as I have now outlined, before I was rudely interrupted, not only did I not breach the member's privilege but I was not even present at the event that she alleges to have taken place. It is an extremely serious accusation from the member for Thornhill to allege that I breached her parliamentary privilege when I was not even present, and I find it deeply hurtful and problematic that a member can make such an accusation and provide disinformation to the House against a fellow member without a shred of evidence.

I hope that the member, Jew to Jew, apologizes for likening another Jew in the House to a terrorist. I welcome her apology, even if it is in private.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre for her intervention regarding the question of privilege.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—REPEAL OF BILL C-5

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC) moved:

That,

(i) whereas the government's experiment with radical liberalization of drugs has contributed to the deaths of 47,000 Canadians and a 200% annual increase of such deaths compared to 2016,

(ii) whereas of 2024, over 80% of accidental opioid deaths involve fentanyl,

(iii) whereas the reduced sentences for drug kingpins and lax borders contribute to these deaths and threaten our trade relationship with our biggest trading partner and greatest ally,

(iv) whereas CSIS has found that "synthetic drugs are increasingly being produced in Canada using precursor chemicals largely sourced from China" and has identified "more than 350 organized crime groups actively involved in the domestic illegal fentanyl market",

the House call on the government to reverse Liberal Bill C-5; to reinstate longer jail sentences for drug kingpins; ban the importation of fentanyl precursor; buy high powered scanners; put more boots on the ground at our ports to stop fentanyl and its ingredients from coming into our country; and stop buying unsafe supply of opioids.

The Speaker: Today being the final allotted day for the supply period ending December 10, the House will proceed as usual to the consideration and passage of the appropriation bill. In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bill be distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, there is a silent killer, relentless and ruthless, marching through our streets. It is stealing breath, stopping hearts, breaking spirits and numbing pain only to multiply it. There is an invisible force, malicious and merciless, taking our loved ones one by one and turning vibrant lives into fading echoes. How do we fight this silent killer, when its poison lingers everywhere in the land? Now, 47,000 Canadians have died of fentanyl overdoses. This is more than died fighting for Canada in the Second World War.

Never before seen homeless camps and drug dens overtake once-beautiful communities, where contorted bodies lie half dead on filthy sidewalks in scenes resembling third world squalor. The government tranquilizes our people with an unsafe supply of tax-funded narcotics, from which those same troubled souls then graduate to even more dangerous drugs.

Business of Supply

Such drugs as fentanyl, which is 100 times more potent than heroin, now abound in our streets. We have seen a 200% annual increase in overdose deaths in the last eight years, with the worst death counts massing in British Columbia, where the policies of soft sentences, non-enforcement and taxpayer-funded drug distribution have all been most enthusiastically embraced. We were told that these policies were based on science and data, yet all the science and data have proven these policies lethal and proven the counterfactual, which is to say that the places doing the opposite are far more secure and safe.

Not only is this killer ravaging our streets, but it is now spilling over our borders. In November, the RCMP busted Canada's largest-ever drug superlab, which had 54 kilograms of fentanyl. This is almost triple what the U.S. border patrol seized crossing the border this year. This lab contained enough fentanyl and precursor chemicals to produce more than 95.5 million potentially lethal doses of fentanyl. It also seized 89 firearms, including 45 handguns, 21 AR-style rifles and submachine guns, many of which were loaded and ready for use. All of these guns were easier for criminals and drug kingpins to get than ever before, not in spite of, but because of, the policies of the NDP-Liberal government. Small explosive devices, large amounts of ammunition, firearm silencers, high-capacity magazines, body armour and \$500,000 in cold hard cash were all part of the drug bust.

The RCMP said that the lab was believed to be behind the “production, and the distribution of unprecedented quantities of fentanyl, and methamphetamine”. In October, the RCMP seized 33 tonnes, which is to say 66,138 pounds, of chemical precursors used to make the same deadly drugs. The RCMP says Canada is now a producer and exporter of fentanyl and other synthetic opioids. In other words, despite our massive consumption of these deadly drugs, we actually produce even more than we consume, and we sell the surplus abroad.

CSIS has identified that more than 350 organized crime groups are actively involved in domestic illegal fentanyl marketing. CSIS says the precursor chemicals are largely sourced from China. Eighty per cent of chemicals used in fentanyl production are actually legal and unregulated in Canada. They can be procured here and imported from China, and even if they were not legal, the head of the border guards recently said that 99% of the incoming shipping containers go completely uninspected. Therefore, it would not even matter if they were banned, because the government would have no way of stopping them from coming in.

• (1625)

Eighty-four per cent of organized crime groups are involved in some aspect of the illicit drug trade, primarily in distribution. Street gangs are involved in the fentanyl trade, and street gang involvement in that trade has more than doubled in five years. U.S. Customs and Border Patrol seizures of fentanyl doses from Canada have gone from 239 kilograms to 839 kilograms. More than three times as much fentanyl was caught in 2023 than in 2024. The U.S. Customs and Border Patrol seized 14 pounds of raw fentanyl in 2022; this has risen to 43 pounds. That, by the way, might not sound like a lot, but 43 pounds of fentanyl is enough to kill almost 10 million people. This illustrates the deadly nature of this poison.

What has the government done in this regard? First of all, it passed Bill C-5, reducing penalties for the murderers who produce and market these drugs. I call them murderers. Members might ask how I know that those producing these drugs have committed murder. The answer is that if we produce fentanyl on a large scale, we know with statistical certainty that we will kill people. There is no doubt that, on a statistical basis, if we are selling 2,000 or 3,000 hits of fentanyl, someone will die as a result of our actions, and we know it.

The government has allowed these murderers to get out of jail and go back to the streets, where they legally import the ingredients that go into this deadly poison. It can then be sold to people who are hopelessly addicted and have no way of getting off the drugs. Simultaneously, the government has found millions of dollars to subsidize the distribution of synthetic opioids that are supposedly used to “reduce harm”.

As my colleague from Kildonan—St. Paul will point out, as I split my time with her, there is no doubt that people are graduating from and using the proceeds of these tax-funded opioids to fund the fentanyl trade. While we have had wild inflation in almost every product that is on the market in Canada, one thing that has become vastly cheaper is synthetic opioids, such as the ones the government funds. They have gone down, not because they are cheaper, but because the greatest part of the price is paid through taxpayer-funded subsidies, supposedly to reduce the harm. We now know that this has done precisely the opposite. It not only murders our people but now threatens our livelihoods as our American friends demand swift action to secure the border, to protect their people against the recklessness of the government.

That is why common-sense Conservatives are making proposals to stop the drugs. We call for the repeal of Bill C-5, the law that allows these drug kingpins to go free. We must act to reinstate longer drug sentences for the kingpins, to ban the importation of fentanyl precursors, to buy high-powered scanners, to put more boots on the ground at our ports in order to stop fentanyl and to reinforce that we have a strong border, as we did nine years ago.

Business of Supply

It should not have taken Donald Trump to make this point. Our government should have been thinking about our people. It is not because of another president that we should take these actions. It is because we believe that not one more mother should bury her face in her hands out of the heartbreak of losing a child. We must take the swift actions to secure our borders, to lock up the drug murderers, to clear our streets of these toxins and poisons, to invest in treatment and recovery, to bring our loved ones home drug-free and to heal our nation.

• (1630)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is shameful, the way in which the leader of the Conservative Party continuously downplays Canada, not only here in the chamber or in Ottawa but across the country and even into the States. Many would argue that he is nothing more than a puppet to President-elect Donald Trump, quite frankly, in the way in which he seems to want to exaggerate situations.

Does the leader of the official opposition know, for example, how many fentanyl deaths there were in the United States in 2023 or 2022, compared to Canada? Does he actually have stats or is he always off the cuff?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, the member had no facts of his own, none whatsoever.

This is from a party whose leader is too weak to stand up for our country, who has lost control of our borders and our immigration. I went and met with him to try and help him because he was so weak, and he showed up for the meeting late and dishevelled, as though he had just gotten out of bed. He had no plan whatsoever to defend Canada against the unfair threats of the Americans against our economy and no plan to secure our borders.

That kind of weakness is intolerable at the best of times. It is impossible in these times. We need someone with the brains and backbone to stand up for our country, protect our people against these drugs, secure our borders and bring home the country we knew and still love.

• (1635)

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, this afternoon, the Leader of the Opposition has been telling us that Bill C-5 is responsible for the toxic drug crisis, and it sounds like he is serious. He has been telling us that Bill C-5, which sought to decriminalize simple possession and not penalize addicts or take them to court, would trigger an extraordinary crisis. He has been telling us that Bill C-5 will let drug lords off the hook. I imagine he knows those people.

Can he name them for us?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, the reality is that Bill C-5 allows drug dealers and producers to serve Netflix sentences and stay out of jail. The Bloc Québécois made a serious mistake by supporting Bill C-5. That is why the Bloc Québécois had to do a U-turn and support a Conservative bill. I do not know if the member knows which bill he voted for, but he later voted to repeal Bill C-5.

I do not know if the Bloc Québécois is doing another U-turn now to support Bill C-5, but the Bloc Québécois supports all the policies that free criminals and all the policies that have resulted in out-of-control crime. The Conservatives' Bill C-325 will repeal Bill C-5 and put drug dealers in jail instead of handing them Netflix sentences. That is common sense. I hope the Bloc Québécois stays true to that—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

[English]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is quite clear that the Conservative leader will not let facts get in the way of a good story.

Earlier this year, the Standing Committee on Health visited Vancouver; we were on the ground at the very epicentre of this crisis. We were there for two days, and not one Conservative MP showed up to speak to the people who are dealing with this on a daily basis.

Mark Weber, the head of the Customs and Immigration Union, is on record saying that, to this day, the CBSA is still recovering from the cuts made under the government of Stephen Harper when the current Leader of the Opposition was in cabinet. Will the Leader of the Opposition take responsibility, here and now, for creating the deficit that has led to such an unsafe situation at our ports of entry?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, the NDP member joins with his boss, the Liberal Prime Minister, to blame the Harper government for the misery that is happening on his own streets. The prior government has not been in power for nine years.

I will point him to the fact that, when we left office, there were almost 2,000 more CBSA officers than there were when we took office. That is an increase, not a decrease. If the NDP knew anything about numbers, they would understand that we had more boots on the ground. In addition, we had far fewer deaths and less crime.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Spadina—Fort York, Public Safety; the hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Natural Resources.

[English]

Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Madam Speaker, today we are talking about the deaths of 47,000 Canadians, many of them young people. Forty-seven thousand Canadians have died in the last number of years in drug-related deaths. Two of them, I am going to be talking about today.

