



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 021
Monday, September 15, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, September 15, 2025

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayer

• (1100)
[*English*]

NEW MEMBER

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Chief Electoral Officer a certificate of the election of the Hon. Pierre Poilievre, member for the electoral district of Battle River—Crowfoot, who has taken the oath and signed the roll.

Accordingly, the member may take his seat.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER OF CANADA

The Speaker: Pursuant to section 536 of the Canada Elections Act, it is my duty to lay upon the table a report from the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada on the 45th general election held on April 28.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(a), this report is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CITIZENSHIP ACT

The House resumed from Thursday, June 19 consideration of the motion that Bill C-3, An Act to amend the Citizenship Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, of course it would be hard to begin this new parliamentary session without wishing everyone, including those watching at home, a warm welcome back. The summer was particularly beautiful in Abitibi—Témiscamingue. I think it was important for many of us to practice self-care after the year we had. That did not prevent some family trips, including to the Quebec Games, and a trip to the north shore for us. I think it was important to do some self-care and I hope everyone was able to do that.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the passing this summer of two of our icons. Léandre Bergeron is known for his bread, but also for the whole encyclopedia representing the core values of Abitibi—Témiscamingue and Quebec. I want to pay tribute to him. There was also the great painter Norbert Lemire, my great-uncle, who was a significant figure in my life. If my colleagues ever have the opportunity to see one of his paintings, I think they will find his style very unique.

I am very pleased to be back in the House to speak to Bill C-3, which aims to correct an injustice affecting many children born abroad to Quebec and Canadian parents. This is one bill that makes sense to me. It will enable these lost Quebecers and Canadians to regain their citizenship. This bill reponds a ruling by the Ontario Superior Court, which invalidated provisions of the Citizenship Act that violated certain sections of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Say, for example, that a Canadian couple works for the government abroad and has a child in another country. Let us say they name her Caroline. The law says that even if Caroline grows up in Canada, if she gets a job abroad and has a child, that child cannot be a Canadian citizen. The situation is a bit complicated and it does not need to be. However, it shows that even though these situations are quite rare, they are still possible. It is not right, and it needs to be corrected.

This bill rectifies that situation by allowing the transfer of citizenship if the parent can demonstrate a substantial connection to Canada, in other words, that they have lived in Canada continuously or intermittently for a period of 1,095 days, or three years. This type of change is helpful, particularly for many diplomats who may have to live abroad while representing Quebec or Canada. This bill corrects an injustice that could have affected them down the road.

Government Orders

What is more, Bill C-3 also rights injustices for other lost Canadians, such as those born between February 15, 1977, and April 16, 1981. At that time, as a result of amendments made to the Citizenship Act in 1977, individuals who wished to obtain Canadian citizenship by descent had to apply for it before the age of 28. Whoever failed to apply would lose their citizenship. This little-known requirement meant that some individuals lost their citizenship. Imagine how a person would feel if they went to apply for a passport only to find out that they were no longer a Canadian citizen, even though their family has been living here for generations. Of course, that is a rather dramatic example, but these individuals became stateless and had to go through a complicated process to prove that they are, in fact, Canadian.

The other change introduced by this important bill is to allow Canadian women who married non-Canadian men before 1947 to regain their Canadian citizenship. In fact, these women lost their citizenship when they married. Their situation is very similar to the experience of many indigenous women, an important issue that Parliament studied in the past before restoring the status of indigenous women who decided to marry non-indigenous men. In a way, it was characteristic of the sexist policies of that time. Bill C-3 corrects an unacceptable situation and takes a step forward toward restoring gender equality, a value that I and Bloc Québécois members in this House hold in the highest regard.

The last group of people to have their status corrected under Bill C-3 are children born abroad, who were adopted but whose parent died, and who were subsequently denied citizenship. Simply put, these changes are beneficial, now and in the future, in helping to address absurd situations arising from various oversights at different points in time. This bill rectifies those situations.

The Bloc Québécois believes it might be worthwhile to overhaul this legislation in the future to clarify some of its provisions, since it is still causing real headaches. I would remind the House that this is the fourth change that has been made in the past 25 years to correct the injustices against many people who have lost their citizenship because of obscure, unfair or discriminatory rules.

• (1105)

For example, in the 1947 legislation, in a clause that has since been corrected, Quebec citizens born abroad were required to spend their 24th year in Canada. In other words, if they arrived here at age 25, they lost their citizenship. The second update to this legislation was made 30 years later. Some changes have made it easier to access citizenship, but, again, some aspects of this legislation have created awful situations, including the ones I mentioned earlier, where Quebecers and Canadians who obtained their citizenship by descent had to apply to keep their status before age 28. This part of the legislation was corrected in 2009, but only for Canadians who were not yet 28 at the time. Today, this bill will correct that major omission.

I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the work of someone with whom I used to work closely. I am talking about my former parliamentary assistant and, more importantly, the former member of Parliament for Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Meili Faille. She and the Bloc Québécois undertook the enormous task of compiling an inventory of problems relating to citizenship in the 2000s. Under

her leadership, the top experts from across Canada worked on those two studies, which many of my colleagues have cited during the proceedings. We must also highlight the work of Don and Brenda Chapman, whom I salute, as I am sure they are watching. Their work has been crucial in enabling many Quebec and Canadian citizens to regain their citizenship. As a result of their efforts, we learned that, due to obscure and complex rules at the time, General Roméo Dallaire, who was a senator and one of the greatest Canadians and Quebecers who made us so proud, did not even have Canadian citizenship. This shows the importance of the work we are doing today.

Later on, numerous reforms were carried out to fix some of the problems that were being created by the Citizenship Act. These reforms, from 2005, 2009 and 2015, made it possible to resolve a number of situations. This means that the Citizenship Act, which was drafted in 1947, has not undergone a substantial review since that time. However, there is no law as important to a country as its citizenship law. The world has changed since 1947. Although some amendments were made in 1977, the fact remains that it may be time to sit down and review this important piece of legislation in order to make it clear what Canada is hoping to achieve in terms of citizenship. The definition of citizenship is at the core of what makes up a country. Canada has a responsibility to its citizens, whether they live here in Quebec or Canada or abroad.

During the pandemic, my office worked day and night to bring people from Abitibi—Témiscamingue home because they were stranded in various countries around the world. Our role as MPs is, first and foremost, to help our constituents and fellow citizens. I think it is worth emphasizing how important it is for Parliament to review the Citizenship Act. It may not be the most exciting topic, but it is perhaps one of the most important, because it forms the basis for defining our rights at a time when defining our identity and who we are is more important than ever.

I would like to remind the House that the Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of this bill because it restores the citizenship that Quebecers and Canadians have lost. I hope that this debate will lead us to begin the important work of reviewing citizenship, and so much the better if we begin our work with a consensus bill, because we have had enough squabbling in the House in recent years.

• (1110)

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I welcome back all members.

Government Orders

During the summer, one of the experiences I had was regarding legislation in general, whether it is Bill C-3 or other pieces of legislation. I found that, whether it is with members of the Conservative Party or other political entities, there is a great sense that the government has to work with the opposition and that the opposition needs to work with the government in passing legislation to ensure that we are doing what is in the best interest of all Canadians.

I am wondering whether the member could provide his thoughts, as we go into the fall session, on the expectation his constituents have to look at legislation objectively and look at ways we can deliver for Canadians by co-operating more this fall.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire: Madam Speaker, it is really great to see the member for Winnipeg North again. Too bad his question is a bit off topic. However, it is customary when Parliament resumes to accept such questions. I will accept this suggestion to work collaboratively and effectively. I know we are in politics, but sometimes we have to be collaborative.

I would like to note that yesterday there was a big announcement promising to build 4,000 housing units. Prefabricated houses are great, but the Liberal government is once again focusing only on large urban centres.

Regions like Abitibi-Témiscamingue are being left out. Back home we have two companies that build prefab houses and a third that contributes to the effort. We are able to provide what it takes. What is more, we have a great need for housing.

I invite hon. members to look beyond politics and think about all Canadians and Quebecers. How the land is used is an important consideration that is often forgotten. The same goes for—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I have to interrupt the member.

The hon. member for Calgary Nose Hill.

[*English*]

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is nice to see my colleague again.

On the substance of Bill C-3, I know that language rights are very important to him. Does he believe that this bill should reflect the fact that anybody obtaining citizenship through the bill should have to reach the same level, at a minimum, of language proficiency as somebody obtaining citizenship through a different path, that those language requirements should be harmonized?

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire: Madam Speaker, it is also nice for me to see the member for Calgary Nose Hill again.

She is right. The notion of fairness in a society is an important issue. We are being asked, in broad terms, what citizenship should look like. Obviously, I believe that all immigration powers should be transferred to Quebec so that Quebec can manage the language issue.

This summer, the ridings were caught up in a kind of ping-pong game. I do not know whether such was the case for all members of

the House, but in my riding, dozens and dozens of people, spouses from abroad and foreign students, were stuck in the system. Right now, the immigration application process is a total mess, and the wait times are horrendous. These people are not numbers. They are individuals who want to come live in Canada, settle here and live here with us. We need to think about them.

That being said, language is definitely something I care a lot about. People need to be able to communicate if they are going to live together.

• (1115)

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is good to be back in this place after the summer break.

Today, we are discussing immigration. However, the unemployment rate in this country is clearly a serious problem. The Conservatives say that the Liberal government's immigration policies and inefficiency are partly to blame for the unemployment rate.

I am curious to know what the Bloc Québécois thinks about the connection between problems with the immigration system that were created by the Liberal government and the unemployment rate.

Sébastien Lemire: Madam Speaker, I feel like the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, whom I thank, is attacking me in a power play with his questions this morning. I will answer, considering that our time is limited.

Quebec has done more than its share when it comes to taking in refugees. A fair balance is missing on that score. I encourage Ottawa to set things straight and ensure that each province can do its fair share and take in the same number of refugees.

I think that drawing a link between immigration and the unemployment rate is a slippery slope. I urge my Conservative colleagues to be careful in that regard.

[*English*]

Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is great to be back after some time with family and in our own ridings. It is wonderful to see everybody.

Our Canadian identity is rooted in our shared values and our deep connection to this country. With our Canadian citizenship, we are granted rights and responsibilities. Our Canadian citizenship guarantees fundamental freedoms, such as conscience and expression. It ensures democratic rights, mobility rights and legal protections. Citizenship is not just about the rights that we inherit. It is also about the responsibilities we accept, such as respecting the laws of this land, contributing to our communities and upholding the values that make Canada strong and free.

Government Orders

As members of Parliament, it is our duty to strengthen and uphold the value of Canadian citizenship, to ensure that it remains a privilege earned through a genuine connection to the country, which in turn fosters a lasting commitment to Canada. Unfortunately, Bill C-3, in its current form, would not safeguard or strengthen the value of Canadian citizenship. In fact, by creating an endless chain of citizenship passed down without meaningful connection, it would risk devaluing what it means to be Canadian.

To be clear, granting Canadian citizenship to adopted children of Canadian citizens born abroad is a positive step. It would ensure that adopted children would be treated as equal to biological children, as they should be. That is a principle I have been quite vocal on. Colleagues in the House who served in the previous Parliament will recall that I put forward a bill to ensure equal access to EI and parental leave for adoptive and intended parents. It is an inequity that unfortunately remains unresolved as the government continues to drag its feet on the issue.

Likewise, restoring citizenship to lost Canadians is a necessary correction. These are individuals with deep, undeniable connections to the country, and many of them were raised in Canada. They went to school here, worked here, paid taxes here and built lives here. Because they failed to apply to retain their citizenship before the age of 28, their citizenship was stripped away. In many cases, they did not even know it happened, as the requirement was never properly communicated.

When the previous Conservative government repealed that rule in 2009, a small group born between February 15, 1977, and April 16, 1981, were left behind. By any reasonable measure, these individuals are Canadians, and this should be corrected. A previous Conservative bill from the other place sought to do exactly that. It was a targeted, measured solution to restore citizenship to lost Canadians.

Rather than pass that bill, the Liberal government delayed it. It then introduced a flawed and far broader bill, Bill C-71, which has now been recycled and presented as Bill C-3 in this Parliament. Bill C-3, in its current form, would reopen the door to Canadians of convenience. It would create a pathway for unlimited, multi-generational citizenship to individuals with no meaningful connection to Canada.

It would do this by removing the first-generation limit and replacing it with an incredibly weak substantial connection test. The first-generation limit was a safeguard that was introduced by the previous Conservative government. It ensured that citizenship could not be endlessly passed down to generations born and living outside of Canada with no real ties to the country.

This policy was not introduced without reason. It followed the 2006 Lebanon crisis, when thousands of people with little or no connection to Canada suddenly claimed citizenship in order to be evacuated. That effort cost taxpayers \$94 million, not including the other benefits that were accessed afterwards. Most of the evacuated returned to Lebanon shortly after. They had no lasting ties to Canada.

• (1120)

That incident raised serious concerns and legitimate questions about the integrity of our citizenship and what responsibilities the Government of Canada should uphold. The first-generation limit was a reasonable and necessary measure to address the issue of Canadians of convenience. It ensured that those inheriting Canadian citizenship have close ties to Canada that are not far removed. It helps prevent people from claiming the rights and privileges of citizenship without accepting its responsibilities.

Significant ties to Canada can show a strong connection to our country, but the bill's requirement of just 1,095 non-consecutive days in Canada before the child's birth weakens the guarantee of a strong connection. Under this change, families can live outside Canada for generations and still pass on citizenship as long as the parent has spent about three years in Canada at some point. This so-called substantial connection is not substantial at all. It also does not require a criminal background check for those claiming citizenship, opening the door for dangerous individuals to gain it automatically. This policy change devalues the significance of Canadian citizenship.

Let us not ignore the fact that the bill creates a two-tier immigration system. On one side, there will be foreign-born individuals who have never lived in Canada, and who may have no intention of living in Canada or contributing to our country, yet they could gain citizenship simply because a parent spent a few months here and there in Canada years ago.

On the other side, there are hard-working newcomers, who actually live and work in Canada, who face strict requirements. They must follow timelines, meet residency rules, and pass language and knowledge tests. They certainly must pass a security assessment, which we all know can be quite a lengthy process. They must prove their commitment to Canadian society before they can become citizens.

This proposed policy change is unfair. It is chain migration without merit. It is a two-tier immigration system, where those who have no attachment to Canada would gain the same rights as those who worked hard to earn their citizenship. This undermines the value of citizenship and the efforts of genuine immigrants.

Another major concern is that we have no clear idea how many people would become eligible under this policy change. A massive influx of new citizens would put significant strain on government resources and come at a cost to Canadian taxpayers. The government has not done a clear cost analysis on this policy. What impact would this have on our already strained social services? Canadians are rightly frustrated that public services, such as health care, pensions and housing, could be further stretched by a surge of new citizens living abroad who have never contributed to our country, not to mention the extra workload that this would create for government departments processing citizenship applications. This would once again disadvantage those applying to Canada who have shown a genuine and legitimate connection to this country.

Canadian citizenship must be fair, secure and meaningful. It should be earned through genuine connection, responsibility and respect for our country. Becoming a Canadian citizen means more than just receiving rights and privileges. It requires a deep commitment to Canada's future and the responsibilities that come with citizenship.

As parliamentarians, we must oppose policies that cheapen the value of our citizenship. We must stand firm for integrity, security and responsible immigration policies. While the bill includes some important elements, like restoring citizenship to lost Canadians and ensuring equal treatment for adopted children, it is neither a measured nor a targeted policy. Instead, it opens the door wide open for our citizenship to be abused as a citizenship of convenience. It is reckless. The lack of a required security screening is deeply concerning. The potential cost to taxpayers is significant, and the added strain on an already overstretched government's resources and public programs is alarming.

This bill requires significant amendments, yet it is hard to believe that will happen given the government has failed to make these necessary changes before reintroducing it this Parliament. The integrity of our Canadian citizenship and our national identity cannot be taken lightly. As elected members of the House, it is our responsibility to uphold and strengthen what it means to be a Canadian citizen.

• (1125)

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is very nice to see you back in the House, and I welcome my colleagues as well.

I want to take this opportunity to ask my colleague a question, based off of her comments, as she did talk about the measures that were adopted in 2009. Many of these measures were deemed unconstitutional by the Ontario Court of Justice, so this is not the first time the bill has come to the House. It has come back because there had to be some changes made to the bill. We have made those changes, and the Conservatives supported those changes.

Why are the Conservatives misleading Canadians once again on what we are actually talking about? They told lost Canadians in the last session that they would pass the bill. Why are they arguing this to be something that it is really not?

Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, what I mentioned was that the bill had been reintroduced. The Liberals rejected the amendments proposed by the Conservatives in the previous Parliament.

Government Orders

This bill was reintroduced by the Liberals unchanged, without taking any of those amendments into consideration.

Given the very first question that opened Parliament from the member for Winnipeg North talked about working collaboratively, this would be a great example, if this happens to go to committee, for amendments to be taken seriously, debated and voted on to strengthen the bill.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is great to see you in the chair. It is great to be back. It is always interesting: The Liberals break something, and they blame everyone else for the accident and for breaking it.

I want to thank our hon. colleague for her thoughtful presentation and intervention today. I have two questions: Does the government have any idea how many people would be granted citizenship automatically if the legislation passes? Has the government put forth any suggestions or details regarding the information and the evidence that would be required to prove the 1,095 cumulative days of physical presence in Canada?

Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, as I mentioned in my remarks, there has been no cost analysis. The Liberals do not know the scope, so we do not know how much this would cost the government, a.k.a. the Canadian taxpayers. Also, we do not have the information on the 1,095 nonconsecutive days that are being proposed. This is an opportunity to provide amendments to make sure that we can strengthen the bill if we believe, as I argued, that we need people granted citizenship to have a deep, meaningful connection to Canada.

• (1130)

[*Translation*]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, I commend the member on her speech.

Earlier, one of her colleagues spoke about language issues. Given that Quebec is a nation, a bill has already been introduced to make a knowledge of French a requirement for obtaining citizenship in Quebec. I would like to know what my colleague thinks about that.

[*English*]

Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, as I spoke of in my remarks, I believe that this would create a two-tier immigration system. I think we should have an even playing field. If there are language requirements in other streams of immigration, absolutely, they should also be applied.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Madeleine Chenette (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages and to the Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to welcome everyone back to the House.

I must admit that I am really pleased to hear our Bloc Québécois colleagues talking about Canadian identity and citizenship and to hear our Conservative colleagues talking about the importance of our Canadian values. With that in mind, I would like to say that, yes, in Canada, we need to work hard, we need to ensure a safe environment and we need to promote an egalitarian environment.

When it comes to solidarity, particularly with regard to our two official languages, can we count on the Conservatives to really highlight this issue in the House?

[*English*]

Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, with respect to the spirit of collaboration, if this passes to committee, I would absolutely expect that when amendments are brought forward, they will be debated thoroughly and voted on in a non-partisan manner.

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to be back here in Ottawa this fall to represent the beautiful riding of Madawaska—Restigouche in Parliament. After spending the summer in the community with my constituents, I am thrilled to get back to our legislative work as part of a team that is determined to quickly deliver concrete results for Canadians and to build a strong Canada.

Today, we are addressing a very important issue with our study of Bill C-3. Canadian citizenship is more than just an administrative status. It is a powerful symbol of belonging to a country. It confers certain fundamental rights, such as the right to vote and the right to travel with a Canadian passport, and it also embodies a civic responsibility, a shared identity and a deep connection to our country. To be a citizen of Canada is to be part of a collective project rooted in democracy, equality, diversity and freedom.

There are three pathways to citizenship under the Citizenship Act: by being born in Canada, through naturalization by immigrating to Canada and acquiring citizenship, or by descent if an individual is born abroad to a Canadian parent.

Today, our debate is focusing on this last pathway, which is citizenship by descent. Since 2009, the fundamental right to citizenship by descent has been unfairly restricted. Thousands of people with a real, long-term connection to Canada have been deprived of that sense of belonging. An amendment made to the Citizenship Act under Stephen Harper's Conservative government introduced an arbitrary rule commonly known as the first-generation limit. This provision means that only children born abroad to a Canadian parent who was born in Canada are automatically entitled to citizenship. In other words, if two successive generations are born outside Canada, even if the parents are active Canadian citizens, the child cannot become a citizen. This provision severed the legal and symbolic tie between Canada and many children of Canadians living temporarily abroad. Canadian families were plunged into legal

uncertainty when they discovered that their children were considered foreigners in their own country.

These concerns are not theoretical. They are affecting children growing up in Canadian households abroad and families who wish to pass on to their children not just a passport, but also a Canadian identity, a cultural heritage, a sense of belonging to a community and a feeling of safety. Failing to recognize them sends a message of exclusion to those who feel like full-fledged Canadians. It is a dismissal of the contributions of our diaspora and of the reality that this is a country where familial and citizenship ties often transcend borders.

In December 2023, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice ruled that the first-generation limit is unconstitutional on the grounds that it violates sections 6 and 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, that is, mobility rights and equality rights. The Government of Canada did not appeal this decision, since it acknowledges that the act has had unacceptable consequences. Instead, our government is bringing forward a legislative framework that is both balanced and responsible. I sincerely believe that this was the right decision.

Today we have an opportunity, I would even say a duty, to correct an injustice. Bill C-3 seeks to expand access to citizenship by descent beyond the first generation. It was designed with one clear objective: to restore the rights of lost Canadians while establishing a fairer framework for future generations. Once passed, Bill C-3 will automatically grant citizenship by descent to anyone who was born abroad to a Canadian parent before the law came into force. That means that the unjustly excluded descendants of Canadians will have their status restored.

● (1135)

For children born after the bill comes into force, a new framework will be introduced that allows citizenship to be passed on beyond the first generation if a Canadian parent can demonstrate a substantial connection to Canada. A substantial connection is defined as being physically present in Canada for 1,095 cumulative days, or approximately three years. This requirement ensures that children who are granted citizenship have a genuine connection to Canada, without arbitrarily excluding people based on their place of birth. Some might wonder why the substantial connection test is not being applied retroactively. That is because it would be unfair to impose conditions on people who were born before the law came into force, when the criterion was not yet in place. The bill takes a forward-looking approach, setting clear, transparent, fair standards for the future.

I would like to emphasize that, since the court struck down the first-generation criterion adopted in 2009 as unconstitutional, it cannot stay in place. However, the court granted us an extension to allow Bill C-3 to run its parliamentary course. If this bill is not passed before the ruling's suspension ends, there will be no limits anymore on citizenship by descent for all the people born to Canadian citizens abroad. People will be able to pass citizenship on to their children in perpetuity without the need for a substantial connection to Canada.

Government Orders

• (1140)

Bill C-3 seeks to strike a balance between implementing reasonable limits to automatic citizenship by descent and protecting the rights and privileges associated with Canadian citizenship. The introduction of the substantial connection criterion helps maintain a reasonable balance. Citizenship by descent will still be possible, but it will have to be rooted in a real, tangible connection with Canada. This criterion guarantees that future generations will not receive citizenship without having real ties to the country. Our goal is to preserve the value of Canadian citizenship without needlessly restricting it.

This is a modern, balanced and responsible framework. In fact, it is more rigorous than simply getting rid of the first-generation limit. It protects the integrity of our citizenship while correcting glaring injustices.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind everyone that, behind the legal and administrative considerations we are discussing today, there are real people with personal stories, life experiences and sincere ties to Canada. We must remember that the decisions we make in this House can shape the destinies of individuals and entire families.

I would also urge everyone to demonstrate caution and accuracy in terms of the tone and content of our debates, particularly when dealing with issues as sensitive as access to citizenship. Provocative slogans and simplistic solutions designed to inflame social media have no place in a serious debate such as this.

We are here to legislate responsibly, not to polarize public discourse. As legislators, we have a duty to maintain a safe social environment and to consider the impact our words could have in the public sphere. We have seen what can happen elsewhere in the world when debates on citizenship and immigration are weaponized. It results in social division, stigma and a rise in intolerance and mistrust. Canada must not go down that path.

Of course, as elected officials, we have to make choices, draw lines and sometimes make difficult decisions. In the process, however, we must never forget the human dimension of our decisions or the impact that our words can have in the public sphere. Bill C-3 is based on a reasoned, balanced approach that allows us to meet our constitutional obligations while maintaining the integrity of our citizenship.

In closing, I want to stress that Canadian citizenship instills in all of us a deep sense of belonging to the diverse, democratic and inclusive country we are proud to call our own. Our government will continue to protect the value of Canadian citizenship by ensuring that the process remains fair, transparent and rooted in sound principles. Bill C-3 strikes a necessary balance. It corrects a past injustice toward Canadians who were deprived of their citizenship, while ensuring that, in the future, citizenship by descent is based on genuine ties to our country.

I therefore call on my colleagues from all parties to work together on advancing this important bill. As legislators, we have an opportunity to set aside partisan differences, show leadership and vision, and reaffirm our commitment to a fair and inclusive model of citizenship that reflects our shared values.

[English]

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Madam Speaker, somebody who is seeking citizenship through naturalization must show proficiency in one of Canada's official languages. Citizenship by descent, which is what is being proposed in this bill, does not require a language proficiency test, so this bill would not require somebody seeking citizenship through citizenship by descent to obtain proficiency in one of Canada's official languages.

Given that my colleague is a francophone, and I am assuming he supports French-language skills, why is he supporting a bill that would not require people seeking citizenship to have proficiency in one of Canada's official languages?

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Madam Speaker, I am proud to represent Madawaska—Restigouche, a riding outside Quebec where over 80% of the population is francophone.

Today, we are debating Bill C-3, which seeks to correct a historic injustice that has been deemed unconstitutional: the first-generation measure. We have a duty to adopt a balanced system to ensure that people who have genuine ties to our country can become Canadian citizens. They should not be unfairly deprived of their citizenship.

There are two different kinds of citizenship. There is citizenship by naturalization, for which we have an immigration system and criteria. However, in this case, we are talking about something else, and that is citizenship by descent, where a parent can pass on citizenship to their children. To that end, I think that Bill C-3 provides a balanced and reasonable system.

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to be back in the House. It feels like the start of a new school year. That being said, today, we are dealing with a subject that merits reflection, but that I think we need to move forward on. I say this as a member of the Bloc Québécois. Bill C-3 is a step in the right direction. I say that because of something that I witnessed recently. I want to give a shout-out to a citizen from Lac-des-Écorces, who was a victim of this. One of her brothers was able to get citizenship, but the two little twins were not.

We do need to take a step in the right direction, but I would like to ask my colleague a question. We are obviously not talking about the need to learn French to obtain citizenship, but does he agree with me that we need to completely overhaul the process for obtaining Canadian citizenship? I will not be there, because I will likely be busy taking care of that issue in Quebec down the road.

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Madam Speaker, for now, Bill C-3 is a welcome step in the right direction because many Canadians have lost their citizenship.

Government Orders

I have also heard stories about people in very problematic situations, which is why I said in my speech that we always have to keep in mind that the decisions we make in the House have a real impact on people's everyday lives. Conversations about access to citizenship are conversations about identity, about who we really are. That is why it is so important to work on Bill C-3.

I believe there is always room for conversations about ways to improve our citizenship system going forward. Talking about these ideas with colleagues is enriching, but, right now, we are talking about Bill C-3. I hope it will be passed as soon as possible in order to correct this historic injustice.

• (1145)

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Madawaska—Res-tigouche, with its large Acadian community, which also speaks French, as do Quebeckers.

I support reforming the Citizenship Act in order to protect the rights of people who have lost their citizenship. However, I would like to propose some amendments.

I have a question for my Liberal colleague. Can it be that the Prime Minister has lost the key to his bulldozer? In June, we did not have time to study any bills. We only had time to get them passed very quickly. However, Bill C-3 is in need of some major changes.

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Madam Speaker, I believe that Bill C-3 was one of the first bills introduced by our new government in the early days of this new Parliament last spring. I would suggest that this shows how important this issue is to our new government and how seriously we take this matter.

Of course, time is of the essence when we consider Bill C-3, since the Ontario Superior Court of Justice declared that the first-generation limit is unconstitutional. We were granted a suspension from the court until November of this year to allow us to examine Bill C-3. As a result, the parties will need to work together to pass Bill C-3.

[*English*]

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am happy to be back in the House of Commons representing the people of Regina—Lewvan.

If I can have some leeway, we obviously had the summer to go back to our ridings to talk to our constituents to find out some of the main points and topics they would like us to discuss here in the House of Commons on their behalf. We did some barbecue circuits and had lots of events in Regina—Lewvan. It is a busy place.

Some things that came up were about affordability. We are facing an affordability crisis in the country. We are also facing a housing crisis and an inflation crisis in this country. Those tie into some of the questions I have regarding Bill C-3 when it comes to what the Liberals are going to do with it. We want to get it to committee so we can put some amendments forward to strengthen it. We agree with some parts of it, but we really want to know what the value of our Canadian citizenship will look like with the Liberals and how it is going to be passed on from generation to generation.

I think the number of Canadian citizens we will be adding is about 115,000. Right now, with the climate in our country, do we know how many would come to Canada? Would there be homes for these people if they came to Canada? These were some of the questions I had when I first glanced at Bill C-3.

One question I would love a Liberal colleague to answer, maybe the member for Winnipeg North, is whether the Liberals consulted with the provinces on this bill. Were there conversations? A lot of the time there are unintended consequences to some of the legislation and policies the Liberals bring forward. If people who get citizenship come back to Canada, what will that look like for the health care system? Have the Liberals thought about that? The health care systems across the provinces are under strain right now. What would this bill do to the health care system in Saskatchewan or Manitoba? When we look at a bill like this, I would say there are a lot of potential unintended consequences to adding that many citizens to this country.

I know a Conservative senator put forward a bill like this in the other place, but Bill C-3 broadens the scope of birthright citizenship substantially. We have questions about expanding that scope. How much pressure does it put on the programs and systems we have in our country that are already on the verge of not being able to handle the influx of people who access those systems, such as health care and education? When we look at this bill, we really want to make some amendments to it. I believe some of my colleagues have talked about working collaboratively in the new session to make sure we have good pieces of legislation going forward for the Canadian people. That is something we look forward to doing by putting forward amendments.

Bill C-3 is the latest attempt by the Liberals to overhaul Canada's citizenship laws. Originally introduced as Bill C-71 in the previous Parliament, it builds on Conservative Senator Yonah Martin's Bill S-245, which targeted a narrow group that was inadvertently affected by the 2009 reforms under the Harper government. This is something we have had our eye and focus on to make sure there is some fairness for the people who were affected in 2009. However, rather than maintaining that focus, as I mentioned earlier, the NDP used its alliance with the Liberals at committee to push forward sweeping changes well beyond the bill's intent. Then when Bill S-245 was stalled, the Liberals reintroduced the expanded version of Bill C-71 in the last in Parliament, which is now Bill C-3.

Government Orders

This legislation drastically broadens access to citizenship far beyond what we can support. It includes measures responding to the December 2023 Ontario Superior Court ruling that struck down the first-generation limitation on citizenship for children born abroad. That was not appealed by the federal government. Under Bill C-3, citizenship would be extended to those born outside Canada with at least one Canadian parent who has lived in Canada for 1,095 non-consecutive days.

That brings up several other questions. How is that going to be regulated? Who is going to oversee it to make sure that criteria is met?

We know that the immigration system is at a breaking point. In Regina—Lewvan, we have a very diverse community, and I would say that about 80% of the cases in our office have something to do with the IRCC. Are the Liberals going to hire more people to ensure that this criteria is met? Who is going to take on the extra bureaucracy to ensure that the criteria laid out in this piece of legislation is met? Perhaps a member from across the aisle could answer that for us as well.

• (1150)

We know there are long wait times at the IRCC. Is this going to add more to those wait times for people who have been waiting years sometimes to get answers from the IRCC? As my colleague from Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake mentioned, this bill would put in place a two-tier system where some people who have been waiting for years and years for an answer from IRCC would be queue-jumped by people who would be given citizenship without some of the criteria we have outlined.

There is the conversation about what the language criteria would look like. That is something else that is not in this bill.

Also, there is no criminal record check for people who are going to become Canadian citizens. Is that something this House is prepared to move forward with? Do we not want to know if the people who are becoming Canadian citizens have a criminal record? That really has to be delved into at the committee level as well.

These are all pretty understandable questions, and questions that people would have if I were to be in support of this legislation. Have the Liberals asked those questions? Have they, on our behalf, made sure that those checks and balances have been taken into consideration?

I really would like a member of the Liberal Party to stand up and talk about the consultations with provincial immigration ministers about this piece of legislation. Was consultation done showing that the policy put forward is something the provinces agree with? As in my remarks earlier, a lot of these programs that may be accessed fall into provincial jurisdiction, and there is a lot more burden on them. Health care would for sure be one of them. Are people going to come back for our health care system if they have Canadian citizenship? I do not know the answer to that. Have the Liberals thought of that potential strain on the system? Are more people who have citizenship going to come back to Canada to access education? That is another question that would be asked.

The question I have is, what is the total number of people? I think I have heard that it is around 115,000. Has that grown over the last couple of years? Is it more or less? When it comes to our systems, that really needs to be answered.

Do not only take it from me. These are questions that lots of other people are asking as well. Someone who has a much broader knowledge of the immigration system than me, Sergio Karas, principal of Karas Immigration Law Professional Corporation, said in 2024:

Introducing tens of thousands of new citizens without a robust integration plan is reckless. Our social infrastructure is buckling, and health care is under severe pressure. The lack of a clear strategy for accommodating this potential population surge only heightens concerns.

It is not just me asking these questions; there are lots of other people who have similar concerns about this piece of legislation. Another person I would like to put on the record is Krisha Dhaliwal, Canadian immigration and citizenship lawyer: “At this point, details have not been provided regarding what kinds of evidence will be required to demonstrate the 1,095 cumulative days of physical presence in Canada.” I mentioned that earlier. Who is going to be the arbitrator of that? Who is going to make sure that criteria has been followed, and how robust will that be? Those are some of the questions we would like answered at the committee level.

I think this bill does something that we as Conservatives take very seriously and puts into question the value of Canadian citizenship. In other countries, it is not the case that people can have next-generation citizenship. A lot of our peer countries have much different criteria for their citizenship, and we should look at best practices around the world to see what they do and how they make sure their citizenship is valued. This is why we have those questions.