Business of Supply

Young Brianna MacDonald was 13 years old when she overdosed. She was found in a homeless encampment after having a cardiac arrest. She was 13, still a child. Her parents tried to get her into treatment for months. They could give her free crack pipes from the government, but they could not get treatment for her. There was also Kamilah Sword, 14 years old, who died of a drug overdose. Again, hooked on drugs from the government's so-called safe supply, which I will talk about shortly.

It is 47,000 people, many of them young people, many of them young children. It is all of their parents, their siblings and their friends. Beyond that, it is all the people in drug psychosis who have committed violent acts and the innocent people they have hurt with violent break and enters, sexual assaults and murders. It is all of the crime and mayhem to our small businesses, and the decay in our cities and in our once safe communities.

We have seen, in a very short amount of time in our cities, in our towns, in rural Canada, from coast to coast to coast, this drug crisis wreak havoc on our communities. Innocent young people have died. I have been in this place now for five years, and what have we heard as the solution, the proposal to this radical liberalization of drugs in this country? From the NDP members and the Liberals they support, their solution to all these drug deaths is more drugs, taxpayer-funded government drugs, on a mass scale, with no accountability.

What is really tragic is that, for this taxpayer-funded so-called safe supply, there is really nothing safe about it. Totally predictably, it is being diverted to vulnerable people, to young people. A drug addict, someone addicted to drugs, will go and get their so-called safe supply from the taxpayer. They will be provided many pills.

What has been happening is that drug dealers will wait outside the pharmacy. The person addicted to drugs will come out with their so-called safe supply and sell it to the drug dealer for either harsher drugs, like heroin or fentanyl, or for cash so they can buy some food, some cigarettes, alcohol or whatever it might be, another substance. They are taking the government safe supply and they are exchanging it with a drug dealer for something harsher. The drug dealer is then taking this so-called safe supply to kids, for example, and saying, "Oh, it is safe. It is government regulated. It will be a nice high."

The government and taxpayers are funding the new gateway drug for kids, which has killed Kamilah Sword, Brianna MacDonald and thousands more young people in this country. The National Post and others have done phenomenal investigative journalism on this, and when they visited Kamilah Sword's community, they talked to many of her friends.

I will call one of her friends "Hannah". It is not her real name. She said that kids aged 11 to 17 in this young lady's circles, kids who should be watching cartoons and having snacks after school, were using taxpayer-funded drugs they bought off drug dealers. Some are 11 years old. Of course, these drug dealers glamorize it saying, "Oh, it will be great. It will be fun." They downplay the risks.

Hannah said that, once they get you hooked on this safe supply, then they push heroin. They are pushing it on 11 year olds and 13

year olds. This how we have Ms. MacDonald ending up dead, having a heart attack. They start on something that is so-called safe and then end up dead on fentanyl.

One of Kamilah's friends' mothers said that she had never met so many teenagers who were drug addicts before, and that a huge majority of teens were using because it was so easily available. She is talking about government safe supply. She said she had to pull her daughter out of that community because it was just so readily available, so tempting. In order to save her daughter's life, she had to pull her out of the community. That is a brave mom and a strong mom, but not all parents are able to do that, not all parents have that ability.

We are also seeing the vulnerability of first nations. Another young woman who was interviewed was a first nations woman. Her name was Jennifer and she was talking about how drug dealers are, same thing, taking these safe supply drugs, massive amounts of them, and selling them for dirt cheap on first nations reserves to vulnerable kids. As if they did not have enough issues to deal with, now there is a flood of taxpayer-funded government safe supply. It is wrong what is being done. It is so wrong that doctors are starting to speak out.

● (1640)

In fact, one is Dr. Michael Lester, a Toronto-based addictions physician. Again, this is Dr. Lester's specialty. He said, "I had several patients who were drug-free for a long time and just couldn't resist the temptation of this very cheap hydromorphone", which is the safe supply, "that was now on the street."

He also said, "Every addiction medicine doctor I've spoken to has told me that, on a daily basis in their offices, they're dealing with diverted hydromorphone, either from new clients coming in addicted to it, or patients of theirs that are using it as a drug of abuse." It is just so readily available and it is so tempting to people struggling to try to move on from their addictions that doctors are saying that what they are seeing is completely unacceptable.

It is getting so bad that the B. C. government actually had to reverse course. The B.C. government had asked the Liberals, who would gladly help, to decriminalize things like small possession. However, we know that it was not small possession as the possession amount could have killed hundreds of people with things like fentanyl. The B.C. government decriminalized toxic drugs like heroin, fentanyl and meth for just over a year before the public outrage and the disorder that it caused forced the B.C. government to move back and ask the Liberals to help them with that.

Business of Supply

This is really wild, but it is just in line with all of this. In that same psychotic government policy year, the top doctor in B.C., Dr. Bonnie Henry ordered vending machines at ERs and hospitals not for Pepsi, Coke or a granola bar, but for free crack pipes. Someone would be walking into an ER with a horrible injury and pass a free crack pipe. They could just get one on their way out like a goody bag.

Obviously, the public outrage on both of these things was fierce, and rightfully so, and both of these things have now been pulled back, thankfully. However, it just shows how far the government is ready to go. That is the reality of where these policies are going.

The people responsible for all of these deaths, over 47,000 deaths, the drug dealers, the drug traffickers, the drug importers and exporters who are bringing in the ingredients and importing the drugs, the ones who are producing the drugs in the meth labs and then of course those pushing them on people, that is, drug importers, drug producers and drug dealers, have a lot of blood on their hands. We should be taking strong measures to ensure that they are punished. A message should be sent to all the other ones that, if they do this, they will be punished and go to jail for a long time. That is what we should be doing or, we would think, that is what would be the case already.

That was the case. There was mandatory prison time for drug trafficking, for drug importing and for drug production. There was, and then the Liberals came along and brought forward Bill C-5, despite all of those deaths.

Do members want to know what Bill C-5 did? It eliminated mandatory prison time for drug traffickers, drug producers and drug importers. All of the people responsible for killing over 47,000 people and causing unbelievable mayhem and destruction in our communities no longer have mandatory prison times. It has been repeated over and over again that Bill C-5's specific goal was that fewer people would go to prison.

Those people are murderers. They are the reason that Kamilah Sword, 14 years old, is dead and Brianna MacDonald is dead. Under a Conservative government, there will be justice for these young women. There will be justice for the 47,000 people who have been killed by these drug traffickers, importers and producers. They will be held accountable.

The porous border we have seen over the last number of years under the government will also be shored up. Did members know that after nine years of the Liberal government, less than 1% of the containers we bring in, all of our shipments, all of our Amazon orders, all of our produce, is checked? That is where guns, drugs and precursors to drugs are coming in. It is less than 1%.

Our approach will be to take the border seriously, invest in scanning technology and hold the monsters who are responsible for killing these 47,000 people and causing destruction and mayhem in our communities responsible for that. They will have to pay for what they have done. They will go to jail, hopefully for a very long time under a Conservative majority government. Rest assured.

• (1645)

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

Speaker, we just cannot believe what Conservatives say. Let me give the House a specific example with actual facts. In the 2011-12 budget, there were actually 14,833 full-time border officers. This is a fact. In 2015-16, there were 13,744. That is a decrease, which is not what the leader of the Conservative Party tries to tell people. There was a decrease, and the leader of the Conservative Party sat around the table when those 1,059 jobs were lost from Canada border control.

Can the member tell Canadians why we should believe anything that members of the Conservative Party have to say when they cannot even get basic facts right as part of their speeches?

Ms. Raquel Dancho: Madam Speaker, after 10 years of the Stephen Harper Conservative majority, there were almost 1,700 more CBSA workers than when he started and an additional half-billion dollars of investment. That is the Harper record. At the same time, we balanced the budget and decreased crime by 20%. Contrast that with the Liberals' record, with an increase of violent crime of 50% and the largest debt of all prime ministers before them combined. I will take our record any day.

• (1650)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Madam Speaker, the part of the Conservative motion I agree with is about the Liberal government's lax borders. My colleague and I both heard about this at the Standing Committee on Public Safety. At times, there are only six RCMP officers covering the entire southern border. The Customs and Immigration Union told us that border services officers would be able to help, but an order in council prevents them from patrolling between border crossings at this time. They can do their job at border crossings, but not between them. Obviously, there are not enough boots on the ground.

Does my colleague agree that the minister could simply reverse this order, which was made several years ago, and allow border services officers to lend a hand at the border to make it safer?

[*English*]

Ms. Raquel Dancho: Madam Speaker, the suggestion made by the member is certainly worth looking into. I have enjoyed working with her on the public safety committee, and of course, we had the Minister of Public Safety there and asked him a number of questions about the border and the fact that Canada is basically staring down the barrel of a 25% tariff from our biggest trading partner. We trade 80% with the United States and they are threatening a 25% tariff if we do not shore up the border, which of course Conservatives have been calling on Liberals to do over the nine years they have been in power.

Business of Supply

However, the minister, who was happy to jet-set to Mar-a-Lago to make excuses for why the border security has been so bad in Canada, of course did not have a plan. There was no commitment on the numbers that are going to be put at the border. There was no commitment to expand the authority of the CBSA beyond the ports of entry. There was no commitment to bring in RCMP officers or to work with provincial authorities. There was no commitment at all. In fact, it does not seem that Liberals have a plan.

The Trump administration is coming in five weeks. They have no plan, and we are facing 25% tariffs. It does not sound like the government is working for the people to me.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, fentanyl is the great killer these days in Canada. It has affected every single community from coast to coast to coast. The fact that it is out there in street drugs means people are playing Russian roulette every time they go and buy from a dealer on the street. That is very true.

When I was on the ground with the Standing Committee on Health for two days in Vancouver, which is the very epicentre of where this crisis originated, people such as street doctors, people who are doing policy on the street, not locked away in an ivory tower, said that the Conservative policy approach on this is offside from where we need to be.

Treatment is important, but there are some people who are simply not ready for treatment and we do not have the spaces available. What do we do with those folks who are going to buy drugs right now? Do we simply allow them to play Russian roulette with their lives? Is that the Conservative approach to these people?

Ms. Raquel Dancho: Madam Speaker, I appreciate where the member is coming from, but I talked about a few of the young women who were killed as a result of the taxpayer-funded drugs that were gateways to this horrific end for them. What the NDP fails to recognize over and over again is the community impact. It is not just on the individual drug addict. It is the community impact of these drug dens, of the needle distribution in children's playgrounds and of children being accosted and assaulted by people at these so-called drug dens, or what we call drug dens but they call safe consumption sites. It is the broader public impact of these harmful policies that has led to all the disarray we are seeing. We need to be realistic about this and bring these ridiculous policies to an end.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice.

I think what we have here today is a classic case of the Conservatives trying to rewrite history. Their outrage when it comes to safety at our border is as fake as their new leader's image. Canadians will not be fooled because we have seen the record of the Conservatives when they were in charge of making sure our border was secure. It is very clear, and I have said this in the House time and again, that when the Conservatives were in power, they actually cut from the CBSA and the RCMP when it came to protecting our border.