As I said, Canada is a beautiful, welcoming country, but we have questions about the criteria and what this legislation would look like. It would put a strain on the system and on our provincial partners as well.

• (1155)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the concerns that the member has expressed. When it comes to consultation, consultations are always done for government legislation. I will put to the member the issue I have. Here we have legislation on which a couple of Conservatives have stood up to say that there are individuals who should receive their citizenship. There is no reason whatsoever why, after having had hours and hours of debate, we should not see the legislation go to committee. It is a minority government, meaning the government cannot ram the bill through a committee. It takes a majority of members to pass an amendment.

If the Conservatives are so confident in the need for changes, why would they not want to see the bill go to committee? Conservative voters themselves want to see more co-operation on the floor of the House of Commons.

Government Orders

Warren Steinley: Madam Speaker, with a new session, there is a new demeanor. I appreciate the calm demeanor of my colleague from Winnipeg North. Sometimes he gets a little robust in his debate.

I find it interesting that the member who probably speaks the most on the floor of the House of Commons has an issue with us standing up and putting our concerns on the record for our constituents. I think a bit of debate and having members address the concerns they hear in their ridings is a good part of democracy. I feel that this is the proper process, and when we get to the committee level, we are looking forward to putting forth amendments that will make this piece of legislation better. We will see if those are accepted by the other parties in the House.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, I love the comment from our colleague across the way, saying we should not worry, it will all get sorted out and Liberals will work with everybody to make things better. I have been here for 10 years and have yet to really see any of that take place.

In the office of my riding of Cariboo—Prince George, the immigration cases far outweigh any of the other cases we do. They are absolutely heartbreaking. There is Maya, whose case we dealt with, a lovely lady from Syria who came to Prince George to take her master's degree. She was by herself. She left her husband behind and worked for years to get her husband into our country. There is also a gentleman by the name of Mal. He worked desperately to get his wife and children from India here. These are families that are separated, torn far apart, and it is absolutely heartbreaking when we hear their stories.

My question to our hon. colleague is this: Do we know whether other peer countries, like the United States, Britain, Italy and France, follow suit with the same practice of passing citizenship on to children who are born abroad?

• (1200)

Warren Steinley: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the hard work the member does for his constituents in Cariboo—Prince George. I do appreciate the fact that the question is something I mentioned in my speech.

I would say it is not the standard of practice in the United States, Britain, France, Italy or a number of our peer countries, which, with the rare exception, have capped passing on citizenship to the first generation born outside of the country. We are definitely not in line with our partner countries.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Madam Speaker, when we talk about Bill C-5, we are talking about human beings, about families.

Let me be clear: The Bloc Québécois will be supporting the bill. Just because we are members of the Bloc Québécois does not mean we think only about the people of Quebec. Among other things, there are real people behind this inequity, which has been described as unconstitutional. Despite the opposition and the fact that comprehensive reform is needed, I dare hope that we can move on to other, equally important issues, and finish with this one.

[*English*]

Warren Steinley: Madam Speaker, I would agree that reforms are needed, especially when it comes to some kind of language criteria. I believe my colleague would agree with that. Those are some of the adjustments that need to be made at committee level, but following the process and ensuring that people do get to speak in the House of Commons about legislation is a good part of the process. I think people do have comments they want to put on the record to reflect the desires and opinions of their constituents.

Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House this afternoon to speak to Bill C-3, an act to amend the Citizenship Act. The proposed bill has three pieces to it to address issues related to citizenship by descent, lost citizenship and the status of born-abroad or adopted children of Canadian citizens. The stated aim is to ensure that individuals born to or adopted by Canadian parents outside Canada have a path to obtaining or retaining Canadian citizenship.

Canada is a beautiful, sovereign and distinct nation with a rich history and free democracy, with values and an identity that have been built and that have existed for longer than just our lifetime. Canadian citizenship, as defined by former minister for citizenship, immigration and multiculturalism Jason Kenney, “is more than a legal status, more than a passport. We expect citizens to have an ongoing commitment, connection and loyalty to Canada.”

Former Liberal minister for citizenship and immigration Lucienne Robillard said, “We [ought] to share our citizenship with those who want it and work hard to deserve it.”

While the Liberal government claims that it is trying to right historical wrongs by loosening its test of connection to our country, it is proposing to remove safeguards and to allow citizenship to be granted without the need for connection, engaging civically or contributing to the social safety nets in Canada that many rely on. In other words, it is proposing to share our citizenship with people who do not want to, in the words of the former Liberal minister, “work hard to deserve it”.

The bill contains elements that could undermine trust at a time when Canadians are seeking to unite in the midst of uncertainty. The bill, however, is also nothing new. It was tabled by the previous Liberal government as Bill C-71 and, before that, in the Senate, as Bill S-245, which was heavily altered by the Liberals and New Democrats, yet another classic example of a Liberal band-aid-like solution to a problem without considering the consequences.

Government Orders

Citizenship is a connection to a home. It is loyalty to one's country. Canadian citizenship comes with a promise that anyone from anywhere can achieve anything if they are willing to work hard. Reducing the requirement to obtain citizenship threatens to undermine the millions of Canadians who have come for decades, fleeing persecution, violence and war, or those seeking to give a better life to their children than they had. It required a process, and it required effort. It required planting roots in Canada, involving themselves in their community and engaging with their fellow Canadians.

Each province within Canada has unique needs, interests, identities and culture. Some have their own distinct language. One provision in Bill C-3 would require a person to live in Canada for 1,095 days. However, it would not require the 1,095 days to be consecutive, meaning that Canadian citizenship may not require participation or a love for their province and the country.

My riding is rural, and families from Saskatchewan have had roots planted in their community for generations, caring and working for the success of one another. It takes time and commitment, resulting in a way of life that is loved and respected by those around them. The west was settled by pioneers, people who risked everything, leaving the comforts of what was known, in order to build a life elsewhere that could be better. The key here is to build a life. It is important that this experience is also shared by those people seeking Canadian citizenship.

Justin Trudeau spent years devaluing and trying to erase what makes up the Canadian identity, referring to Canada as a "post-national state". Measures like the one set out in Bill C-3 devalue the importance of choosing Canada as a home with shared duties and responsibilities. While the Liberals had no clue and were unable to even guess how many people the change could affect, the Parliamentary Budget Officer estimates that if the bill passes, more than 100,000 new people would be granted citizenship in five years.

• (1205)

At a time when Canadians feel that the health care system and our economy are more fragile than ever, the Liberal government wants to issue new citizenship without requiring that the people in question pay taxes, just to reside in Canada from time to time over the course of their lifetime. With no requirement that it be consecutive or accomplished within a time frame, and for those of descent, citizenship could be passed to those who have never lived in Canada.

Conservatives will always support positive changes that seek to correct issues to current legislation. That is why it is so difficult to support the bill in its current form. At the time the bill was introduced, not even the parliamentary secretary had read it until that same morning. The legislation seems to create more challenges than it solves. We owe it to both Canadians and newcomers to handle this fragile system with the utmost care. I fail to see that this is what is happening with the last-minute communications from a minister to a parliamentary secretary when it was introduced.

For example, let us talk about the backlog in citizenship applications. The backlog is in the hundreds of thousands, while the government has failed to meet its own metrics for processing applications in spades. There are no details that outline what background checks would look like or even whether they would occur at all.

Canadians should be able to expect that their elected leaders would consider their safety ahead of rushed solutions.

The department, IRCC, has nearly a million total applicants outside acceptable processing times. That is on top of the more than one million applicants it claims are waiting for their application to be resolved. What is the plan to solve the new influx of citizenship applications if we are going to add 30% more in just five years? Adding more seems like a plan to fail, more than it seems like a plan.

I hope for the sake of Canadians that the bill is not an example of how the Liberal government plans to enact changes, by simply rushing the process instead of fixing the deep-rooted issues it has spent the last 10 years creating.

Conservatives know that it is not just the legislation that is the issue; it is also that the Liberal government continues to put band-aids over a broken immigration system. Canadians are looking for change from the fourth-term Liberal government, change that delivers on the promises the Liberals made in the last election rather than the same old band-aid solutions that may cause even more damage.

While we are a generous and compassionate nation, citizenship must be valued, and immigration should work for the betterment of Canadians and Canada. Conservatives will always stand on the side of a fair and robust system that does not disenfranchise Canadians or potentially risk their safety.

That is why Conservatives, through Bill S-245, sought to correct the very changes the Liberals are now claiming to fix, but without creating more problems for our already overburdened immigration system. The members opposite me are using the bill that the Conservatives brought forward to put forward their own ideological biases. The Liberals changed it and then stalled it in the Senate. They have never given an account to Canadians and to those they claim they are trying to help for why they delayed the solution we brought forward and why they put their own interests first. I think that is shameful.

While the Liberals say it is because of an Ontario court ruling from June 2023, a ruling they never appealed, it is now an emergency, and only because they have not been able to propose a decent piece of legislation and get it passed in the last two years. Canadians deserve and should be able to expect better from their government.

Government Orders

• (1210)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member uses the word “broken”, and this is something that Pierre Poilievre likes to talk about, to give a false impression—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member knows that he should not mention other members by name.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I thought we could use his name as long as he has not been brought to the bar.

The former member for Carleton consistently talks about Canada being broken. Now he is talking about immigration being broken, yet he sat around a cabinet table where it took years to be able to sponsor a spouse and where the then minister of immigration deleted literally hundreds of thousands of files of people who were in that process for years.

Yes, there are issues with immigration. There could even be issues of concern with respect to Bill C-3. Even Conservative speakers have indicated there is a need to pass elements of Bill C-3 in order to provide justice, for individuals to be able to receive their citizenship. One of the first steps in achieving that justice is recognizing that even Conservative voters want to see more co-operation on the floor of the House of Commons so we can give that justice.

My question for the member is this. Would she not agree that Conservatives can talk and debate, even at committee stage, and bring forward amendments, and all they need to do is get the support of the majority? After all, it is a minority government. If their arguments are that strong, surely to goodness they would be able to pass it at committee stage.

Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, I believe that not only I but others who have already spoken to this piece of legislation this morning have indicated that we believe in a strong, fair and meaningful Canadian citizenship. We also support restoring citizenship to lost Canadians and equal treatment for adopted children. However, as we have stated, the bill goes far beyond that, cheapening the value of Canadian citizenship by creating a new system of unlimited chain migration, which only serves to undermine our national identity.

I look forward to watching what happens at committee. I trust that, based on what the member has said, members of the Liberal caucus who serve on that committee would be more than open to the amendments we bring forward.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her debate and her tone.

I would like her to expand on her question. What amendments will the Conservatives move in committee to improve the bill? Above all, when she talks about a loophole that the bill might create for some immigrants, what loophole is she referring to, exactly? I would like to better understand my colleague, and I think it is a matter of general interest.

[*English*]

Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, I would not presume to pre-empt what the members on the committee that will be reviewing this piece of legislation may choose to bring forward and what they may choose to bring forward based on the testimony they may hear in regard to this piece of legislation.

I believe that, as in the past, we have a case here of some deeply flawed legislation being proposed. We have already indicated some of the things that we have difficulty with. The government does not know the number of people this will impact, it does not know what the costs are, and it has not been able to confirm processes that need to be put in place in order to follow up with its 1,095-day requirement.

• (1215)

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, our hon. colleague from Winnipeg North stands up once again, points fingers and says that all the Conservatives say is, “It is broken.” Well, this file is broken, and the truth is that the Liberals broke it. Our country was built on the backs of immigrants. Immigration is so important to our country, yet the Liberals broke it. They lost track of over a million immigrants coming into our country; we know that from the last session.

I know our hon. colleague, who I have the deepest respect for, has heard some of the same stories that I have in my constituency. Could the member share another story of a constituent in her riding who has some deep fears about this piece of legislation?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek has 10 seconds.

Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, I think I would have difficulty choosing just one story because, as my hon. colleague pointed out, immigration issues consume a lot of our time in our ridings.

I will say this: Conservatives will continue to support a system that is one of integrity and security and is based on responsible policy. We will continue to support—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Unfortunately, we have to resume debate; we are way over time.

The hon. member for Niagara South.

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is good to be back in this place after a very eventful summer. It is nice to see my colleagues. Welcome back to you, Madam Speaker.

It is always a pleasure to rise in this House and speak on behalf of the constituents of Niagara South. Today we are debating an important piece of legislation that seeks to make amendments to the Citizenship Act and that for a third time is up for debate in this chamber.

For those who have not been following Bill C-3, it is the third iteration, which started as Bill S-245 in the other place, introduced in the last Parliament. The original iteration of the bill was commendable and received bipartisan support from this chamber. In it, the bill sought to achieve two key changes, with the first relating to adoption.

Currently, if parents adopt a child from abroad, once the adoption is completed they are required to file a permanent residency application on behalf of the child. The financial cost associated with this can be quite high, often requiring the services of an immigration consultant or lawyer, and the process can be incredibly stressful and time-consuming for the family seeking to adopt. That bill and Bill C-3 would do away with that process entirely and instead allow for the adopted child to obtain citizenship as if they were born in Canada, the moment the adoption itself is finalized. This is a positive change and one that Conservatives support.

The second component of the original bill dealt with the issue of lost Canadians, a topic with which I was unfamiliar prior to arriving here. This deals with restoring citizenship to a group of people born between 1977 and 1981 who had lost their citizenship as a result of a glitch in our immigration system. Again, Conservatives supported this provision.

What is the issue that our side has with this bill? The problem lies with the third component of this bill, which did not exist until the Liberal-NDP coalition hijacked the original bill at committee stage in the last Parliament. During clause-by-clause review, and by way of last-minute changes, the Liberals inserted a controversial clause creating multi-generational citizenship, which went far beyond the original intent of the bill. Ultimately, because of this last-minute change, which sought to fundamentally alter the way citizenship is passed on in Canada for citizens living abroad, this bill got bogged down in committee and died on the Order Paper.

The government proceeded to reintroduce the bill as a government bill, Bill C-71, which also failed to pass. Today, the government is trying again, for a third time, introducing what is effectively the same bill with the same controversies and somehow expecting it to have a different result. Let us take a moment to look at what multi-generational citizenship is and the issues we have with it.

Currently, passing on Canadian citizenship to children born abroad is subject to the first-generation limit introduced by the Harper government in 2009 through Bill C-37. The first-generation limit states that only the first generation of children born abroad can automatically claim and obtain Canadian citizenship. A Canadian citizen can pass on their citizenship to their child born outside of Canada, but the next generation also born abroad would not automatically receive it. This new bill would change that by creating a substantial connection test. Specifically, if a parent wants to pass citizenship to their child, they must prove that they have spent at least 1,095 non-consecutive days physically present in Canada at one point in their lives before the birth of their child abroad, subject to some conditions.

This means that citizenship now is multi-generational, as parents no longer have to be born in Canada. This can translate into having a family permanently living abroad, with multiple generations born outside Canada, gaining citizenship. To assist those watching, imagine this scenario: A second-generation Canadian parent who has been living abroad for nearly their entire life could, in theory, send their kids to school in Canada for three years, at a discounted rate, and that would make those children eligible for Canadian citizenship.

Government Orders

That person would never have to file a T1 in Canada or be required to speak either of our two official languages, yet they would be eligible for citizenship, given the simple fact that at one point in their life they spent three non-consecutive years visiting Canada. Their child could, in fact, repeat the process for their children and pass on citizenship onto yet another generation. That is akin to generational citizenship in perpetuity. The only requirement is the three-year stay in Canada.

I am proud to be Canadian. I ran for public office to better the lives of the people in my community, bring investments to the Niagara region and advocate for the issues that the people in my community care deeply about.

● (1220)

Individuals who were born abroad and who have spent their entire adult lives there, do not pay taxes here and do not have any real connection to the sense of community that makes us Canadian should not be eligible for citizenship, in my opinion. To allow individuals who have never truly lived here to enjoy all the benefits that come with being a Canadian citizen, including health care, government pensions, voting, protection from our government while abroad or even the privilege of running as an elected official, seems wrong to me.

Frankly, in my opinion and that of many of my Conservative colleagues, these amendments diminish the value of our citizenship and turn what otherwise would have been a very good piece of legislation into a piece of bad legislation.

If members opposite took the time to speak to some of the permanent residents in their riding who pay taxes, contribute to our communities and are building lives here with their families, I believe they would find that they too agree with the Conservative position and are frustrated with how people with such inconsequential connections to Canada could obtain citizenship.

Most importantly, the legislation assumes the government would be able to properly manage it. The success and implementation of these changes are based on whether IRCC or CBSA would in fact verify when Canadians arrive and when they leave to determine whether they are eligible to meet the substantial connection test of 1,095 days. This is a monumental task when one considers that over four million Canadian citizens currently live abroad, according to Stats Canada. This opens the door to yet another enormous bureaucratic burden and cost.

The staff in my constituency office have been flooded with requests and complaints this past summer regarding IRCC's poor handling of immigration casework and the backlogs it faces. Members will pardon me for not having faith in the Liberal government, which cannot even seem to deliver passports on time, let alone track the movement of millions of citizens abroad.

Government Orders

Lastly, I would like to comment on the view that the Conservatives were obstructionist with the legislation at committee in the last Parliament. First, the concerns regarding fundamental changes to multi-generational citizenship are quite legitimate, and debating the issue of whether individuals with few ties to Canada should receive citizenship is indeed a valid concern worth significant discussion. Some of these individuals may have spent their entire life abroad except for three short nonconsecutive years; this is not substantial enough and is like counting vacation days to qualify for citizenship.

Citizenship is the most valuable asset one can enjoy in Canada. Citizens should know and learn about our values, our history and the very fabric of our nation. These are things that should not be simply discarded or replaced over an 1,100-day stay in Canada. To that end, I look forward to working with other members of the committee to dive deeper into these issues in good faith so that we can move forward with what otherwise would have been a very good piece of legislation.

• (1225)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will use a hypothetical example: A third-generation Canadian, who was born, raised, everything, here in Canada, has a child, and that child, upon hitting five years old, moves with the family to any European country, or to any other country in the world, lives there for 30, 40 or 50 years, and then makes the determination that they want to come back. Would the member then apply the very same principles he is espousing today of them not having that connection?

The 1,095 days that the Conservatives continue to talk about is something that qualifies an individual to become a permanent resident to Canada. There are some requirements to qualify to become a citizen. Depending on the age, there might be an English requirement or a French requirement. There is the 1,095 days requirement. Is the Conservative Party suggesting that we should be changing the 1,095 days?

The Conservative Party needs to recognize that its members might have some ideas that are good to have some debate on, but let us respond to what Conservative voters are saying and have a more robust sense of co-operation in getting legislation to committees, where they can have the kind of debate the member seems to want to have.

Would the member not agree that it is time to allow legislation to actually go to committee, as opposed to talking endlessly in regards to it, so that Canadians would get what they want, which is a robust opposition that wants to co-operate, just like the government?

Fred Davies: Madam Speaker, there is a lot to unpack there.

Let me say this: We have concerns about the legislation. There are two or three components that we agree with, and we are quite happy to dive into this at committee.

What I am not in favour of, and what our party is not in favour of, is citizenship in perpetuity being given to people who may not have ever set foot in Canada to become Canadian citizens. To me, that is absurd.

We will debate this, diving into the legislation at committee, and we will put forward amendments to improve it. I do not see what is wrong with that. The member suggests that we are talking endlessly, but this is what we do in this place when legislation is presented at second reading. We debate it, and we present our opinions, on the record.

I look forward to having this sent to committee, as well as reviewing it and the improvements from this side of the House.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Niagara South for his speech. I think it is appropriate to send him my regards for the first time in this Parliament.

I would like to know more about the Conservatives' position. This morning, it felt as though Niagara Falls was such a sieve that it was about to become the new Roxham Road.

However, that is not what I take from this bill. I would like my colleague to clearly explain to me what the loophole is that, if I understood his previous colleague's intervention correctly, would open Canada's borders to hundreds of thousands of people for citizenship in perpetuity.

What exactly are the Conservatives afraid of and, more importantly, what concrete, pragmatic and simple solutions will they propose in committee to fix this loophole?

• (1230)

[*English*]

Fred Davies: Madam Speaker, my colleague's reference to Niagara Falls is quite timely. I was in Niagara Falls the other day with the mayor of the community. We were walking down Fallsview Boulevard, and he was pointing out all the hotels that are full of people waiting to have their refugee applications dealt with, at hundreds of millions of dollars in cost to the taxpayer. This goes to the heart of part of the reason we have an issue with this bill.

The backlog at IRCC to have files dealt with, in some cases, is up to two years. That is one of the issues that could be created with this bill if it were to pass in its current form. The backlog and the burden on IRCC and CBSA is going to be overwhelming, and it is going to be very costly to the taxpayer.

Niagara Falls is not the next Roxham Road, but I can tell the member that there are serious issues affecting that community now because we cannot get a handle on our immigration cases.

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to welcome back my hon. colleague and all those who have returned to the House with the goal of making Canadians' lives better.

The hon. member rightly points out that this bill is about fixing an infringement to the rights of a group of people with a substantial connection to Canada who, through an accident of fate, did not fit certain technical rules that were enacted with good intentions by a previous government. The courts have challenged us to work together to repatriate these lost Canadians while preventing those without a real connection to Canada from treating our country as a passport of convenience.

The world is a volatile and scary place for so many right now, and Canada remains a beacon of relative calm in that storm. Can the hon. member point to any measure in Bill C-3 that would ensure that the lax 1,095 non-consecutive day test would not take us full circle right back to the abuse of Canadian passports that created the need for the—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I have to give the hon. member for Niagara South 15 seconds to answer the question.

Fred Davies: Madam Speaker, the provision of 1,095 days is very strange to me. Canadian citizenship is a valuable asset for anybody who wants to be part of this country. I just cannot connect the dots between that number of days and being able to qualify—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Provencher.

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise this afternoon to speak to Bill C-3.

Canadian citizenship is one of the most important things our country has to offer. It is not just a document or a passport; it is a commitment to Canada, its people and its values. It carries not only rights and privileges, but also responsibilities, and that is why citizenship must be defended and upheld. It cannot be treated casually, and it must never be handed out without limits. Bill C-3 undermines that principle. People who may never set foot in Canada, who have not contributed to our society and who have no intention of living here could be granted Canadian citizenship. That would be to destroy what it means to be Canadian.

Canadians understand that our immigration and citizenship systems are already broken. Adding a vast open-ended pool of new applicants without any planning or clear limits would only make things worse. The government has not released how many new citizens Bill C-3 could create. Numbers, costs and the implementation plan are clearly lacking.

This lack of accountability matters. Citizenship must and does mean more than a piece of paper. It represents a real and substantial connection to Canada. That means living here, contributing here and being a part of a united Canadian society.

Conservatives believe in a citizenship system that is fair, is reasonable, is rooted in accountability and puts Canada first. We will not support policies that would so badly skew the meaning of being a Canadian citizen, and we will not put Canadian workers and families at a disadvantage. Conservatives will continue to fight for policies that protect our sovereignty, ensuring that citizenship retains its value and keeps our country strong for generations to come. Canada deserves no less.

Government Orders

Conservatives cannot support this bill. It is an attempt to cheapen citizenship and make it less valuable. Conservatives stand up for integrity, security and responsible immigration.

As many here know, Canada's immigration policy used to be the envy of the world. This bill would potentially radically obscure a common vision of the value of being a Canadian. To hand out Canadian citizenship to people with little or no connection to Canada is insanity.

Regarding its background, Bill C-3 is a re-creation of a previous bad bill with which the Liberal government last attempted to overhaul Canadian citizenship laws. Back in December 2021, 23 applicants from seven families filed a constitutional challenge. The subsequent ruling by the Ontario Superior Court of Justice declared that the first-generation rule in the 2009 Citizenship Act was unconstitutional and gave the federal government six months to respond. Instead of an appeal of that decision, there have now been four extensions. The current requirement is that a response be legislated by November 20 of this year, so the clock is now ticking, and Bill C-3 represents the new version of the Liberals' unpassed Bill C-71 in the last sitting.

Just because the timer is on does not mean that we should pass bad policy. All we need to do is respond to what needs to be fixed. Instead, Bill C-3 would open the door to abuse by dramatically broadening access to citizenship. This would primarily be done by eliminating the requirement for strong ties to Canada. Where Bill C-3 could have maintained a focused and targeted approach like Conservative Senator Martin's Bill S-245 did, this bill, Bill C-3, proposes sweeping changes that would dramatically impact the face of citizenship.

To give a bit of context on this, back in 2009, the Conservative government at the time addressed concerns about Canadians of convenience, that is, Canadians who hold Canadian citizenship who live outside the country and do not participate in Canadian society. Consequently, Bill C-37 amended the Citizenship Act to limit citizenship access down to one generation. In other words, non-resident parents could pass on citizenship to their children, but grandchildren would not automatically be granted citizenship. From this legislation, we became aware of lost Canadians, who are people who either had Canadian citizenship and lost it or thought that they were entitled to Canadian citizenship but never received it. Senator Martin's Bill S-245 could have addressed these concerns.

Instead, the government is trying to rush through a bad bill when so many other factors need our immediate attention. Not considering factors such as housing, inflation, homebuilding, job security, natural resources, crime and even our drug rate is not being honest to newcomers to Canada.

Government Orders

• (1235)

When people come to Canada, we want to extend the Canadian promise that envisions hard work being rewarded, food and homes being affordable, streets being safe, borders being secure and all people coming together, united under a proud flag, and that is why getting the legislation right is so important. Right now we have the second highest unemployment in the G7, the worst household debt and, in some regions, the highest house prices. To top it all off, our food prices keep going up and up.

Throughout the election, we were promised that we would “build, baby, build”, doubling homebuilding, but instead we are being told homebuilding will fall by 13%. Already in Toronto and the GTA, homebuilding has fallen by half. I know there were announcements made on the weekend by the Liberal government, but as far as I know, announcements so far are not translating into shovels in the ground. Either way, we simply do not have enough homes for Canadians.

In the previous version of the bill, the Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer revealed that 115,000 new Canadian citizens could immediately be added to Canada at a cost of \$21 million just for the processing, that being only one estimate. Ryan Tumlilty of the National Post wrote that, in fact, the government has no idea how many people would automatically be granted citizenship if the legislation is passed, because there is retroactivity to the current legislation.

I note that this is all happening after we were promised less spending during the election, and from what we know right now, deficit spending looks to be 100% bigger than what we were promised. This is important, because the proposed cost implications of Bill C-3 to Canadians, related to health care, pensions and education, are not even considered a factor. That was discovered in the technical briefing. Canada is already challenged economically.

Again, the election promise was that we would have more investment, but just last week, we discovered that \$62 billion of net investment has left the country since the Prime Minister took office. The National Bank says that this is the biggest net outflow in any five-month period in Canadian history.

Unemployment, the cost of living, the cost of homebuilding, tariffs and crime are all up. Worse yet, CIBC says that unemployment matches levels that are typically seen only during recessionary periods, and our youth are the ones who are suffering the most. Over 17% of students are returning to school this fall having failed to secure a summer job. For younger students, aged 15 to 16, unemployment rose to a rate of over 31%.

We have some catching up to do, which is one of the reasons Bill C-3 is just not doable in its current form. Ministers have expressed that they are open to edits and changes, but the bill has massive flaws. There is an old proverb that reads, “Plans fail for lack of counsel, but with many advisers they succeed.” Conservatives want better legislation. We want legislation that will be passed and that will be successful.

The Liberals are proposing that we streamline multi-generational foreign residents to claim citizenship with minimal presence in the country. We would be extending multi-generational access, genera-

tion after generation, when a parent has to spend only 1,095 non-consecutive days in Canada, and with no criminal record check. One immigration lawyer asked what kind of evidence would be required to demonstrate one's physical presence in Canada. Citizenship is not about having minimal connection to Canada or joining a club for convenience; citizenship is a commitment to Canada, to its people and its values, and it carries rights and privileges but also carries responsibility.

Finally, it is about people coming from different backgrounds, different languages, and different countries and cultures, all uniting meaningfully with common vision for the country we love.

God keep Canada, the true north, strong and free.

• (1240)

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to welcome my colleague opposite back to the House of Commons.

There are a lot of things that were said in my colleague's speech that, although I do not want to blame him for misleading, were very misleading to Canadians. Connecting crime, jobs and housing to Bill C-3 is very misleading to Canadians. I think it is important to remember what the bill is about, and the Conservatives have, on multiple occasions, voted for the bill. I have met lost Canadians, some of whom are family members of service members of our country.

Why are we misleading Canadians by making them think that it is a new bill and that it is something that it is not, by connecting crime, housing and all other issues to a bill in which we have made a promise to Canadians who have served our country, that we will bring them back to our country and give them the citizenship that they deserve because they are members of our country?

Ted Falk: Madam Speaker, the bill is about providing citizenship to multi-generational people who have never lived here, who have no intention of living here and who have never been in Canada. Under the bill, to become a Canadian citizen, a person would not be required to have spent a day in Canada. The parents are required to spend 1,095 days in Canada over their lifetime. However, a person could conceivably, in the bill's current form, receive Canadian citizenship without ever having spent a day in Canada, and they could use their Canadian citizenship for travel purposes, for coming here in the event of a medical emergency, for cheaper education or to take advantage of our social system here, because they would be a Canadian citizen.

The bill is seriously flawed, and the member should actually take notice of that.

[*Translation*]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague and congratulate him on his speech.

There are cases where the law seems unfair. For example, Canadian citizens who go to a foreign country for work and have a child there have to reapply for citizenship for the child when they return. If that child then leaves the country, they will also have a hard time obtaining citizenship for their child.

Can the member give me a specific, very clear example of a situation where someone would get Canadian citizenship through Bill C-3 in a way that he deems unfair?

• (1245)

[*English*]

Ted Falk: Madam Speaker, I have great respect for the member for La Pointe-de-l'Île and for the work he does in Parliament.

The question is very good: Where would Bill C-3 not be fair to someone?

Bill C-3 would extend citizenship to people whose parents have been here only 1,095 days. They themselves may never come here, never want to come here, never contribute to our Canadian society, never be part of our communities and not even necessarily know either of our two official languages, yet they could be full Canadians.

Right now there is a group of people called lost Canadians, who are affected by previous legislation, which the bill also captures, but it could do it with a lot less broadening than in its current state. If the bill is not defeated entirely and something better brought forward, then it needs some significant amendments at committee that would really refine the scope of the bill to include lost Canadians, as is the intent.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to be very clear that what the deputy government House leader suggested is that the first day back in the House of Commons, after Liberal prorogation, a leadership race and an election, is that somehow we should not be debating a bill on immigration, after the Liberals have broken Canada's immigration system. We know that the Liberals have increased immigration levels to an extent while the economy has shrunk. Immigration levels cannot keep up with housing supply, with jobs and with health care. There have been reports and news articles to the contrary. I think it is really important to set the record straight.

Of course Parliament should be looking at any bill that the government is proposing with regard to immigration, and so my question to my colleague is this: There are amendments that the bill needs with regard to language proficiency, the length of time somebody has to be in Canada and likely other things, like criminal record checks. Does my colleague think that the Liberals will work collaboratively and pass those amendments?

Ted Falk: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the member for Calgary Nose Hill for all the tremendous work she has done in Parliament over the years, especially on the piece of legislation before us. She has really shown her expertise in this area and on this file.

Government Orders

The member is absolutely right; our immigration system has been severely broken by the Liberals. They are not taking into consideration the reality we live in Canada and that many things are broken that need to be fixed. Our eyes should be on that.

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to be back after our summer in our ridings. I know that all of us worked really hard seeing our constituents.

Throughout the summer, on top of meeting with constituents at the office and across the riding, I attended multiple fairs, festivals, parades and rodeos every weekend. It was just great to get out there and to see as many people as we did. I spent the last two weeks before coming back here meeting with municipal councils across our large riding of Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, and meeting with farmers. We talked about the challenges we have right now in the riding. I can tell my colleagues that a lot of things came up.

In coming back here, I am glad to see that one of our priorities as Conservatives will be to deal with the cost of living crisis that has been created by the Liberal government. We are going to deal with the jobless crisis that is particularly hitting youth, including in our riding, and deal with the crime crisis that continues to terrorize our communities right now because of the catch-and-release policy of both the previous Liberal government and the current government. It is the number one issue I am hearing about.

Of course, there are a lot of concerns about how immigration has been left to go without any strategy and plan to actually support Canada and our economy. As well, we need to plan ahead in how we deal with housing, education, health care and other social infrastructure we need in order to deal with the burdening cost of having a population that has boomed over the last 10 years because of unbridled immigration.

We are going to propose solutions for that as Conservatives. We are going to make sure that everybody can have a stronger paycheque so they can afford the higher costs. However, we want to look at how we can cut back on inflation and create more jobs.

We want to make sure our streets are safe. There is going to be a lot of legislation proposed by our Conservative Party that would make our communities and our streets safer and keep the criminals behind bars.

Government Orders

We are going to want to make sure that we secure our borders as well, by hitting the brakes on immigration and on anything that is suppressing local jobs and creating high youth unemployment, such as the temporary foreign worker program.

I am looking forward to when we table our Canadian sovereignty bill here in the House. It would open up Canada for business. It would create a pile of jobs, cut government taxes and improve the approval times of all major nation-building projects, not through creating bureaucracy but by cutting the red tape, regulations and bad legislation that came in under the Liberal government.

I am here to speak to Bill C-3. There is a reason why the government is doing this. There was a court decision that was made.

I was in the Harper government in 2009, when we had to deal with a crisis because of Canadians of convenience. We created the first-generation limit on citizenship to ensure that Canadians who claim citizenship have a direct connection to the country, and that they value that citizenship and plan to utilize it in a responsible manner. If somebody was born in Canada, went abroad and had a child, that child would still be a Canadian under the current legislation, under the first-generation limit, but the grandchildren would not be, without any direct connection. We are saying that Canadians have to have a direct tie, value Canadian citizenship and use it responsibly.

The Ontario Superior Court ruled it was unconstitutional and asked the government to put in place a way to fix it by June 2024. Here we are with a new deadline. It has been extended about four times by the government because it has not been able to get it done. The bill before us would have to pass by November 20, but there are things in the bill that we have to change.

There are things in the bill that we are very supportive of. We are supportive of the changes in the adoption section about children who are adopted from abroad. As soon as they are adopted, they would be considered to be Canadians, and their parents would be able to bring them home and start raising them.

● (1250)

I have heard heartbreaking stories in my riding over the years from constituents who have actually gone to adopt children from other countries. It took years to get them back into Canada because Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada put up roadblock after roadblock. This process would take away all the red tape and bureaucracy, allowing those children who are legally adopted abroad to come to Canada immediately with their parents and start their lives here. I applaud the government for doing this. It is something that Conservatives really support.

Also, I support the proposed section in Bill C-3 with regard to lost Canadians. The issue of lost Canadians has to be rectified. A lot of people who were born here from 1977 to 1981, over roughly 50 months, had Commonwealth citizenship but could no longer claim Canadian citizenship. That happened in my riding as well. Constituents have come to my office saying they do not have citizenship, they cannot get a passport, they cannot get access to health care and they do not have the ability to travel or vote. The inherent rights of citizenship have been taken away from individuals who have lived, worked and paid taxes here their entire lives. Yes, Con-

servatives support this proposed section of the bill and want to see it passed quickly. Twenty thousand Canadians potentially fall under the lost Canadians mandate.

The problem we are dealing with is trying to address the issue of Canadians of convenience, which we have witnessed going back to 2006 and which we tried to rectify in 2009. The courts claimed it was unconstitutional, and now the government is coming forward with a very weak substantive connection test for people who want to inherit Canadian citizenship. To claim Canadian citizenship, people have to stay in Canada for only 1,095 days, or roughly three years. If someone is born to those who have Canadian citizenship, that person can claim it; then their children will automatically get to claim citizenship as well, although they may have never lived in Canada. This creates a problem with multi-generational Canadians who have never lived in Canada and never, ever called it home.

I will give an example. About 20% of Canadians living abroad live in the United States. They move there because they want to pay lower taxes; they do not like the situation in Canada. It has been happening for generations. They move to the United States, they work in the United States and they take on U.S. citizenship, but they maintain their Canadian citizenship. If their children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren come back to Canada every year to holiday in my riding, along beautiful Lake Winnipeg or Lake Manitoba, because they have a cottage there, their children can stay there for three weeks of the year. Since this is not consecutive and can be spread out over time, at the age of 52, they can come back and claim citizenship. Then, if they have substantive health challenges going forward, they will get access to our health care system without ever paying a dime of tax or anything to Canada.

As well, once they hit age 65, they can move back to Canada without ever paying any taxes up to that point in time and start participating in GIS and OAS, our old age pension system. Twenty per cent of Canadians living abroad are in the United States, and this will also apply to them along with anyone else. This could potentially include tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of people who want to claim this right of citizenship, because of this erroneous proposed section in Bill C-3.

This would create two new major administrative burdens on the Government of Canada that it will have to deal with, including new proof of citizenship applications for issuing passports and a new process for the substantive connection test that has to happen. The Parliamentary Budget Officer says that in the first five years, it is going to cost at least \$21 million. We know it would also undermine the value of Canadian citizenship.

Government Orders

Conservatives believe in strong, fair and meaningful Canadian citizenship that we can all be proud of. We talk about a two-tier system. Those of us who are born here get to enjoy the benefits, and then there are those who claim Canadian citizenship by working here, living here, connecting here and raising their families here. Now we are going to make it easy for others to come who have no connection to this country in any way, shape or form. Let us stop the two-tier immigration system that Bill C-3 would start and support the amendments that the Conservatives are bringing forward.

• (1255)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like the member to listen to a hypothetical situation that is a possible reflection of reality. There are many Canadians, generations of Canadians, who move to another country, and after living in that country for 50 years, 60 years or maybe even much longer than that, come back to Canada.

Applying the same principle, would the member say to those individuals that they should not be entitled to OAS, GIS or Canadian health services? Would he apply that very same principle?

The bottom line, I believe, is that there are some concerns. Let us bring the bill to committee, as opposed to filibustering the legislation, and listen to what even Conservative voters are saying, which is that they want to see more co-operation among all parties in the House. Would the member not agree?

James Bezan: Madam Speaker, if this is a filibuster, why is the member for Winnipeg North up talking? He always gets up in debate. This is actually my first chance to talk on Bill C-3, and we just got back. Let us try to work across the aisle here and see if we can make some headway.

I want to read some quotes about Canadians living abroad.

Sergio Karas, who is principal of Karas Immigration Law Professional Corporation, stated:

...many Canadians born abroad live in low-tax countries and regard Canada as an insurance policy if trouble ensues, but have no intention to pay exorbitant Canadian taxes.... Introducing tens of thousands of new citizens without a robust integration plan is reckless. Our social infrastructure is buckling, and health care is under severe pressure. The lack of a clear strategy for accommodating this potential population surge only heightens concerns.

We have to address those concerns first, before we open up citizenship to everybody around the world.

• (1300)

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am listening to the Conservatives and wondering if I did the right thing in coming to Ottawa today. Will I make it home safe at the end of the week? Luckily, Bill C-3 has not passed yet.

I would like to ask my colleague how many potential terrorists are there among the Canadian women who married non-Canadians before 1947 or among the people born between February 15, 1977 and April 16, 1981 and who, at the age of 28, forgot to reapply for Canadian citizenship.

What is my colleague afraid of? What is this major loophole that is being created and that I cannot see that will apparently serve as a gateway for terrorists who were children born abroad, adopted by a now-deceased parent and excluded from obtaining their citizenship?

Those people already followed the process so Canada could ensure it was okay to let them in. Essentially the bill covers individuals whose past we already known and have vetted. Should I still be worried? I would like my colleague to answer that question.

[*English*]

James Bezan: Madam Speaker, I do not think we know what that number is at this point in time. However, we do know that with Bill C-3, people could qualify for Canadian citizenship without ever going through a criminal record background check or without anyone ever looking at whether they appear on anything such as a terrorist list. Under the legislation, they could be two or three generations removed from being a Canadian, and using their citizenship, they could claim the right to return, even if they were on a terrorist watch-list. That has to be changed, and I cannot support Bill C-3 in its present form.

Garnett Genus (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I wanted to comment on what the member for Winnipeg North said. I am looking at the clock, and it is one o'clock. Parliament has been sitting for two hours, and this is maybe the 20th or 21st day in 2025 that Parliament is sitting.

We are trying to have a serious conversation about an important immigration issue, and the parliamentary secretary, who is the only Liberal to have spoken at all today as far as I have seen, says that two hours of debate is too much and that he has had enough. If he has had enough, maybe he can go do something else and let others participate in the conversation.

In the meantime, I would say that this is literally our job: to discuss important issues before the House. If the parliamentary secretary does not want to do the job anymore, that is up to him, but we need to actually talk about major public issues facing the country. That is our job. It is the purpose of the people's House.

James Bezan: Madam Speaker, I agree completely with my colleague from Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan. Again, here we have the member for Winnipeg North, who has been here forever—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): We have to resume debate.

The hon. member for York Centre.

Government Orders

Roman Baber (York Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to debate this proposed legislation for the first time in the House of Commons. What makes this debate even more special to me is that it is about citizenship. Like many of us in this House, I am a citizen of Canada who did not acquire Canadian citizenship by virtue of birth; I gained it later in life, when I was almost 20.

Gaining Canadian citizenship is like winning the lottery, and even though I do not recognize our country after 10 years of the Liberals, I still believe that Canada is the best country in the world. Holding Canadian citizenship is a remarkable privilege that should not be afforded loosely to anyone who was not born in Canada.

The bill would confer Canadian citizenship on children of Canadian citizens who were not born in Canada. These are not children born to Canadian-born Canadians living abroad, which is already law, but children whose parents are Canadian but were not born in Canada, and their children and their children's children, in perpetuity, if they meet the substantial connection test. If a Canadian not born in Canada demonstrates that they were present in Canada for only three years in total, not consecutively, their non-Canadian children would also be eligible for Canadian citizenship. My fear is that Bill C-3 seeks to diminish and devalue the value of Canadian citizenship. It is an irresponsible position.

Last week, along with my family, I celebrated our 30th “Canada-versary”, 30 years of blissful existence in Canada. That is why I have a unique perspective on this piece of legislation, as it touches directly on one of the greatest things in the world, one of the most precious documents one could ever imagine: a Canadian passport reflecting Canadian citizenship. My story is not unique; it has been experienced by many Canadians and many members of the House. Is it the story of coming to Canada.

Thirty years ago, Canada was in need of chemical engineers. My father was a chemical engineer. We applied, passed a medical check and passed a criminal background check, and within a short time, we were invited to immigrate to Canada as landed immigrants. The system worked.

I remember the night we came to Canada. It was on September 5, 1995, in the middle of the night. We landed at Pearson airport in Toronto and drove to North York, to Sheppard and Bathurst, inside the heart of the riding I am now blessed to represent in this House. I looked out the window and I saw Earl Bales Park and the Don Lands, and on the other side of the park was Yonge Street, with beautiful lights and towers, in the great riding of Willowdale. I was in love from day one.

We did not have a cent to our name. I remember what true poverty was like. My dad initially sold ice cream off those yellow dixie bicycles. My mom was an unemployed teacher, but it did not matter because I always had a job and always had incredible joy. All we ever needed in order to succeed in Canada was to work hard and be nice to people. That was it. That was the Canadian promise, which my fellow Conservatives and our party leader seek to restore. Since then, I have had every blessing this country has to offer to study, work, succeed, practice law and start a small business, and eventually to be elected to this House to represent the very constituents who welcomed me as an immigrant.

I also remember the day we became Canadian citizens. It was on March 16, 2000. We went to a federal building at St. Clair and Yonge. I remember taking the oath of citizenship with my new fellow Canadians. It was a beautiful thing. It is very sad that the requirement to attend in person to take the oath has recently been diluted by the Liberals. It is shameful.

I remember the judge, who smiled at me. I remember her smiling at me as we were leaving the room after my oath. It was so important to me to speak about this bill because I do not want to see this value diminished.

• (1305)

Canadian citizenship gave rise to future generations of Canadians who helped build this country, who pay taxes and participate in civil society and national conversations, new Canadians who represent Canadians. Many of my friends in the House are new Canadians who represent Canadians in their respective constituencies.

This is why I and my colleagues oppose what Bill C-3 would accomplish, in essence, which is to devalue Canadian citizenship. We already had Justin Trudeau devalue the Canadian passport, eliminating images of Terry Fox in favour of a picture of himself, presumably at Harrington Lake. We would not expect that kind of behaviour from a leader of a democratic country.

Now, the current Prime Minister seeks to devalue our citizenship by offering it in perpetuity to children not born in Canada. The Liberals propose that all one would need to do is spend three years in Canada on and off, which could be a year, could be over a decade or could be dozens of summer vacations, and that would be enough to establish a substantial connection, to pass on our precious Canadian citizenship.

Someone could even have a criminal record and still be eligible for Canadian citizenship as long as one of their parents spent three years in Canada, on and off; this is with no residence, no property, no Canadian employment, no Canadian education, nothing.

I submit, respectfully, that to qualify for Canadian citizenship, one must establish roots in Canada, contribute to our society, get a job, go to school, buy property, at the very least, instead of a short-term stay on and off.

Also, we already have enough crime and chaos on our streets because of Liberal bail and sentencing policies. We rightfully insist that anyone with a criminal record should not be admitted to Canadian citizenship. Canadians and future generations of Canadians will thank us.

I am incredibly grateful for the opportunity to rise in the House to debate this very, very personal piece of legislation. I invite all of us to remember why we stood for office and why we got elected. We got elected for Canadians. We got elected to defend our country and to preserve its culture, its security, its safety, its well-being, its economic well-being.

What this legislation would do is undermine all of that. We look forward to reviewing it at committee, and we hope that our friends across the aisle will sincerely consider some serious amendments to beef up the substantial connection test. Future generations of Canadians will thank us.

• (1310)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for his speech. I am glad that he came to Canada and exercised his Canadian citizenship rights. However, I think it is very important that we avoid creating a bogeyman or criticizing something that is not true.

I am going to share a little story. I am hoping my colleague can give me some advice about one of my constituents, born to Canadian development workers in Africa. He was born outside Canada and wanted to work internationally, which he did in several countries. At one point, he moved to the United States and married an American woman. Now that his parents are ill, he has returned to Canada to take care of them. Unfortunately, the problem is that his children cannot obtain Canadian citizenship. However, his children are not a threat to the national security of Canadians; they are four and six years old.

I would like to know why the hon. member believes that this issue should not be resolved for people who want to contribute to Canadian society.

[*English*]

Roman Baber: Madam Speaker, we absolutely feel that there is room to look. For those who were born to parents outside of Canada, to parents who are Canadian citizens but who were not born in Canada, we should certainly look at ways to let them become Canadian. The disagreement on this side of the House is with the substantial connection test and with the *de minimis* requirements that Bill C-3 prescribes.

What I hear from my friend opposite is that the non-Canadian is now living in Canada, that his parents are living in Canada and that he is here, in fact, to help them, which is very commendable, but it sounds to me as if that particular resident has some roots in Canada, which is all we are asking for.

Devise a framework where non-Canadians can become Canadians not by virtue of doing the minimum and showing up for a couple of summer vacations but by living in Canada—

• (1315)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from York Centre for his heartfelt remarks and for sharing his story. I appreciated hearing him talk about how proud he felt during his immigration process, but I was surprised that he expressed concern about people from other countries coming to Canada on a path similar to his own.

As a lawmaker, I want to understand what the Conservatives are opposed to and, more importantly, how they want to close the loophole that could lead to so many problems. They have been talking about citizenship in perpetuity and the substantial connection test. I am trying to understand. What amendment will the Conservatives suggest to the committee to close this loophole?

We all know the Bloc Québécois will have the balance of power in committee, so we certainly need a good understanding of their amendment if we are to fix the bill they claim is so catastrophic.

[*English*]

Roman Baber: Madam Speaker, I reject the proposition that I, in any way, am not in favour of other non-Canadian residents obtaining Canadian citizenship. In fact, I specifically said that new Canadians contribute to our country, pay taxes, work, go to school, contribute to our culture and heritage and even get elected. I would like to preserve that privilege for future generations of Canadians instead of diluting the right to become Canadian, as the legislation seeks to do.

Conservatives would offer various options at committee. We would look at asking the government to amend the act to provide for additional years. We would ask the government to provide for some consecutive terms, something that would enable the establishment of roots in the country, instead of coming and going, as the Liberals propose.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola.

Before I begin, having been away for the summer, I want to welcome everybody back. It is always a pleasure and an honour to speak on the floor of the House of Commons, something that so few Canadians get to experience. I welcome everybody back. I welcome you, Madam Speaker, back to the chair.

I recently got some sad news. A childhood friend of mine, a friend I went to school with from, I believe, grade 3 or grade 4, Dennis Doyle, passed away tragically and unexpectedly. He leaves behind his father, Peter Doyle; his mother; his sister, Leanne; and his fiancée, Ashley Sumner. This was completely unexpected.

I went to high school with Dennis. He was such a character. Whenever he walked by, everybody would give a good-natured sound effect; if someone knows, they know. To Dennis' family, I am so sorry to hear of his loss. I am going to say it one time for Dennis, in commemoration of his life: bah.

Government Orders

I also wish to recognize the life of Marilyn VanDongen. Marilyn VanDongen was somebody who was so devoted to the community of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. She and her family were active participants in the Alzheimer's walk. She was afflicted with this horrible disease, a disease that ultimately took the life of my grandmother.

Marilyn leaves behind her husband, Casey, to whom I awarded a Queen's Platinum Jubilee Medal. She also leaves behind her daughter Diane; son Ken; another son, Neil; and daughter Sheila. Neil and I actually went to kindergarten together, so this is a family I have known for over 40 years. Their contributions cannot be understated. I see Neil and Sheila frequently in the community, and I want to recognize Marilyn's life. May perpetual light shine upon her.

We are talking about immigration today, and I often speak about this topic in the House of Commons. It actually came up in my first speech. It is something that is really close to my heart. People are probably tired of hearing about my family story, but I am going to say it again because I am able to say it again. When I talk about how proud I am to walk onto the floor of the House of Commons, I mean it. Every single day, I just take it in.

In fact, the night I was elected, September 20, 2021, my mother, who came to this country as an immigrant, asked, "What would your grandfather, my father, think if he saw this today?" This simply was not an option for him, to be in the House of Commons. My mom has told a story about how he had to borrow money for a chicken so he could have a chicken on Christmas Day. Those are my roots. That is where I come from.

My mother followed her father, who came when he did not have the money to bring the whole family. He came to Canada to work because he came from a very poor part of Italy. My mother followed him in 1957. My father came with his family in 1959. They met in Canada. My dad actually did not finish high school; he went to work. He went to work at a place called Balco, now named Tolko, a huge employer in British Columbia, and he worked there until he literally could not physically work there anymore. That was the Canada they came to.

My mom spent her time as a homemaker. She went back to school when I was 10 years old and became a legal assistant. On the one hand, we had a mill worker; on the other hand, we had a legal assistant. They had three children: my sister Rosie, my other sister Ellie and then me. My sisters both became teachers, which is a very noble career.

My parents lived that Canadian dream, and now I am living that. To me, that is what this place embodies. That is what Canada embodies.

• (1320)

What do we have to say about that? I owe everything I have to immigration. I would not be standing here were it not for immigration. My parents came to a very different Canada, and places change. When my dad came to Canada, if someone showed up, they got a job. If they worked hard, they kept that job. That was the promise of Canada. That was the Canadian dream.

My dad worked very hard. I know that because I spent a summer working at the sawmill where he worked, and after two shifts, I had never had more respect for my father, knowing the back-breaking labour that he did for over 30 years. There I was, 19 years old, thinking, "I do not know how my dad has done this." He sacrificed so much. In return, he gave back so much to Canada. I cannot tell members how many hours of volunteerism they gave or how proudly patriotic my family is.

This all comes back to immigration. I owe Canada. We, as a family, owe Canada a tremendous debt of gratitude, and it is against that backdrop that I speak about Bill C-3, a bill on immigration. Frankly, I have heard a number of falsehoods, things I vehemently disagree with from our friends on the Liberal side.

I just heard a question: "Why are we not prepared to welcome Canadians?" Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, I received a message from somebody the other day. I had worked with her on a few things. We had worked together on one thing in particular, and she said that she had just gotten her permanent residency. She went through it the right way. I wrote a note back, and I said that I could not wait to sign her citizenship certificate someday.

This idea that Conservatives are not welcoming, that there is a *carte blanche* "no" to immigration, could not be further from the truth. We are a welcoming party, an inclusive party, and if I look around, even in the House of Commons right now, I see people like me who are first-generation Canadians, who owe everything they have to immigration, or who themselves immigrated, like the member who spoke just before me.

Against that backdrop, we have to ask ourselves how we deal with this and how we deal with immigration law going forward. We have Bill C-3 before us. This bill would eliminate the first-generation limits and grant citizenship to those born abroad if one parent were to spend just 1,095 non-consecutive days in Canada, and there would be no criminal record checks.

I want to dive into that. I know I have spoken a lot about my background, but I think it is really important. I wish I had more time to speak to it. Maybe the member for Winnipeg North will pass a unanimous consent motion so that I could keep on talking.

The reality is that for those 1,095 non-consecutive days, or about three years, somebody could divide their time up. How much time are we talking about? How many of those 1,095 non-consecutive days are we looking at? Where are the checks and balances to determine whether the person has actually spent that much time?

What we are talking about is what the courts have called a “substantial connection”, and “substantial” is one of these legal words. I come from a legal background, as most people hear way too much about, but the reality is that “substantial” is one of these legal buzzwords. What does it actually mean? Can I have a substantial connection to a number of places? Do I have a substantial connection, for instance, to the place where my parents came from, where they landed when they first came to Canada, where they settled or other places? I question whether somebody can have a substantial connection to a number of places.

The reality is that Conservatives are completely open. We want to show an angle of compassion and an angle of just immigration and appropriate immigration. I am completely open to that. In fact, I welcome it. I want people to live and experience what I have lived and experienced. I cannot wait to welcome these people with an immigration system that is just, appropriate and reflects Canadian values.

• (1325)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we have been here all morning listening to Conservative after Conservative stand in their place to say that there are some just cases for which people would be able to have their citizenship if we were to pass this legislation. Members on all sides of the House recognize the value of it, so if the member says that the Conservative Party wants to show progressive forward movement, one of the things it could do is recognize that there have been hours of debate. Back in June, we were debating this legislation.

There is no reason whatsoever that we cannot continue this debate at committee and look at the amendments the Conservatives have. It is a minority government. That means all they have to do is convince a majority of MPs to be on side with them. The opposition has a majority membership on the standing committee.

My question for the member is this: If he is convinced of the amendments the Conservatives apparently have, why not allow it to go to committee?

Frank Caputo: Madam Speaker, what I appreciate about the member for Winnipeg North is not what he says, but how loud he says it.

I have watched here all morning and have seen countless Liberals, many women, standing behind him, who do not get to ask a question of the government or of us here, when all the while he stands and speaks. If this is going to be a discussion and the government is going to put its money where its mouth is, this is the reality. There is one member who speaks on behalf of the government. I take issue with the fact that he is asking all the questions on behalf of the government when there are countless individuals, some newly elected, who would love to participate in this debate, and they have to take a back seat to that one member.

• (1330)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I would remind the hon. member that that is not correct. There have been other members asking questions. Also, it is not the tone of the debate to remark on who asks the questions.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I find it interesting that this member should lecture us on the tone and volume of speech in the House. That said, it is evidently the tone and volume to be expected in the coming year.

In practical terms, I believe that one question remains, a question that was raised by the member for Winnipeg North: What will be studied in committee? I need to understand the loophole because I cannot imagine that the government would not conduct any background checks. If so, then we would definitely have to clarify the legislation to make these checks mandatory. That said, mounting a fearmongering campaign by saying that it will allow in people who are going to threaten our security is a dubious conflation.

I would like to hear what my colleague has to say about the amendments that the Conservatives are going to propose in committee.

[*English*]

Frank Caputo: Madam Speaker, I do not believe that we as Conservatives have spoken about propaganda and fear. In fact, I spoke about the Canadian dream and how amazing it is to be here speaking about this.

At the end of the day, we want an immigration system that is just, is appropriate and reflects that those who should be coming to Canada, those with an appropriate connection, would actually come here. The reality is, when it does come to consideration at committee, we should be looking at a number of different things. We should be looking at the substantial connection. How much time does that really mean? How many generations beyond the current generation are we looking at?

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Madam Speaker, how is it that the bill provides a system for people to obtain citizenship in a way that the government cannot even estimate how many people would be eligible over a set period of time? That is problem one.

Problem two is that the bill does not have any language requirements for people who are obtaining citizenship by descent, whereas we do for citizenship by naturalization. The third problem is that the bill has no criminal record check, and the fourth problem, as my colleagues have already talked about, is that the presence in Canada test is probably not adequate.

What is important to understand is that the Liberals, in their debate, are trying to move away from the fact they have broken Canada's immigration system. Can my colleague talk about how Conservatives have been putting forward common-sense proposals to fix the immigration system the Liberals have broken and restore order and fairness to a once great system that served our country well?

Frank Caputo: Madam Speaker, I believe it was Senator Martin who put forward a bill that would have rectified so many of these issues, yet the Liberals, as I understand it, voted against it.

Government Orders

When we are talking about who is on what side and how we are doing this, a Conservative senator put forward this bill and it was voted against, and that should be remembered.

Jamil Jivani (Bowmanville—Oshawa North, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise today to raise very serious concerns about Liberal legislation, Bill C-3. This legislation proposes to create a new system of unlimited chain migration into Canada at a time when Liberal immigration policies have already skewed population growth to the point where public services are under great strain. I believe this is not only bad policy, but also immoral policy.

The Liberals would like to make it easier for people who have never stepped foot in Canada to obtain Canadian citizenship. It is absurd. It is outrageous. The population growth the Liberals have already inflicted upon our country has put us in a vulnerable position on many fronts. The reality is that they want to hand Canadian citizenship out like candies at the counter.

By treating Canadian citizenship this way, the Liberals will further increase the number of people who are trying to access social programs, housing and health care. This is already a growing problem where we have more people than we have services available for the people who are here. The quality of life for Canadians is threatened to be further eroded by Bill C-3. It would make many of the problems in our country even worse.

I am particularly concerned about the implications this would have for our health care system, which is already in a state of degradation because of the surge in population growth across the country. We do not have enough hospitals. We do not have enough beds. We do not have enough doctors. We do not have enough nurses. The prospect of Liberals wanting to bring even more people into Canada is truly concerning to many.

I would like to share with the House a story to illustrate just how population growth is lowering the quality of life for Canadians across this country, and it is a personal story of my family dealing with the hospital system. On Monday of last week, my dear mother, who I love, went into the hospital for hip replacement surgery.

As has become the norm across Canada, she had to wait far too long for her surgery date. In fact, by the time my mother went in to have her surgery, the surgeon said the damage to her hip had reached the point of being a 10 out of 10. That means that my dear mother was dealing with a lot of pain for a long period of time while waiting for the chance to have a surgery that everybody in the health care system acknowledged she needed much more urgently than it was provided.

The state of our health care system becomes even more clear with the experience we had in the hospital itself. The morning of the surgery, everything went smoothly. I was with my mom. The surgeon was awesome. The nurses were awesome. They took great care of her. We are very thankful for the excellent work they did. We are also very grateful to be in a country where someone does not have to go into debt to see a doctor. It was a very good experience in the morning.

I was with my mom in the afternoon and in the evening. Around 10:00 p.m., I decided I was going to go home to get some sleep. I hit the 401. I was driving east on my way back home, and I got a

phone call from my mom, who was frantic and upset. My mother is a very calm, cool and collected lady. She does not get upset easily, but she was freaking out. She was freaking out because she awoke from her rest while recovering from surgery to the sounds of hospital staff moving a male patient into her room.

I appreciate that some people in the House might not see that as a big deal, but a lot of people across Canada would. When someone is recovering from a surgery in a hospital, they are in a physically vulnerable state and can barely move. The idea that hospital staff would move a dude into my mom's room in the middle of the night with no notice and no acknowledgement, and not even recognize that this was a bizarre and weird action to take to begin with, made my mom quite unhappy. The male patient who was moved into the room was also very uncomfortable with the situation. The only thing dividing them was a thin curtain pulled between the hospital beds.

Naturally, when my mom is upset, it is like the bat signal going up. I got off the highway, headed westward and got back to the hospital. I went to speak to the supervising nurse. After some persistence, and I think, Madam Speaker, you know me well enough to know what my persistence might look like, the staff did move my mom to a new hospital room with a female patient.

I asked the supervising nurse what the hospital policy was that allowed it to force a male patient and a female patient to share a room without their consent. The supervising nurse printed the policy off and handed it to me. I looked at it, and it was a policy that said that, due to overcrowding and under-resourced hospitals, the hospitals in Toronto had made the decision that they would have to give themselves that power.

● (1335)

I am not of the belief that this makes it a good choice for them. I do not like the policy, but in that moment, I could see very practically what population growth has done to our hospitals. I did some research, and I found that this has become a common practice in hospitals all across Canada. They give themselves the ability to pair male and female patients in the same room against their will because they do not have enough space.

A week later, after that whole ordeal, I came back to Ottawa, and what was the first thing on the legislative calendar? The Liberals want to make it easier to bring even more people into our country, increasing the demands on our health care system even further and continuing to demonstrate a quite objectively observable pattern of policy-making that indicates the Liberals would rather bring new people into this country than take care of the people who are already here.

My mom and seniors like her built this country, paying taxes for decades on the promise that they would be looked after when they needed it. However, we have a series of policy choices continuously being made by the Liberal government to make life harder for people like my mom. Forgive me, but I cannot get down with that. It is not right.

I appreciate that Liberal MPs may want to dismiss or deflect this. They might say this is a provincial issue, asking why we do not take it to the provincial government and claiming they have no responsibility. Well, my response to that would be this: Maybe that is a message they could deliver to the Prime Minister, as he is the one having fireplace chats with the Premier of Ontario. He is the one sipping Chardonnay by the fire with the man who is in charge of the government in this province. If the Liberals want to make health care funding an issue, by all means they should encourage the Prime Minister to do so. I am not able to. I do not get invited to the fireplace. I do not think the Speaker does either. Most Canadians do not get to go to the fireplace.

• (1340)

What do we have control over in this House? We have the ability to control what we vote for and what we stand for. We get to represent our constituents and say to them that we are going to take a stand for what is right and what is good for the people of this country. With Bill C-3, the Liberals cannot even tell us how many new people they would bring into the nation. They cannot give us an answer. They expect us to just rubber-stamp their legislation when the basic information required to know how it would affect our families, our communities and the people who send us here to Ottawa is not being provided by the Liberal government.

It is unacceptable. It is an unacceptable way to do business, and the reality is that the Liberals are going to continue this approach of valuing bringing more people in instead of taking care of the people who are already here. We will all lose. That is what will happen. We will all lose in that situation.

My request of every Liberal MP here and every Liberal MP who might hear my words is for them to please do their job, please take care of the people of this country, join the Conservatives in pointing out how reckless Liberal policies are in growing our population and join the Conservatives in pointing out that, at minimum, the Canadian people deserve to know how many new people will be entering this country.

My mother did not deserve what happened at the hospital. I do not think anybody's mother deserves it. That is a good enough reason to say this legislation is just not good enough.

• (1345)

Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague chose to spend his time talking about the health care system, and it is the hon. member's right to do so. He shared a story about his mother. I appreciate that, because I too have a story, with my mother recently being in the hospital for emergency surgery. My mother and I actually had a similar conversation about the state of our health care system, and I shared with her that I was very proud of the fact that I voted in favour of providing even more money for transfers to the provinces, record funding of \$200 billion, which we know is going to have a very positive impact on the health care system. I am wondering if my hon. colleague can say the same.

Jamil Jivani: Madam Speaker, with every dollar the Liberals claim to be spending, they are bringing more people here. There is a pretty basic way of understanding how the math works: When money is added to a system, demand is also added to that system, and then we expect to get better results. It is illogical, immoral and

Government Orders

dishonest to pretend the Liberals' immigration policies are not adding to the burden of our health care system and making it harder for Canadians to get the health care they deserve.

[*Translation*]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, I think there are some very good things in this bill that will correct some injustices. I am sure other changes need to be made too. The Citizenship Act as a whole is very confusing.

Does my colleague agree that the Citizenship Act is in need of a complete overhaul?

[*English*]

Jamil Jivani: Madam Speaker, I do not understand why the first question everybody is not asking is "How many people?" This is the primary point I am trying to make here today. We do not have basic information on the number of people. We can make this more complicated and dress it up in political language if Liberals would like, but all I want to know is how many people they are planning to bring into our country, so that when we go back to our constituents, we can at least say that we made an informed decision.

I would encourage my hon. colleague from the Bloc to ask that very same question and make it the number one priority in this conversation. How many people are coming here, and how many hospital beds, jobs and houses will not go to Canadians because of this legislation?

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to ask a follow-up question on something my colleague said about the spending of health care dollars and the number of people coming into the country.

I am looking at an article from December 12, 2024, that says, "Canadians faced longest ever health-care wait times in 2024, study finds". We had one colleague get up and say that we are spending all this money on health care, but at the same time, we have a vertical hockey stick increase in the number of people who are coming into the country. The government cannot even say how many people it will allow into the country through this bill.

The government is trying to claim it is spending enough money on health care while exponentially juicing the immigration numbers. It is not an immigrant's fault for wanting to come to Canada. It is the Liberal government's fault for burdening our already broken health care system with numbers of people that our country cannot support. Does the member agree?

Jamil Jivani: Madam Speaker, absolutely, I agree.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as I said earlier in my speech, debate on a subject as serious as access to citizenship merits accuracy and discipline on our part. When I said that, I was referring to this type of speech. I think we should avoid exaggeration, oversimplification and provocative slogans designed to rile up social media. We should take our responsibilities as legislators seriously and focus on studying Bill C-3, which is about access to citizenship.

Here is my question for my colleague. What so-called amendments would his party make to Bill C-3?

[English]

Jamil Jivani: Madam Speaker, we have yet another example of a member of Parliament saying that he is concerned about information and studying the legislation and that he really wants to make an informed decision and elevate the discourse. However, when I ask basic questions like how many people would be brought into our country, that is crossing a line somehow.

This is basic stuff. People deserve to know, with the scarce resources our country has, how many people the Liberal government is going to bring in to further divide what is a finite pie of resources and opportunity. This is a basic element of managing a country, an economy and a health care system. The Liberals want to make it more complicated than that, but it is very simple.

Jagsharan Singh Mahal (Edmonton Southeast, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to once again stand in the House and speak on the first day back in session.

First, to all my colleagues, I want to say welcome back. After a summer spent in our constituencies, I am certain we are all excited to be back doing the work Canadians elected us to do. As a new MP elected just under five months ago, I can say that it has been a busy summer in Edmonton Southeast talking with people, studying their issues and building a new office that will faithfully serve them. I want to thank the people of Edmonton Southeast again for putting their trust in me to be their champion in Ottawa.

The people of Edmonton Southeast are upset. They are upset with rising crime. They are upset with the chaos in the immigration system. They are upset with the cost of living crisis. They are upset with the old Liberals, who did nothing under Justin Trudeau and have done nothing under the current Liberal Prime Minister. To Edmonton Southeast, I am here and I am listening. I am eager to bring their voices to the House and to fight for them.

Bill C-3 is just another Liberal upset. This amendment to the Citizenship Act would do little but cheapen what Canadian citizenship is. Right now, Canadians living abroad pass Canadian citizenship on to their children. However, if the family continues to live outside of Canada, it would not pass on to the next generation. There is a one-generation limit. There are reasons that a one-generation limit exists. Introduced by Stephen Harper in 2009, it was a reasonable and necessary measure to stop Canadians of convenience.

This Liberal bill would throw that out. All that would be required of a foreign-born Canadian is to spend three non-consecutive years of their life in Canada, and they can pass on citizenship to their children. This would create a repeating cycle. Generation after gen-

eration of foreign-born people could maintain Canadian citizenship without ever living in Canada. People who have never been in Canada would get citizenship because their parents spent a few months in Canada and their parents spent a few months in Canada, and so on. It is chain migration.

This would not be a small number of people either. We are talking about 100,000 new people who would become eligible to get Canadian citizenship if this law passes, with no background check, no security check and no need to contribute to Canada. This would be on top of an already backlogged immigration system that cannot even keep up with the number of people applying for citizenship who are living in and contributing to Canada.