In fact, it was confirmed by the president of the CBSA at the public safety committee that in 2014, the number of CBSA employees was 13,700, and as of today, it is now 16,300. Therefore, when Conservatives say there were more CBSA employees under their watch, the math is just not "mathing" because they are wrong. They cut over 1,000 jobs from the CBSA. Then, today, they introduced this motion to try to rewrite their abysmal record and their history. They are hoping Canadians will not remember what was said about their decisions at the time, so I am here to remind them.

In April 2012, the CBC reported:

Jean-Pierre Fortin, [then] national president of the Customs and Immigration Union, said 1,026 jobs will be eliminated within three years, and that represents a "direct attack to our national security and public safety."

"These proposed budget cuts would have a direct and real impact on Canadians and our communities across the country: more child pornography entering the country, more weapons, illegal drugs, will pass through our borders, not to mention terrorists, and sexual predators and hardened criminals," he said.

When we see the Conservatives here today, and even within their motion, saying, "more boots on the ground", it is all for show, because when they had a chance to act, they cut those budgets. It also is quite comical when they boast about their record, saying they would take their record over ours on reducing the deficit. It is not quite the brag they think it is when they inherited a surplus and then tried to get their deficit down. They are bragging and looking back to rewrite their record. Canadians will not forget. The Conservatives did not seem to care about securing the border against, as was stated, more weapons, illegal drugs and child pornography, but now they want to talk tough. They have no action, no plan, other than to say they are going to do something. What is it? They have not come up with a rhyme yet, so I am not sure if this is a policy priority, but I am sure that eventually they will.

On our side, we are taking action. We do not spend our time playing Dr. Seuss and rhyming; we spend our time making investments in the things that Canadians want and that actually get results.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, I can hear them heckling over there because they know I am right. They practise their rhymes and not their policies. On something as serious as our border safety, one would think they would spend a significant amount of time coming up with policies, but that does not fit into their leader's gold star program of the school of Dr. Seuss for opposition parties. While Conservatives go to that school, we are investing in the RCMP. We invested in the CBSA and the number of CBSA employees has increased.

Business of Supply

The minister and the Prime Minister have acknowledged that if we need to do more on the border, we will. We are committed to making sure we are securing our border, but also protecting Canadians from illicit drugs, weapons and the things we have talked about, like auto theft. The member who spoke right before me talked about scanners at the border. Funnily enough, it was Stephen Harper's government that removed the scanner in Brampton dealing with auto theft, and we reinstated it. Then the Conservatives stand up and say, "We have an idea: scanners."

• (1655)

The Conservatives have no plan. They come after the fact, when we have already made the investments, and then try to take these ideas for their own because, once again, they have spent a little too much time at the Dr. Seuss opposition school for rhymes.

Part of our investment has led to very real success stories as a result of the RCMP and its good work. I was on the finance committee, on one of my first budgets as a member in this place, and one of the things we heard, as we were reinstating some of these budgets and officials were coming forward, was not only that those cuts were impactful on the actual day-to-day work, but that when those sorts of specialized services are cut, as Conservatives did in dealing with organized crime, violent crime and transnational-type imports, we also lose institutional knowledge and enforcement.

One result of our investment, for example, was that over 95 million lethal doses of fentanyl and a lab were seized by the RCMP. When we invest in the police and do not make cuts, like Conservatives do, we actually get results. When we invest in the CBSA, we get more secure borders. However, when people rhyme and just talk tough, they get a leader who is all fake image and no substance.

We are going to keep making those investments because that is what is right for Canadians, and that is what is going to keep our community safe, not just talk.

• (1700)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Madam Speaker, we always hear a lot of words from that member. Unfortunately, Canadians have been suffering for nine years. They are suffering terribly because, as we know, the cost of living and food prices are up, while inflation is at an all-time high. Two million Canadians visit food banks every month. All of the government's initiatives centre on one thing only, and that is satisfying the Prime Minister's ego and his propensity for spending Canadians' money. Unfortunately, there is little to show for it.

Was that member one of the 24 MPs who called for this Prime Minister to step down so that we could avoid sinking deeper and deeper in debt? In fact, has she been informed of the current deficit?

[*English*]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, perhaps it is because I was not speaking in rhymes that the member opposite forgot he should have been asking a question on the subject of the Conservatives' own opposition motion. Instead, the Conservatives are taking personal shots at the Prime Minister, whom I fully support, in case

they are wondering. It is funny that they did not refute any of the numbers I posed. They did not refute the fact that Conservatives made cuts. Instead, they make personal attacks. I think it was because I was not rhyming that they did not quite put two and two together.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, this morning, at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Health, a mother who lost her daughter to this toxic drug crisis told us the following:

I have shared my story for years on behalf of my daughter...yet the deaths caused by the toxic drug supply continue. As a country we have regressed significantly, especially in the way harm reduction has been vilified. As a country, we have regressed significantly, including in how harm reduction has been demonized. Instead of being recognized as a vital tool in saving lives and supporting people who use drugs, harm reduction has faced increasing stigma, misinformation, and political resistance.

My colleague heard the mind-boggling speech given by the previous Conservative member. Is that not exactly what we are witnessing, the exploitation of human misery for political gain?

[*English*]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for bringing us back to this debate. In fact, any life lost to fentanyl in this drug epidemic is absolutely heartbreaking.

What we see the Conservatives doing is, frankly, an old Conservative trope, which we have seen in the U.S. as well. When they do not know how to deal with harm reduction and real solutions that save lives, they try to demonize people. They demonize people who are suffering and who need help, all of our help. It is also because by fearmongering on something as tragic as this, they hope it will benefit them politically, but they do not bring forward any ideas to address the opioid crisis in this country and they certainly do not listen to experts on the ground who know how to help save lives.

• (1705)

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Madam Speaker, it really is a tragedy in communities across this country that people are losing their lives due to a toxic and poisoned drug supply.

Today is Human Rights Day and the federal housing advocate has talked about housing as a fundamental human right. People are homeless and living in encampments right now, their human rights are being violated, in most of our communities.

I would ask the member about policy that puts people first, ahead of corporate profits. Why was that not included in the national housing strategy?

Business of Supply

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the question because, although it is not on the topic of the opposition day motion, ensuring people have a safe home is crucial.

We also know it helps lead to better health outcomes and better socioeconomic outcomes, and it makes our communities safer. When people have access to housing, it gives them so many more opportunities. I agree with the member opposite that it is a very important debate and one we must all work together on.

Again, Conservatives keep using this as a fearmongering opportunity for their own political benefit.

Mr. James Maloney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to discuss the important issue of drug crime, the opioid crisis and the efforts our government has taken in this respect. I want to speak specifically about the criminal law framework in place to address drug-related crime, including where it is linked to organized crime.

Off the top, I want to note the inconsistencies in the motion the Leader of the Conservatives moved today. First, it says “to reinstate longer jail sentences for drug kingpins”. The maximum penalty for drug trafficking is life in prison. For the CPC to imply at all that it is not is harmful and shameful, but we know that it is the party of disinformation, which we have seen again here this afternoon. Second, the motion calls for “more boots on the ground at our ports”.

I ask, “Who cut over a thousand CBSA officers working to intercept drugs, guns and irregular migrants?” It was the Harper government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member. Who regularly voted against our efforts to increase funding to CBSA? The Conservative leader and his caucus did, all on the leader's orders.

It is deeply ironic that Leader of the Opposition put the motion forward today. The Conservatives call themselves the party of law and order, but when they are in government they cut, and when they are in opposition they vote against support. It is complete hypocrisy.

Canada is not alone; countries around the world are confronted by the challenges in combatting and addressing organized crime. The UN Office on Drugs and Crime puts the value of illegal drug trade in the hundreds of billions of dollars annually. According to its “World Drug Report 2024”, cocaine is being produced and trafficked at record levels, and the scourge of fentanyl is causing significant overdoses across North America.

Addressing drug crime and the harms caused by illicit drug use requires a multidisciplinary and multisectoral response. No one organization, level of government or solution will address this, despite the claims of the Conservative leader. Our government is committed to the multi-faceted, team Canada approach, unlike the opposition. One part of the solution is, of course, ensuring an effective criminal law response that targets organized crime, drug traffickers and illicit drug manufacturing. In this respect, Canada has a robust legal framework.

I also find it amusing when the Conservatives suggest that Canada has decriminalized drugs. This is simply not the case, and

they know it. Drug trafficking always has been and continues to be a serious criminal offence, punishable by significant penalties of imprisonment. Those who traffic in schedule 1 or schedule 2 drugs, which include fentanyl, are subject to the most significant penalty in Canadian law: life imprisonment.

Courts treat drug trafficking seriously and routinely impose significant periods of imprisonment that recognize the seriousness of the offence, the harm it causes and the profits it generates for criminals. The same is true for illegally importing, exporting or manufacturing schedule 1 or schedule 2 drugs, which are also serious crimes punishable by maximum penalties of life imprisonment.

Between 2019 and 2022, 46% of all drug prosecutions for manufacturing resulted in a finding of guilt. The Controlled Drugs and Substances Act also requires courts to consider, at sentencing, certain factors as aggravating. These include whether the crime involved violence or a weapon, whether trafficking occurred in or near a school, and whether the commission of the offence used the services of a young person. I would also point out that persons charged with any of these trafficking offences are subject to a reverse onus at bail. This demonstrates our intention that getting bail in these cases should be more difficult.

There is a robust criminal law framework already in place to address illegal drug activity. The broad range of tools available to address drug crime and organized crime are being put to good use in Canada. Just two weeks ago, we learned that the RCMP in Burnaby arrested two people and shut down what was described as a “super lab” in Langley that was capable of producing multiple kilograms of fentanyl every week. We applaud the RCMP's efforts.

Related is that our government is continuously working to improve Canada's ability to combat financial crime, particularly due to the rapidly evolving and complex nature of financial crime. In every budget since becoming finance minister, the Deputy Prime Minister has introduced a significant number of measures to strengthen Canada's anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing regime. These include responding to the recommendations of the Cullen commission, increasing information sharing and providing significant funding. The Conservatives have voted against every single one of those.

Business of Supply

• (1710)

Since 2019 we have also invested close to \$379 million to fight financial crimes. The Conservatives voted against that too. The Conservatives also voted this spring against our measures to combat auto theft. They voted against measures in the fall economic statement to combat organized crime. They have voted repeatedly against increased funding to the CBSA. There is a deep irony to the Leader of the Opposition's putting forward the motion today, given the record.