I am an immigrant, like many in this House. Like many across the country, I worked to become a Canadian. I contributed to Canadian society. I built my career. I am raising my family here. I am representing my neighbours and community here in our sacred democratic institution. I, like many Canadians, chose to invest myself here and become part of this great country because I believed in it. Canadian citizenship comes with value, responsibility and something we Canadians truly love and believe in.

Being Canadian is something many people seek. There are many people who have invested their lives, built businesses and raised families in this country. So many of these people are still waiting for citizenship. There are many good people taking the right steps out of love for this country.

It is a long process and has many hurdles. One has to prove their commitment to this country. It has always been a privilege to be earned by birth or by contributing to and living in this country. It has never been up for grabs so easily with so little effort in Canadian history. If Bill C-3 passes as is, we will have two tiers of foreign-born Canadian citizens. We will have those like me, who worked hard to proudly call themselves Canadians, and we will have those who were raised abroad and have a grandparent or great-grandparent born in Canada.

Neither of these groups was born in Canada, but only one would need to believe in Canada to get citizenship. Only one would need to prove themselves to get citizenship. Only one would truly need to contribute to get citizenship. Do not mistake me for believing that foreign-born relatives do not deserve Canadian citizenship. There are Canadian families that live much of their lives abroad and that have children abroad, but we need to have reasonable measures in place.

Government Orders

● (1350)

This legislation would come with major risks to the immigration department, the IRCC, as well. When the bill was proposed in the last Parliament session as Bill C-71, it was estimated that over 100,000 people would get Canadian citizenship.

At the moment, IRCC is completely dysfunctional. There is a massive backlog that has pushed back the decision-making ability of IRCC way past the acceptable timelines. In the few months since I was elected, over 400 constituents have come to me with their concerns over delays with IRCC applications. Papers are misfiled. Officials do not respond. On average, it takes 18 months to two years for people who are living in Canada, who are investing in Canada and who are building in Canada to get their citizenship complete.

The status quo is not okay. People's life plans, their futures and their families are being messed up because IRCC cannot process their applications in a timely manner. If over 100,000 citizenship requests were added to the system tomorrow, what would happen to the system?

I wonder if the minister would consider the practical organizational effects of the legislation. It would be a nightmare for the department. A great Canadian, Dr. Jordan Peterson, once wrote that if a person wants to change the world, they should start by making their bed. If the immigration minister wants to change immigration in this country so badly, perhaps she should start making her bed by fixing the absolute embarrassment of the immigration department, IRCC, and its backlog.

There are good things in the bill, and Conservatives will support those things. However, Conservatives want the bill to be amended. There is room for compromise, but what is clear is that the requirement of three years, or 1,095 nonconsecutive days, spent in Canada in order to pass on citizenship to the next generation is unacceptable. There must be stronger ties, such as at least five years of time; then we would know that the people have invested in Canada. They have children who have ties with Canada, and it would not be just because of a technicality for convenience that they would pass their citizenship on.

The hon. Minister of Immigration said on the record that the Liberals are open to amendments. I hope she keeps her word. The bill could be properly studied in the immigration committee, and real safeguards could be put in place so that Canadian citizenship is not weakened and abused. Then those who were born here, or those millions of other Canadians who worked as hard as I did to become Canadian citizens, can feel that their citizenship is worth something.

In closing, I want to see the bill fixed. I want to see this go to the immigration committee. Conservatives want proper safeguards in place. We want stronger requirements for passing down citizenship. It is clear that Conservatives are the ones standing up for strong and fair Canadian citizenship. My hope is that the eyes of my colleagues across the aisle will be opened to the need to protect Canadian citizenship and to amend the bill.

● (1355)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the 1,095 days that we often hear about from the Conservative benches is not just a number pulled out of the House. Today, it takes 1,095 days in order to be able to qualify for citizenship when people who are permanent residents apply. That applies to a lot of people today in Canada.

What I consistently hear from the Conservatives is that they have amendments, but when asked to share them, the amendments magically disappear. Conservative voters want to see more co-operation on the floor of the House of Commons. A lot of the debate that we have seen in the last three hours could have been taking place in the committee stage, when we could actually do what, in part, the Conservatives want. That is to provide citizenship for some individuals who should have citizenship today.

Does the member not agree that we should be listening to Canadians, being more co-operative and at least allowing legislation to get to the committee stage without having to use time allocation?

Jagsharan Singh Mahal: Madam Speaker, as I said in my initial speech, Conservatives need the bill to be amended. Strong changes need to be made. A mere three years, or 1,095 non-consecutive days, is not enough to claim citizenship down the road after a third or fourth generation. It is not enough. There needs to be a more genuine connection with the country. Citizenship is not easy; it is not up for grabs. People should have to prove their intent and their genuine ties to the country in order to have citizenship, and Conservatives are in agreement with that.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, to my hon. colleague from Winnipeg North, Conservatives are listening to Canadians. Canadians have concerns. We are already facing hospital closures in our province of British Columbia. There are not enough doctors. There are not enough nurses to be able to fulfill the duties and the services that we need right now. The Liberals cannot tell us how many people they are going to bring into our country.

To our hon. colleague from Edmonton Southeast, how is that compassionate? When we bring new entrants into our country, we want to be compassionate. There is no compassion in showing that the Liberals cannot tell—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I will give the hon. member for Edmonton Southeast 30 seconds for a brief answer.

Jagsharan Singh Mahal: Madam Speaker, as I said, Conservatives will propose for the bill to go to committee for proper review, for proper safeguards to be put in place so that Canadian citizenship is not misused, so that it is not abused and so that it is equally valued by the hard-working non-Canadian-born Canadians like me and like millions of others, so they also feel appreciated. There should be no two-tier tests for immigration.

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

● (1400)

*[English]***WILDFIRES IN COURTENAY—ALBERNI**

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary courage and resilience shown in my riding during the devastating Wesley Ridge and Mount Underwood wildfires that struck our communities this summer.

At the heart of the response were career and volunteer firefighters, men and women who put their lives on the line, working around the clock with bravery and determination on the front lines. Their skill and sacrifice protected homes, livelihoods and lives in dangerous and unpredictable conditions.

I also want to thank first nations, local governments and the many neighbours, volunteers, church groups, service clubs and local businesses who rallied to support families, opening their doors, caring for animals and ensuring no one was left behind.

These fires reminded us that in the face of danger, we are strongest when we stand together. I ask all members to join me in expressing our deepest gratitude to the firefighters and to every person whose courage and compassion has carried us through these increasingly frequent and devastating wildfires.

* * *

*[Translation]***INTERNATIONAL DAY OF DEMOCRACY**

Eric St-Pierre (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hope you and all of my colleagues had a good summer. I want to welcome everyone back to the House.

[English]

I rise today to recognize International Day of Democracy. Democracies around the world are facing strong headwinds. Misinformation, disinformation, foreign interference, growing polarization, political violence, declining trust in institutions, hyperpartisanship and the increased inequalities are rising significantly.

On this International Day of Democracy, I urge us all to remember why Canada is the best nation. I urge that we strengthen our democratic institutions through honest dialogue, participation, transparency and trust.

Together, to ensure a peaceful and inclusive future for generations to come, we should all work to build a stronger democracy.

* * *

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise in this place on the first day of the fall session to resume the important work we should have been doing over the summer.

At a time when Canadians were promised a government that was here to meet the moment and to accomplish things at speeds not seen in decades, the Liberals went on vacation, posed for photo ops

and signed empty agreements. This is more of the same, with the same Liberal ministers and the same Liberal MPs delivering the same old results.

I spent the majority of the past nine months in the riding hearing from constituents, and they want to see the tired government held to account for its inaction and empty promises. Canadians want a government that meets their issues with the same urgency they themselves feel.

Conservatives are ready to do the work and continue to hold the Liberals to account to deliver more than just empty promises, with real results for Canadians.

* * *

MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, September 16, is Mexican Independence Day, and I rise to recognize this momentous occasion. For over 80 years, Canada and Mexico have built a strong partnership rooted in shared values and mutual respect. We collaborate across countless fronts, from cultural exchanges to substantial investments that strengthen both of our economies.

The current challenge of U.S. tariffs presents an unprecedented opportunity for Canada and Mexico to deepen our relationship. As our Prime Minister emphasized in his discussions with President Sheinbaum, our governments are committed to strengthening trade ties and exploring new economic co-operation.

The Mexican Canadian community has nearly doubled over the past decade, bringing tremendous energy and expertise to our economy. These hard-working individuals contribute immeasurably to Canada's success, enriching our communities through their entrepreneurship, innovation and cultural vibrancy.

I look forward to an even brighter future of collaboration, prosperity and friendship between Mexico and Canada. *Viva México. Viva Canadá.*

* * *

● (1405)

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, right now, Foothills farmers are in the middle of what looks to be a bumper canola crop. However, instead of celebrating what looks to be one of the best harvests they have had in years, they are being crushed by canola tariffs of 75% or more from Communist China, blocking them from their second-largest market.

The Prime Minister said he was a master negotiator who would be there when Canadians needed him most. Instead of results, Beijing has added more tariffs and higher ones on canola farmers. Now our pea, canola, pork, seafood and beef producers are all being blocked from a critical market.

The Liberals' response to this is higher loans for farmers, but canola growers are adamant that they cannot borrow themselves out of this crisis. Canada's Conservatives are committed to finding real solutions to this crisis, but Canadian farm families know they have a real champion in Canada's Conservatives, led by the hon. member for Battle River—Crowfoot.

* * *

[Translation]

RENÉ HOMIER-ROY

Madeleine Chenette (Thérèse-De Blainville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great emotion that I rise today to pay tribute to René Homier-Roy, a cultural icon in Quebec, who has passed away at the age of 85.

For over six decades, he shaped our collective imagination. René Homier-Roy talked about our culture, our literature, our films, our theatre and our artists on the radio, on television, and in his columns with a rare intellect, insatiable curiosity and great respect. His unique voice, which was both strong and warm, was part of the daily lives of generations of Quebecers. On a more personal note, he taught me about our Quebec and Canadian culture and opened my mind to international talent. We have lost much more than a journalist or radio or television host. We have lost a voice that brought our culture to life and gave it the full recognition and dignity it deserves.

I want to express my sincere condolences to his family and friends, as well as to his colleagues at Radio-Canada and in the cultural community. Quebec and Canada are mourning the loss of a man who gave us so much. His legacy will live on—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière.

* * *

DAVID BERTHOLD

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a message for David's friends.

David was our first child, mine and Caro's first child. He had a heart as big as the sky, and we were so proud of him. As a big brother, he was protective toward his two sisters, Marie-Soleil and Justine. He was a boy who never held back from saying "I love you" to his parents.

David was also a young man who tried marijuana one day with his friends. He was the type of young person who wanted to try everything himself. After experiencing his first heartbreak, David found comfort among his friends. Experimentation evolved into addiction. One day he went too far and wound up in front of a judge, but he promised he would never do drugs again. He turned his life around, found love again and became a dad to Clovis and Éloi. David saw himself as a strong guy. He had no need of therapy.

Statements by Members

However, life threw him one curveball and then another, and David's old demons resurfaced because he had kept in touch with his friends.

My wife, Caro, wrote this on Facebook on September 10:

Seven months ago today, my son took his own life...Because he wouldn't ask for help...he wouldn't take the hand that was being held out to him...

Today, September 10, is Suicide Prevention Day.

Please...ask for help or...accept the help that people who love you offer you...

I urge all of David's friends not to do what he did. Help is always available.

We love you, David.

The Speaker: My deepest condolences go out to the member.

* * *

[English]

MISSISSAUGA—ERIN MILLS

Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was a busy summer in Mississauga—Erin Mills. I met with constituents across my riding, listening to their concerns and their hopes for the future of Canada.

I hosted my annual community barbecue, where thousands of neighbours and their families came together to enjoy a meal and connect with our community. I facilitated round tables for constructive solution finding and joined my community in their events and their celebrations. What I heard most clearly was a growing concern about crime. Families want safe streets, parents want peace of mind for their children, and seniors want security in their homes and online.

These concerns cannot be ignored. We must be ready to meet the moment. Our priority must be to reduce crime, support families and ensure that Canadians feel secure where they live.

I will continue to work with colleagues in the House to deliver real solutions.

* * *

● (1410)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Amarjeet Gill (Brampton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised to fix the broken bail system, but he left for summer vacation without delivering, and he returns to Parliament still empty-handed.

Let me share with members how bad the crime waves are in Brampton and across Canada: Violent crime is up 55%, gun crime is up 130%, hate crimes are up 258%, extortion is up 350%, and overdoses are tearing through our neighbourhoods. In Brampton, a home invasion resulted in the death of a young Canadian. This is becoming the norm in Canada.

Canadians deserve a justice system that protects Canadians. It is time to put victims ahead of criminals. Let us put repeat violent offenders in jail and not give them bail. Canadians expect safer streets and neighbourhoods, not more Liberal delays and excuses. It is time for action, and it is time for change.

Statements by Members

I urge the Prime Minister to put political games aside and protect Canadians from these everyday crimes.

* * *

[Translation]

GUY ROCHER

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the choice of topic for my first intervention this fall was clear. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude, affection, recognition and admiration for the timeless Guy Rocher, a man, a sociologist, a nation builder and an educator, at once so kind and so clear, who left us on September 3 at the age of 101.

Guy Rocher was the founder of Quebec's education system, the father of secularism in Quebec, the author of our Charter of the French Language, and a pioneer of our sociological tradition. He was a quiet revolutionary who laid the groundwork for everything we are as a people and for our distinct, legitimate and generous national identity.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I would like to express my deepest condolences to Guy Rocher's loved ones. If not for his leadership, I doubt the noble pursuit of making Quebec a country in its own right would ever have come to be.

I am grateful to Mr. Rocher. He is no mere centenarian; history will render him eternal.

* * *

[English]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians still pay the price for the lost, anti-development Liberal decade. Six months ago, to get elected, the Prime Minister promised to put shovels in the ground on big projects at unimaginable speeds, but what Canadians got was the same old Liberal bait and switch, photo ops and more bureaucracy, because the PM is just another Liberal.

The Liberals say five projects have made their secret list so far, some already approved and some already being built, but there is not a single pipeline to create Canadian jobs with Canadian steel and pay for programs that all Canadians want.

Conservatives worked to improve and pass Bill C-5, but it is not enough to get back the \$60 billion that left Canada due to Liberal red tape. Bill C-5 admits that the Liberals' own laws blocked building. They must scrap the "no new pipelines, never build anything anywhere" Bill C-69; the shipping ban, Bill C-48; Canadian energy censorship; the Liberal oil and gas cap; and the federal industrial carbon tax so Canada can compete.

Conservatives want to unleash natural resources to make a strong, united Canada self-reliant, affordable—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Saint-Laurent.

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF PEACE

Emmanuella Lambropoulos (Saint-Laurent, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, I had an opportunity to participate in the Peace Road in Beaudet Park in my riding. It is an event organized by the Universal Peace Federation as well as other organizations in Saint-Laurent to celebrate the International Day of Peace. This event reminds us that peace starts here, at home.

[English]

International Day of Peace, celebrated on September 21 each year, also reminds us of the millions affected by conflicts and wars worldwide and that we cannot let values like empathy, compassion and co-operation falter at home or abroad. These are the values that make us Canadian. They are the reason we chose Canada to be our home.

[Translation]

In a context where incidents of hate and violence seem to be growing in Canada, we have a duty to build inclusive communities where we all feel respected and safe. This is how we can build Canada strong.

[English]

Let us reaffirm our shared responsibility as Canadians and as global citizens, to uphold peace every single day.

* * *

• (1415)

LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we all want Canada to succeed, and that is why we will hold the Prime Minister accountable for his promises, compared to the results. Do his words match his deeds?

He promised the fastest-growing economy in the G7, yet we have seen shrinking growth, high unemployment, rising food prices and worsening debt. He promised that he would double homebuilding, but it has fallen, and he is adding more bureaucracy that has not built a single home.

He promised that after 10 years of Liberals driving up costs, crime and chaos, he would be different. Sadly, whether it is unemployment, the cost of living, homebuilding, tariffs, crime or immigration, it has gotten worse. It is more broken Liberal promises from another Liberal prime minister.

Conservatives are here to help. We will oppose the things that are not good for Canadians, support the things that are and propose solutions to the problems that Liberals have created.

ADAM'S RIDE TO RECOVERY

Hon. Helena Jaczek (Markham—Stouffville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to tell the House about a remarkable constituent of mine from Markham—Stouffville. In 2023, Adam Shah was just nine years old when he came up with the idea of organizing “Adam's ride to recovery”, a charity event to raise money for Markham Stouffville Hospital. He encouraged his family members and his friends at Wendat Village Public School to take part.

Now, Adam is 11 and the “ride to recovery” has become an annual event. I was happy to be there this summer to see 150 participants on bikes and on foot. The ride is supported by the phenomenal people at the Markham Stouffville Hospital Foundation. Each year, the ride has raised more money than the year before, now totalling \$3,185. Adam has shown an incredible example of leadership and commitment to community service at such a young age.

I congratulate Adam and the “ride to recovery” team. Keep up the amazing work.

* * *

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, freedom of speech is the cornerstone of a free society. It means we will hear ideas that we disagree with and express views that may be offensive.

This freedom can make us uncomfortable or even hurt, but silencing voices, whether for a moment or forever, is never the answer. We must protect a society where people can hold beliefs and share opinions without fear of losing their jobs, being censored or worse.

Charlie Kirk was an outspoken advocate for faith, family and freedom. Many disagreed with him; some were offended. Tragically, on September 10 he was assassinated in an attempt to silence his voice.

When has political violence ever been the solution? It destroys dialogue, it undermines democracy, and it breeds fear instead of understanding. True progress comes from persuasion, not intimidation. As we grapple with our personal response to this, may we be honourable in our actions, may we fiercely defend the right of our opponents to speak freely, and may we join our hearts with Charlie's family, his wife Erika and his two young children. May he rest in peace.

* * *

KEN DRYDEN

Hon. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Ken Dryden, whose passing is a profound loss for Canada.

I had the privilege of working with Ken and witnessed first-hand his thoughtfulness, intellect and dedication. He was deeply committed to improving sport culture and advancing efforts to better protect athletes from concussions.

Oral Questions

While many will remember him as a Hall of Fame goaltender and six-time Stanley Cup champion with the Montreal Canadiens, he was so much more. He was a scholar, an author, a parliamentarian and a leader whose influence extended far beyond the ice. Ken's life left an indelible mark both in sport and in public life. His vision, generosity and commitment to excellence continue to inspire Canadians across generations.

On behalf of this House, I extend my deepest condolences to his family, his loved ones and all those whose lives he touched. May he rest in peace.

* * *

● (1420)

[*Translation*]

RENÉ HOMIER-ROY

Marie-Gabrielle Ménard (Hochelaga—Rosemont-Est, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the country lost more than a voice. René Homier-Roy, a broadcaster, cultural critic and, as he liked to say, professional spectator, has died at age 85. He had just hung up his microphone and retired.

René, today, I am listening to my gut, as you taught me to do. I will not talk about you, René. Instead, I will talk directly to you.

René, my dear mentor, I spent 10 years by your side and 43 years listening to you, appreciating your quick wit, your uniqueness and the depth of your knowledge and experience.

René, you had the strength to resist complacency. You never believed in objectivity. You took the path of honesty.

René, you are a great communicator. The capacity to listen is a talent that you certainly had, coupled with your curiosity.

René, I hope that wherever you are, it is very entertaining.

Farewell, René.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my mother taught me never to be late, so please forgive me for my late arrival to the session.

I had some meetings with extremely important people in east central Alberta, after which I was honoured to be elected by the great people of Battle River—Crowfoot. I thank the great Damien Kurek, who made it possible, and I thank the Prime Minister for calling a prompt by-election. I wonder if one day he might regret that decision.

Oral Questions

In the spirit of good faith, I wonder if the Prime Minister agrees that our goal should be a Canada where hard work is rewarded, where food and homes are affordable, where streets are safe, where borders are solid and where we are all united under a proud flag.

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all parliamentarians in welcoming the member for Battle River—Crowfoot back to the House of Commons. He may notice a few things have changed since he was here last: the largest women's caucus in Canadian history and a spirit of collaboration that was shown in the opening session, including in the passage of the Building Canada Act.

[*Translation*]

The House also passed the Bloc Québécois's Bill C-202 to protect supply management.

I absolutely agree with the Leader of the Opposition's feelings and objectives for our great country.

[*English*]

The Speaker: I was deliberately flexible on time because it is a special day, but now we are going to respect the 35-second limit.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, some things never change.

[*Translation*]

I would like to thank my constituents in Battle River—Crowfoot, Mr. Kurek and the Prime Minister for holding a by-election so quickly. I wonder whether he will regret that decision sometimes, but I think we can all agree with the goal of once again making Canada a place where hard work is rewarded, where food and homes are affordable, where streets are safe, where borders are solid and where we are all united under a proud flag.

Does the Prime Minister agree with that?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with the Leader of the Opposition's feelings and objectives for our great country.

* * *

• (1425)

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister mentioned how much had changed, and it is true. I look around this place, and when I left, there was a Liberal prime minister who was making excuses about breaking promises and was running massive deficits, and costs, crime and chaos were all out of control, whereas today we have a Liberal Prime Minister breaking promises, making excuses and running massive deficits, with costs, crime and chaos out of control.

When will the Prime Minister match the grand promises with the real change Canadians need?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Leader of the Opposition was busy. He missed

the largest tax cut for 22 million Canadians. He missed the cut on the GST for new homes. He missed our eliminating all federal barriers to trade. I hope I will have another opportunity to finish a very long list of what the Leader of the Opposition missed.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in a non-partisan spirit, we will simply insist the Prime Minister keep his promises.

He promised the fastest-growing economy in the G7, but now, ours is the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7. He promised food would cost less, but it costs more and food inflation is getting worse even faster. He promised a budget in October, more than halfway through the fiscal year. Now, it will be in November, with double the deficit.

When will the Prime Minister—

[*English*]

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has been absolutely focused on improving affordability for Canadians. That is why there was the largest tax cut for 22 million Canadians, every taxpayer in this country. That is why we made the cut to the GST. That is why we launched "build Canada homes", which will reduce the cost of homebuilding in this country. That is why we backed the CRTC to get broadband costs down for Canadians.

We are building the strongest economy throughout the worst crisis in our history.

* * *

FINANCE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of non-partisanship, we are simply going to hold the Prime Minister to his own promises. He promised that he would spend less. He is already spending 8% more. He promised the budget would be in October. Now he says it will be in November, more than halfway through the fiscal year. He promised that his government would have a smaller deficit than Justin Trudeau's. Instead, now we hear that it might even be double.

I have a trivia question: Can the Prime Minister tell us whether there ever been a prime minister who has successfully doubled the deficit without even introducing a budget?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is undertaking the biggest investment in protecting Canadians in the Canadian military, doubling our investment in the Canadian military from last year, when the member last sat in the House, by the end of this decade.

There is more.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a lot more debt is what there is. There is a lot more debt than we ever imagined would be possible. The Prime Minister said we would have the fastest-growing economy in the G7; we have the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7. He said grocery prices would go down; they are going up faster than ever before. He promised to create jobs; he has the second-highest unemployment in the G7. He is really reminding us all of that sign at the bar, “free beer tomorrow”. When someone goes back the next day, the beer is still not free, and tomorrow never comes.

Why is it that all of the Prime Minister's promises of yesterday turn into today's disappointments?

• (1430)

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think if we are going to build the strongest economy in the G7, and we will, we need to be clear about the scale of the crisis we are in. We need to be clear about the scale of investment that we need. There was \$60 billion in new projects announced last week, \$200 billion in investment announced last week and \$100 billion in housing investment announced just yesterday. That is the scale of what we need.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA-U.S. RELATIONS

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was elected based on claims that he would be hands-down the best person to handle the tariff crisis and the trade crisis. Four months later, Canada is failing miserably. The best we can say is that it has not been a success and that the results are falling short of expectations.

Will he commit today to making it a real priority to end the tariffs and sign a trade treaty with the United States?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the current situation is as follows. We have the best agreement in the world with the U.S. Right now, more than 85% of exports to the United States are tariff-free. That is huge. We have the lowest tariffs in the world right now. I call that a success.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I flat-out reject those statements, as they do not stand up to economic analysis. Other forums will be necessary, considering the format.

The Prime Minister said that the once close and trusting relationship we had with the United States is over. That statement was not well received in Washington.

Can he say whether he is now confident that the once special and trusting relationship between Canada and the U.S. administration will soon be restored? It is a necessary step toward restoring the trade relationship.

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada-U.S. relations are good. Yes, we have difficulties, we have challenges, and we have differences of opinion.

Oral Questions

I am proud of this government.

[English]

The government stands up for Canada.

[Translation]

That is true.

I speak with the President on a regular basis, including last weekend, about the current situation in Ukraine, Russia, and China.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's rare appearances or absences in Washington have been widely noted in Washington, both by the political apparatus of the administration and by economic associations which often share our views.

When did the Prime Minister last travel there and when does he intend to start spending some serious time in the capital of our primary trading partner? Will he make it a priority instead of fantasies about infrastructure that will not see the light of day before the end of Mr. Trump's term?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is a modern man: He has a cell phone. I speak to him on a regular basis and we exchange texts.

The most important thing right now for Canada is to diversify our trade relations abroad, with Europe, Asia, Africa and South America.

* * *

[English]

THE ECONOMY

John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is the same Liberal promises and the same Liberal results. Canadians are paying the price for another Liberal Prime Minister's broken promises. The Prime Minister said that Canadians are going to be judged by prices at the grocery store. The results are in: The Prime Minister has failed. Food prices have surged 40% since the last Liberal prime minister broke that same promise the last time.

Should the Prime Minister's promise to Canadians be judged not by food prices at the grocery store but by the number of families being forced to food banks?

Oral Questions

• (1435)

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the number one cost for Canadians is their housing, and the Liberals have taken action to make housing more affordable. Yesterday, the Prime Minister and I announced the launch of “build Canada homes”, which will be a one-stop shop for making housing more affordable across Canada. We are launching that on six pieces of Canada Lands Company land. That is 4,000 homes that we will start building immediately.

John Barlow (Footfalls, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians cannot afford to put food on the table, let alone pay for the Liberals' bureaucracy when it comes to housing.

Let us be clear: This was the Prime Minister's promise. These were the Prime Minister's words. This is the Prime Minister's failure. Food prices are going to go up \$700 per Canadian family this year. Canned soup is up 26%. Apples are up 14%. Tuna is up 19%. The daily essentials have become unaffordable.

Is sticker shock at the grocery store the experience that the Prime Minister promised Canadians?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as far as promises delivered goes, the government promised to launch “build Canada homes” and make the largest investment in affordable housing in Canadian history.

We are taking action where it matters most, and Canadians need support on affordable housing. Across the board we need more support, but starting with housing, housing first, particularly for those on low income and those who are homeless. We are taking action.

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister told Canadians that they should judge him by the prices they pay at the grocery store, but food inflation is 70% above target. The grocery prices are up 40% in less than a decade, and all of those years, the Liberals were in power. The cost of food has risen overall more than inflation every single month that the Prime Minister has been here. Canadians should judge the Prime Minister by his words; that is only fair.

Is it that the Prime Minister never shops for food, or is it that he thinks inflation is something that happens to other people?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, we will come back to the number one cost and concern for Canadians, which is affordability of housing. I know the Conservatives and the members opposite do not care about affordable housing. We are here to take action on it and make life more affordable for Canadians, starting with their home.

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister cannot ignore the problem of millions of Canadians using a food bank every single month. That has not changed. It happened under the Liberal government's watch. Now the Liberals are making excuses or changing the subject entirely.

Canadians are getting fleeced at the grocery store, and it is only going to get worse, because next year their bill will be \$700 higher per family. That is another Liberal broken promise, another Liberal bait and switch by another Liberal Prime Minister. Is that the experience that he is now promising Canadians?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we listen to Canadians, something the Conservatives may want to do a bit more of. What Canadians have told us is that affordability is their first concern. The second is housing, and the third is the economy.

What have we done while their leader was away? The first thing we did was reduce taxes for 22 million Canadians. Everyone got a raise on Canada Day. The second thing was to remove the GST for first-time homebuyers.

We are going to build with Canadians, with every Canadian, the strongest economy in the G7. That is what this Liberal government is about.

[*Translation*]

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on the day his cabinet was sworn in, the Liberal Prime Minister said that Canadians would judge him by the cost of groceries.

Let us take a look at the results of this Liberal regime: Food inflation is now 70% higher than the inflation target, families are paying more, children are eating less, and this is just another broken promise from the Liberals.

Does the Prime Minister admit that those words were just more Liberal deceit because this Prime Minister is just another Liberal? Why is this Prime Minister making grocery shopping an increasingly painful and expensive experience for families?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this morning, I was with my colleague and friend, the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, our colleagues from the Quebec government, and the mayor of Montreal. At that time, I had the pleasure of announcing a project to build 20,000 housing units. That 20,000 units includes 6,000 affordable off-market units—social housing to help families and young Montrealers. We are going to be doing this across the country.

• (1440)

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, are the Liberals ashamed that their Prime Minister has not kept his promise to make groceries more affordable?

Statistics Canada has revealed that, since this Liberal Prime Minister came to power, the price of stewing beef increased by 22% from March to June, the price of potatoes went up by 20% and the price of onions by 11%. Even the folk singer La Bolduc would no longer be able to afford the tasty stew she sang about.

Canadians will judge him by their grocery bills. He said so himself. The verdict is in: another broken Liberal promise. Why is this Prime Minister making grocery shopping a costly and painful experience for all families?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find my colleague's question somewhat surprising.

We listened not only to Conservative voters, but to all Canadian voters. They want us to tackle the cost of living, so the first thing the Prime Minister's Liberal government did was lower taxes for 22 million Canadians. That means more money in the pockets of the people in his riding.

The second thing Canadians asked us to do was to build affordable housing. Just yesterday, we announced build Canada homes to help more families. Those of us on this side of the House will work together to build the strongest economy in the G7.

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when his cabinet was sworn in, the Prime Minister said that Canadians could judge his performance by the cost of groceries.

All summer, the people of Montmorency—Charlevoix talked to me about their interests and concerns, and the cost of groceries was at the top of the list. The federal government promised lower prices, but, once again, it is not keeping its promises. One thing is clear: Since the Liberals came to power, the cost of groceries has risen by 40%.

When the Prime Minister promised food at a fair price, was that another broken promise?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what young Canadians in general want is to be able to live affordably in Canada, be able to buy a home, have affordable housing and build a resilient economy for the future. On this side of the House, we have always understood that the best thing we can do is build a strong economy for all Canadians.

On this side of the House, I can say that the Liberals will work together to build the strongest economy, make life affordable for Canadians, build more homes and make Canada the best economy in the G7.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in just one summer, 10 years of progress on the environment has been wiped out.

The Prime Minister adopted Bill C-5 to approve projects that disregard legislation and social acceptability. He says he is open to pipelines circumventing environmental assessments. He has not renewed the incentives for purchasing zero-emission vehicles. He even backtracked on the mandatory sales targets for those vehicles. Last week, he went even further, refusing to commit to meeting his greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Will the government meet its own reduction targets for 2030 in the middle of a climate crisis?

Oral Questions

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are continuing to fight climate change. We know that it is important. It is important for future generations and it is important for our economy. We see that every economy in the world is looking for low-emission products.

That is exactly what we are going to do. We are going to build a strong country, a strong Canada that will be good for future generations.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the major government projects that Bill C-5 covers. Bill C-5 takes an inappropriately top-down approach that sullies projects, even good ones.

Good projects do not need to bypass environmental assessments. They do not need to be able to break 12 federal laws. They do not need to spurn social acceptability. If they really need to do all those things, they are not actually good projects.

Will the government promise that all these major projects will abide by environmental assessments, laws and the will of Quebecers?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I always find it interesting when the Bloc Québécois talks about important projects, given that the Bloc Québécois leader himself authorized drilling and fracking on Anticosti Island when he was Quebec's environment minister.

We are going to build an economy that is strong and clean for our future generations. That is what we are doing. We are going to build Canada for future generations.

* * *

• (1445)

[English]

HOUSING

Scott Aitchison (Parry Sound—Muskoka, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised to double homebuilding to 500,000 homes per year, but today, housing starts are down 13%. It is another broken Liberal promise. Yesterday, the Prime Minister introduced a fourth \$13-billion housing bureaucracy to build, wait for it, 4,000 homes.

What blocks homebuilding is government bureaucracy, red tape and taxes. Why does the Prime Minister believe that adding \$13 billion in more bureaucracy is now suddenly going to solve the housing crisis?

Oral Questions

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to share that a significant commitment of \$13 billion will be invested in housing and will leverage private investment as well. We are working with private capital, builders, and communities across Canada to make sure we are building the affordable housing that Canadians need, particularly young Canadians who cannot afford to get into the market.

Those 4,000 units are the first start by the Canada Lands Company, and the very beginning of the most comprehensive investment in Canadian affordable housing.

Scott Aitchison (Parry Sound—Muskoka, CPC): Mr. Speaker, \$13 billion for a fourth federal Ottawa housing bureaucracy to build 4,000 homes is not a solution. It is yet another Liberal boondoggle that will cost Canadians a fortune and will solve nothing.

The Prime Minister said, “The core challenge present in the housing market is it’s just too hard to build.” It is hard to build because of government taxes and red tape. In Toronto and Vancouver, the cost of government on a new home is over 25%. Housing starts there have stopped.

Why does the Prime Minister not understand that if we are going to get homes built, we have to cut the bureaucracy, not add \$13 billion more?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite and the Conservatives may not believe in investing in affordable housing, but this government does. This government is making an unprecedented investment in building affordable housing, in partnership with the private sector and in partnership with cities, provinces, territories and indigenous nations. We are going to deliver with our partners like never before.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the Liberal government, lawlessness has become the norm in Canada. In many cities, children cannot play safely in parks, families cannot walk down sidewalks, businesses are suffering and residents are living in fear. Tent encampments and lawlessness are taking over public spaces.

This summer, Barrie mayor Alex Nuttall was forced to take the extraordinary step of declaring a state of emergency to try to restore order back to Barrie. Canada was not like this 10 years ago.

When will the Prime Minister stop this reckless Liberal agenda and bring order back to our communities?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our plan to keep communities safe will keep drugs, guns and criminals off our streets. We are partnering with police services across the country to fight organized crime. We will make it tougher for violent criminals to get bail and will impose stricter sentences on repeat violent offenders. We are hiring 1,000 CBSA and RCMP officers to add to the 10,000 frontline personnel who are already keeping our borders safe. This work will be bolstered

by investing in community safety initiatives to stop crime before it starts. We will always be there to keep Canadian communities safe.

* * *

HOUSING

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Prime Minister swaggered in promising a massive surge in homebuilding, with half a million new homes a year. After all that hype, Vancouver families are still staring at million-dollar price tags. That surge has not even made a ripple. Projects are stalled and permits crawl through red tape, and the only thing going up faster than prices is the bureaucracy he is building. Now that big pledge has shrunk to just 4,000 homes at a cost of \$4 billion in yet another Liberal broken promise.

When will the Liberals stop building bureaucracy that makes homes more expensive for Canadians?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government focuses on building affordable housing with our partners. This is an unprecedented investment, alongside a cut to the GST for first-time homebuyers, which we are rolling out.

We are focused on delivering solutions and on delivering housing in the communities that need it the most. That investment was never seen from Conservative governments, certainly not in the history that I am familiar with. We saw housing not being a priority for the members opposite. We are focused on delivering.

● (1450)

[*Translation*]

Jason Groseau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are back again with a new housing bureaucracy that basically causes inflation and solves absolutely nothing. The Prime Minister promised Canadians that he would double housing construction and committed to building 500,000 homes a year. What is he actually doing? He is proposing a new bureaucratic machine that, in reality, will only provide for the construction of 4,000 new homes.

Why is this government coming back to us once again with more bureaucracy instead of focusing on building more housing?

Oral Questions

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to build more housing, we need to work together. We need to work with municipalities. We need to work with stakeholders on the ground. We need to work with the provinces. Unlike the Conservatives, who think we need to insult people, we believe we should work together.

That is what we did this morning, when the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and I made a historic announcement to build 20,000 homes. That is 20,000 homes in a single announcement, and that is just the beginning. We are going to do this across the country. From coast to coast to coast, we are going to build more homes with our partners.

[English]

Bruce Fanjoy (Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians made it clear in the last campaign that they expect us to deliver real housing solutions to get more homes built faster and to bring down the cost of housing so that young people, families, the most vulnerable and those along the housing continuum can access housing that meets their needs.

Can the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure please tell this House about the government's recently announced plan to deliver affordable housing to Canadians?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Carleton for the focus today on affordable housing.

I know the member for Carleton is very concerned about making sure it is green and sustainable housing, and we will certainly focus on ensuring that energy costs are low and that there are resilient homes that get us through the challenges ahead with climate change. We will make sure they are affordable, first and foremost, and build a new Canadian industry manufacturing the best homes in the world.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said he would make streets safer on behalf of the Liberals. He promised to fix the broken Liberal justice system, yet an eight-year-old was killed while sleeping in the place he should have been safest.

The justice minister said this is not the Wild West, and he is right. Eight-year-old children sleeping in their homes and getting killed did not happen in the Wild West. The Liberals say they are tough on crime, but they will not repeal Bill C-5 and Bill C-75. It is another bait and switch from another Liberal prime minister.

When will the same old Liberals get tough on crime and fix the system they broke?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously these circumstances my hon. colleague raises constitute an entire tragedy that should shock the conscience of every Canadian. However,

when the hon. member poses a question about repealing Bill C-75, I would suggest it is a good idea to read it first. He does not seem to understand that that bill actually makes it harder for people who are charged with intimate partner violence to receive bail.

I am willing to work in good faith with members of any party to help strengthen the bail system, have harsher penalties for serious crimes and, most importantly, keep Canada safe. The only question remains whether the Conservatives will join us in that effort.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have been waiting for 10 years to help the Liberals create safe streets and the Liberals have brought forward next to nothing. I spent some time with Vancouver police officers this summer. What did we see in Vancouver? Guns, lawlessness and drug overdoses. I saw first-hand the 152% increase in overdoses. The Liberals promised safer streets and fewer overdoses, which was another bait and switch to go with their broken promises. When will the Liberals fix the justice system they broke?

• (1455)

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I too had the opportunity to be with the Vancouver police officers and see first-hand the challenges they are facing. I was there with our fentanyl czar, Kevin Brosseau. We saw the incredible work of the Vancouver police officers in ensuring their communities are safer. In fact, just two days ago, the Mayor of Vancouver indicated that the program they put in place is working. Together with the work that we are going to be doing on bail reform and ensuring that repeat violent criminal offenders are put away, we will make our communities safer.

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, violent crime is up over 55% and more than half of Canadians do not feel safe in their own neighbourhoods. The Prime Minister promised to crack down on crime, yet repeat offenders keep getting out on bail. That is another broken promise and Canadians are paying the price. Families are shattered. Lives have been lost. That is why my jail-not-bail act will put these criminals behind bars.

The question is simple: Will the Prime Minister support our bill and restore safe streets or was that another broken Liberal promise?

Oral Questions

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was in our platform. We have a mandate. We promised Canadians that we were going to keep our communities safe. This fall, we are tabling legislation to make bail tougher and have harder and stiffer sentencing for repeat violent criminals. We are going to make sure these types of criminals stay behind bars and that everyone feels safe in their homes and on their streets.

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised to fix the Liberals' broken bail system, but has not delivered. It is another broken Liberal promise and another Liberal bait and switch because the Prime Minister is just another Liberal.

Chief McBride, Saskatoon's top cop, says that it is a struggle every day with repeat offenders. The Prime Minister said he would get tough on crime, but since the Liberals took power, repeat offenders have fuelled a crime wave in Canada with violent crimes up 55%.

When will the Prime Minister stop breaking promises and put repeat violent offenders behind bars?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to see there is alignment between the Conservative opposition and the Liberal government when it comes to improving public safety, including through the adoption of stronger laws to help build safer communities. I have good news for my colleague. We will be introducing legislation during this parliamentary session to strengthen bail reform in this country, to have harsher sentences for repeat violent offenders and to make sure that we have support to help keep communities safe with direct investment in law enforcement. I look forward to working with my hon. colleague and members on both sides of the aisle to advance public safety in this country.

Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised to fix the Liberals' broken criminal justice system and did nothing all summer. Meanwhile, seven shootings have occurred in Vaughan in less than three weeks. A father, Abdul Aleem Farooqi, was shot dead protecting his family. Families across Canada are terrified.

Repeat violent offenders are still on our streets because of weak Liberal laws like Bill C-5 and Bill C-75. It is another Liberal broken promise, another Liberal bait and switch, because the Prime Minister is just another Liberal. When will his broken promises stop?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the tragedy the member refers to is one that has impacted my community greatly, and my sincere sympathy goes out to the family. We are going to make sure that repeat violent offenders are kept behind bars.

This summer, I consulted with many police agencies across the country. A lot of their recommendations are going to be seen in this bill. However, provinces have to do their part to fix the broken justice system. They have to invest in Crown prosecutions, and they have to make sure that there are enough judges to hear the trials.

LABOUR

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised to grow the economy, but it is shrinking. Since he took office, tens of thousands of jobs have been lost, but the Liberals are on track this year to bring in the most temporary foreign work permits ever. It is so bad that a former Liberal immigration minister just said that they admitted they let industry become, "addicted to temporary work", and he is right. Amid the PM's pledge to cut the public service, even the Liberals are using TFWs to fill federal government jobs.

We have talked about buying Canadian. Why is the Prime Minister not making people hire them?

• (1500)

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, temporary foreign worker use is down by 70% in this country. Less than 1% of our workforce is temporary foreign workers. In fact, in Canada, Canadians come first for any available jobs, which is why the department has rigid rules for employers who are looking to fill vacancies with workers from other countries. If employers abuse the program, they receive serious penalties, including being banned from the use of this program.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, only a Liberal prime minister could promise to secure our border and fail in just six months. Over the summer, asylum claims from illegal U.S. crossings spiked dramatically, piling onto a staggering backlog of nearly 300,000 unprocessed claims. Many of these are likely bogus, yet claimants are immediately entitled to work permits, health care and benefits on the backs of Canadian taxpayers. It is another broken Liberal promise, another bait and switch, because he is just another Liberal Prime Minister.

How much longer is the Prime Minister going to keep our border open and let it become a backdoor, unplanned stream of economic migration before he finally takes action?

Oral Questions

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the opposition is concentrating on making assumptions and speaking about things that are not there, let me tell members that, with the asylum system, our numbers are down 40%. We have also introduced Bill C-2, which will strengthen our border, and this legislation is in front of the House. We campaigned on it, and Canadians gave us a mandate. So did Conservatives, and we hope that the Conservatives will help us pass it.

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals promised to fix Canada's immigration system and broke that promise. Up to 500,000 people have overstayed their visas in Canada. Canadians cannot find work, health care is overwhelmed, housing is out of reach and crime rates are soaring because of the Liberals' reckless policies.

The Liberals continue to maintain high levels of immigration and will not even remove those who are non-citizen criminals convicted of serious crimes. The Liberals had all summer to find these non-citizen criminals and remove them. Why did they not?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know that Canadians are concerned. Our government has been working tirelessly. We understand that we need to see a return to sustainable immigration levels that fit our capacity and serve our growth, which is exactly why we are focused on our levels plan with reducing both temporary and permanent residents in this country, and we are seeing results. We are bringing population to sustainable levels and decreasing the pressures on housing and services.

We are focused on solutions on this side of the House. There is legislation in front of this Parliament, and we hope that the Conservatives will support it.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me get this straight. The Prime Minister promised to grow the economy, but it is shrinking. He promised he would create jobs, but Canadians are losing them. We are in a health care crisis and a housing crisis, but the Liberals still issued record numbers of TFW permits this summer. They continue to allow the asylum system to be abused, and they still have not removed countless non-citizen criminals.

Why does the immigration minister still have her job?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, temporary foreign workers make up less than 1% of our total workforce. In fact, this is a program where employers must demonstrate that they vigorously and actively looked for Canadian workers because Canadian workers come first.

If an employer is found to have violated this program, there are severe penalties. There is also a tip line so that if any Canadian or any member of Parliament feels there has been an abuse, this can be reported to officials and it will be investigated.

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Natilien Joseph (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is a nation of builders. That is why, earlier this month, the Prime Minister announced the first series of projects being referred to the historic Major Projects Office. It includes projects as diverse and ambitious as the expansion of liquefied natural gas production in British Columbia, the development of small modular reactors in Ontario, major mining projects in western Canada and the container port terminal project in Contrecoeur, near my riding, Longueuil—Saint-Hubert.

Can the Minister of Finance inform—

• (1505)

The Speaker: I have to interrupt the member.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his excellent work.

The major project in Contrecoeur will increase the port of Montreal's capacity by roughly 60%, giving eastern Canada the world-class infrastructure it needs to help us diversify our markets.

With the creation of the Major Projects Office, we are moving from vision to action by creating thousands of good jobs, connecting regions, unlocking new industries and building Canada into the strongest economy in the G7.

That is the way to build a country in the 21st century.

* * *

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, allow me to remind the Prime Minister that on the day he swore in his cabinet, he said that Canadians would judge him by the cost at the grocery store. Well, the judgment is here and the verdict is failure.

Food inflation is now 70% above target. Another Liberal broken promise, another Liberal bait and switch, because the Prime Minister is just another Liberal.

Six months later, why are Canadians still being forced to choose between rent and groceries?

Oral Questions

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will once again take this opportunity to let the opposition members know “build Canada homes” is up and running as a one-stop shop to build affordable housing in Canada. We are going to deliver like never before. We are going to ensure that, particularly for Canadians who are on low incomes, there is a billion dollars dedicated to transitional supportive housing for those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. We are delivering on affordability across the country.

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said, when he swore in his cabinet, that Canadians would judge him by the cost at the grocery store. However, with elbows flying up and down, the Liberal government did not roll up its sleeves and bring down grocery prices.

While the Prime Minister does his chicken dance, 5,000 people use a food bank in Cambridge. Canadians are getting crushed. Food prices are up nearly 40% and food inflation is 70% above target. This is another Liberal broken promise, another Liberal bait and switch because the Prime Minister is just another Liberal.

Is this sticker shock his promise to Canadians?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have good news for the member. This is a very real issue and that is why we have a very real answer on this side of the House. The very first thing the Prime Minister did for Canadians was reduce taxes for 22 million Canadians. Some 22 million Canadians have more money in their pockets to face the cost of living.

On this side of the House, we are not about slogans. We are not about jokes. We are serious about delivering for Canadians and we will continue to fight for Canadians at every step of the way.

[*Translation*]

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the problems that Canadians are facing every day. On the day that he was sworn in, the Prime Minister said that Canadians would judge him by the cost of groceries. Four months later, grocery prices are extremely high. Inflation is rising and so is the cost of everything. People who were already struggling are struggling even more because of this broken promise. Canadians are now realizing that the Prime Minister breaks his promises, just as all the Liberals have done over the past 10 years while mismanaging Canada.

Will the Prime Minister explain to Canadians why their grocery bills are going up as a result of food inflation?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have met the Prime Minister and they have seen one thing: a Prime Minister who listens, a Prime Minister with vision and, most importantly, a Prime Minister who takes action.

The first thing that the new Liberal government did was to cut taxes for 22 million Canadians across the country. We recognized that we need to make a collective effort to help those who need it most. What is more, we also reduced the GST for homebuyers, and we introduced the most ambitious list for building Canada—

• (1510)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Bay of Quinte.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Chris Malette (Bay of Quinte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this summer, I heard from folks in my riding of the Bay of Quinte about the cost of living challenges they face. For members of the Canadian Armed Forces, this is no different.

As our government makes a generational investment in our military, can the Minister of National Defence update the House on the support we are providing for our men and women in uniform?

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that our forces and their families face challenges as they move across the country from posting to posting. That is why, this summer, we gave our forces a well-deserved and overdue pay raise. Our \$2-billion compensation package is the largest in a generation. It means that untrained sailors, aviators and soldiers will receive a 20% pay raise. As the brave women and men of the Canadian Armed Forces answer the call to serve, they need to know we have their backs.

* * *

MARINE TRANSPORTATION

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised that he would be elbows up and buy Canadian. He broke that promise when he rewarded the Communist Chinese government a billion-dollar loan to buy ferries for B.C. as it tariffs our seafood and ag producers. That is not elbows up. It is another Liberal broken promise, another Liberal bait and switch, because the Prime Minister is just another Liberal. Newly uncovered documents show senior Liberals were only concerned about their political interests. They did nothing to cancel the contract and ensure that our shipbuilders could participate.

When will the Prime Minister stop rewarding Beijing, cancel this loan and buy Canadian?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think I speak for all members of the House when I say that we are disappointed that BC Ferries made the procurement decision that it made. It is really unfortunate that no Canadian companies bid on the contract with BC Ferries. That is something that we have to all rectify, and we have to change that by buying Canadian. I agree with the member opposite.

On this side of the House, we are bringing forward a comprehensive buy Canadian program to make sure all of our agencies and departments are focused on buying Canadian.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, unemployment has surged to its highest level in a decade. Young people are being hit the hardest. One in six cannot find work. Our economy is facing a recession and millions of Canadians are worried about their jobs, yet the Liberals are planning to slash services people rely on and eliminate family sustaining jobs through an austerity budget this fall.

Will the government reverse course and create much-needed jobs through bold initiatives, such as a youth climate corps, as New Democrats have proposed?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week was a very proud moment for me to stand with the Prime Minister and Canada's Building Trades Unions, which is training young people all across the country for great-paying union jobs that are going to build the things that will make us the strongest economy in the G7.

The government has a fantastic plan for youth. We are investing in skills training. We are investing in the provinces and territories, so they can do this work with us. We will make sure no young person gets left behind.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of the Hon. P.J. Akeagok, Premier of Nunavut.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: I also wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of Ms. Winnie Byanyima, executive director of the joint United Nations program on HIV/AIDS and an under-secretary-general of the United Nations.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Routine Proceedings

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1515)

[*Translation*]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and in accordance with the Policy on Tabling of Treaties in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in electronic format and in both official languages, the treaty entitled "Agreement between Canada and the European Union on the Transfer and Processing of Passenger Name Record Data", done at Mirabella Eclano on October 4, 2024.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(1), and subsections 21(2) and 21(6) of the National Security and Intelligence and Committee of Parliamentarians Act, I am pleased to enclose two copies in both official languages of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians' special report on the lawful access to communications by security intelligence organizations for tabling in the House of Commons.

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), the report is deemed referred to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. I guess that last line was your line, Mr. Speaker, but nonetheless, I am pleased to table the document.

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(1), and subsections 21(1) and 21(6) of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians Act, I am pleased to enclose two copies in both official languages of the National Security Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians' 2024 annual report for tabling in the House of Commons.

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), the report is deemed referred to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8)(a), I have the honour to table in both official languages the government's response to 11 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

*Routine Proceedings***COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present in both official languages the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Science and Research. The first report is entitled “Distribution of Federal Funding Among Canada’s Post-Secondary Institutions” and the second report 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 each of these reports.

Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise in this chamber as the first vice-chair of the Standing Committee on Science and Research, representing the Conservatives. Witnesses, committee analysts and parliamentarians from all parties contributed their valuable time and effort into producing this report in the previous Parliament, and I am pleased to see this report being tabled today. His Majesty’s opposition did submit a dissenting opinion, which is attached and included in the first report. In essence, Conservatives disagree with the recommendations in the report that called for unfunded spending.

With regard to the second report, “Science and Research in Canada’s Arctic in Relation to Climate Change”, the Conservatives have produced a dissenting report, and we again, in essence, disagree with the notion of unfunded spending.

* * *

● (1520)

PETITIONS

PRISON NEEDLE EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of petitioners in Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford who are opposed to the drug policies in federal institutions. Correctional officers in particular are calling for an end to the prison needle exchange program and corresponding programs that give free illegal drugs and paraphernalia to convicted felons in Canadian federal institutions.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today on behalf of my constituents to present a petition with respect to the rising rate of crime in our community.

I rose 58 times in the last Parliament for the people of Swan River, presenting petitions on the alarming increase in violent crime that has threatened the safety and well-being of families all across the region. Unfortunately, crime in my region has continued to spiral out of control under the same Liberal government.

Petitioners are concerned that, since 2015, violent crime has increased by 55% and firearms crime is up 130%. Over the past year, assaults, break-ins and thefts by armed criminals have become regular occurrences in our area, leaving residents fearful in their own homes. This is why the people of Swan River are demanding jail, not bail, for violent repeat offenders. I support the good people of Swan River.

ATLANTIC LOOP

Hon. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is great to see you again. I hope you had a great summer.

Today I rise on behalf of petitioners across the country, including petitioners from the riding of Kings—Hants, who are asking members of Parliament and ultimately the Government of Canada to consider revisiting federal assistance on the Atlantic Loop as part of a federal grant for the HVDC transmission line corridor between Quebec and Atlantic Canada. The petitioners note that premiers in Manitoba and Quebec and other communities have highlighted the importance of federal grants to upgrade transmission lines and would like to see the former Atlantic Loop loan revisited, perhaps as a grant for transmission upgrades in Atlantic Canada and Quebec.

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to table e-petition 6530. This petition was signed by 781 Canadians who are deeply concerned about the future of our forestry sector. These petitioners point out that forestry has long provided good jobs in both rural and urban communities but now faces devastating challenges ranging from wildfires and insect infestations to the ongoing softwood lumber dispute and the Trump tariffs.

The petitioners stress that forest biomass energy production presents a sustainable opportunity to power Canadian electrical grids with clean energy while creating new jobs, yet the government’s failure to implement biomass tax incentives has left the sector at a clear competitive disadvantage compared to the United States. The petitioners therefore call on the government to finally, in this 2025 fall budget, commit to passing the proposed biomass component of the clean technology investment tax credit that was highlighted in the fall economic statement of 2023. This is to protect Canadian forestry jobs and strengthen our economy.

● (1525)

OPIOIDS

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, thank you, and to my hon. colleague from Courtenay—Alberni who just preceded me.

I am rising, and having travelled through my communities in Saanich—Gulf Islands, I have the great honour to represent the wonderful community of Pender Island and to present this petition while thinking of my friend and constituent Leslie McBain, one of the founders of Moms Stop the Harm.

Petitioners from my community are asking that we recognize the overdose crisis as a public health emergency. The number of individuals who have died in opioid-related deaths is now up to over 15,000. We are dealing with a poisoning crisis because of fentanyl contamination in the drug supply.

Petitioners ask that the current Parliament declare that the opioid crisis is a public health emergency; that we reframe this crisis as a health issue rather than a criminal issue; that we take a comprehensive wraparound approach to this crisis, addressing issues of addiction, poverty, housing, health care, racism and the economic disparities and instabilities and precarious situations that drive people into a situation where their lives are at risk; and that we do something about it.

Petitioners ask that the House work on the recommendations made by frontline workers, health care community experts and those directly involved in the drug-using community to decriminalize drugs in Canada.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 3, 5, 10, 15, 16, 26, 29, 34, 39, 41 to 44, 50, 51, 57 to 59, 66, 67, 75 to 77, 81, 97, 100, 102, 103, 110, 111, 118, 120, 122, 126, 129, 130, 132, 133, 138, 148, 149, 151, 153, 158, 161, 163, 166, 167, 170, 173, 177, 179, 181, 182, 184, 190, 193, 197, 201, 207, 208, 210, 213, 215, 216, 219, 224, 225, 228, 229, 234, 236, 238, 240 to 244, 246, 249, 252, 253, 263, 268, 269, 273, 275 and 276.

[Text]

Question No. 3—**Dan Muys:**

With regard to complaints reported by air carriers to Transport Canada: (a) how many complaints were reported by Air Canada, WestJet, Porter Airlines, Sunwing Airlines, and Air Transat, respectively, for (i) tarmac delays, (ii) denied boarding (bumping), (iii) issues with seating of children, (iv) lost baggage, (v) delayed baggage, (vi) damaged baggage, broken down by year from 2016 to 2025; (b) what was the monthly total number of complaints for each category listed in parts (a)(i) to (a)(vi), broken down by year, from 2016 to 2025; and (c) of the complaints listed in parts (a)(i) to (a)(vi), how many were resolved by the air carriers, broken down by carrier, and further broken down by year, from 2016 to 2025?

Mike Kelloway (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Transportation Act requires that before passengers can submit a complaint to the Canadian Transportation Agency, or CTA, they must first submit their complaint to the airline directly.

If the airline does not resolve the passenger's complaint, the passenger can then choose to submit it to the CTA, which processes complaints and settles disputes between travellers and airlines.

The CTA collects and shares data of complaints it receives, including the number of complaints, the airline involved, and the type of issue. This information can be found in the following publications: the 2023-24 Annual Report, available at <https://otc-cta.gc.ca/eng/publication/annual-report-2023-2024>; and the most recent dashboard outlining complaints per 100 flights to/from/within Canada submitted to the CTA, per quarter, available at <https://otc->

Routine Proceedings

cta.gc.ca/eng/air-travel-complaints-100-flights-airline-january-2024-march-2025.

Question No. 5—**Heather McPherson:**

With regard to the implementation of Bill C-41, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make consequential amendments to other Acts: (a) what funds have been allocated under the new system, including (i) to which organizations, (ii) for work in which countries; (b) how many authorization applications has the government (i) made for its own activities, (ii) received from outside government, (iii) approved, and for which countries, (iv) sought for its own work in Afghanistan; (c) what is the wait time for applicants to receive a response from the government and, during those wait times, what projects have been halted or delayed; (d) what is the current list of countries and sub-regions for which an authorization is deemed necessary, and which deputy ministers, including their departments and agencies, are involved in developing this list; and (e) what is the wait time for security review for individuals listed in applications, and who is the current minister responsible for the security review?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to parts (a)(i)-(ii) of the question, the Authorization Regime is an instrument to facilitate the delivery of certain, needed activities in areas controlled by a terrorist group, rather than an instrument to facilitate the allocation of funds. By statute, decisions to issue authorizations are based on weighing the benefits and risks of an activity. The Government of Canada cannot publicly disclose information regarding authorization holders, as it would reveal sensitive or potentially identifiable information.

With respect to part (b)(i), the Government of Canada has received eleven applications from Government of Canada departments.

With respect to part (b)(ii), the Government of Canada has received four applications from outside of the government.

In terms of part (b)(iii), to date, two authorizations as well as one request for renewal have been granted. Due to privacy considerations and safeguards in place to protect sensitive or potentially identifiable information, the Government of Canada does not disclose specific details pertaining to applications and or granted authorizations. However, overall, the applications received have involved activities to be conducted in the geographic areas of Afghanistan, Gaza, and Syria.

With respect to part (b)(iv), due to privacy considerations and safeguards in place to protect sensitive or potentially identifiable information, the Government of Canada cannot publicly disclose this information.

In terms of part (c), applications are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The length of time required to process an application will vary depending on the complexity of the application and the comprehensiveness of the information provided. By statute, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and/or the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, and the Minister of Public Safety each have responsibilities with respect to reviewing and assessing applications.

Routine Proceedings

The Government of Canada acknowledges that some applicants have chosen to pause or delay their projects while awaiting decisions regarding their application. Due to privacy considerations and safeguards in place to protect sensitive or potentially identifiable information, the Government of Canada does not disclose specific details pertaining to applications.

Further, the Government of Canada does not provide legal advice to the public with respect to this program, and it is up to the applicant to determine whether to halt or delay their project while an application is undergoing assessment.

With respect to part (d), the Authorization Regime does not maintain a list of countries or sub-regions for which an authorization is deemed necessary. It is up to the applicant to determine whether an authorization is required in their particular circumstances, based on the activities planned, mitigation measures they may employ, and their particular legal considerations.

To provide additional clarity for prospective applicants in determining whether an authorization is required, the Authorization Requirement Inquiry mechanism is available. This optional step allows prospective applicants to request additional information from the Minister of Public Safety regarding the need for an authorization in a specified geographic area. Directions for making a request for this information are available on the Authorization Regime webpage.

This process considers the dynamic nature of terrorism and allows for the most up-to-date assessment of terrorist entities and their control of specific geographic areas.

While PS's Authorization Regime webpage and the Authorization Requirement Inquiry process provide information for prospective applicants, the Government of Canada does not provide legal advice to the public. It remains incumbent upon potential applicants to determine whether an authorization is required in their particular circumstances in consultation with their legal advisors.

With respect to part (e), pursuant to subsection 83.032(10) of the Criminal Code, the Minister of Public Safety is responsible for conducting a security review of each application.

Applications are assessed on a case-by-case basis. As such, the length of time required to process an application, including the completion of a security review, will vary depending on a number of factors, including the nature of the activities and the degree to which information in the application is sufficient when submitted. It is important to ensure that the security review of each application is comprehensive and thoroughly considers the risks and benefits of the proposed activities.

Question No. 10—Warren Steinley:

With regard to the Pest Management Regulatory Agency's Pest Control Products Fees and Charges Regulations: (a) what was the amount collected in fees in the last fiscal year, in total and broken down by each specific type of fee or component; (b) what is the itemized breakdown of how the Pest Management Regulatory Agency spent the money collected from each of the fees in (a); and (c) for which of the fees in (a), did the government collect more money than it spent in costs related to processing the related application, and, for each such fee, how much was (i) collected from the applicants, (ii) spent on processing?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question,

Health Canada's 2024–2025 Report on Fees, covering last fiscal year, will be released in the Fall 2025. In fiscal year 2023-2024, the Pest Management Regulatory Agency, or PMRA, collected a total of \$17,087,969 in revenues, including \$6,271,360 from the pre-market submissions business line and \$10,816,609 from the post-market annual charge business line. For details on the revenue collected by application type, please refer to 2023-2024 Report on Fees available at <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/corporate/about-health-canada/reports-publications/report-fees-2023-2024.html#a20>.

With respect to part (b), the PMRA spent the money collected from (a) as follows: In fiscal year 2023-2024, concerning the Pre-market submissions business line revenue: PMRA incurred \$60,864,504 in costs against this revenue line, namely, \$37,526,680 in salaries, \$6,826,085 in Operations & Maintenance, \$10,132,204 in Employee Benefit Plan, \$4,878,468 in accommodation, and \$1,501,067 in Shared Services Canada costs. Concerning the post-market annual charge business line revenue: PMRA incurred \$35,584,837 in costs against this revenue line, namely, \$21,794,993 in salaries, \$4,200,046 in O & M, \$5,884,648 in Employee Benefit Plan, \$2,833,349 in accommodations, and \$871,800 in Shared Services Canada costs. Additionally, PMRA remitted \$48,094 in fees to registrants for missed service standards from the pre-market submissions revenue collected last fiscal.

With respect to part (c), given that the total costs of PMRA were \$96,449,341 and the revenue collected was \$17,087,969, the Government did not collect more money than it spent in any of the application fees or fee lines.

Question No. 15—Alex Ruff:

With regard to the government's decision to implement changes regarding the regulation of Natural Health Products through regulation enabled by Bill C-47 (Budget Implementation Act, 2023, 44th Parliament) through sections 500-504: (a) how many individual pieces of correspondence has the Minister of Health received in support of these regulations to date, broken down by (i) date, (ii) medium (i.e. online, phone, email, mail), (iii) federal riding; (b) how many individual pieces of correspondence has the Minister of Health received to date in opposition to these regulations, broken down by (i) date, (ii) medium (i.e. online, phone, email, mail), (iii) federal riding; and (c) how many individual pieces of correspondence has the Minister of Health received to date in total, regardless of whether support or opposition to the regulations was conclusive or not, broken down by (i) date, (ii) medium (i.e. online, phone, email, mail), (iii) federal riding?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), two emails were received in support of the regulation of natural health products.

The response to (a)(i) is from March 28, 2023, to May 27, 2025. In response to (a)(ii), the minister received two emails. In response to (a)(iii); as these were received via email, we do not know from which ridings they were sent.

With regard to (b), 2,952 pieces of correspondence were received by the Minister of Health opposing the regulation of natural health products.

Routine Proceedings

The response to (b)(i) is from March 28, 2023, to May 27, 2025. In response to (b)(ii), the minister received 533 emails and 2,419 letters. In response to (b)(iii); 435 were referred by the MP for Prince Albert on behalf of his constituents, and there was one each from Kings-Hants, Lambton-Kent-Middlesex, Calgary Shepard, Vancouver Quadra, York-Simcoe, Burnaby-North Seymour, Yorkton-Melville, and Barrie-Innisfil. The riding of origin of the rest of the correspondence could not be determined, either because it was part of a write-in campaign and was only counted, not tracked, or was received by email.

With regard to (c) in total, 2,954 pieces of correspondence were received by the Minister of Health regarding the regulation of natural health products. The response to (c)(i) is from March 28, 2023, to May 27, 2025. In response to (c)(ii), the minister received 533 emails and 2,419 letters. The response to (c)(iii) is the same response as for (a)(iii) and (b)(iii).

Question No. 16—Dan Mazier:

With regard to the government's Net Zero Accelerator Initiative: (a) what are the details of the funding under the "decarbonization of large emitters" investment pillar, including the total (i) funding allocated, (ii) funding committed, (iii) funding disbursed, (iv) funding uncommitted, (v) number of applicants, (vi) commitments for emission reductions in tonnes; (b) what are the details of the funding under the "industrial transformation" investment pillar, including the total (i) funding allocated, (ii) funding committed, (iii) funding disbursed, (iv) funding uncommitted, (v) number of applicants, (vi) commitments for emission reductions in tonnes; (c) what are the details of the funding under the "clean technology and battery ecosystem development" investment pillar, including the total (i) funding allocated, (ii) funding committed, (iii) funding disbursed, (iv) funding uncommitted, (v) number of applicants, (vi) commitments for emission reductions in tonnes; (d) for large emitters, what (i) is the total number of applications received, (ii) is the total number of contributions signed, (iii) is the dollar value of the contribution agreements signed, (iv) are the total disbursements, (v) are the commitments in the contribution agreement to reduce emissions in tonnes, (vi) are the actual results achieved in terms of carbon reductions in tonnes; (e) for medium emitters, what (i) is the total number of applications received, (ii) is the total number of contributions signed, (iii) is the dollar value of the contribution agreements signed, (iv) are the total disbursements, (v) are the commitments in the contribution agreement to reduce emissions in tonnes, (vi) are the actual results achieved in terms of carbon reductions in tonnes; (f) for small emitters, what (i) is the total number of applications received, (ii) is the total number of contributions signed, (iii) is the dollar value of the contribution agreements signed, (iv) are the total disbursements, (v) are the commitments in the contribution agreement to reduce emissions in tonnes, (vi) are the actual results achieved in terms of carbon reductions in tonnes; (g) what was the emission reduction target at the program level when the Net Zero Accelerator Initiative was created; (h) what is the amount of actual emission reductions achieved to date; (i) what are the details of the contribution agreements that have been signed under the initiative, including, for each, (i) the company name, (ii) the amount of funding, (iii) whether the applicant was seeking funding of \$50 million or more, (iv) the date when the application was received, (v) the date the contribution agreement was signed, (vi) cost of emissions reduction per tonne; (j) what is the total number of employees or full time equivalents working on delivering the Net Zero Accelerator; and (k) what are the details of all contracts signed to date related to the initiative, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount or value, (iii) vendor, (iv) description of the goods or services, (v) manner in which contract was awarded (sole-sourced or competitive bid)?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada has determined that producing and validating a comprehensive response to this question would require the manual collection of data that cannot be completed within the allocated timeframe. Proceeding under these constraints risks the disclosure of incomplete or inaccurate information.

Question No. 26—Alex Ruff:

With regard to the December 5, 2024, and March 7, 2025, announcements that the government would extend the list of prohibited "assault-style" firearms to include 503 new makes and models: (a) how many of these new models have been used in crimes in Canada since 2015, broken down by (i) model, (ii) make, (iii) crime committed, (iv) whether the crime was committed with a legally-owned or illegally-owned firearm, (v) the date the crime was committed; (b) did the government consult with Indigenous people on this program expansion; (c) if the answer to (b) is affirmative, who was consulted, how were they consulted and what were the results; and (d) how is the government notifying impacted law-abiding, non-restricted and restricted firearms owners, who do not have email, internet or phone services, of these changes in a timely fashion?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question, data on the specific makes and models of firearms used in crime are collected by individual law enforcement agencies across Canada for record keeping purposes. There is no central database at the national level with this information.