We know that the Conservatives do not have a plan to keep Canadians safe. When they were in power, they made significant cuts to the CBSA, the RCMP and our intelligence services. They have promised to make assault-style firearms legal again. They are blocking our legislation that would protect children from online sexual exploitation. It is shameful. Here they are today, claiming they can keep Canadians safe.

I know that drug crime has profound impacts on our communities and our residents, but I also know that we have the resources, the laws and the justice system to keep people safe and to hold traffickers to account. We are always open to constructive dialogue on how we can improve this, but we are not taking any lessons and we are certainly not hearing constructive dialogue from the other side.

Mr. Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Liberal member is talking about the government's record. Well, in Vancouver last year, the same 40 criminals were arrested a total of 5,000 times and set free again. Police are asking me, "What is the use of even arresting them?" Even outside behind my office, I see people constantly shooting up. There are deaths all over the place.

This falls upon the Liberals and the New Democrats because of their crazy drug policies, which have led to tens of thousands of deaths. Will the member not recognize that what the Liberals are doing is not working? As a matter of fact, what they are doing is making things worse.

Mr. James Maloney: Madam Speaker, probably the best thing we could do is give a civics lesson to the Conservatives. They need to know the responsibilities of the federal government. They need to learn the responsibilities of the provincial government. If the member wants to address some of the issues he is speaking to, I would encourage him to speak to the Government of British Columbia about the enforcement it is taking regarding our bail laws.

Our bail laws have been strengthened since 2015. They are stronger than at any time in our life. If we talk to Conservatives off the record, they will tell us that the issue is not the laws; the issue is enforcement. Therefore I would encourage the member to go talk to the people he should be talking to, instead of using cheap political rhetoric when standing up in the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want my colleague and the rest of the House to be aware of a security and safety issue, particularly in the context of drug use. Indigenous communities are asking for extra support to

be able to ensure the autonomy of their police services. This could greatly improve their situation.

I want my colleague to be aware of the situation of the Long Point community, in Winneway, Témiscamingue. The community is being affected by growing violence, as street gangs seem to be intimidating its people, and it is asking for extra help. The community has not had an indigenous regional police force since 2006, for lack of funding, but it has plans to put one in place. Indigenous peoples have been waiting, too patiently maybe, for provincial or federal intervention. I talked to the Minister of Public Safety and the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations about this situation, but the community has been waiting for more than a year. When will they be able to take action on this?

Will my colleague commit to ensuring that indigenous police stations everywhere receive more support?

• (1715)

[*English*]

Mr. James Maloney: Madam Speaker, it is a great question. I am proud to be part of a government that takes the issue incredibly seriously. I am proud to serve with my colleague who is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services. Just this past week, the Prime Minister spoke before the AFN here in Ottawa and addressed the very issue of indigenous policing.

Indigenous policing is an issue that is being addressed by the government. It is an issue the Prime Minister is committed to making sure of, but it has to be done correctly because past mistakes have to be learned from. We are going to create a new system and work with our indigenous communities. It has to be done in consultation with them and not to them or for them.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will agree with my colleague that the Conservatives are certainly living in a fact-free environment with the motion before us. Every single expert on the ground is completely offside from what the Conservatives are trying to do, but that does not let the Liberals off the hook, because they campaigned on a promise of a \$4.5-billion mental health transfer. We know that a lot of the people who are using drugs are doing so to try to resolve unresolved trauma from their previous life. They are not getting the help they need.

Therefore, when are the Liberals going to take responsibility for the federal deficit in this area, live up to what they promised and make sure that our mental health funding is where it should be so we can meet people where they are at and actually give them some hope to relive in society where they once were.

Mr. James Maloney: Madam Speaker, that is an excellent question from an excellent member of the House, for whom I have a tremendous amount of respect.

Mental health is an issue that is very near and dear to my heart for a variety of reasons. It is an issue that the government is committed to, but no, we are not there yet; I will concede that. There is a long way to go. When we were elected in 2015, the first thing we did was put \$3 billion in new money into health care, specifically designated for mental health. In the province of Ontario, the challenge we ran into was that the province then turned around and cut mental health services.

It is an uphill battle, but we are charging full steam ahead. There is always a long way to go. It is a problem that is not going to be solved overnight, but we are 100% committed to it.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, I would love to take up the parliamentary secretary on his offer for constructive dialogue.

The government, to its credit, re-funded the substance use and addictions program in budget 2023 with \$144 million. It is a really critical program for harm reduction and for support for folks who use drugs. In communities like mine, though, hot spots across the country, there were zero dollars in this year's allocations.

Is the parliamentary secretary advocating to increase the funding for the substance use and addictions program to ensure that hot spots like Waterloo region are not overlooked?

Mr. James Maloney: Madam Speaker, yes, we are always advocating to find better ways and better solutions to help the very people the member is talking about.

I would be more than happy to sit with the member and have a discussion. I know that the other MPs in the same geographic area are deeply committed to the issue and are working on it every day.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia.

What our Conservative colleagues are essentially proposing is to turn back the clock and basically cancel Bill C-5, which already passed. They are doing so for all sorts of reasons that could be called fallacious, false or unfounded. First, Bill C-5 sought to do two things: repeal mandatory minimum penalties in many situations and establish diversion measures for simple drug possession offences. We were among those who, at the time, asked for Bill C-5 to be split. We felt that these were indeed two separate issues and that it would have been more effective to deal with them one at a time. However, as it is so often the case with these things, the government tried to get us to swallow a bitter pill with a bit of honey. We had to vote on both at the same time, even though we had reservations about some aspects of both issues. Still, we agreed on the spirit of the bill.

I will start with mandatory minimum penalties, or MMPs, which do not work at all. That has been demonstrated many times. MMPs are useful for someone who wants to decide for the judge what sentence should be handed down. However, commentators, criminologists, lawyers and others who have studied this issue have all said that MMPs do not work and do not reduce crime. Professor Tonry, an American criminologist who researched and wrote about this subject, stated the following:

Business of Supply

Evaluated in terms of their stated substantive objectives, mandatory penalties do not work. The record is clear...that mandatory penalty laws shift power from judges to prosecutors, meet with widespread circumvention, produce dislocations in case processing....

In fact, when Crown prosecutors find themselves with a case that they may or may not have to litigate, they will often be less enthusiastic about negotiating a deal with the defence attorney if there is already a mandatory minimum sentence in place. The case will end up going to trial because the Crown knows there is a minimum sentence. They are guaranteed that minimum if the individual is found guilty. If there is no mandatory minimum sentence, there is no knowing what the judge will decide. Not knowing in advance encourages discussions between the lawyers, who often come to an agreement.

This is between two experienced lawyers who come to a compromise by realizing that there is a good chance that the court, if it were hearing the case, would come to a similar conclusion. Then comes an agreement where everyone is satisfied with the sentence that will be applied. The courts do not get bogged down with an extra case, which would be a very good outcome these days. In our view, and in the view of Professor Tonry and many other observers, this is a substantial argument.

Another argument against mandatory minimum sentences is that they are unconstitutional. The Supreme Court of Canada said as much before Bill C-5 was passed. That was the inspiration for it. The Supreme Court told us that it was unconstitutional. Mandatory minimum sentences violate section 12 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which protects people from “cruel and unusual treatment or punishment”. Key decisions in this area include Nur in 2015, Lloyd in 2016 and Boudreault in 2018. These may be the most seminal cases on this subject, but many other court decisions have always been along the same lines: mandatory minimums hurt more than they help.

● (1720)

In Lloyd, the Supreme Court addressed another aspect when it said:

Another solution would be for Parliament to build a safety valve that would allow judges to exempt outliers for whom the mandatory minimum will constitute cruel and unusual punishment. Residual judicial discretion for exceptional cases is a technique widely used to avoid injustice and constitutional infirmity in other countries....

What we are being told is that mandatory minimum sentences go against the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and that if we want to keep them, there needs to be a safety valve to exempt outliers. That is what the Bloc Québécois proposed. I sat on the Standing Committee on Justice during the discussions on Bill C-5, and I moved a series of amendments to the bill. First there was a general amendment.

We proposed adding section 718.11 to the Criminal Code, which would say:

Business of Supply

718.11 The court may waive any minimum punishment of imprisonment under this Act if it considers that exceptional circumstances warrant it and that the imposition of a minimum punishment would be unfair.

That is exactly what the Supreme Court said. To be clear, I did not take my cue from the Supreme Court. The idea came from a criminologist during the study of Bill C-5. I moved that amendment, but it was ruled inadmissible. I challenged the chair's ruling, but every single member of the committee, all the Liberals, NDP and Conservatives, voted against me. I said I understood that my proposal exceeded the scope of Bill C-5, and so we began the clause-by-clause study.

In clause 10, I proposed the following:

(2.1) The court may waive the minimum term of imprisonment under paragraph (2)(b) if it considers that exceptional circumstances warrant it.

What was the result? The Liberals, Conservatives and NDP opposed it. So be it; clause 11 also mentioned a minimum sentence. Once again, I suggested the same provision so that the court could use it to waive the minimum sentence in exceptional circumstances. Once again, the Liberals, Conservatives and NDP opposed my proposal.

The same thing happened with clause 12. In fact, clauses 12 and 13 dealt with crimes involving the use of a firearm. We in the Bloc Québécois felt that this was serious enough to send a clear message to the courts that the minimum sentence should be applied, but with the possibility of waiving it in exceptional circumstances. I proposed the same provision in clauses 12 and 13, specifically exceptions for exceptional circumstances. I got the same result. The Conservatives, Liberals and New Democrats all opposed my proposal.

That is why I am a little surprised today to see the Conservatives proposing to repeal Bill C-5 or to backtrack on the provisions of Bill C-5 by adding mandatory minimum sentences, when they know full well that the Supreme Court has ruled that this is unconstitutional.

What is more, the Conservatives rejected my amendments, which would have allowed mandatory minimum sentences to be introduced for the most serious crimes, but with a safety valve that would be acceptable to the Supreme Court according to the decisions I cited earlier, including the Lloyd decision. Furthermore, this provision met the objectives and responded to the concerns of all the experts who appeared before the Standing Committee on Justice during the meetings on Bill C-5. No, they rejected all that, but now they want to go back in time. This is an incomprehensible decision that I would describe as illogical and irrational.

Furthermore, as I was saying, MMPs are ineffective and unconstitutional. They are also costly, because more people are sent to prison. MMPs cost a lot of money and they are ineffective. That is what experts are saying. A potential criminal is not going to think twice about committing a certain crime because there is an MMP. As far as I know, or as far as the experts know, no one wonders what the MMP is before robbing a bank or killing someone. That just does not happen.

There is also the diversion aspect. That was the second part of Bill C-5. We were in favour of diversion. The Bloc Québécois believes in rehabilitation, but, of course, diversion might not be the

best idea for serious crimes. At the very least, more thought would need to go into that.

• (1725)

However, in the case of simple drug possession, we are talking about a health problem. We are talking about people who are addicted to drugs and, for medical and health reasons, they have to inject themselves with dangerous substances. We think that those individuals need treatment, not jail time.

I would have liked to talk about our proposals—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I would have liked to hear the hon. member's proposals, but we have to go to questions and comments.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity).

[*English*]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I really appreciate my hon. colleague's insight and experience at the justice committee during the study of this bill.

I am glad he brought up the question of the Supreme Court ruling when it came to mandatory minimums. I have often found this conversation with the Conservatives very interesting, and I wonder what he thinks. If we know that the Supreme Court would rule mandatory minimums as unconstitutional, what does he think the Conservatives plan to do? They say they are going to reinstate them. Are they just trying to fool Canadians, or do they plan to reinstate them just to waste taxpayers' money to have them challenged in court and sent back once again?

I have never understood why Conservatives pretend that there was not a Supreme Court decision. I do not know if that was discussed at committee. Could the member share his insights?

• (1730)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Madam Speaker, I cannot add anything to what I have already said. The Supreme Court ruled on it. We found an alternative that was acceptable to the Supreme Court. The Conservatives, the Liberals and the New Democrats all voted against it. I do not understand what we are doing here today.

I will take this opportunity to add that, instead of mandatory minimums, the Bloc Québécois is proposing in Bill C-420 that an organized crime registry be created. We think we should hit organized crime groups in their wallets by reversing the burden of proof so that the assets of criminals are seized when they are charged.

Business of Supply

We are also proposing Bill C-392, which seeks to codify the Jordan decision by providing for an exception to the reasonable time limit established by the Supreme Court. These are new meaningful measures that would help tackle crime instead of turning back the clock and recreating a situation that makes no sense. The Supreme Court has already said as much.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to quote Marc Bellemare, who has represented victims of crime in Quebec since 1979. He was Quebec's justice minister from 2003 to 2004. Here is what he had to say about Bill C-5: "It is repugnant that this law applies to violent criminals. Last year, 112 of the 569 offenders convicted of sex assault in Quebec were sentenced to house arrest, a generous gift made possible by [this Prime Minister's] government's Bill C-5, which has been in effect since November 17, 2022." He then went on to cite a long list of cases.

How can the member support the substance of a bill like this?

Mr. Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Madam Speaker, I still believe that Bill C-5 is a good bill with a good foundation. Unfortunately, the amendments we proposed were rejected, leaving us with provisions that are far from perfect.

The point that my colleague raised is worrisome. However, I think we need to be careful when we look at justice statistics. We need to consider each case individually. When a court is seized with issue X in the case of Mr. Y or Ms. W, it gives one decision. Another judge in a different case involving the same provisions will give another decision, because the circumstances are different and the accused is different. All sorts of factors need to be taken into account.

My colleague is right. What he is telling us is serious. However, I would like to look at those statistics and cases individually. I still believe that we have to trust our justice system and our courts to make the most appropriate decisions based on the circumstances.

[*English*]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, I enjoy serving with my colleague on the justice committee.

I am glad that, in his remarks, he made mention of the fact that there is clear, demonstrable evidence that mandatory minimums do not work, yet the Conservatives keep on pursuing this as a policy ideal. It is the same with their drug policy. All of the experts on the ground have told us that a Conservative approach is absolutely the wrong thing at this moment in time.

I am just wondering if my hon. colleague could comment on the damage it does to public policy-making and the quality of debate on these two very important subjects when one party is spreading this kind of misinformation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Madam Speaker, I would say that it is not a good idea to plant seeds of doubt in the minds of the public about the effectiveness of our justice system. That is not and never will be a good idea. Instead, we should seek to improve our institutions and improve the public's perception of them.

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Madam Speaker, I wanted to begin my speech by talking about the only part of the Conservative motion that I agree with: the government's lax approach at our borders. However, after hearing my Conservative colleagues talk about the opioid crisis the way they did, I decided to start on a different vein, because I found what they said to be completely mind-boggling. I may come back to how the government is managing our borders, if I have enough time.

As is often the case when it comes to the opioid crisis, the Conservative motion is inaccurate, if not downright misleading. Unfortunately, the Conservatives' speeches were full of misinformation. At no time was the government ever involved in the radical liberalization of drugs, as the Conservative Party is suggesting. We do not even know whether that means anything. Are they talking about the decriminalization of marijuana? Are they talking about the diversion measures set out in the Criminal Code via Bill C-5? Are they talking about the pilot project in British Columbia? If so, none of those measures deserve to be described as a radical liberalization of drugs.

While the borders are indeed lax and more must be done to secure them, the part of the motion that mentions reduced sentences for drug kingpins has zero basis in fact. Is it actually about Bill C-5, which eliminated certain minimum sentences? If so, are the Conservatives insinuating that eliminating minimum sentences caused thousands of people to die, as a member said earlier? That is an absurd idea for sure.

We know that the causes of the opioid crisis are far more complex and far-reaching than the Conservative Party's motion suggests. They range from mental health and poverty to the housing shortage, legal opioid prescriptions and more. Crime and the contamination of drugs with opioids is certainly a big part of the problem, but the Conservatives' magical solution of putting everyone in jail, be they victim or criminal, is not a sustainable solution. It is actually no solution at all. That is why it would be impossible for us to vote in favour of the Conservatives' motion. The Conservatives are offering up simplistic solutions to complex problems. That is something we see too often in the House, unfortunately.

My colleague from Rivière-du-Nord spoke at length about Bill C-5 and the fact that we had proposed splitting it in two because it dealt with two elements that are both extremely important but different, so I will not go into that again. I will talk more about diversion measures rather than mandatory minimums.

Business of Supply

The diversion measures included in Bill C-5 were aimed at only one provision of the Criminal Code and that was simple drug possession. I do not think this has been said enough so far, but the goal of this approach is to divert people with drug problems who do not necessarily pose a threat to public safety away from the justice system. The idea behind diversion is to relieve the courts of the burden of dealing with drug users so that resources can be dedicated to the real threat posed by drug traffickers. Diversion is not the same as legalizing all drugs. A person who systematically refuses to abide by the alternatives proposed by the justice system and who uses drugs in a way that is dangerous to others can still be prosecuted.

The Bloc Québécois supported this change of approach because the war on drugs, as waged in the U.S. by President Nixon, for example, is simply not working. People with substance use problems need health care and social services. Putting them in prison will certainly not improve their fate. It is better to focus our resources on helping as many people as possible so that they can become productive members of society again and to ensure that our courts can focus on prosecuting the real criminals who sell harmful drugs, cut with synthetic drugs.

Our approach to substance abuse is to see drug use as a public health issue, not a strictly criminal one. While the diversion approach is a step in the right direction, the fact remains that the federal government has, in a way, done only half the job. Diversion is modelled on Portugal's highly successful approach. However, their success is also due to the fact that they have invested heavily in social services and in services directly on the ground.

- (1735)

If the federal government were sincere about taking this approach, it would increase health transfers to the provinces and provide more funding to community organizations working on the ground.

The Bloc Québécois's approach is also consistent with the Quebec government's 2022-25 national strategy for preventing overdoses involving psychoactive substances. The strategy proposes actions based on a harm reduction model and promotes the idea of seeing users as voluntary participants, rather than criminalizing them. The strategy addresses not only opioids, but other psychoactive substances as well, given the evolving epidemiological situation. It includes 15 measures divided among seven clearly defined areas of action. I will name a few. Without reviewing everything, it is fascinating to see what the Quebec government is doing.

For starters, there is education and awareness, which involves disseminating relevant information and raising awareness among the general public about the risk of overdose from psychoactive substances. We need to raise awareness among various communities about user stigma. Then there is overdose prevention and harm reduction, which involves strengthening and improving access to naloxone, a fast-acting drug that temporarily reverses the effects of an opioid overdose, and strengthening and expanding the availability of supervised consumption services.

Let us not forget that the Conservative Party, under Stephen Harper, did everything it could to undermine the supervised injection site programs of Quebec and the provinces by refusing to grant the sites an exemption so that they could store the drugs that they

were providing. The Supreme Court put the then Canadian government in its place. That is why I am so surprised today to see the leader of the Conservative Party denouncing these initiatives and safe supply programs.

The Conservatives seem to forget that their ideologically driven approach to problems is often inconsistent with fundamental rights. Not only was their opposition to drug-related health care ruled incompatible with our rights, but some of the mandatory minimum sentences they introduced to the Criminal Code were also struck down.

The programs that supply drugs to patients are justified by the fact that they save lives. These programs allow people with an addiction to consume a substance whose content is known, which helps prevent overdoses. What is more, thanks to these programs, the individuals receive social services and health care and come in contact with social workers and nurses. This creates a range of benefits, such as detecting and treating STIs, which can become the first step on the long road to ending addiction.

Getting back to the measures in the Quebec government's national strategy, the next one is public policies and regulations. The aim is to develop safer supply practices. Unlike supervised injection sites, where people use drugs under supervision, safer supply programs provide prescription drugs to prevent overdoses. These programs target individuals who would otherwise purchase drugs on the black market, which is highly risky.

The strategy also talks about monitoring and surveillance; evaluation, research and training; addiction treatment; and pain treatment. I think these measures work much better than putting victims of drug addiction behind bars, as it were.

This strategy is based on pragmatism and compassion, two values that are antithetical to the Conservatives' ideological approach.

I know that I only have a little time left, but I want to come back to border management. The past few years have not been easy. We had to repeatedly remind the government to take action at the border. It was reactive, not proactive. We saw the same thing recently with new President-elect Trump, who made campaign threats to deport millions of people. We thought it seemed likely that these people would try to come to Canada, so we needed to secure the border. When I asked the Minister of Public Safety about it the day after the U.S. election, he told me that everything was fine at the borders and that there was really nothing to stress about there.

Today, we learn that the government is going to spend \$1 billion on a plan to secure the border. The government is talking about buying helicopters and drones. I mentioned one solution earlier, which is to allow border services officers to patrol between border crossings. Right now, an order in council prevents that from happening. There are all sorts of solutions. We definitely need to improve border security. That is one of the solutions that would work better than what the Conservative Party is proposing in this motion.

● (1740)

[English]

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, safe supply is not safe. The member's suggestion is that we need a safer safe supply. There are now 47,000 people dead because of this approach, and their families are devastated.

Addiction has skyrocketed since this has been brought in. I have seen every day, walking from my home to this place, over the course of months and years now, what is happening directly in front of me on our streets. To suggest that our approach is limited shows that the member does not have any clue as to what we will do to make life better for Canadians who have been forced into these circumstances, where safe supply is not safe.

Oregon has shut down this program, and B.C. has asked for help. How can the member possibly trust this existing policy and not want to see it removed from our country?