With respect to part (b), extensive public engagement on the issue of banning handguns and assault-style firearms, or ASFs, led by the then Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, took place between October 2018 and February 2019 with the provinces and territories, municipalities, Indigenous partners, law enforcement, community organizations, and industry. The engagement process included a series of in-person meetings and virtual submissions, of which the following Indigenous organizations participated: Tsuut'ina Nation Police Service; File Hills First Nation Police Service; Assembly of First Nations; Congress of Aboriginal Peoples; Grand Chief of Atikamekw; Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami; Kwanlin Dün First Nation; Métis National Council; Native Women's Association of Canada; Treaty #3 Indigenous Police Service; Treaty 7 Chiefs.

In the context of Parliament's consideration of former Bill C-21, in 2022 and 2023, there was extensive parliamentary debate and engagement with Indigenous groups and stakeholders on ASFs. A broad range of views and considerations were raised, including the public safety imperative of achieving a comprehensive prohibition of ASFs and concerns regarding potential impacts on hunting. From January to May 2023, the Government of Canada held discussions with a number of National Indigenous Organizations, Modern Treaty and Self Government Agreement Holders, and Indigenous communities to understand concerns and obtain a better understanding of the impacts of prohibiting firearms, that is, how firearms are used by members of Indigenous communities, key capabilities and features of firearms, impacts of firearm prohibitions/substitutions.

Routine Proceedings

With respect to part (c), in the context of Parliament's consideration of former Bill C-21, officials held virtual and in-person discussions: on January 20, a virtual technical briefing with National Indigenous Organizations; on January 27, a virtual technical briefing with Modern Treaty and Self-Government Agreement Holders; on March 8, virtually with the Manitoba Metis Federation; on March 14, in person with Tribal Chiefs Ventures; on March 15, in person with the Manitoba Metis Federation; on March 16, in person with Manitoba Keewatinowi Okimakanak Inc; on March 27 and April 21, virtually with the Metis National Council, Metis Nation British Columbia, Metis Nation Alberta, Metis Nation Saskatchewan, Metis Nation Ontario, and Les Femmes Michif Otipemisiwak; on March 28, virtually with the Metis Nation BC; on April 6, in person with the Hunting, Fishing, Trapping Coordinating Committee; on May 3, virtually with the First Nations Chiefs of Police; on May 10, in person with the Native Council Prince Edward Island; on May 24, virtually with the Wolastoqey Nation New Brunswick; on May 25, virtually with the Native Council of Nova Scotia

Overall, Indigenous organizations were supportive of initiatives to enhance public safety initiatives, while also underlining the importance of upholding rights recognized and reaffirmed in section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. Indigenous organizations noted the importance of consultation to identify and consider potential adverse impacts on hunting and harvesting, food sovereignty, conservation, cultural practices/traditions, and protection from predators on the land.

With respect to part (d), through the Canadian Firearms Program, licence holders were informed of the December 5, 2024 and March 7, 2025, prohibitions through several methods of communication. Individuals and businesses received a notification detailing the impacts and options, which was sent by email; those without an email address on file were advised by mail.

Additionally, the Canadian Firearms Program published web content and updated its toll-free phone line with a recorded notice.

This is in addition to the news releases and backgrounders published by Public Safety Canada.

Question No. 29—Arnold Viersen:

With regard to the government's announcement on November 4, 2024, to cap emissions on the Canadian oil and gas sector by about one-third over the next eight years: (a) has the government undertaken an assessment on how this will impact Canadian families, and, if so, what were the results of the assessment; (b) what will be the estimated increased cost to average Canadians as a result of increased prices for groceries, gas and home heating, broken down by year over the next eight years; (c) what increases does the government expect in Canadian energy imports from countries with lower environmental and ethical standards as a result of the cap; (d) did the government consider the impact that an increased reliance on oil and gas from countries with lower environmental standards will have as a result of imposing this cap, and, if not, why was it not considered; (e) what assessments, if any, has the government undertaken to examine the impact of the emissions cap across the (i) construction, (ii) manufacturing, (iii) finance, (iv) hospitality, sectors; (f) how many jobs have been cut by oil and gas companies as a result of emissions caps in the last nine years; and (g) how does the government plan to ensure that Canada's oil and gas competitors (United States, Russia, China, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, United Arab Emirates) have comparable emissions caps, and, if they do not, how does the government plan to allow Canadian oil and gas companies to compete with them?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), yes, a thorough analysis of impacts has been conducted and can be found in the Canada Gazette, Part 1, Volume 158, Number 45: Oil and Gas Sec-

tor Greenhouse Gas Emissions Cap Regulations. Because oil prices are set internationally and natural gas prices are set continentally, the analysis suggests that cost pass-through to consumers would be minimal. The ability for firms to pass on costs to consumers is further detailed in the response to question (b).

With regard to (b), the department concluded in its analysis of the proposed Regulations that there is low risk of costs being passed through to fuel consumers. The price of crude oil and natural gas commodities are generally determined in global or continental markets. Given that oil prices are set in international markets, the ability of firms to pass on these compliance costs to consumers is limited. In some instances, prices can be influenced by regional dynamics, which could result in some ability for oil and gas producers to affect downstream prices.

With regard to (c), departmental modelling indicates that the proposed Regulations would have very minimal impact on import levels and would not result in any increases in imports. Imports of oil and gas are in fact estimated to fall over time under scenarios with and without the emissions cap in place. Between 2019 and the 2030-2032 period, oil and gas imports are estimated to decrease by 5.6% without the emissions cap in place, and by 5.4% with the emissions cap in place. The increase between these two scenarios corresponds to 0.2% more oil imports in the regulatory scenario (with the emissions cap in place) than the baseline (without the emissions cap) over the 2030-2032 period. The modelling conducted for this analysis does not estimate from which jurisdictions the imports would originate.

With regard to (d), as noted in the answer to question C, departmental modelling indicates that the proposed Regulations will not have a significant impact on imports, and that imports are expected to continue to decrease with the oil and gas emissions cap in place. Likewise, departmental modelling shows that production is expected to grow by 16% between 2019 and 2030 under a scenario with the oil and gas emissions cap in place, compared to 17% growth in a scenario without the emissions cap. These very small decreases in production could be offset by production elsewhere in the world that is either more or less carbon intensive.

With regard to (e), as noted above, the price of crude oil and natural gas commodities are generally determined in global or continental markets. As such, there is limited ability for the oil and gas sector to pass on costs to end-users including Canadian households and other sectors. The cost of the emissions cap on the above noted sectors is thus expected to be very limited.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to (f), the proposed emissions cap is not yet in place and would not establish a restriction on emissions until 2030. The department estimates that labour expenditure in the oil and gas sector will continue to grow with the emissions cap in place. The analysis projects growth of 53% from 2019 to the 2030 to 2032 period with the proposed emissions cap in place, which is only slightly below the 55% growth expected without the emissions cap. This corresponds to labour expenditure being only 1.6% lower in the 2030 to 2032 period under the emissions cap than without it, and this does not account for increases in labour expenditures in other parts of the economy or from post-2032 activity driven by decarbonization investments and long-term competitiveness in a net-zero future.

With regard to (g), the proposed Regulations would cap greenhouse gas emissions, not production and they are designed to ensure predictable emissions reductions from the oil and gas sector while enabling increased production.

Although global demand for oil and gas is expected to decline as the global economy switches to cleaner fuels to address the urgent issue of climate change, global demand for oil and gas is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. In a low-carbon world, improvements in emissions intensity are expected to improve the sector's competitiveness over time.

Question No. 34—Blaine Calkins:

With regard to the Substance Use and Addictions Program, and safe and safer supply projects, commissioned by or which have received funding from Health Canada, since January 1, 2024: (a) what were the costs incurred by the government related to the program, in total and broken down by type of expenditure; and (b) what are the details of all projects, including the (i) project name, (ii) location, (iii) amount of government funding, (iv) description of the project?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, information regarding grants provided under the Substance Use and Addictions Program is available at <https://search.open.canada.ca/grants/>.

Question No. 39—Scot Davidson:

With regard to the government's response to Order Paper Question Q-3051 of the first session of the 44th Parliament showing the number of taxpayers in each riding that received the Canada Carbon Rebate rural supplement: what is the government's explanation for why certain individuals in completely urban ridings, such as Winnipeg Centre, Ottawa Centre and numerous completely urban ridings in the Greater Toronto Area, are receiving the rural supplement?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to my colleague's question, what follows is the response from the Canada Revenue Agency as of May 27, 2024, that is, the date of the question.

Some individuals received the Canada Carbon Rebate, or CCR, Rural Supplement despite living in urban ridings, mainly due to the mailing address of the recipient at the time of payment.

Mailing addresses were used when generating the data for Q-3051 because it aggregates how many people received the CCR payment at the time of the quarterly issuance in each federal electoral district. The mailing address is what is used to aggregate benefits data in past publications and reports. For consistency purposes, this address type was chosen.

Note 11 in the original response to Q-3051 is as follows: "The Federal Electoral District information is based on the recipient's mailing address(es) of the benefit year. This data captures recipients across the four quarters of the benefit year, thereby reflecting movement between federal electoral districts."

Eligibility and entitlements of the CCR and the Rural Supplement are based on the province of residence indicated on a recipient's tax return for that benefit year, qualifying them for CCR throughout the year. The Rural Supplement is calculated by using both the recipient's mailing and home address postal codes. If one of these postal codes is considered outside a Census Metropolitan Area, or CMA, based on our CMA validation table, the recipient is entitled to the Rural Supplement.

CCR entitlements are calculated based on the province of residence on the first day of the payment month. If an individual lived in a rural area when the CCR entitlement was calculated, but moved to an urban area, it could appear as though they were issued a rural supplement amount while living in an urban area.

Question No. 41—Luc Berthold:

With regard to the \$247,485 announced for Island Telecom Services Inc. to connect 106 households in Prince Edward Island with high-speed internet: (a) on what date is this project expected to be completed; (b) why was the funding recipient unable to complete this project by the original prescribed project completion date; (c) were there any penalties given to the funding recipient for not meeting the original project completion date, and, if so, what are the details of those penalties; (d) has the funding recipient requested additional funding to complete the project; and (e) how much of the \$247,485 in funding was from the (i) federal government, (ii) provincial government?

Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), 81% of households now have improved connectivity. Work is underway by another Internet Service Provider to connect the remaining households by March 2027 at the latest.

With regard to (b), the funding recipient was initially impacted by supply chain issues delaying procurement of necessary materials as well as local labour shortages. Subsequently they faced delays due to extreme weather, such as a hurricane and heavy rain, as well as permitting delays.

With regard to (c), payments have been withheld, pending continued investigation on the funding recipient's compliance against the terms and conditions of the contribution agreement.

With regard to (d), the funding recipient has not requested additional funding to complete the project.

With regard to (e)(i), the federal government authorized funding of up to \$247,485.00.

With regard to (e)(iii), the Government of Prince Edward Island authorized funding of up to \$42,262.00.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 42—Luc Berthold:**

With regard to the \$445,395 announced for Island Telecom Services Inc. to connect 150 households in Prince Edward Island with high-speed internet: (a) on what date is this project expected to be completed; (b) why was the funding recipient unable to complete this project by the original prescribed project completion date; (c) were there any penalties given to the funding recipient for not meeting the original project completion date, and, if so, what are the details of those penalties; (d) has the funding recipient requested additional funding to complete the project; and (e) how much of the \$445,395 in funding was from the (i) federal government, (ii) provincial government?

Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question, 77 percent of households now have improved connectivity. Work is underway by another Internet Service Provider to connect the remaining households by March 2027 at the latest.

With respect to part (b), the funding recipient was initially impacted by supply chain issues delaying procurement of necessary materials as well as local labour shortages. Subsequently they faced delays due to extreme weather (e.g. hurricane and heavy rain) as well as permitting delays.

Concerning part (c), payments have been withheld, pending continued investigation on the funding recipient's compliance against the terms and conditions of the contribution agreement.

With respect to part (d) the funding recipient has not requested additional funding to complete the project.

With respect to part (e)(i), the federal government authorized funding of up to \$445,395.00.

Lastly, with regard to part (e)(ii), the Government of Prince Edward Island did not co-fund for the project.

Question No. 43—Rachael Thomas:

With regard to the government's "Choose Canada" advertising campaigns, including social media, in late March and early April 2025, broken down by participating department or agency's campaign: (a) who is the highest-ranking official who approved the campaign; (b) on what date was final approval given for the campaign; (c) on which platforms and dates was the campaign (i) scheduled to be disseminated, (ii) disseminated; (d) was its continued dissemination during the 2025 general election consistent with the Treasury Board's 2016 Directive on the Management of Communications or 2025 Directive on the Management of Communications and Federal Identity; (e) following the dissolution of Parliament on March 23, 2025, what steps were taken to suspend or end the campaign; (f) on what date was the campaign fully suspended or ended; and (g) what was the total expense incurred in relation to the campaign?

Rachel Bendayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), the Clerk of the Privy Council Office was the highest-ranking official who approved the campaign.

With regard to (b), the Clerk of the Privy council approved the campaign on March 17, 2025.

With regard to (c)(i), digital Advertising purchased programmatically including static, audio, video and connected television advertisements were scheduled to begin on March 21, 2025. Social Media Advertising on Meta, TikTok, Snapchat and Reddit were scheduled to begin on March 24, 2025.

With regard to (c)(ii), programmatic advertisements went live on March 21, 2025, and social media advertising went live on March

24, 2025, apart from Meta advertisements, which went live on March 26, 2025, due to a technical issue.

With regard to (d), the Policy on Communications and Federal Identity allows deputy heads of departments to approve specific types of advertising to proceed during general federal elections. The Clerk of the Privy Council is the Deputy Head of PCO. He approved the continuation of the Choose Canada campaign during the 2025 federal election on March 17, 2025.

With regard to (e), no steps were taken to suspend the campaign, as the Clerk of the Privy Council had previously provided approval for the campaign to continue during a federal election.

With regard to (f), the first phase of the campaign ended March 31, 2025.

Lastly, with regard to (g), the total net expenditure of this campaign is \$2,517,000. This figure includes production costs, media costs and fees. Following the completion of the media agency's billing reconciliation, additional credits may be received which could impact this figure.

Question No. 44—Blake Richards:

With regard to Veterans Affairs Canada: (a) how many lawsuits have been brought against the government related to the issue of medical assistance in dying since January 2018; (b) what is the overall cost of these lawsuits that the government of Canada had to pay to settle, in total and broken down by legal fees versus settlement payments; (c) how many veterans have accepted medical assistance in dying from the government of Canada since January 2018; and (d) how many of the settlements involved the recipients signing a non-disclosure agreement to ensure that the government wouldn't be further embarrassed by its actions?

Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question, two legal actions were filed against Veterans Affairs Canada related to medical assistance in dying, or MAID, since January 2018.

As for part (b), the Department of Justice Canada represents the Canadian government in any litigation matter, and when a settlement takes place, it is common for the terms to be confidential.

With respect to part (c), medical assistance in dying is not something that the government offers to Veterans. It is something that is discussed between the person and their primary care provider. Health Canada released the fifth annual report on MAID, which can be consulted at <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/health-system-services/annual-report-medical-assistance-dying-2023.html>.

Routine Proceedings

Canada's MAID system has been carefully designed with safeguards to affirm and protect the inherent and equal value of every person's life. To be eligible for MAID, a person must have a serious and incurable medical condition, be in an advanced state of irreversible decline in capability, and be experiencing enduring and intolerable suffering related to their medical condition. The person and their practitioners must have discussed reasonable and available means to relieve the person's suffering (including counselling services, mental health and disability support services, community services, and palliative care, and be offered consultations with professionals who provide those services) and agree that the person has seriously considered those means.

With respect to part (d), one legal action brought against Veterans Affairs Canada related to medical assistance in dying has been the subject of a settlement and, in accordance with common practice, the terms are confidential.

Question No. 50—Lianne Rood:

With regard to projects funded under Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy, since its inception in 2017, and broken down by year: (a) what are the details of all projects funded, including the (i) project name, (ii) implementing partner, (iii) country, (iv) total funding amount, (v) project description, (vi) date of the funding; (b) for each project, what was the proportion of funding allocated toward activities related to gender-based ideology versus measurable humanitarian outcomes such as clean water, food, health care and education; (c) which projects were flagged for ideological risk, redundancy with multilateral efforts or weak accountability measures in internal departmental risk assessments, and what specific actions were taken in response to each flag; (d) what indicators does the government use to measure its effectiveness; (e) what performance metrics have been met since 2017; and (f) what are the total expenditures under the Feminist International Assistance Policy, broken down by year and region?

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Global Affairs Canada delivers international assistance programming aligned with the Feminist International Assistance Policy through a diverse portfolio of bilateral and multilateral projects. These initiatives aim to advance gender equality while achieving sustainable development outcomes across sectors such as health, education, and humanitarian assistance.

Furthermore, Global Affairs Canada and its partners manage risks associated with all development projects. For example, fiduciary risks are managed via Global Affairs Canada's Fiduciary Risk Evaluation Tool, while context-specific non-fiduciary risks are managed in coordination with implementing partners. In both cases, this requires identifying specific risks, assessing their likelihood of happening and potential impacts, identifying appropriate responses to those risks, and monitoring their evolution in order to avoid negative effects on project implementation. Global Affairs Canada's new grants and contributions integrated management system will include a dedicated component to enhance risk management across all grants and contributions.

Next, Global Affairs Canada does not use a standard set of results indicators across all projects. Each development project funded by Global Affairs Canada must include a tailored, context-specific logic model and performance measurement framework. These frameworks use indicators that will also align with government priorities, such as the Feminist International Assistance Policy. This requirement applies to more than 2,000 development projects active

at any given time, with larger projects using on average 40 indicators.

For example, in a typical health project, effectiveness is measured using quantitative and qualitative indicators such as quality of care, the number of people accessing essential health services, such as maternal health, family planning and nutrition, as well as the use of supplements like vitamin A, iron, and folic acid. These indicators help track improvements in health service delivery.

Moreover, the Office of the Auditor General's 2023 report on the Implementation of the Feminist International Assistance Policy recommended that Global Affairs Canada measure both outputs and outcomes so that the department fully reports on the impact of funding against policy goals and priorities. Global Affairs Canada is committed to implementing improved solutions to address this recommendation, completing several actions to that effect. For example, the department refocused the International Assistance Report to Parliament to report on Feminist International Assistance Policy, policy-level outcomes. In addition, Global Affairs Canada's new grants and contributions integrated management system will support results reporting and information management needs.

Moreover, the Department undertook an extensive preliminary search in order to determine the amount of information that would fall within the scope of the question and the amount of time that would be required to prepare a comprehensive response. The level of detail of the information requested is not systematically tracked in a centralized database. The Department concluded that producing and validating a comprehensive response to this question would require a manual collection of information that is not possible in the time allotted and could lead to the disclosure of incomplete and misleading information.

Due to the broad scope and volume of the data requested, and the time required to compile it in the format requested, Global Affairs Canada refers the member to a few publicly available resources for project-level information.:

First is a downloadable dataset that includes comprehensive historical data on international assistance projects funded by Canada since 2005, including those aligned with Feminist International Assistance Policy since 2017. It can be found at <https://www.international.gc.ca/transparency-transparence/international-assistance-report-stat-rapport-stat-rapport-aide-internationale/index.aspx?lang=eng>.

Next is DevData, a data visualization platform that offers dashboards, charts, and maps to explore Canada's international assistance by theme, country, and policy priority, including gender equality. It can be found at <https://www.international.gc.ca/transparency-transparence/international-assistance-report-stat-rapport-aide-internationale/dashboard-tableau-bord.aspx?lang=eng>.

Routine Proceedings

Lastly, there is Project Browser, an interactive tool that allows users to search, filter, and export information on active and completed projects by year, country, partner, and sector. It can be found at <https://w05.international.gc.ca/projectbrowser-banqueprojets/>.

These platforms provide transparent and accessible means to explore project-level data, in line with Canada's commitment to aid transparency, accountability, and open government.

Question No. 51—Lianne Rood:

With regard to all international development projects funded by the government that include language related to "climate justice", "intersectionality", "anti-racism" or "decolonization" since January 1, 2018: (a) what are the details of each such project, including the (i) project name, (ii) recipient organization, (iii) country or region, (iv) funding amount, (v) project description, (vi) date of the funding; (b) what were the measurable humanitarian outcomes produced by each project, as assessed by (i) Global Affairs Canada, (ii) third-party evaluations, broken down by evaluator; and (c) which projects underwent formal audits for cost-effectiveness or ideological bias, and what were the details, including the results of each audit?

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Global Affairs Canada manages an extensive network of 181 missions in 112 countries. Global Affairs Canada undertook an extensive preliminary search in order to determine the amount of information that would fall within the scope of these questions and the amount of time that would be required to prepare a comprehensive response. The department does not use object codes related to "climate justice", "intersectionality", "anti-racism" or "decolonization". The department concluded that producing and validating a comprehensive response to these questions would require a manual collection of information that is not possible in the time allotted and could lead to the disclosure of incomplete and misleading information.

Question No. 57—Fred Davies:

With regard to homes constructed under the Housing Accelerator Fund, since the program's introduction in March 2023: what are the details of each finished home completed by the fund, including, for each, the (i) address, (ii) date on which construction began, (iii) date on which construction was completed, (iv) description of the home (three-bedroom house, studio apartment, etc.)?

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to homes constructed under the Housing Accelerator Fund, or HAF, since the program's introduction in March 2023, growth resulting from the Housing Accelerator Fund is measured by the number of permitted housing units approved under the Fund agreement, compared to a baseline anchored in the community's historical growth. Each agreement includes an overall Housing Supply Growth Target that must be achieved by the end of the agreement.

The Fund will fast track more than 112,000 permits for new homes over the course of the program, which runs from 2024 to 2028. Over the next decade, municipalities forecast that these agreements will unlock more than 750,000 newly permitted homes.

The earliest short-term impacts were reported through communities' annual reports, submitted to Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation from November 2024 up to March 2025. In the first year of the program, communities issued 160,585 building permits, beating the combined forecast by 22,000, an early indicator of mid-term potential.

The Housing Accelerator Fund incentivizes local governments to make systemic reforms to land use planning and development approvals that will accelerate the supply of housing that Canadians need, with long-term impacts. Local governments have a significant impact on housing development. Local regulations and municipal bylaws influence where, what kind, and how quickly housing can be built.

To earn funding, approved local governments commit to a set of initiatives and growth targets called an Action Plan. Each community's Action Plan is unique, but all will result in more new housing permits than would have been approved otherwise. Following an initial payment upon signing, three annual payments are conditional upon satisfactory implementation of Action Plan commitments. All initiatives must be completed by the end of the second year of the agreement.

While construction of individual homes or housing projects is not a universally mandated reform under the program, once the funds from the Housing Accelerator Fund are earned, communities may choose to invest in a range of housing-related priorities, including individual housing projects or housing-related infrastructure. Many communities have dedicated funds from the Housing Accelerator Fund to directly support housing and infrastructure development, and details on such would be captured by the unique agreements signed with each of them.

Question No. 58—Fred Davies:

With regard to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada: how many provincial attestation letters or territorial attestation letters has Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada permitted designated educational institutions to allocate for international students, for each province and territory since 2024, broken down by Classification of Instructional Programs tied to the allocation, including (i) Classification of Instructional Programs code, (ii) Classification of Instructional Programs series, (iii) Classification of Instructional Programs subseries?

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, insofar as Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, or IRCC, is concerned, immigration is a shared jurisdiction while education is the responsibility of the provinces and territories. With respect to the implementation of the intake cap on study permit applications, IRCC has allocated study permit application spaces under the cap to provinces and territories, which are in turn responsible for distributing them among designated learning institutions in their jurisdiction.

Routine Proceedings

Provincial or territorial attestation letters are issued by provinces and territories, and confirm that a study permit applicant has a space within the allocation for that jurisdiction. Therefore, provinces and territories retain control over how the distribution of international students aligns with their respective immigration goals and other regional objectives. More detailed information on how a province or territory has distributed its allocation can best be obtained by contacting a provincial or territorial government.

IRCC has not placed additional conditions on how provinces and territories choose to distribute their allocations, including the extent to which spaces may be allocated according to the Classification of Instructional Programs.

Further information on the 2025 allocations can be found by referring to the notice published on January 24, 2025, titled “2025 provincial and territorial allocations under the international student cap.”

Question No. 59—Brad Vis:

With regard to Canadian counter tariffs: (a) how much money has been collected through the Canadian counter tariffs that came into effect on March 4, 2025; (b) how much of the money collected has come from small businesses; and (c) how much of the money collected through these counter tariffs has been allocated to small business programs in total and broken down by program?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), as of May 30, 2025, the government has collected approximately \$1.7 billion dollars in revenue from counter-tariffs imposed on imports from the U.S. This figure is net of remissions and other relief programs, such as the relieving provisions in Chapters 98 and 99 of the Customs Tariff, the Canada Border Services Agency Duties Relief Program and the Duty Drawback Program.

With regard to (b), this information is not currently available as tariff revenue collected by the Canada Border Services Agency is not disaggregated based on business size.

With regard to (c), the federal government has committed to using any revenues from Canada’s countermeasures to support Canadians and affected firms, including small businesses.

This includes \$500 million in favourably priced loans and advisory services from Business Development Bank of Canada has been made available to support affected small and medium-sized businesses and help them adapt, in addition to providing more funding to Canada’s regional development agencies so they can better support businesses.

Federal support also includes broad programming such as for the Employment Insurance Work-Sharing Program, which helps employers and employees avoid layoffs during temporary decreases in normal business activities, the \$5 billion Trade Impact Program through Export Development Canada, to help exporters reach new markets and by providing resources to navigate U.S. tariffs, and \$1 billion in new financing through Farm Credit Canada, to help manage financial challenges and market disruptions caused by tariffs for the Canadian agriculture and food industry.

Question No. 66—Greg McLean:

With regard to the Housing Accelerator Fund: (a) how much of the allocated \$228,466,276 has been released to the City of Calgary to date; (b) what was the date and amount of (i) the first advance, (ii) each subsequent payment; (c) has this

advance been fully disbursed; (d) what milestones have been achieved; and (e) how much of this funding has been allocated to create direct incentives for developers, and what kind of incentive was it?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a) concerning the Housing Accelerator Fund, the total funding allocated to the City of Calgary amounts to \$251,309,276. The City was allocated an additional \$22,843,000 during the annual review process. Additional funding was awarded to the fastest growing communities that submitted new initiatives through the annual review process and met action plan commitments and unit targets. The City of Calgary has received \$121,847,471 to date.

With regard to (b)(i), the first advance of \$57,116,569 was disbursed on November 2, 2023. With regard to (b)(ii), subsequent payments were made as follows: \$57,116,569 on January 9, 2025; and \$7,614,333 on March 3, 2025.

With regard to (c), yes, the first advance has been fully disbursed. Currently, two disbursements remain, contingent on satisfactory progress as determined during the annual review process.

With regard to (d), detailed progress updates can be found on the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation website at <https://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/professionals/project-funding-and-mortgage-financing/funding-programs/all-funding-programs/housing-accelerator-fund/housing-accelerator-fund-progress>.

With regard to (e), the City of Calgary has allocated approximately \$124 million of the Housing Accelerator Fund funding towards incentives to support office to residential conversions, market and non-market housing and infrastructure programs.

The City of Calgary’s action plan contains several initiatives that have direct incentive components.

The Accelerate Housing Delivery in the Downtown initiative will revise guidelines for the Downtown Calgary Development Incentive Program and provide additional funding to support the conversion of surplus office space.

The Promote Missing Middle Land Use Districts initiative will create a Stormwater Incentive Program to assist developers with the costs of utility upgrades required to support additional density.

The Incentivize Legal Secondary Suites initiative is a new incentive that is expected to significantly expand the supply of legal, registered secondary suites and will help homeowners with safety and other upgrades.

Routine Proceedings

The Build Inclusive and Equitable Affordable Housing Programs initiative will refresh the Housing Incentive Program, create a new Indigenous capital grant program and provide funding to support the sale of surplus City-owned lands to non-market housing providers.

Question No. 67—Fraser Tolmie:

With regard to the government's \$700 million contribution agreement with Powerco through the Net Zero Accelerator initiative: (a) how many emissions does the government expect will be reduced as a result of this contribution agreement; and (b) how many emissions did Powerco commit to directly reduce in the contribution agreement, if any?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question, the Net Zero Accelerator initiative has a number of objectives: decarbonizing large emitters, which is pillar 1, industrial transformation, which is pillar 2, and clean technology and battery ecosystem development, which is pillar 3.

This project falls under pillar 3: Clean technology and battery ecosystem development. The objective of projects under this pillar is to capitalize on emerging clean economy opportunities and promote the development of a made-in-Canada battery ecosystem. Access to batteries will in turn support electric vehicle manufacturers in Canada and help accelerate the adoption of electric vehicles, or EVs, replacing internal combustion vehicles and thereby reducing emissions. Emission reductions are down stream. There are no direct emissions reductions from the project.

With respect to part (b) of the question, PowerCo is constructing a new best in class greenfield facility. There are no specific reduction targets in the contribution agreement. The Recipient committed to integrate environmental solutions and to further investigate ways to reduce emissions associated with battery manufacturing, including throughout its supply chain. One of the reasons that the company chose to invest in Canada is to have access to low carbon grid electricity, supporting environmental sustainability.

Question No. 75—Eric Melillo:

With regard to the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario's target in the 2023-24 Departmental Results Report, to render a decision on applications within 80 working days of the receipt of a complete application and to issue payment on eligible claim submissions within 35 working days: (a) what is the rationale for why these targets are not being met 15% of the time; and (b) how many applicants have waited longer than 80 working days for a decision to be rendered?

Annie Koutrakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Jobs and Families, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), regarding the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario's target of rendering a decision on applications within 80 working days of the receipt of a complete application and to issue payment on eligible claim submissions within 35 working days, this target was not met 15% of the time due to increased demand from rural and Indigenous communities and delays in resourcing vacant positions within the Agency, both of which impacted service delivery time.

With regard to (b), 19 applicants waited longer than 80 working days for a decision to be rendered.

Question No. 76—Eric Melillo:

With regard to the departmental result indicator for the amount leveraged per dollar invested, by Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario projects, for which the target is 1.80: (a) what is the explanation for the result decreasing from 2.02 in 2021-22 to 1.61 in 2023-24; and (b) what is the rationale for not meeting the 1.80 target in 2023-24?

Annie Koutrakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Jobs and Families, Lib.): Mr.; Speaker, with regard to the departmental result indicator for the amount leveraged per dollar invested by Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, or FedNor, projects, this agency proactively publishes this information on GC Infobase. As such, the result explanation can be found at [https://www.tbs-sct.canada.ca/ems-sgd/edb-bdd/index-eng.html#infographic/dept/561/results/-.--\(indicator.-.-'DR-dr-r23-14051\)](https://www.tbs-sct.canada.ca/ems-sgd/edb-bdd/index-eng.html#infographic/dept/561/results/-.--(indicator.-.-'DR-dr-r23-14051)).

Question No. 77—Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:

With regard to the five-year lease that Public Services and Procurement Canada contracted with ILG LTÉE (Pierre Guay) in August 2021, to consolidate previous leases and retrofit two existing buildings (337 and 339 Guay Road, Lacolle): (a) did the lease, which was to run from April 1, 2022, to March 31, 2027, end with the closure of Roxham Road, at midnight on March 25, 2023; (b) if the new five-year lease contracted with ILG LTÉE did not end with the closure of Roxham Road on March 25, 2023, when did it end; (c) if the new five-year lease contracted with ILG LTÉE did not end as of November 6, 2024, when will it end; (d) if the new five-year lease contracted with ILG LTÉE did not end on March 25, 2023, is it possible to obtain the total amounts paid to ILG LTÉE since that date; and (e) if the new five-year lease contracted with ILG LTÉE did not end on March 25, 2023, is it possible to obtain the total amounts that remain to be paid to ILG LTÉE until the end of the contract?

Hon. Jenna Sudds (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement and to the Secretary of State (Defence Procurement), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question, Public Services and Procurement Canada has two leases with Importations Guay Limitée in Lacolle, Quebec, at 337 Guay Road and 339 Guay Road. The leases did not end in March 2023.

In response to parts (b) and (c) of the question, Public Services and Procurement Canada's lease for 337 Guay Road ends March 31, 2027. Public Services and Procurement Canada's lease for 339 Guay Road ends June 30, 2027.

As for parts (d) and (e) of the question, total amounts paid and remaining to be paid for these leases is commercially sensitive information that Public Services and Procurement Canada does not have the authority to release unilaterally under sections 18 and 20 of the Access to Information Act.

Question No. 81—Anna Roberts:

With regard to Canada Pension Plan payments: (a) has the government conducted any analysis of (i) how much it would cost to allow individuals, who continue to pay into, and don't start collecting, Canada Pension Plan payments until an age later than 65, such as 70, to defer those payments and receive larger payment when they do start collecting Canada Pension Plan payments, (ii) any proposal similar to that outlined in (a)(i); and (b) if the answer to (a)(i) or (a)(ii) is affirmative, what are the details, including the findings and projections associated with the analysis?

Routine Proceedings

Annie Koutrakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Jobs and Families, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, individuals are able to continue to contribute and defer the start of their Canada Pension Plan, or CPP, retirement pension in exchange for a higher monthly pension based on age of claim-related adjustments and this has been the case since 1987 when flexible retirement provisions were introduced to the CPP.

Under flexible retirement, while the standard age of eligibility for the retirement pension under the CPP is 65, individuals can choose to start collecting a permanently reduced pension as early as age 60, or to delay the start of their pension and receive an increased amount up to age 70.

These upward or downward adjustments to the pension amounts, referred to as actuarial adjustments, were put in place to ensure that, on average, the CPP's aggregate financial health is not impacted by individual decisions of contributors as to when to start collecting the CPP retirement pension and, by extension, to ensure that no individual's decision affects the benefits or contributions of other Canadians. The actuarial adjustment factors reflect the fact that those who start collecting their pension earlier will, on average, have made fewer contributions to the CPP and will also generally receive benefits for a longer period than those who begin receiving it later.

This means that, on average and in aggregate, there is no additional cost to the CPP for individuals who choose to defer their pension, nor is there a cost savings when individuals begin collecting their retirement pensions early.

From 1987 to 2011, the CPP's actuarial adjustment factors were set at 0.5% per month the pension was started before, or after, age 65, up to a maximum adjustment of 30% to a claimant's monthly retirement pension benefit. Individuals who collected their CPP retirement pension upon reaching age 60, as soon as they were eligible, had their pensions reduced by 30%, while pensions of those who waited until age 70 or later was increased 30%.

The actuarial adjustments factors were updated following the 2007-2009 Triennial Review of the CPP, after the Chief Actuary of Canada indicated that the old factors were no longer neutral as a result of a number of factors, including increases in life expectancies and the changing of the CPP's financial model following the 1998 reforms that restored the Plan's long term financial health. These updates were phased in over a number of years, from 2011 to 2016. Since that time, the adjustment factor for early retirement has been 0.6% per month, to a maximum reduction of 36% for those who begin their pension immediately at age 60. The adjustment factor for deferral is 0.7% per month of delay, to a maximum increase of 42% for those who begin their pension at age 70.

Further, to ensure that the adjustment factors remain neutral to the CPP's finances, the 1998 CPP reforms also introduced a legislated requirement, in subsection 115 (1.11) of the Canada Pension Plan, that actuarial adjustment factors were to be reviewed on a periodic basis by the Office of the Chief Actuary. The legislation requires the Chief Actuary to re-calculate the actuarial adjustment factors and specify them at least once every nine years, coinciding with the standard Triennial Review of the CPP timelines. The re-

view may be done more frequently if deemed necessary by the Chief Actuary.

The 27th CPP Actuarial Report at 31 December 2015, which was tabled in the House of Commons on 27 September 2016, confirmed that the current actuarial adjustment factors remain actuarially neutral. The full details of the analysis that led to that determination can be found in the Actuarial Study Canada Pension Plan Actuarial Adjustment Factors as specified in the 27th Actuarial Report on the Canada Pension as at 31 December 2015 – Actuarial Study No. 18, available at the following link: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2017/bsif-osfi/IN5-1-18-2017-eng.pdf.

The Actuarial Report (32nd) on the Canada Pension Plan at 31 December 2024, which is expected to be tabled in House of Commons in the fall of 2025, will confirm if the current factors remain appropriate and specify whether new factors are needed, based on most recent available projections of the Chief Actuary.

Statistics on the number of new CPP retirement pensions established by age, gender and by calendar year are published annually. Results observed from 1987 to 2024 for claims observed by age are available at the following link: <https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/ea075020-b9f4-43c4-8d04-075132cbbc7d/resource/c76328d2-d3f1-4daf-b101-719e5d081a26>.

Question No. 97—Laila Goodridge:

With regard to the finding of the "National Cyber Threat Assessment 2025-2026" that vendor concentration in technology services increases cyber vulnerability: (a) what is the government's current assessment of its own level of dependence on dominant technology service providers, across all departments and agencies; (b) has the government conducted any specific studies or analyses, since January 1, 2023, to quantify its dependency on individual dominant technology service providers, and, if so, what are the details and findings of each such study or analysis; and (c) has the government formally identified specific dominant technology service providers whose compromise could lead to cascading disruptions of essential government services or endanger national security, and, if so, what are the names of these identified dominant service providers?

Hon. Jenna Sudds (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement and to the Secretary of State (Defence Procurement), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting responses to the questions concerning the finding of the "National Cyber Threat Assessment 2025-2026" that vendor concentration in technology services increases cyber vulnerability.

With regard to (a), Shared Services Canada has not conducted a formal quantitative assessment on individual dominant technology services providers. However, the Government of Canada has taken steps to reduce its reliance on any single provider through implementation of diversification strategies as part of the development of enterprise services, and ensuring that products from multiple vendors are incorporated into procurements for Shared Services Canada services, including cyber security products, cloud hosting, desktop and mobile services, server and storage, and networking. Continued work on this Information Technologies Diversification Strategy is led by Shared Services Canada, with support and collaboration from the Office of the Chief Information Officer of Canada, in the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, and the Canadian Centre for Cyber Security, in an effort to reduce vendor concentration in these strategic areas.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to (b), Shared Services Canada has not conducted specific studies or analyses to quantify dependency on individual dominant technology service providers since January 1, 2023.

With regard to (c), for national security reasons, the Government of Canada cannot publicly disclose the names of specific dominant service providers. However, it actively monitors and manages cybersecurity risks through a range of tools and measures.

Question No. 100—Jeremy Patzer:

With regard to the Prime Minister's conflict of interest screen: (a) who in the Office of the Prime Minister or the Privy Council Office is responsible for ensuring that the Prime Minister abides by the terms of the screen; (b) on what date was the screen implemented; (c) on what day did the Prime Minister notify the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner that the screen was in force; (d) what specific measures are in place to ensure that any actions taken by the Prime Minister do not directly benefit Brookfield Corporation, Brookfield Asset Management, or any other Brookfield entity; and (e) other than Brookfield, which other corporate entities are covered by measures contained in the screen?

Hon. Rachel Bendayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question about who in the Office of the Prime Minister or the Privy Council Office is responsible for ensuring that the Prime Minister abides by the terms of the screen, the Prime Minister's conflict of interest screen is administered by the Prime Minister's Chief of Staff and by the Clerk of the Privy Council. The administrators ensure that the Prime Minister is not made aware of, and does not participate in, a decision or matter for which the screen applies.

In response to part (b) regarding the date on which the screen was implemented, the Prime Minister placed all of his financial assets, other than personal real estate, into a blind trust, which was submitted to the Commissioner on March 9. His team delivered a full and robust conflict-of-interest management plan on that same timeline. It has been implemented since that time.

The Prime Minister's finalized screen was dated July 10 and publicly disseminated on July 11, 2025.

In response to part (c) of the question on what day the Prime Minister notified the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner that the screen was in force, in collaboration with the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, a preliminary screen was put in place shortly following the Prime Minister being initially sworn in to office in March, and then further refined. The Prime Minister's finalized screen was dated July 10, 2025, and publicly disseminated on Friday, July 11, 2025.

Point (d) of the question asks what specific measures are in place to ensure that any actions taken by the Prime Minister do not directly benefit Brookfield Corporation, Brookfield Asset Management, or any other Brookfield entity. To support the Clerk in his role as one of the administrators, the Privy Council Office, in consultation with the office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, has developed a process for identifying matters that could be subject to the screen. Where appropriate, the screen administrators may directly consult the Commissioner, and if the screen administrators and the Commissioner agree, the screen must be applied.

All products subject to the screen will be marked as such and not provided to the Prime Minister. Where the screen applies, the matter will be referred to another minister.

Where the screen is applied to a matter for discussion/decision by Cabinet or Cabinet committees chaired by the Prime Minister, the Vice-Chair will assume the role of Chair for any matters covered by the screen. Recusal under the Conflict of Interest Act requires the Prime Minister to remove himself physically or virtually from the meeting or discussion where the matter is being decided.

If the Prime Minister recuses himself from a discussion, he must make a public declaration of the recusal to the office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner within 60 days after the day on which the recusal took place.

Part (e) of the question asks which other corporate entities, other than Brookfield, are covered by measures contained in the screen. The finalized screen applies to a list of companies detailed in Annex A of the screen.

Question No. 102—Eric Melillo:

With regard to Community Futures Program funding awarded to Community Futures Ontario: (a) what percentages and amounts of funds in the contribution agreements were allocated to Community Futures Development Corporations in Northern Ontario, for each of the 2023-24 and 2024-25 fiscal years; (b) what are the projections for the percentages and amounts of funds in the 2025-26 contribution agreement that will be allocated to Community Futures Development Corporations in Northern Ontario; and (c) what is the breakdown of (a) and (b) by federal riding?

Annie Koutrakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Jobs and Families, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), Community Futures Ontario, as an eligible applicant, receives funding from the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario to administer services to Community Future Development Corporations in Northern Ontario; no funds are directly re-allocated by Community Futures Ontario to individual Community Future Development Corporations in Northern Ontario.

With regard to (b), since no Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario Community Futures Program funds are further allocated to Community Future Development Corporations in Northern Ontario through Community Futures Ontario, there are no projections to report.

Lastly, with regard to (c), since no Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario Community Futures Program funds are further allocated to Community Future Development Corporations in Northern Ontario through Community Futures Ontario, there is no breakdown of funds by federal riding to report.

Question No. 103—Xavier Barsalou-Duval:

With regard to the federal government's purchase of the Quebec Bridge: (a) did the federal government carry out one or more expert assessments on the lifespan of the Quebec Bridge; (b) if the answer to (a) is affirmative, how long ago were they performed; and (c) if the answer to (a) is affirmative, what was the assessed remaining lifespan of the Quebec Bridge, in years?

Routine Proceedings

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the federal government's purchase of the Québec Bridge, and particularly with respect to part (a) of the question, Jacques Cartier and Champlain Bridges Incorporated, supported by Parsons-Tetra Tech, submitted a life cycle analysis of the Québec Bridge covering the 75 years following its acquisition by the Government of Canada.

With respect to part (b) of the question, this analysis was submitted to the government in September 2024.

Lastly, with respect to part (c) of the question, the life cycle analysis of the Québec Bridge, provided in September 2024, focused only on a 75-year period and did not assess the bridge's lifespan beyond that timeframe. The analysis concluded that, under a scenario of continued maintenance, the infrastructure could be kept in good condition and remain in service during the 75 years following its acquisition.

Question No. 110—Jamil Jivani:

With regard to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada in the 2024-25 fiscal year: (a) how much was spent administering the student visa program, in total and broken down by type of expense; (b) how many employees were assigned to the program (i) in total, (ii) for processing applications, (iii) for ensuring the compliance of those already granted a visa; (c) how many student visas were active; and (d) how many student visas were revoked, broken down by reason of revocation?

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, regarding (a), the 2024/2025 expenditures are currently unavailable and will only be accessible once the public accounts have been tabled in the House of Commons, which is expected in the fall.

Program expenditures will be made public following the tabling of the Departmental Results Report, which is also expected in the fall.

With regard to (b), the full-time equivalent assigned by program will also be made public following the tabling of the Departmental Results Report.

With regard to (c), the start and end date of a permit determines the time period for which it is active. To ensure permits that either expired during the 2024-2025 fiscal year or were issued within that timeframe but remain valid beyond March 31, 2025, are not excluded, and to avoid double-counting individuals who held more than one valid study permit, IRCC is reporting the total number of unique individuals who held a valid study permit on any date over the course of the time period. At any point in time between April 1, 2024, and March 31, 2025, there were approximately 1,317,680 persons who held a study permit, including extensions. Note that a permit may be valid for the duration of study and is not necessarily issued in the same year that it expires. As a result, this data includes instances where the permit was issued prior to this fiscal year.

With regard to (d), with few exceptions, foreign nationals traveling to Canada require either a Temporary Resident Visa, or TRV, or Electronic Travel Authorization, or eTA, prior to seeking entry to Canada. While the study permit, or SP, is approved in these instances prior to seeking entry, it is not confirmed, or issued, until arrival at the port of entry by CBSA. For extension applications where the client is already studying in Canada, the approval and confirmation/issuance take place at the same time.

Between April 1, 2024, and March 31, 2025, IRCC revoked approximately 16,760 SPs, including extensions in person. Note that an eTA or TRV issued as part of a SP application that was revoked may not be affected by the SP revocation and are not included with this data. Additionally, this data does not include unique counts, which may mean that the number of individuals affected by a revocation could be lower.

Data for the reasons for revocation is not systemically tracked.

Question No. 111—Jamil Jivani:

With regard to the Temporary Foreign Worker Program during the 2024-25 fiscal year: (a) how much was spent administering the program, in total and broken down by type of expense; (b) how many employees were assigned to the program, in total and broken down by type of assignment (processing applications, compliance, etc.); and (c) how much did the government spend promoting or advertising the program abroad, in total and broken down by country?

Annie Koutrakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Jobs and Families, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question, for the 2024-25 fiscal year, the cost of ESDC activities relating to the direct administration, which excludes internal services in support of the Temporary Foreign Worker, or TFW, Program totaled \$139,004,775. This includes operating expenditures of \$105,099,587, transfer payments of \$18,750,934 for the Migrant Worker Support Program, or MWSP, contribution to employee benefits of \$15,109,254, and refund of previous year revenues of \$45,000.

In terms of part (b) of the question, for the 2024-25 fiscal year, a total of 1,144 Full-Time Equivalent employees, or FTEs, at ESDC were assigned to the direct administration of the TFW Program.

Of these, 513 FTEs were assigned to Labour Market Impact Assessment, or LMIA, application processing activities, 304 FTEs were assigned to employer-compliance-verification activities, 16 FTEs were assigned to Employer Contact Centre regional activities, 6 FTEs were assigned to MWSP contribution delivery activities, and 305 FTEs were assigned to National Headquarters to provide strategic and policy direction, systems support, operational guidance, and oversight in support of program delivery.

Lastly, with respect to part (c) of the question, for the 2024-25 fiscal year, ESDC did not spend any money promoting or advertising the TFW Program abroad.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 118—Scot Davidson:**

With regard to the government's announcement in budget 2024 that they will create a new "capstone research funding organization": (a) what will be the purpose of this organization; (b) how much money has been allocated to, or is projected to be required by, this organization to date and over each of the next five fiscal years; (c) what specific gaps, deficiencies, or coordination challenges in the current federal research support system is this new capstone organization intending to address; (d) what is expected to be achieved by the organization in the (i) short, (ii) medium, (iii) long, term; (e) how will capstone fit in organizationally with the (i) Canadian Institutes of Health Research, (ii) Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, (iii) Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council; (f) will the new capstone organization have any funding authority or influence over any of the entities in (e), and, if so, what are the details; (g) how will the government avoid duplication between the work of capstone and the other entities in (e); (h) what impact, if any, will the establishment and funding of capstone have on the funding of the other entities in (e); (i) what metrics will be used to assess the impact of the new capstone organization, and whether or not the government is receiving value for its money; (j) how often will the assessments in (i) take place, and how will the results be made public; (k) what will be the composition of the board, or other governing body of the capstone, and how much will they be paid; and (l) on what date is capstone expected to be fully operational?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Budget 2024 announced the Government's intent to create a new capstone research funding organization. The creation of this new organization is intended to increase the impact of federal funding through better coordination and stronger connections among diverse actors, with a view to driving collaboration and harnessing Canadian research to better meet and address emerging challenges.

The Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council would continue to exist within the new organization, with a focus on supporting excellence in investigator-driven research, including linkages with the Health portfolio, and contributing to the collective and strategic direction of the new organization.

Through the capstone organization, the government is delivering on the observation of the Advisory Panel on the Federal Research Support System that more coordination is needed to effectively support the collaborative, international and interdisciplinary approaches increasingly necessary to address complex societal challenges and respond to emerging opportunities.

As committed to in the 2024 Fall Economic Statement, further details will be announced in the coming months.

Question No. 120—William Stevenson:

With regard to the statement made by Andrew Campbell, Senior Vice-President, Operations for Parks Canada, at the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development's meeting on the Jasper wildfires, where he stated "we do not take notes at my operations team meeting": (a) is this a standard practice at all operations team meetings, and, if so, why and when did this become standard practice; (b) when did the Minister of Environment and Climate Change become aware of this practice; (c) did the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, or anyone from his office, encourage this practice in any way; and (d) how does this practice comply with government record-keeping obligations?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), operations team meetings allow open discussion and are primarily used for sharing information and updates related to a variety of regional and national issues. Formal agency decisions are taken through a governance process whereby

documents are maintained in compliance to the Government of Canada records management standards.

With regard to (b), I was not, and am not routinely, updated or engaged on the note-taking practices at internal Parks Canada meetings.

With regard to (c), neither I, nor anyone from my office, provided any input into the note-taking practices at internal Parks Canada meetings.

With regard to (d), as per Government of Canada information management best practices, all decisions and actions of business value are kept and maintained in official records.

Question No. 122—Jeremy Patzer:

With regard to the government's efforts to control inflation: (a) does the government have a target rate specifically for food price inflation, and, if so, what is the current target rate; (b) since the new cabinet was sworn in on May 14, 2025, what measures, if any, have been put in place to reduce food price inflation; and (c) which Ministers, departments or agencies has the Prime Minister tasked with lowering food price inflation, and what specific measures is each doing to lower food price inflation?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the rise in food prices in recent years has been a global phenomenon, driven primarily by supply constraints and shortages faced during the pandemic, compounded by commodity price increases due to the Russian invasion of Ukraine and subsequent global geopolitical events. Indeed, the peak rise in food price inflation in Canada, at 10.6 percent in January 2023, was the second lowest in the G7 next to Japan. Moreover, food price inflation has moderated significantly since that peak, averaging just 1.8 percent on average over the first four months of 2025, again, second lowest in the G7.

The Government of Canada is committed to a policy of low, stable and predictable total inflation. This policy is achieved through a joint agreement between the Government of Canada and the Bank of Canada, the latter of which has as its central objective for monetary policy to target an annual rate of 2 percent for All-Items Consumer Price Index inflation. This has contributed to a more stable economic environment relative to previous decades and allowed households and businesses to make better long-term financial plans.

Routine Proceedings

The government has taken several steps to address food price inflation and affordability, including implementing a middle-class tax cut by reducing the first personal income tax rate from 15 percent to 14 percent, effective July 1, 2025, which will provide tax relief for nearly 22 million Canadians and save families up to \$840 annually starting in 2026, the first full year when the tax rate will be 14 percent; launching the National School Food Program, which will save the average participating family with two children up to \$800 per year; together with provinces and territories, establishing Canada's first-ever industry-led Grocery Sector Code of Conduct, which came into effect on June 1, 2025; creating a Food Price Data Hub, to provide Canadians a centralized location to view detailed information on food prices and help consumers make informed decisions about their food purchases; and amending the Competition Act to enhance competition and gave the Competition Bureau more power to crack down on unfair practices.

Food price inflation is influenced by many complex factors, such as extreme weather events, global supply chain disruptions, exchange rate, energy and transportation costs, and competitive environment to name just a few. Therefore, several federal government portfolios contribute to lowering food price inflation, including Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, and Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada, which specifically addresses food costs in remote northern communities through the Nutrition North Canada program.

Question No. 126—Andrew Lawton:

With regard to legal services and the Department of Justice: what are the total legal costs incurred by the government, broken down by (i) Canadian Frontline Nurses and Kristen Nagle v. Attorney General of Canada, (ii) Canadian Civil Liberties Association v. Attorney General of Canada, (iii) Canadian Constitution Foundation v. Attorney General of Canada, (iv) Jeremiah Jost, Edward Cornell, Vincent Gircys and Harold Ristau v. Governor in Council, His Majesty in right of Canada, Attorney General of Canada, and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the legal costs incurred by the Government for the cases Canadian Frontline Nurses and Kristen Nagle v. Attorney General of Canada, Canadian Civil Liberties Association v. Attorney General of Canada, Canadian Constitution Foundation v. Attorney General of Canada, and Jeremiah Jost, Edward Cornell, Vincent Gircys and Harold Ristau v. Governor in Council, His Majesty in right of Canada, Attorney General of Canada, and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, to the extent that the information that has been requested is or may be protected by any legal privileges, including solicitor-client privilege, the federal Crown asserts those privileges. In this case, it has only waived solicitor-client privilege, and only to the extent of revealing the total legal costs, as defined below.

The total legal costs, namely the actual and notional costs, associated with Federal Court and Federal Court of Appeal files related to Canadian Frontline Nurses and Kristen Nagle v. Attorney General of Canada, Canadian Civil Liberties Association v. Attorney General of Canada, Canadian Constitution Foundation v. Attorney General of Canada, and Jeremiah Jost, Edward Cornell, Vincent Gircys and Harold Ristau v. Governor in Council, His Majesty in right of Canada, Attorney General of Canada, and Minister of Pub-

lic Safety and Emergency Preparedness, amount to approximately \$3,645,000.00. The services targeted here are litigation services provided in these cases by the Department of Justice, as well as litigation support services. Department of Justice lawyers, notaries and paralegals are salaried public servants and therefore no legal fees are incurred for their services. A “notional amount” can, however, be provided to account for the legal services they provide. The notional amount is calculated by multiplying the total hours recorded in the files for the relevant period by the applicable approved internal legal services hourly rates. Actual costs represent file related legal disbursements and legal agent fees, as the case may be. The total amount mentioned in this response is based on information contained in Department of Justice systems, as of June 6, 2025.

Question No. 129—Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:

With regard to goods imported into Canada with ties to Xinjiang: (a) what goods are entering the Canadian market after being refused entry into the United States, and in what quantities; (b) how many of these goods did not comply with the United States' Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act; and (c) what goods and materials entering Canada have ties to Xinjiang, and in what quantities?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Customs Act only requires importers to identify the country of origin, for example, “China”, of their goods, not the region. The region where goods originate within a country is not a data element that is mandatory; importers do not have the obligation to report it. However, the CBSA can report that from January 1, 2024 to June 25, 2025, of the 34 shipments that have been intercepted for suspected ties to forced labour, goods contained in one of those shipments were subsequently determined to have been produced wholly or in part by forced labour and were originating from the Xinjiang region.

Establishing that goods have been produced by forced labour requires significant research, analysis and supporting information. CBSA works closely with the key government departments such as Employment and Social Development Canada and Global Affairs Canada to identify goods of concern related to forced labour. Canada also cooperates and exchanges information and best practices with US Customs and Border Protection related to the enforcement of the forced labour import ban.

When a shipment is detained, importers have the opportunity to provide information that will be analyzed by the CBSA in order to inform the final decision of the officer. The officer is then required to make a tariff classification determination on the imported goods, based on the information provided by the importers. If the officer determines that the goods were produced by forced labour, the officer will prohibit the goods from entering Canada.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 130—Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:**

With regard to products containing polysilicon that are imported into Canada: (a) how many of these products are linked to Xinjiang; (b) what percentage of all imported products containing polysilicon do the products in (a) account for; and (c) how many were previously denied entry to the United States because they were not compliant with the United States' Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Customs Act only requires importers to identify the country of origin, for example, "China", of their goods, not the region. The region within a country where goods originate is not a data element that is mandatory; importers do not have the obligation to report it. As such, the CBSA cannot provide the information requested specific to Xinjiang. However, the Canada Border Services Agency, or CBSA, can report that from January 1, 2024, to June 25, 2025, 34 shipments were intercepted for suspected ties to forced labour. Based on a manual search of our records, 32 of those shipments were products containing polysilicon imported from China, but none of the 32 shipments appear to have originated in Xinjiang.

Establishing that goods have been produced by forced labour requires significant research, analysis and supporting information. CBSA works closely with the key government departments such as Employment and Social Development Canada and Global Affairs Canada to identify goods of concern related to forced labour. Canada also cooperates and exchanges information and best practices with US Customs and Border Protection related to the enforcement of the forced labour import ban.

When a shipment is detained, importers have the opportunity to provide information that will be analyzed by the CBSA in order to inform the final decision of the officer. The officer is then required to make a tariff classification determination on the imported goods, based on the information provided by the importers. If the officer determines that the goods were produced by forced labour, the officer will prohibit the goods from entering Canada.

Question No. 132—Tamara Kronis:

With regard to the \$5 million promised by the government to the Nanaimo Loaves and Fishes Community Food Bank in December of 2024: (a) how much of the funding has been delivered to date; (b) on what dates was funding delivered to the food bank and how much was delivered on each date; and (c) what are the dates and amounts of future payments by the government to the food bank which have not yet occurred?

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question, with regard to the \$5 million proposed in the government's December 2024 Fall Economic Statement, or FES, the FES represents proposed funding and a contribution agreement with Loaves and Fishes does not exist.

Part (b) of the question is not applicable, as no funding has been delivered.

As for part (c), no information is available regarding dates and amounts of future payments.

Question No. 133—Tamara Kronis:

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency during the 2024 calendar year: (a) how many registered charities existed; (b) of the charities in (a), how many and what percentage were religious charities or charities whose primary purpose is related to the advancement of religion; (c) how many and what percentage of charities

were audited; and (d) how many and what percentage of religious charities, or charities whose primary purpose is related to advancement of religion, were audited?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to my colleague's question, here is the response from the Canada Revenue Agency, or CRA, as of June 9, 2025, the date of question.

The CRA's data is maintained by fiscal period, from April 1 to March 31. As such, the CRA is providing the data for the 2024-2025 fiscal period.

With regard to (a), as of March 31, 2025, there were 85,315 registered charities in Canada.

With regard to (b), as of March 31, 2025, 32,078 charities were included under the charitable category "Advancement of religion," which represents approximately 38% of registered charities.

At the time of registration, the CRA assigns all registered charities' category and sub-category codes that reflect their purposes and activities. The CRA's publicly available databases retain this information, including its list of charities and certain other qualified donees, available at <https://www.canada.ca/en/revenue-agency/services/charities-giving/list-charities/list-charities-other-qualified-donees.html>, which identifies each registered charity's category and sub-category code.

The category code generally identifies the category under which a charity's purposes are classified. It is important to note that category codes may not always reflect the full extent of a charity's activities. A charity may have religious motivations or associations without being categorized under an "advancement of religion" category code. For example, a charity with religious motivations that operates a food bank could be categorized under a "relief of poverty" category code. Another example could be a charity whose directors are members of the clergy, who operate the charity based on religious principles, but who offer humanitarian relief programs.

If a charity changes its programs over time, its category code is not automatically updated. The charity must inform the CRA of any such changes for this code to be revised.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to (c), during the 2024–2025 fiscal period, the CRA audited 220 registered charities, which represents approximately 0.3% of registered charities. Through its understanding of the charitable sector population, the CRA has developed and implemented a risk-based and multi-streamed approach involving audits and various non-audit interventions. The risk-based and multi-streamed approach is designed to provide the appropriate balance of compliance treatments, which include an array of activities ranging from reminder and nudge letters, to conducting audits, which can result in outcomes ranging from education letters, to sanctions, and revocations. This approach is based on the understanding of how risk is distributed through the charitable sector population. A priority of the CRA, through its risk-based approach, is to address high-risk non-compliance, which has a severe negative impact on the charitable sector.

With regard to (d), the confidentiality provisions of the Income Tax Act prevent the CRA from commenting on specific cases. The CRA's actions can only be made public when an audit results in a charitable registration being revoked, annulled, or suspended, or when a charity is penalized. However, the CRA can confirm it does not select registered charities for audit based on factors such as faith or denomination, nor would such factors influence the outcome of an audit.

Question No. 138—**Jim Bélanger:**

With regard to the Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario for 2024–25: what metrics are being used to determine whether funding has achieved Economic Development Initiative objectives and expected results, including objectives to (i) demonstrate participation and support of the Francophone community, (ii) respond to a priority and need of the Francophone community?

Annie Koutrakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Jobs and Families, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario in 2024–25, the metrics used to determine whether funding has achieved the initiative's objectives and expected results are drawn from the horizontal performance measurement strategy led by Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.

The Economic Development Initiative supports the sustainable economic growth of Official Language Minority Communities and is part of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada's commitment under the Official Languages Act and the Action Plan for Official Languages 2023–2028.

Performance is assessed through a common logic model applied across all Regional Development Agencies, including metrics such as for part (i) of the question, the number of Official Language Minority Communities businesses and organizations supported; the jobs created or maintained in Official Language Minority Communities; the partnerships established or strengthened with Francophone organizations; for part (ii), the capacity-building activities that respond to identified community needs; and the evidence of new expertise, services, or market access for Francophone entrepreneurs.

Progress is reported through annual data and narrative reporting that contributes to horizontal evaluations and official languages accountability. Metrics also assess how projects demonstrate meaningful participation by the Francophone community and address identified priorities and needs.

Question No. 148—**David Bexte:**

With regard to the government's policy on pipeline approvals: (a) what is the government's policy, including which specific parties or entities must agree or consent before an approval is given; and (b) how long will it take for the government to approve or reject any new pipeline proposal?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, or CER Act, establishes the Canada Energy Regulator, or CER, as the federal body that oversees the regulation of pipelines that cross provincial or international boundaries. The CER Act can be found at <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-15.1/index.html>.

The CER's mandate, responsibilities and powers are established under the CER Act and a number of other Acts and Regulations, which are found at <https://www.cer-rec.gc.ca/en/about/acts-regulations/list-acts-regulations/index.html>.

The Commission of the CER is an independent entity within the governance structure of the CER, authorized under the CER Act and other relevant legislation to adjudicate pipelines and other energy projects. The Commission adheres to the purpose and provisions of the CER Act when assessing whether a pipeline application should be approved, balancing factors that are set out in the CER Act such as: impacts to the environment; impacts to the rights and interests of Indigenous Peoples; the need for the project; economic impacts; job creation; and whether it can be built and operated safely. The CER Act requires the Commission to establish fair, inclusive, transparent, and efficient regulatory processes for assessing applications. Prior to making a recommendation or decision about a project, the Commission considers the views of the people and communities who may be potentially impacted by the project.

When making recommendations and decisions, the Commission is required to consider a number of factors including any adverse effects that a project may have on the rights of the Indigenous Peoples of Canada recognized and affirmed by section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982.

The CER uses a cooperative and respectful approach to engagement with Indigenous Peoples. The UN Declaration, including its provisions regarding free, prior and informed consent, provides important context for this work and can be a relevant consideration for the Commission when designing its hearing processes for the purpose of making decisions or recommendations for new pipeline projects.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to (b), the CER Act mandates that all applications must be dealt with as expeditiously as the circumstances and procedural fairness and natural justice permit and sets out legislated time limits for how long assessment processes can take. In addition, the Commission has established service standards that identify specific delivery targets for processing applications. Information about the CER's time limits and service standards can be found at: <https://www.cer-rec.gc.ca/en/about/who-we-are-what-we-do/cer-time-limits-and-service-standards.html>.

These time limits and service standards vary according to the size and complexity of the proposed project. Pursuant to the time limits set out in the CER Act, pipelines that are 40 km in length or under must be processed by the Commission within 130 – 300 calendar days, and these are generally processed faster, within service standards of between 40 and 120 days, depending on complexity. Applications for pipelines that are over 40 kilometres in length must be processed by the Commission within a 15-month time limit. For these projects, the Commission makes a recommendation about whether a project should be approved, but the final decision is then made by the Governor in Council.

The CER has achieved the time limit for 99% of the thousands of applications assessed under the CER Act for which time limits apply.

Pipeline projects that meet the thresholds in Physical Activities Regulations, available at <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-2019-285/FullText.html>, go through an impact assessment or integrated review process, led by the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada and a decision is made by the Governor in Council.

Question No. 149—Scott Anderson:

With regard to the Minister of Public Safety: (a) on what date did the minister complete the Canadian Firearms Safety Course; and (b) if the minister has not yet completed the Canadian Firearms Safety Course, has he signed up to take the course, and, if not, why not?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, completion of the Canadian Firearms Safety Course, or CFSC, is a prerequisite to apply for a Possession and Acquisition Licence.

The topics covered in the CFSC include the evolution of firearms, major parts, types and actions, basic firearms safety practices, ammunition, operating firearm actions, safe handling and carry procedures, firing techniques and procedures, care of non-restricted firearms, responsibilities of the firearms owner/user, and safe storage, display, transportation and handling of non-restricted firearms.

In accordance with Section 26 of the Privacy Act, the RCMP cannot provide any information on individuals who have enrolled or participated in the CFSC.

Question No. 151—Rachael Thomas:

With regard to the \$11,985 contract between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and GCStrategies Inc., which was noted in the June 2025 report of the Auditor General: (a) what was the contract for; (b) on what date was it signed; (c) who at the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation decided to award this contract to GCStrategies Inc.; (d) what specific work was done and what results were achieved by GCStrategies Inc.; and (e) did GCStrategies Inc. approach the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to initiate this contract or did the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

approach GCStrategies Inc. to initiate this contract, and which individuals approached which individuals?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), the purchase order was for a one-time, non-recurring recruitment service to secure the recruitment of a specialized external candidate.

With regard to (b), the purchase order was issued on October 5, 2016.

With regard to (c), CBC's hiring manager responsible for filling the posting authorized the purchase order following the hiring of the successful candidate.

With regard to (d), GC Strategies Inc. identified and provided a candidate who was ultimately successful. The agency earned a corresponding placement fee.

With regard to (e), GC Strategies Inc. approached CBC's hiring manager following the public posting of the job opportunity.

Question No. 153—Blaine Calkins:

With regard to government measures to monitor the border: (a) what is the total number of helicopters used at the border, broken down by those (i) owned, (ii) leased; (b) for helicopters leased, which companies are they leased from; (c) what is the total number of patrol boats in use, broken down by type of boat and whether the boats are owned or leased; (d) for patrol boats being leased, which companies are they leased from; (e) what is the total number of drones used at the border, broken down by type of drone and whether they are owned or leased; and (f) for drones leased, which companies are they leased from?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to parts (c) and (d) of the question, for security reasons and to maintain the integrity of the operations of the Canada Border Services Agency, or CBSA, information pertaining to the use of boats has been withheld.

As of June 11, 2025, the CBSA owns 11 rigid hull inflatable boats.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police, or RCMP, deploys helicopters, marine vessels, and drones, also referred to as Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems, or RPAS, to support border operations, as well as other mandated priorities. The specific number of each asset used at the border can fluctuate each day, dependent on several factors. Key factors include: a rapidly evolving operational landscape; how border operations are conducted by the RCMP; and the demand for resources placed on the RCMP by shifting priorities, which are determined either by evolving risks/threats or Government of Canada priorities.

To protect the integrity of RCMP equipment and the operations which they support, the RCMP is not able to provide specific details on the type of marine vessels or RPAS used by the organization.

In response to part (a) of the question, the RCMP currently owns a total of nine helicopters; six of which can be deployed, as required, to support border integrity operations. Additionally, two Black Hawks, chartered by Helicopter Transport Services; and another one (1) Black Hawk, chartered by Expedition Helicopters Inc.

With respect to part (b), the RCMP does not currently lease helicopters; however, the RCMP does charter three helicopters as described in part (a). Note that the RCMP defines leasing as a long-term agreement for the use of an asset, like an aircraft, with the lessee, or user, often having more control and responsibility over its operation. Chartering equipment is usually a shorter-term arrangement for a specific purpose, with the charterer, or user, often relying on the owner or operator for the asset's operation, including pilot, crew, and maintenance.