● (1745)

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud: Madam Speaker, the premise of the Conservative motion is quite simply false. Thousands of people are not dying from drug overdoses because of Bill C-5. Addiction is a problem. It is a sickness that needs to be treated by offering these people help and health and social services. Workers need to be there for them. We are not going to combat the opioid crisis by putting these people behind bars.

[English]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Madam Speaker, we just heard that ridiculous ideology from the Conservative members. It was Stephen Harper's own former adviser on criminal justice who condemned the Conservative policy. He said, "No amount of scientific evidence studies from criminologists, from medical experts, can displace that ideology because it...is not based on facts."

While Conservatives continue to use no facts and only ideology, can the member opposite please speak to why we know supports for rehabilitation are the only thing that works in this country to truly deal with addictions and saving lives?

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud: Madam Speaker, of course, we can do like the Conservatives and tell all kinds of stories about people who unfortunately died as a result of drugs. However, we can also tell the success stories of people who overcame their addictions with the help of the public policies that were put in place and the health and social services that are available for people with addictions.

Business of Supply

We must not confuse the issue. What the Conservatives seem to be doing here, with this motion in particular, is blaming Bill C-5 for the fact that thousands of people are dying from opioid overdoses. That is not exactly true. In fact, I would say that it is false. All of the things that my colleague from Rivière-du-Nord mentioned earlier are meaningful, worthwhile measures that could be implemented to fight crime. We need to separate these subjects and not put all of our eggs in one basket.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I found my colleague's speech very interesting, and I obviously agree with her. I want to share a little experience I had with my colleagues.

Last spring, members of the Standing Committee on Health travelled to Montreal to talk about the opioid crisis and addiction. How many Conservative members came to learn about what is really happening on the ground? Not a single one. There are 120 Conservative MPs, but not a single one went to Montreal to meet with the doctors at CHUM, the people at Dopamine and the people at Cactus Montréal. These are success stories. These people save lives every day. Cactus Montréal is an injection site where there are two or three overdoses a day. How many people died last year? Not one, because the organization saves everyone who goes there. What does my colleague think about that?

Ms. Kristina Michaud: Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting question. I went through a similar situation with the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. As part of the study on vehicle theft in Canada, we went to the port of Montreal to see how things are done and how the CBSA collaborates with the various police services. My colleague was there. There were not many Conservatives there with us.

It is easy for members to stick their heads in the sand, blame everything on the government and not go out and see what is really happening. It is true, there are often success stories. We feel these experiences allow us to come back to the House and do a better job. I invite my Conservative colleagues to take every opportunity to go out into the field.

● (1750)

[English]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, they say that when the only tool that one has is a hammer, every problem looks like a nail. That is exactly the Conservatives' approach to criminal justice and drug policy. Their arguments are so full of logical fallacies, it is laughable. They cherry-pick the data. They make use of straw man arguments, and when we dare challenge them, it is all ad hominem attacks from them.

Business of Supply

The laughable part of this motion today is about putting more boots on the ground at our ports to stop fentanyl and its ingredients from coming into our country. It is laughable because the Customs and Immigration Union president, Mark Weber, is the one who has identified publicly that the CBSA today is still trying to recover from the deficits launched by the Stephen Harper government nine years ago.

With that in mind, and to clear up the obvious disinformation from the Conservatives, I am prepared to move an amendment. I move that the motion be amended by replacing the words “reverse Liberal Bill C-5”, with the words “hire the 1,100—

The Speaker: I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but I will allow him to finish reading his amendment into the record.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Mr. Speaker, I will start from the top so that it is very clear what the House is dealing with.

I move that the motion be amended by replacing the words “reverse Liberal Bill C-5”, with the words “rehire the 1,100-plus border officers cut by the previous Conservative government to stop illegal guns entering from the United States.”

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby is rising on a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, the practice, as you know, in the House is that the mover, the House leader, the deputy House leader or the whip or the deputy whip of the party that has the opposition day motion then consents to the amendment.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

[*Translation*]

The member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, I am saying no to this amendment.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, then the Conservatives have rejected this common-sense amendment.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: That is a matter of debate.

It being 5:52 p.m. and today being the last allotted day for the supply period ending December 10, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

The question is on the following motion.

Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

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.

● (1755)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we would request a recorded vote, please.

The Speaker: Following discussions among representatives of parties in the House, I understand that there is an agreement for the bells to ring for not more than 15 minutes.

Call in the members.

● (1825)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 918*)

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
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferrier	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genius	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	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards

Business of Supply

Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer— 121

Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Sauvé
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martínez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sara
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— 210

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchet
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Davies
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
Jones
Julian

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

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

* * *

[English]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 2024-25

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN HERITAGE

The Speaker: The next question is on opposed Vote No. 1. Pursuant to order made Wednesday, February 28, the motion is deemed moved and seconded. Furthermore, the question is deemed put and a recorded division is deemed requested. The question is as follows:

Business of Supply

That Vote 1b, in the amount of \$10,725,771, under Department of Canadian Heritage — Operating expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2025, be concurred in.

• (1835)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 919*)

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	Dance
Davies	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	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay

McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Miller	Morrisce
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe
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 Koevorden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 176

NAYS

Members

Abouitaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Berthold	Bérubé
Bezan	Blanchet
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
d'Entremont	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	Kmic
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Larouche	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert

Business of Supply

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
Sauvé	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)
Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Therrien	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudel	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vignola
Villemure	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer — 152

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[English]

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2025, except any vote disposed of earlier today, be concurred in.

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.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we would request a recorded vote.

• (1850)

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

(Division No. 920)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron

Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Dance	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
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
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Medicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough

Business of Supply

Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Sauvé
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 — 209	

NAYS

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
d'Entremont	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
Poillievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts

Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shiple	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)	Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer — 120

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

The hon. member for Surrey Centre on a point of order.

Mr. Randeep Sarai: Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to have, in the second vote, my nay changed to yea.**The Speaker:** Is it agreed?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

Hon. Anita Anand moved that Bill C-79, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2025, be read the first time.

(Motion agreed to and bill read the first time)

[English]

Hon. Anita Anand moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

[Translation]

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

[English]

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting against.

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.**Mr. Mike Morrice:** Mr. Chair, the Green Party agrees to apply the result of the previous vote and is voting in favour.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote, voting nay.

● (1855)

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

*Business of Supply**(Division No. 921)*

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Dance	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
El-Khouri	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
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay

McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Sauvé
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— 209	

NAYS

Members

Aboultarif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
d'Entremont	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

Business of Supply

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
Shiplay	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)	Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer— 120

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mr. Chris d'Entremont in the chair)

(On clause 2)

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Chair, I wonder whether the President of the Treasury Board could confirm that the supplementary estimates bill is in its usual form?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Chair, the presentation of this bill is identical to that used during the previous supply period.

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 6 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 6 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 2 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 1, the short title, carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Title agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill agreed to)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill reported)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Anita Anand moved that the bill be concurred in.

*Business of Supply**[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 Liberal members voting in favour.

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting against.

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats agree to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

[Translation]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the result of the previous vote, voting nay.

- (1900)

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

(Division No. 922)

YEAS

Members

Alhabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cornier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Dance	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
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
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Paupé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Sauvé
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 Koevorden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi— 209	

Business of Supply

NAYS

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
d'Entremont	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	Kmicie
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
Shipley	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)	Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer — 120

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Anita Anand moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

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

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, the official opposition agrees to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting against.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

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

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the result of the previous vote, voting nay.

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

(*Division No. 923*)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Dance	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill

Business of Supply

Gould	Green	Block	Bragdon
Guilbeault	Hajdu	Brassard	Brock
Hanley	Hardie	Calkins	Caputo
Hepfner	Holland	Carrie	Chambers
Housefather	Hughes	Chong	Cooper
Hussen	Hutchings	Chong	Cooper
Iacono	Idlout	Dalton	Dancho
Ien	Jaczek	Davidson	Deltell
Johns	Joly	d'Entremont	Doherty
Jones	Jowhari	Dowdall	Dreeshen
Julian	Kayabaga	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Kelloway	Khalid	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Khera	Koutrakis	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Ferri	Findlay
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Gallant	Généreux
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Genuis	Gladu
Larouche	Lattanzio	Godin	Goodridge
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Godin	Goodridge
Lebouthillier	Lemire	Gourde	Gray
Lightbound	Long	Hallan	Hoback
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Jeneroux	Jivani
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Kelly	Khanna
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Kitchen	Kmiec
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Masse	Mathyssen	Kurek	Kusie
May (Cambridge)	McDonald (Avalon)	Lake	Lantsman
McGuinty	McKay	Lawrence	Lehoux
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
McPherson	Mendès	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Mendicino	Miao	Lloyd	Lobb
Michaud	Miller	Maguire	Majumdar
Morrice	Morrissey	Martel	Mazier
Murray	Naqvi	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Ng	Noormohamed	Melillo	Moore
Normandin	O'Connell	Morantz	Morrison
Oliphant	O'Regan	Motz	Muys
Pauzé	Perron	Nater	Patzer
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Paul-Hus	Perkins
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Poilievre	Redekopp
Robillard	Rogers	Reid	Rempel Garner
Romanado	Rota	Richards	Roberts
Sahota	Sajjan	Rood	Ruff
Saks	Samson	Scheer	Schmale
Sarai	Sauvé	Seeback	Shields
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia	Shiple	Small
Schiefke	Serré	Soroka	Steinley
Sgro	Shanahan	Stewart (Toronto—St. Paul's)	Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake)
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Strahl	Stubbs
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard	Thomas	Tochor
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh	Tolmie	Uppal
Sorbara	Sousa	Van Popta	Vecchio
Ste-Marie	St-Onge	Vidal	Vien
Sudds	Tassi	Viersen	Vis
Taylor Roy	Thériault	Vuong	Wagantall
Therrien	Thompson	Warkentin	Waugh
Trudeau	Trudel	Webber	Williams
Turnbull	Valdez	Williamson	Zimmer—120
Van Bynen	van Koeverden		
Vandal	Vandenbeld		
Vignola	Villemure		
Virani	Weiler		
Wilkinson	Yip		
Zahid	Zarrillo		
Zuberi—209			

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
(Bill read the third time and passed)

Adjournment Proceedings

[Translation]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Speaker: 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-230, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I suspect that, if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent to see the clock at 7:07 p.m.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Kevin Vuong (Spadina—Fort York, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, on November 27, the Prime Minister avoided my question and tried to deflect the failures of his immigration minister to protect Canadians and secure our borders.

The Prime Minister should worry less about the opposition leader and concentrate more on his ongoing refusal to name the individuals implicated in working on behalf of Chinese foreign interests and bring them to justice. What is motivating the Prime Minister to not provide those names? Is he afraid that on that list are members of his own party or cabinet, people who have benefited from Chinese foreign interference? Treason is a serious offence, as is being bought off by foreign influencers in being in receipt of electoral and financial benefits, as reported by NSICOP. These are all very serious matters that require full investigation by the appropriate authorities.

The Prime Minister does not have the legal authority to determine if traitors get shielded from our laws. The Prime Minister knows the damage and the danger caused by his weak and ineffectual immigration minister and the precarious position his failures are posing to the Canadian economy in light of the 25% tariff threat issued by President-elect Trump. How is it possible that the Prime Minister would shelter people and permit a porous border, where terrorists and those out to betray our democracy and our country are given free entry passes? Are we now to see another influx of extremists like we have seen with the IRGC, but this time from potential extremists exiting Syria?

At least 14 countries have already frozen Syrian asylum applications, four of which, by the way, are fellow G7 members. What about Canada? Is the immigration minister going to let even more extremists waltz into Canada under the pretext of being bona fide refugees, eager to exploit our compassion as Canadians and our refugee program as a cover to avoid detection or persecution? What kind of immigration and refugee system do we have under the gov-

ernment? It seems more interested in letting in terrorists rather than acting to defend our borders and protect Canadians.

The Prime Minister must come clean and explain why he is so reluctant to bring those names forward for investigation and prosecution. This entire mess cannot be the product of some misguided personal or twisted interpretation by the Prime Minister of some form of executive privilege. It is the Prime Minister's duty to protect Canadians, our democracy and our economy. While he is at it, he must find a new immigration minister who is actually capable of doing the job.

It is not a coincidence that the Prime Minister did not bring the immigration minister with him to Mar-a-Lago, despite one of the core issues being the fact that there were 350 people on the U.S. terror watch-list stopped from crossing into the United States from Canada. First and foremost, how did these people enter Canada in the first place? For the same period, 52 people were stopped on the U.S.-Mexico border. That is nearly one-seventh of the terror suspects stopped at the Canada-U.S. border. Before the parliamentary secretary accuses me of talking down our country, I am focusing on the safety of Canadians, the dangers of the government and the worst immigration minister in our nation's 157-year history.

My question to the parliamentary secretary is simple. If someone who worked for him messed up this badly, putting his team, his staff and his customers at risk, would he not fire them?

- (1905)

Mr. Paul Chiang (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada takes the security of our borders and the integrity of our immigration system very seriously. We have processes and measures in place to safeguard Canadians, while also ensuring that those who seek to come here are treated with dignity and respect.

As part of our risk mitigation process, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, in collaboration with the Canada Border Services Agency, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, conducts comprehensive security screening to identify those who might pose a threat to Canadians. Everyone coming to our country must meet entry and admissibility requirements. Before entering Canada, everyone is screened to ensure individuals do not pose a threat to the health, safety or security of Canadians.

This pre-screening is conducted through visa or electronic travel authorization applications. It involves verifying identity and assessing for potential risk; it can also involve the use of biographic and biometric information. We check applicants' fingerprints against a wide range of databases, including RCMP and international partner holdings, to identify potential security risks. These thorough checks help maintain the integrity of our immigration system and keep our country safe, while facilitating the safe travel of those who do not pose a risk.

Applicants flagged as potential threats are referred to, and undergo further screening by, the CBSA and CSIS. Immigration officers evaluate admissibility under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, addressing criminality, security risks and misrepresentation. CBSA officers conduct another layer of screening upon applicants' entry into Canada. People who misrepresent themselves or use fraudulent documents, as well as those flagged in the system, can be denied entry.

All adults who claim asylum in Canada are subject to comprehensive security screening by CBSA and CSIS. Once people are admitted to Canada, security partners and law enforcement work together to manage threats within our borders. To uphold the integrity of our immigration system, we collaborate with international partners to establish agreements that enhance our shared commitment to secure and effective processes. These agreements allow for the secure exchange of immigration data and personal information of applicants to support informed decision-making and strengthen the integrity and efficiency of our immigration system.

These partners are essential in helping to make swift, reliable decisions about admissibility; enhancing security; and promoting legitimate travels. The Government of Canada is committed to continuing to protect our borders and communities and to uphold a fair and well-managed immigration system. We will keep working with our partners to strengthen our system and keep our country safe.

● (1910)

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, given the complete and utter failure of the government and the immigration minister, honestly, I do not blame the parliamentary secretary for reading his script word for word. Frankly, I do not blame him for trying to run out the clock with his government-issued talking points either.

The parliamentary secretary talked about safeguards. Let us look at how those safeguards are performing. Earlier this summer, a father-son duo was arrested in Toronto before being able to execute an advanced-stage terror plot, an attack in Toronto, Canada. That father was in an ISIS terror video, in which he was pictured dismembering the body of a victim that they had murdered, hacking at them with a sword. Therefore, the safeguards are not working.

What is the plan to keep Canadians safe, defend the integrity of our immigration system and secure our borders?

Mr. Paul Chiang: Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada continues to prioritize security at our borders and integrity within our immigration system.

I reiterate that all people applying to IRCC must meet specific requirements. All foreign nationals are screened before entering Canada. IRCC also collaborates with its partners to conduct thor-

ough security screening. Admissibility decisions are evidence-based and are in place to identify those who might pose a threat to Canadians, while facilitating the safe travel of those who pose no risk. Canada collaborates with international partners to securely exchange immigration data and personal information of applicants. This enhances security, supports informed decisions and promotes legitimate travel.

Through the many steps taken by the government and IRCC, we will continue to protect our border and maintain a fair, well-managed immigration system.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before I begin my late show, I just want to acknowledge that I am joined this week by my daughter, Jada. I was really happy to have my 12-year-old out here with me for the week, so I just want to give a quick shout-out to her.

I was also honoured this week to be able to host the U18 Shaunavon Badgers hockey team here in Ottawa. We had a quick little tour on the floor this morning. I really enjoyed doing that. They have a game tonight at 10 o'clock against the Ottawa Sting. I believe they are a rep B level team, so I am looking forward to that game tonight.

When I got up to ask a question of the Minister of Natural Resources, it was with regard to the government's emissions cap. I have talked to people from the area around Shaunavon, in particular. Even those young men earlier today talked a lot about what the future of our country looked like.

When we look at policies like the emissions cap that the government is implementing, we have seen from independent analysis that it is going to be a production cap. I know the parliamentary secretary, when he stands up, is going to say that it is a cap on emissions and not a cap on production. However, the proof is in the pudding. We have seen multiple reports already by several groups saying that the emissions cap will amount to a one million barrels per day reduction in oil production, so we have already seen that there is going to be a reduction in the amount of oil that is produced in this country due to the emissions cap.

Adjournment Proceedings

Why is that a big deal? It is a big deal because a million barrels per day would amount to a 1% hit to Canada's GDP. Coming up next Monday we are going to hear from the finance minister finally on the supplementary estimates. She has not told us what the deficit is going to be, but she did say that, because the PBO said we have room for a 1.5% swing in GDP, everything is fine and it does not matter how big the deficit is; it will be okay.

The reality is that, when we implement policies that blow a 1% hole in this already right off the top before we even get to this 1.5%, we know we are going to be operating within a very tight margin. What is going to happen to the spending power of the average Canadian after this production cap hits Canadians fully is that it will amount to \$420 a month per Canadian household in disposable income that they will not have access to. They are going to lose \$420 per month based on those numbers. That is important because, when we look at the forecast for the cost of food for 2025, grocery prices are going to go up on average \$800 per Canadian family.

When we factor bad policy A with bad policy B and with things like the carbon tax and the Liberal fuel standards, we are seeing a continual assault on the cost of living for Canadians. When we look at the energy security of our country, we are seeing around the world right now that energy security is of utmost importance. When we see what the oil and gas sector does for Canada, the strategic advantage that we have with our natural resources, and we see policies put in place like the emissions cap that are going to cost 115,000 jobs for Canadian workers, we see the 1% hit in GDP and we see the multiple billion dollars that are going to be lost in the Canadian economy because of this singular bad policy. However, if we add that on top of the other pancaking of bad policies from the government, Canadians are going to be worse off.

How can the government seriously look Canadians in the face, Canadians who are looking to the future in their small towns, and even in our country at large, and say that this is going to be a good policy when it is going to hamper and strike down the futures of Canadians?

• (1915)

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Sport and Physical Activity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague in welcoming his daughter Jada to the House of Commons and to Ottawa. As well, I would like to join my colleague in welcoming the Shaunavon Badgers to Ottawa. Since there is no Milton team in the tournament, I presume, I can cheer for the Shaunavon Badgers.

Is it the Badgers, Jeremy?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: It is the Badgers, okay.

Mr. Speaker, I am a big fan of sports and I love that we celebrate that collectively, as we did last week when our Olympic and Paralympic teams were here. It was a nice moment of non-partisan celebration here in the House of Commons for everyone.

On to the issue of the day, which is the emissions cap that our government has proposed very proudly. We are one of the first oil and gas producing nations to propose an emissions cap. Before I start, I would like to acknowledge one thing my colleague said. He said that I would say it is not a production cap. He is indeed correct; it is not a cap on oil and gas production. It actually accommodates a more than 16% increase in production.

Many of the products in the oil patch, certainly not all of them, but some of them, have the highest emissions intensity in the world of certain types of projects. Those mostly include projects that are not in the province where my colleague resides but mostly in the oil sands in Alberta, where there is bitumen production. The emissions intensity in the oil sands has actually gone up. Alberta has acknowledged it needs to have an emissions cap. We can have a conversation as to where that should be, but no sector in Canada should be entitled to unlimited pollution. I do not believe any sector should be able to operate in the absence of any regulations around how much it pollutes. I am also, like my colleague, concerned about the future of our planet and our country. I am also concerned about our economy and that climate change is having a really negative impact on our economy.

Food reports have come out from various organizations and agencies recently, and all of those have pointed to climate change as the leading cause of food inflation. The Conservatives have recently kind of leaned in the direction of misinformation when they have talked about the difference in food inflation rates between Canada and the United States. I would like to call them out on that because they continually provide false information and false narratives around the difference in food inflation between Canada and the United States. Canada and the United States have very similar rates of food inflation: the United States in the absence of a federal price on pollution, and Canada with a federal price on pollution. All of these things are very measurable. It is not a new thing.

We have been pricing carbon in Canada in various ways for over a decade and we know that with the so-called axe the tax campaign, if we were to reduce or eliminate carbon pricing entirely in Canada, it might save Canadians about 50¢ on \$100 worth of groceries. It would also cost them the Canada carbon rebate.

Back to the issue of the day, which is the cap on emissions in the oil and gas sector. We have to use absolutely all of the tools in our tool box to combat pollution. On November 4, our government introduced the proposed regulations to cap greenhouse gas pollution from the oil and gas sector, which would drive innovation and create jobs in the oil and gas sector. We have been very clear that the pollution cap would work to curb pollution and not production. It would drive investment; create good, new jobs; grow a strong and greener economy; and encourage many of those energy products that we need for both our economy and our day-to-day lives, to heat our homes, drive our cars and deliver our goods. We also need to ensure that those emissions go down. We also have to keep reminding Conservatives that the cap on emissions will allow, and actually encourage, production to expand by 16% by 2030.

I have more to say, but I know there will be an opportunity for a rebuttal. Once again, these regulations would set reduction levels at 35% below 2019 levels by 2030 and that is a good thing for future generations.

• (1920)

The Speaker: Before I go to the hon. member, I want to point out one of the reasons I gave a hand signal that might have been misinterpreted. Although we are all Badgers fans, and there was a really respectful debate between the two members, I want to mention that it is important not to refer to members by their first or last names in this place. Out of respect, we refer to them by their position title or the name of their riding.

The hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands has the floor.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Speaker, we are already starting to see the effects of these bad policies the government is putting in place. Enbridge is investing \$700 million in an American pipeline down in Texas. Shortly after the American election, TC Energy approved over a billion dollars' worth of capital spending on three natural gas plants.

We know Canada has a strategic advantage for producing natural gas, but particularly for producing liquefied natural gas. We have a cold climate, as we are experiencing outside right now, which is strategically advantageous for trying to produce it. We are also the closest point to Europe and Asia, so logistically, it makes the most sense to be producing LNG in Canada. If we have our main energy-producing companies going down to the United States, and these companies also are the largest investors in wind turbines, solar farms and things like that, the current government is chasing that

Adjournment Proceedings

investment out. There is going to be nothing left when the government is done.

Mr. Adam van Koevorden: Mr. Speaker, my colleague will not be surprised to hear that I disagree that effective climate policy, climate action and emissions reductions are chasing away investment. They do not. They do the opposite, in fact. The world wants cleaner and greener electricity. The world demands cleaner and greener energy, oil products and fuels, and that is where we have to go. Many of the oil companies, and the member mentioned some of them, are doing a lot of these things on their own. Certainly, with respect to the LNG sector, they are constantly looking for ways to innovate and to create a greener, cleaner fuel supply chain.

I would ask my colleague from Saskatchewan if he shares the sentiment of the Premier of Saskatchewan, who has said that he has considered alternatives to carbon pricing but sided against those because he has decided that they are too expensive. More recently, he said that people often come to him and say that Saskatchewan has the highest carbon emissions per capita in Canada, but “I don't care”.

The Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:23 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, December 10, 2024

Points of Order

Oral Questions—Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker 28775

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

The Environment

Mr. Guilbeault 28776

Committees of the House

Government Operations and Estimates

Mr. McCauley 28776

Science and Research

Ms. Bradford 28776

Mr. Lobb 28776

Official Languages

Mr. Arseneault 28776

Justice and Human Rights

Ms. Diab 28776

Mr. Van Popta 28777

Public Accounts

Mr. Kmiec 28777

Motion for concurrence 28777

Mr. Lamoureux 28779

Mr. Perron 28779

Mr. Julian 28779

Mr. Lloyd 28779

Mr. Lamoureux 28781

Mr. Angus 28781

Mrs. Wagantall 28782

Mr. Lamoureux 28782

Motion 28784

Mr. Bezan 28784

Mr. Sauvé 28785

Mr. Angus 28785

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 28785

Ms. Chagger 28785

Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné 28786

Mr. Lamoureux 28789

Mr. Desjarlais 28789

Mrs. Wagantall 28789

Mr. Perron 28790

Mr. Angus 28790

Mr. Lamoureux 28792

Mr. Shipley 28792

Mr. Sauvé 28793

Mr. Desjarlais 28793

Mr. Lamoureux 28794

Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné 28794

Mr. Julian 28795

Mr. Julian 28795

Mr. Lamoureux 28798

Mr. Small 28798

Mr. Villemure 28798

Ms. Kwan 28799

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 28799

Mr. Shipley 28799

Mr. Lamoureux 28801

Mr. Perron 28801

Ms. Ferreri 28801

Ms. Mathysen 28801

Mr. Strahl 28802

Division on motion deferred 28803

Industry and Technology

Mr. Masse 28803

Motion 28803

Mr. Lamoureux 28807

Mr. Lemire 28807

Mr. Angus 28807

Mr. Villemure 28808

Mr. Julian 28808

Mr. Lamoureux 28808

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Human Rights Day

Ms. Taylor Roy 28810

Organizations in Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles

Mr. Paul-Hus 28810

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Ali 28810

Serge Godon

Mr. Villemure 28810

Elevation to Cardinal

Ms. Lattanzio 28810

Elevation to Cardinal

Mr. Barrett 28811

Housing in Richmond Hill

Mr. Jowhari 28811

Omar Zia

Ms. Khalid 28811

Justice

Mr. Brock 28811

Surrey Police Service

Mr. Dhaliwal 28812

Ethics

Mr. Schmale 28812

Leader of the New Democratic Party of Canada	
Mr. Albas	28812
Scholars at Risk	
Mr. Naqvi	28812
John Horgan	
Mr. Davies	28812
Quebec Film Industry	
Mr. Champoux	28813
Leader of the New Democratic Party of Canada	
Mr. Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	28813
Leader of the Conservative Party of Canada	
Mr. Kelloway	28813

ORAL QUESTIONS

Finance	
Mr. Poilievre	28813
Mr. Trudeau	28813
Mr. Poilievre	28813
Mr. Trudeau	28814
Mr. Poilievre	28814
Mr. Trudeau	28814
Mr. Poilievre	28814
Mr. Trudeau	28814
Mr. Poilievre	28814
Mr. Trudeau	28814
Diversity and Inclusion	
Mr. Blanchet	28815
Mr. Trudeau	28815
Mr. Blanchet	28815
Mr. Trudeau	28815
Taxation	
Mr. Singh	28815
Mr. Trudeau	28815
Health	
Mr. Singh	28815
Mr. Trudeau	28815
Finance	
Ms. Lantsman	28815
Ms. Freeland	28816
Ms. Lantsman	28816
Ms. Freeland	28816
Ms. Lantsman	28816
Ms. Freeland	28816
Mrs. Vien	28816
Ms. Freeland	28816
Mrs. Vien	28816
Ms. Freeland	28816
Mrs. Vien	28817
Ms. Freeland	28817
Immigration, refugees and citizenship.	
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	28817

Mr. LeBlanc	28817
Ms. Michaud	28817
Mr. LeBlanc	28817
Ms. Michaud	28817
Mr. LeBlanc	28817
Finance	
Mr. Hallan	28817
Ms. Freeland	28818
Mr. Hallan	28818
Ms. Freeland	28818
Mr. Berthold	28818
Ms. Freeland	28818
Mr. Berthold	28818
Ms. Freeland	28818
Housing	
Ms. Zarrillo	28818
Mr. Fraser	28819
Air Transportation	
Mr. Bachrach	28819
Ms. Anand	28819
Taxation	
Ms. Dzerowicz	28819
Ms. Freeland	28819
Finance	
Mr. Chong	28819
Ms. Freeland	28820
Mr. Chong	28820
Ms. Freeland	28820
Ms. Ferreri	28820
Ms. Gould	28820
Ms. Ferreri	28820
Ms. Gould	28820
Public Services and Procurement	
Mr. Savard-Tremblay	28820
Mr. LeBlanc	28820
Mr. Savard-Tremblay	28820
Mr. LeBlanc	28821
Finance	
Ms. Rood	28821
Mrs. Valdez	28821
Ms. Rood	28821
Ms. Gould	28821
Mr. Paul-Hus	28821
Mr. Duclos	28821
Taxation	
Mr. Hardie	28821
Ms. Saks	28822
Finance	
Mr. Perkins	28822
Ms. Gould	28822
Mr. Perkins	28822
Mr. Virani	28822
Mr. Morantz	28822

Ms. Gould	28823
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. McLeod	28823
Ms. Joly	28823
Natural Resources	
Mr. Angus	28823
Mr. Wilkinson	28823
Ms. McPherson	28823
Mr. Guilbeault	28823
Nobel Peace Prize	
Ms. Barron	28824
Motion	28824
(Motion agreed to)	28824

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Federal Sales Tax on New Homes

Motion	28825
Motion negatived	28826

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House

Public Accounts

Motion for concurrence	28826
Motion agreed to	28827
Motion for concurrence	28827
Motion agreed to	28829

Privilege

Access to Parliamentary Precinct

Ms. Gazan	28829
-----------------	-------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Repeal of Bill C-5

Mr. Poilievre	28830
Motion	28830
Mr. Lamoureux	28832
Mr. Thériault	28832
Mr. MacGregor	28832
Ms. Dancho	28832
Mr. Lamoureux	28834
Ms. Michaud	28834
Mr. MacGregor	28835
Ms. O'Connell	28835
Mr. Berthold	28836
Mr. Thériault	28836
Ms. Zarrillo	28836
Mr. Maloney	28837

Mr. Dalton	28838
Mr. Lemire	28838
Mr. MacGregor	28838
Mr. Morrice	28839
Mr. Fortin	28839
Ms. O'Connell	28840
Mr. Berthold	28841
Mr. MacGregor	28841
Ms. Michaud	28841
Mrs. Wagantall	28843
Ms. O'Connell	28843
Mr. Boulerice	28843
Mr. MacGregor	28843
Motion negatived	28845

Supplementary Estimates (B), 2024-25

Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Heritage

Motion No. 1	28845
Motion No. 1 agreed to	28847
Ms. Anand	28847
Motion for concurrence	28847
Motion agreed to	28848
Bill C-79. First reading	28848
(Motion agreed to and bill read the first time)	28848
Second reading	28848
Motion agreed to	28850
(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mr. Chris d'Entremont in the chair)	28850
(On clause 2)	28850
Mrs. Kusie	28850
Ms. Anand	28850
(Clause 2 agreed to)	28850
(Clause 3 agreed to)	28850
(Clause 4 agreed to)	28850
(Clause 5 agreed to)	28850
(Clause 6 agreed to)	28850
(Schedule 1 agreed to)	28850
(Schedule 2 agreed to)	28850
(Clause 1 agreed to)	28850
(Preamble agreed to)	28850
(Title agreed to)	28850
(Bill agreed to)	28850
(Bill reported)	28850
Motion for concurrence	28850
Motion agreed to	28852
Third reading	28852
Motion agreed to	28853
(Bill read the third time and passed)	28853

Message from the Senate

The Speaker	28854
-------------------	-------

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Public Safety

Mr. Vuong	28854
Mr. Chiang	28854

Natural Resources

Mr. Patzer 28855

Mr. van Koeverden 28856

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>