With respect to part (c), the RCMP owns approximately 45 marine vessels deployed for federal border operations across Canada. This number may vary slightly due to vessels in and out of service and for other operational matters.

With respect to part (d), the RCMP does not currently lease marine vessels.

With respect to part(e), in collaboration with Public Services and Procurement Canada, the RCMP procured 60 drones specifically for task missions tied to integrated border enforcement work that it carries out across the country. The use of RPAS allows the RCMP to monitor remote or hard-to-access areas more effectively, helping detect and respond to potential risks in real time. The Canadian Armed Forces provided over 40 secured drones to support RCMP border security activities.

With respect to part (f), the RCMP does not currently lease drones.

Question No. 158—Cathay Wagantall:

With regard to Veterans Affairs Canada's public and private directives to veterans concerning the certification of service dogs: (a) what are the directives currently issued; (b) how has each directive changed between January 1, 2016, and today; and (c) from January 1, 2016, to today, what are the details of any internal or external communications or briefing materials between Veterans Affairs Canada officials or with other departments, stakeholders, or individuals relating to the public and private directives issued to veterans regarding the certification of service dogs, including the (i) date, (ii) title, (iii) sender, (iv) recipient, (v) type of communication, (vi) file or tracking number?

Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Veterans Affairs Canada recognizes the growing interest in the use of service dogs to support Veterans with physical and mental health conditions as well as offering a range of mental health treatments for various conditions. At present, psychiatric service dogs are not currently recognized under Veterans Affairs Canada's treatment benefits however Veterans Affairs Canada remains committed to reviewing its approach to psychiatric service dogs.

While Veterans Affairs Canada acknowledges the potential of psychiatric service dogs to assist individuals with mental health conditions, the priority remains to ensure Veterans have access to evidence-based, safe, and effective health benefits. At present, there is insufficient evidence to support the efficacy of psychiatric service dogs as a recognized treatment.

Routine Proceedings

In June 2022, the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs released its report, "Incorporating Service Dogs into the Rehabilitation Program of Veterans Affairs Canada." Among its recommendations, the committee encouraged Veterans Affairs Canada to consider the ongoing five-year service dog training pilot program by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs, once a national standard is established in Canada.

Veterans Affairs Canada continues to monitor emerging research on psychiatric service dogs including the aforementioned study, which began in late 2022 and is expected to run for five years. Veterans Affairs Canada will review the study's findings and best practices to assess their relevance and applicability within the Canadian context. In 2015, Veterans Affairs Canada funded a pilot study to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of service dogs for Veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder. In 2019, through the Veteran Family and Well-being Fund, Veterans Affairs Canada provided funding to Wounded Warriors Canada to support the development of a post-traumatic stress disorder service dog certification program.

Of note, in 2018, the Government of Canada expanded the Medical Expense Tax Credit to include expenses for specially trained service animals. This credit is available to eligible Canadians, including Veterans.

With regard to (a), Veterans Affairs Canada does not have any public or private directives concerning certification of service dogs for Veterans.

With regard to (b), the response is not applicable.

With regard to (c), although Veterans Affairs Canada has had, and continues to have, internal and external communications regarding service dogs in general, it does not have records relating to the public and private directives issued to Veterans regarding the certification of service dogs.

Question No. 161—Garnett Genuis:

With regard to the call between the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the India External Affairs Minister, in late May 2025: (a) what were the issues and topics discussed during the call and what progress or agreements, if any, were made in relation to each issue or topic; and (b) have there been any follow-up calls or meetings between the minister, her office, or other government officials and the Government of India, and, if so, what are the details of each such meetings?

Rob Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following reflects a consolidated response approved on behalf of Global Affairs Canada ministers.

Routine Proceedings

With respect to part (a) of the question, on May 25, 2025, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada and the Indian external affairs minister held a productive discussion on strengthening Canada-India ties, deepening economic co-operation and advancing shared priorities.

With respect to part (b), diplomatic channels have remained open, and conversations have continued between Government of Canada and Government of India officials throughout the recent challenging period in bilateral relations. Following the call between the foreign ministers, the Prime Minister of Canada spoke with the Prime Minister of India on June 6, 2025. The two leaders discussed the long-standing Canada-India relationship, emphasizing strong people-to-people ties and substantial commercial links. They agreed that the bilateral relationship must be founded upon mutual respect, the rule of law and a commitment to the principle of sovereignty and territorial integrity. They also agreed to continue law enforcement dialogue and discussions to address shared security concerns. The Prime Minister of Canada extended an invitation to Prime Minister Modi to attend the 2025 G7 Leaders' Summit in Kananaskis, Alberta. Both leaders agreed to remain in contact and looked forward to meeting later that month at the summit.

Question No. 163—Cathay Wagantall:

With regard to communications sponsored by the government during the COVID-19 pandemic: (a) which individual or agency developed the "Pregnancy, childbirth and caring for a newborn during the COVID-19 pandemic" communication, which was first published on July 13, 2021, and last updated on October 25, 2023; (b) who provided the final approval of the communication in (a) and when; (c) which individual or agency developed the narrative for the video titled, "Are there any ingredients in the COVID-19 vaccines that I should be concerned about", narrated by Dr. Ayesha Raza; (d) who provided the final approval of the communication in (c) and when; (e) which individual or agency developed the narrative for the video titled, "Can the COVID-19 vaccines affect fertility", narrated by Dr. Darine El-Chaâr; (f) who provided the final approval of the communication in (e) and when; (g) on December 23, 2021, which individual or agency developed the advice to Canadians about the interchangeability of vaccines found on the government's website, titled, "COVID-19 vaccine: Canadian Immunization Guide, For health professionals, Notice"; and (h) who provided the final approval of the communication in (g) and when?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question, the "Pregnancy, childbirth and caring for a newborn during the COVID-19 pandemic" fact sheet was developed by the Public Health Agency of Canada, or PHAC. The content was drawn largely from text that was previously posted to Canada.ca.

In response to (b), the fact sheet was approved on May 19, 2021, by the chief of operations in the health portfolio operations centre.

In response to (c), the scripts were developed in collaboration between PHAC and Health Canada.

In response to (d), the Privy Council Office, or PCO, provided final approval of the script on July 16, 2021.

In response to (e), the scripts were developed in collaboration between PHAC and Health Canada.

In response to (f), PCO provided final approval of the script on July 16, 2021.

In response to (g), the Canadian Immunization Guide, or CIG, is a comprehensive resource on immunization maintained by PHAC. The CIG is developed based on recommendations from PHAC and

statements of independent expert advisory committees, including the National Advisory Committee on Immunization, or NACI, and the Committee to Advise on Tropical Medicine and Travel.

The initial publication of the COVID-19 vaccine chapter in the CIG, released on December 23, 2021, integrated all NACI guidance that remained relevant and current at the time, including the June 1, 2021, advice on the interchangeability of authorized COVID 19 vaccines.

In response to (h), as outlined in the NACI terms of reference, NACI provides ongoing and timely medical, scientific and public health advice for routine programs and in urgent situations, such as an influenza pandemic, related to Canada's use of vaccines to prevent infection and disease, and certain prophylactic agents, for example immunoglobulins.

While NACI is responsible for developing scientific and public health advice related to vaccine use in Canada, PHAC retains final decision-making authority. Final approval of guidance published in the CIG, including notices, rests with PHAC to ensure alignment with federal public health policies and operational considerations. Approval for the publication of the content within the COVID 19 vaccines CIG chapter was provided by the vice-presidents of the PHAC COVID 19 vaccine rollout task force and infectious disease programs branch on November 30, 2021.

Question No. 166—Michael Cooper:

With regard to preliminary audits of registered third parties undertaken by Elections Canada during the 45th general election, prior to April 28, 2025: what were the details of each preliminary audit undertaken, including the (i) name of the third party, (ii) website name and uniform resource locator of the organization, (iii) cause or concern for issuing the preliminary audit, (iv) results of the preliminary audit?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Elections Canada does not perform preliminary audits of registered third parties. The interim returns that are filed during the election period are for information purposes only and are not subject to audit. Audits will be conducted following the submission of Third Party's Electoral Campaign Returns, which are due on August 28, 2025.

Below are links to the third party interim returns that have been published for the 45th general election, or GE, as well as to the tools for third parties page.

Third party financial returns for the 45th GE can be found at <https://www.elections.ca/content.aspx?section=fin&dir=oth/thi/advert/tp45&document=index&lang=e>.

Tools for third parties can be found at <https://www.elections.ca/content.aspx?section=pol&dir=thi&document=index&lang=e>.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 167—Philip Lawrence:**

With regard to eligibility for Canada Student Loan forgiveness for healthcare professionals working in rural and remote communities: (a) for which specific professions is such forgiveness available; (b) for which healthcare professions is such forgiveness not available; (c) why were the professions in (b) excluded; and (d) is the government reviewing the list of eligible professions, to consider possible changes, and, if so, what are the details of the review process?

Annie Koutrakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Jobs and Families, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question, the Canada student loan, or CSL, forgiveness benefit is currently available to family doctors, family medicine residents in training, registered nurses, registered psychiatric nurses, registered practical nurses, licensed practical nurses, and nurse practitioners who work in an eligible underserved rural or remote community. As announced in budget 2024, the government is expanding the list of eligible occupations to include early childhood educators, dentists, dental hygienists, pharmacists, midwives, teachers, social workers, psychologists, personal support workers and physiotherapists. Budget Implementation Act, 2024, No. 1, S.C. 2024, c. 17, included necessary legislative amendments to the Canada Student Financial Assistance Act and the Canada Student Loans Act to expand the list of eligible occupations. Pending regulatory approval, it is expected that the CSL forgiveness benefit will be available to borrowers working in the newly eligible occupations this fall.

In response to (b), loan forgiveness will be available only to borrowers working in an occupation specifically listed in the Canada Student Financial Assistance Act and the Canada Student Loans Act.

In response to (c), the government considered several factors when determining the list of newly eligible occupations, as follows:

One, labour market information, i.e., the Canadian occupational projection system and customized data on demand in rural tracts, was used to identify sectors that are projected to be in shortage in the coming years. These expected shortages include occupations such as physiotherapists, psychologists, pharmacists, dentists and allied healthcare professionals.

Two, in addition, extensive consultations were undertaken with provinces and territories, stakeholders from numerous different professions and student organizations to ensure their voices were heard while the government examined various options. The need for enhanced mental health supports, the growing importance of interdisciplinary care and care services for an aging population were all highlighted as being a priority for stakeholders, supporting the addition of psychologists, social workers, pharmacists, midwives and personal support workers to the list of eligible occupations.

Three, certain occupations were considered and identified as playing key roles in supporting the implementation of Government of Canada priorities, namely the Canada-wide early learning and child care system, the Canadian dental care plan, and the national pharmacare plan.

Four, in addition, while the Government of Canada recognizes that there are numerous other occupations in shortage in rural and remote communities, the government has a fiscal responsibility towards Canadians and must ensure that tax dollars are being spent efficiently on programs that matter most to them. The expansion of

the list to add the additional 10 new occupations balances both fiscal prudence and health and social service shortages, and it is anticipated that the 10 new occupations will have an important and immediate impact on the lives of Canadians living in these underserved communities.

In response to (d), this is the last of three planned enhancements to the CSL forgiveness benefit, which also included increasing the amount of forgiveness available to family doctors and nurses by 50% in November 2023 and expanding the definition of underserved rural or remote community to include all communities with a population of 30,000 or less in November 2024. Further amendments to the list of eligible occupations are not anticipated at this time.

Accessibility Standards Canada has reviewed all available data and has confirmed that it has not participated in the Canada student loan program, nor does it have such a program within its mandate.

The Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety has reviewed the information available and has confirmed that it has not participated in the Canada student loan program, nor does it have such a program within its mandate.

Question No. 170—Philip Lawrence:

With regard to the Main Estimates, 2025-26: (a) what is the total amount of netted revenue projected for the fiscal year 2025-26, broken down by department, agency and Crown corporation; (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by source of revenue; (c) what is the total amount of gross expenses, broken down by department, agency and Crown corporation; and (d) what is the breakdown of (c) by type of expense?

Tom Osborne (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Main Estimates 2025-2026 includes netted revenue projections of \$15.6 billion for the 2025-26 fiscal year.

The “2025–26 Budgetary Expenditures by Standard Object” table, found at <https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/planned-government-spending/government-expenditure-plan-main-estimates/2025-26-estimates/budgetary-expenditures-standard-objects.html>, shows planned expenditures for each organization in the main estimates, broken down by type of expenditure. The table also provides projections of netted revenues for each organization. Additional information on planned expenditures and revenues is available in the 2025–26 departmental plans, found at <https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/planned-government-spending/reports-plans-priorities/2025-26-departmental-plans.html>.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 173—Kelly DeRidder:**

With regard to meetings held by the Strategic Science Fund's steering committee in which a declaration, conflict, potential perception of conflict, abstention or recusal was noted in the meeting minutes, from December 1, 2022, to June 11, 2025: what are the details of each instance noted in the meeting minutes, broken down by director, including (i) the decision in question, (ii) the amount of funding tied to the decision, (iii) the name of the entity receiving funding related to the decision, (iv) the name of the board member for whom a declaration, conflict, potential perception of conflict, abstention or recusal was noted, (v) the reason for which the declaration, conflict, potential perception of conflict, abstention or recusal was divulged by the board member, (vi) whether the board member held a private interest in the decision?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for the time frame identified, there were no declarations of conflict, potential perceptions of conflict, abstentions or recusals of the strategic science fund's steering committee members or delegates.

The purpose of the strategic science fund steering committee is to provide strategic oversight in the design and delivery of the program. The steering committee affirms the robustness and credibility of the review process and confirms that the appropriate level of due diligence was conducted. The strategic science fund steering committee does not make funding decisions. Funding decisions for the strategic science fund are made by the ministers of industry and health, informed by the advice of an independent expert advisory panel.

Question No. 177—Helena Konanz:

With regard to the lease agreement between the government and the Penticton Shooting Sports Association: (a) what is the legal property designation subject to the lease agreement; (b) on what date did the government decide to end the lease agreement; (c) on what grounds was the decision to end the lease agreement taken; (d) what consultation was done on the decision to end the lease agreement between January 1, 2023 and June 13, 2025; (e) on what date was the Penticton Shooting Sports Association informed of this decision; (f) what is the estimated value of the land previously subject to the lease agreement; (g) does the government have a plan to sell the land, and, if so, to whom and what will the land be used for in the future; and (h) what impact did the government's anti-sport shooter and anti-hunter agenda have on the decision to end the lease agreement?

Hon. Heath MacDonald (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a) of the question, the property title is KD93041, and the parcel is identified as 011-370-963 in the Osoyoos Division Yale District, except plans H397 and 41847.

In response to (b), the Penticton Shooting Sports Association, or PSSA, was formally advised through a letter in May 2024 that the lease termination date is December 31, 2025.

In response to (c), this federal land is not required for program and operational purposes. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, or AAFC, is in the process of disposing of this surplus land, pursuant to the Treasury Board directive on the management of real property. The property must be vacated so that divestiture activities may move forward, including environmental remediation of the lands and indigenous consultations.

In response to (d), AAFC and the PSSA have been in consultation on the potential end of the lease agreement, pursuant to the terms and conditions of their agreement. AAFC communicated to the PSSA the decision to divest the land parcels by letter in January 2023, followed by an in-person meeting in June 2023. PSSA were

also notified in December 2023 that ongoing environmental site assessment work was taking place in the spring of 2024 and that once the environmental remediation was planned, the lands would have to be vacated to prevent any potential recontamination of the lands. A follow-up letter was issued on May 3, 2024, notifying the PSSA that its lease will terminate on December 31, 2025, by which time the property must be vacated. The requirement to remediate the lands aligns with the divestiture activities prescribed in the Treasury Board directive on the management of real property.

With regard to part (e) of the question, the PSSA was notified of the department's decision to divest the surplus land in January 2023, and again during an in-person site visit in June 2023, where we verbally informed the PSSA of the requirement to eventually terminate the lease in order to continue with disposal requirements. The PSSA was officially notified by letter in May 2024 of the termination date of December 31, 2025.

With regard to (f), a market value assessment has yet to be completed.

In response to (g), AAFC is following the Treasury Board, or TB, prescribed divestiture process, which is currently under way. We are completing the necessary due diligence requirements as outlined in the TB directive on the management of real property. As such, and at this time, it would be premature to speculate on future ownership or use of the property, as these considerations occur later in the process.

With respect to part (h), as part of its due diligence to ensure sound stewardship of taxpayer funds, all Government of Canada departments are required to review and evaluate property holdings on an ongoing basis. Properties that are underutilized, inefficient or no longer needed to support programs are typically declared surplus. The parcels of land in question are not being used by the department due to their topography and distance from the Summerland Research and Development Centre. From an AAFC perspective, the decision to dispose of them aligns with standard government practice regarding surplus assets, including the decision to terminate the lease on the site in order to move forward with the divestiture process. This reflects AAFC's obligations to manage federal lands responsibly and align with broader real property strategies.

Question No. 179—Heather McPherson:

With regard to the government's standing agreements with the state of Israel, including the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement and the Canada-Israel Strategic Partnership: (a) what are the timelines, including specific or approximate dates if available, for both annual and comprehensive reviews; (b) what is entailed and who is involved in the reviews; (c) which departments and agencies, and specifically which directorates, sectors or branches are, involved in the reviews; and (d) what mechanisms, if any are available for public participation in this process?

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada remains deeply alarmed by the dire humanitarian situation in Gaza. An immediate ceasefire, the release of all hostages and the resumption of unhindered United Nations-led humanitarian aid must be secured to alleviate this crisis. Canada is committed to supporting efforts to advance progress towards the two-state solution, the only pathway to enduring peace and security for Israelis and Palestinians.

Routine Proceedings

The Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement, 1997, Canada's first free trade agreement outside of North America, was modernized in 2019 to expand market access in Israel for Canadian companies and to include progressive provisions on gender, small and medium-sized enterprises, corporate social responsibility, labour and the environment. Palestinian exports to Canada also benefit from preferential treatment under the agreement. The Canada-Israel Strategic Partnership Memorandum of Understanding was announced in 2014 and covers an array of areas of bilateral co-operation.

With regard to (a), the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement allows the parties to undertake a review of the agreement within five years of its entry into force and periodically thereafter as the parties decide. To date, neither party has requested to undertake a review of the agreement. Per the terms of the strategic partnership memorandum of understanding, Canada and Israel will review annually, during the political consultations process, the progress made in achieving the desired goals and benchmarks set out in the memorandum of understanding. Canada and Israel will also conduct a comprehensive review of the memorandum of understanding every five years.

With regard to (b), with respect to the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement, the agreement is not prescriptive about the review process or the specific personnel involved in the process for each side. Participants and procedures would be determined by the parties to the agreement, Canada and Israel, on a case-by-case basis. Review of the Canada-Israel Strategic Partnership Memorandum of Understanding involves officials from both countries.

With regard to (c), the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement is not prescriptive with regard to the directorates, sectors or branches of the governments that would be involved in a review of the agreement. Specific actors involved in the review process would be identified by the parties upon notification of a request for review by either party. For Canada, any review would be led by Global Affairs Canada.

With regard to (d), Global Affairs Canada has a public consultations mailbox, consultations@international.gc.ca, which remains available to receive and respond to enquiries on any trade agreement, including the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement, at any time. Should both parties undertake to review the agreement, methods of public consultation would be identified by each party.

Question No. 181—William Stevenson:

With regard to the government's firearms buyback program and the confiscation of firearms: (a) how were the prices determined; (b) what appeal procedures are available to hunters that believe the price being offered by the government is unfairly low; (c) at what physical locations are firearms owners supposed to go to drop off these firearms, and what are the hours of each location; (d) to what locations will the firearms be sent and destroyed once they are purchased by the government; (e) how are the firearms secured, while in transport from the drop off location, where they are destroyed, including what additional security measures are in place to ensure that violent criminals do not intercept the firearms during transit; and (f) how much has been paid out to date to firearms owners under the buyback program?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), the assault-style firearms compensation program, ASFCP, opened to all eligible businesses between December 6, 2024, and April 30, 2025. Compensation amounts for assault-style firearms affected by the

May 2020 prohibition were determined based on in-depth research and analysis, which included reviewing manufacturer prices, Canadian dealer and retailer prices, foreign retailer prices, pricing guidebooks and auction listings; and consulting with the Canadian Sporting Arms and Ammunition Association, CSAAA, which served as an intermediary with businesses and confirmed that compensation amounts reasonably reflected what businesses may have paid in 2020 for affected ASFs.

A \$250 administrative amount was also provided for each assault-style firearm turned in to offset processing and packaging costs as well as inventory and holding costs incurred since the 2020 prohibition.

With regard to (b), PS continues to make progress towards a launch of the program for individuals later this year. Details will be shared in due course.

With regard to (c), (d) and (e), during the operation of the program for businesses, businesses were responsible for the safe packaging of their firearms in accordance with the Storage, Display and Transportation of Firearms and Other Weapons by Businesses regulations SOR/98-210 and any applicable provincial or territorial laws. Businesses were also responsible for making shipping arrangements with a carrier licensed by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or Canada Post for the firearms to be shipped for destruction.

Due to security and safety issues, the names and locations of the contractors involved in the ASFCP cannot be disclosed. Collection activities under the program for individuals will be supported by contribution agreements with provincial and municipal authorities.

With regard to (f), the ASFCP is a voluntary program. As of April 30, businesses had claimed over 12,000 prohibited items for compensation. As of July 3, \$13,044,823 in compensation has been paid.

Question No. 182—William Stevenson:

With regard to government knowledge of the estimated firearms inventory in Canada: (a) how many firearms does the government currently estimate are legally owned in Canada, and by how many legal owners; and (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by classification and specific make and model of firearm?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), as there is no requirement to register non-restricted firearms with the RCMP Canadian firearms program, it is not possible to provide actual counts or estimates for the number of firearms legally owned in Canada or the number of firearms owners. However, as of December 31, 2024, there were 1,267,992 firearms registered in Canada and 814,005 licences with prohibited and/or restricted privileges.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to (b), as of December 31, 2024, there were 775,266 restricted licence-holders, 38,739 prohibited licence-holders, 1,104,147 restricted firearms registered and 163,845 prohibited firearms registered.

Regarding the classification and specific make and model of firearms, the RCMP undertook an extensive preliminary search in order to determine the amount of information that would fall within the scope of the question and the amount of time that would be required to prepare a comprehensive response. The level of detail of the information requested is not systematically tracked in a centralized database. The RCMP is a decentralized organization composed of over 700 detachments in 150 communities across the country. The RCMP concluded that producing and validating a comprehensive response to this question would require a manual collection of information that is not possible in the time allotted and this could lead to the disclosure of incomplete and misleading information.

Question No. 184—Don Davies:

With regard to Canadian counter tariffs and other countermeasures put in place by the government since March 4, 2025: (a) how much money has been collected, in total, and broken down by (i) month, (ii) countermeasure; and (b) how much of the money collected has been allocated to help for workers in total and broken down by program?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), as of May 30, the government has collected approximately \$1.76 billion in revenue from countertariffs imposed on imports from the U.S. This figure is net of remissions and other relief programs, i.e., relieving provisions in chapters 98 and 99 of the customs tariff, Canada Border Services Agency duties relief program and duty drawback program.

With regard to (i), monthly surtax net amounts were \$397 million in March 2025, \$709 million in April 2025 and \$654 million in May 2025.

With regard to (ii), surtax net amounts by countermeasure were \$1.06 billion, effective March 4, U.S. surtax order 2025; \$685 million, effective March 13, U.S. surtax order, steel and aluminum; and \$21 million, effective April 9, U.S. surtax order, motor vehicles.

Please note that figures do not add due to rounding. Further, figures do not match exactly to what was publicly reported in the May 2025 Fiscal Monitor as the statistics are only accurate as of that moment in time, due to continual corrections/adjustments made by importers during the accounting period following the release of their goods.

With regard to (b), in March 2025, in response to the continued threat and introduction of foreign tariffs, the government announced temporary employment insurance, EI, measures as a direct support to help more workers access the income support that they need. Specifically, this included the following. This included waiving the waiting period so that all EI claimants receive benefits for the first week of unemployment. This measure is in effect for a six-month period from March 30 to October 11.

This included suspending the treatment of monies paid on separation, e.g., severance, vacation, to allow claimants to receive EI benefits sooner. This measure is in effect for a six-month period

from March 30 to October 11. This included adjusting the EI regional unemployment rates upward by one percentage point, to a maximum of 13.1%, with no region below 7.1%. This measure reduces the hours required to qualify for regular benefits to no more than 630 hours and increases the number of weeks of entitlement to those benefits by up to four additional weeks. This measure is in effect for a three-month period from April 6 to July 12.

These temporary changes apply to all EI claims established during the period in which the measures are in effect. At the time of implementation, the cost of these temporary measures was estimated at \$1,096.6 million over two years, 2025-26 and 2026-27. It is too early to know what the final costs of these measures will be. Note that temporary measures are available to all eligible EI claimants and not only those affected by tariffs.

These measures were in addition to the introduction on March 7 of temporary one-year flexibilities to the EI work-sharing program to increase its availability to workers and employers impacted directly or indirectly by tariffs. The work-sharing program provides EI benefits to employees who agree to temporarily work a reduced work week when their employer faces a decrease in business activity beyond their control, thereby helping to avoid layoffs.

From March 30 to June 7, 506 EI work-sharing agreements were approved with about 15,330 employees participating in these agreements. Approximately \$92.4 million in EI work-sharing benefits has been paid to employees over this period.

The provision of additional EI benefits to claimants is a cost to the employment insurance operating account.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 190—Scott Reid:**

With regard to the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada: for each of the president and vice-presidents, what are the details of all travel claim expenses in each instance of travel for which airfare expenses were greater than \$0, incurred in each of 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025, including, for each instance of applicable travel, (i) the travel start date, (ii) the travel end date, (iii) the total travel expense amount, (iv) the origin city, (v) the destination city, (vi) any cities or locations travelled to, other than the origin or destination cities, for which any expenses were claimed, including dates, times, and transportation method, (vii) the purpose of travel to each location, including the name, itinerary, and duration dates of any events, conferences, or other official gatherings attended, (viii) the dates, times, locations, purposes, and attendees for each meeting attended during travel, (ix) the total days of per diems claimed, (x) the daily per diem rate, (xi) the total amount of per diems claimed, (xii) the date, type, purpose, and amount spent on ground transportation, per use, (xiii) the location, per-night rate, and amount spent on accommodations, per night, (xiv) the daily itinerary items for each day of travel for which per diems were claimed?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as part of the Government of Canada's measure to enhance transparency, the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, IAAC, proactively discloses expenditures related to travel and hospitality for senior management.

In addition, IAAC proactively discloses expenditures for travel through the annual report on travel, hospitality and conference expenditures.

Question No. 193—Grant Jackson:

With regard to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, broken down by year: (a) since January 1, 2006, how many individuals who were credibly threatened by foreign actors have been contacted under the Royal Canadian Mounted Police's Duty to Warn policy; (b) how many of the individuals in (a) were members of Parliament; (c) how many of the members of Parliament were provided police protection; and (d) what was the cost of providing police protection to the individuals in (a)?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), to ensure the safety of our members and those we protect, as well as to ensure the integrity of security measures and operations, the RCMP does not disclose information that could expose specific details about any individual or group of individuals who were credibly threatened by foreign or domestic actors and contacted under the RCMP's duty to warn policy.

With regard to (b) and (c), under s. 14(1)(e)(v) of the RCMP Regulations, the RCMP is responsible for providing protection to "any other Canadian citizen or permanent resident ... who is designated by the Minister [of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness] for the period designated by the Minister." This includes the protection of members of Parliament and their immediate families. The extent of the protection provided is at the discretion of the RCMP, based on their assessment of the threat or risk to the security of the person. In the case of a credible threat, the RCMP would revise its assessment and make the necessary changes to the level of protection being provided for the member of Parliament under threat. This is a separate process from the duty to warn.

To ensure the safety of our members and those we protect, as well as to ensure the integrity of security measures and operations, the RCMP does not disclose information that could expose specific details about any particular protectee or the number of personnel assigned to protect any given individual.

With regard to (d), to ensure the safety of our members and those we protect, as well as to ensure the integrity of security measures and operations, the RCMP does not disclose information that could

expose specific details about any particular protective event or about the number of personnel assigned to protect any given protectee. As such, specific breakdowns of costs cannot be provided as they may indicate how many resources were deployed on individual assignments. Furthermore, the RCMP does not disclose information related to protective measures or information that could identify the level of protection that any one individual receives.

Question No. 197—James Bezan:

With regard to the Royal Canadian Air Force: (a) how many filled fighter pilot positions were there in each year from 2020 to 2025; (b) how many fighter pilot positions in total were available to fill in each year from 2020 to 2025; (c) how many combat ready CF-18 flying positions were available to fill in each year from 2020 to 2025; (d) how many flying positions were available that were not combat ready (i.e. Squadron 410 Operational Training Unit, Squadron 419, wings, Aerospace Engineering Test Establishment, etc.) in each year from 2020 to 2025; (e) how many combat ready flying positions were available on each operational squadron and wing in each year from 2020 to 2025; (f) how many fighter pilot positions were available to fill each year from 2015 to 2025; (g) how many combat ready fighter pilots were released each year from 2020 to 2025; (h) how many fighter pilots in total were released annually from 2020 to 2025; (i) what are the estimated projections for 2025 to 2034 for (i) filled fighter pilot positions, (ii) fighter pilot positions, (iii) combat ready CF-18 and CF-35A flying positions, (iv) flying positions that are not combat ready, (v) combat ready flying positions available on each operational squadron and wing; (j) what is the estimated production rate of combat ready fighter pilots for each year from 2025 to 2034; (k) what is the estimated attrition rate for fighter pilots for each year from 2025 to 2034; (l) how many fighter pilot positions and personnel in the Royal Canadian Air Force are pre-Fighter Pilot Course students; (m) what is the Trained Effective Strength or operational functional point for fighter pilots; (n) what is the combat ready point for fighter pilots; (o) where and when does the combat ready point for fighter pilots take place; (p) what is the minimum, maximum, and mean time, in months, between recruitment and combat ready status for fighter pilots; (q) how many fighter pilots are greater than TIP 2 in CF-18 flying positions; (r) how many fighter pilots are two-ship leads in the CF-18 flying positions; (s) how many fighter pilots are four-ship leads in the CF-18 flying positions; (t) as of June 16, 2025, how many fighter pilots are (i) combat ready, (ii) non-combat ready, (iii) wingman, (iv) fighter electronic warfare instructors, (v) fighter weapons instructors; (u) are fighter pilot students (e.g. At Squadrons 410 and 419) included in fighter pilot positions Preferred Manning Level or Trained Effective Strength; and (v) how many fighter pilots are combat ready on the CF-35A?

Hon. David J. McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Royal Canadian Air Force, RCAF, fighter force is continuously recruiting, training and releasing pilots through normal attrition. Nevertheless, Canada faces recruiting and retaining challenges in relation to fighter pilots common to all its allies.

As of June 16, the RCAF had a staffing rate of 66% for pilots at frontline fighter squadrons. Detailed information regarding pilot numbers is considered sensitive as it can provide adversaries with information about CF-18 readiness and the broader capabilities of the North American Aerospace Defense Command, which could be injurious to the defence of Canada and North America.

Routine Proceedings

As the RCAF prepares to transition from the CF-18 to the CF-35A, work is ongoing to meet appropriate fighter pilot staffing levels. For example, the RCAF has expanded the employment of reserve fighter pilots and has directed qualified fighter pilots in headquarters staff positions to maintain their CF-18 flying qualifications.

The RCAF continues to analyze and adjust its pilot training courses to increase numbers of trained pilots and to reduce attrition. The RCAF has significantly reduced the time pilots need to wait to proceed to the next phases of course training in the past several years. In fiscal year 2024-25, wait times for phases I and II of pilot training decreased and are now two and three months respectively, which is the time it takes to effectively move personnel from one training location to another.

To increase the pool of pilot candidates, the RCAF has developed targeted recruitment and retention strategies. For example, the RCAF attractions team participated in more than 115 in-person events and over 230 virtual events in 2024 including air shows, exhibitions, career fairs and sport events. This complements wider Canadian Armed Forces recruitment efforts that showcase existing recruiting allowances, pay incentives and subsidized education programs.

Additionally, National Defence recently finished implementing a revised pilot pay scale to support retention efforts. The pay scale compensates pilots based on their experience and qualifications through the introduction of a new skills and competencies-oriented pay system.

Finally, the RCAF continues to engage with our allies to share information on how to mitigate this common challenge.

Question No. 201—Clifford Small:

With regard to Canadian fish stock assessments and stock advisory committees on commercial species, broken down by specific species: (a) what organizations, stakeholders, First Nations and environmental non-governmental organizations have observer status; (b) what organizations, stakeholders, First Nations and environmental non-governmental organizations have stakeholder status; (c) what is total length of time between when scientific and harvester data is received and when a quota decision is made; (d) what changes in science methodology have been made since 2015; (e) what changes in methodology to incorporate fish harvester logbook data into assessments, outlined by species, have been made since 2015; and (f) what are the net changes in the number of stakeholder seats and environmental non-governmental organizations seats at stock advisory, broken down by species and year since 2015?

Ernie Klassen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a) and (b), most advisory committees do not have a formally defined observer status or stakeholder status. For this reason, the department cannot provide the requested information on individuals or organizations that have observer or stakeholder status in advisory committees.

With regard to (c), this information is not tracked by the department, and therefore the question cannot be answered in the manner requested.

With regard to (d), this is not information that is held by DFO in a way that could support an answer in the format requested. Stock assessment methodologies evolve as new tools, analytical techniques and data streams become available.

With regard to (e), this is not information that is held by DFO in a way that could support an answer in the format requested.

With regard to (f), the department does not track the specific changes in advisory committee membership or participation over time in a centralized system that would facilitate reporting. An answer would require a manual search of documents that would exceed the time allowed to answer this question.

Question No. 207—Scott Reid:

With regard to Parks Canada land currently under lease to the municipality of Smiths Falls, Ontario: (a) does an archaeological assessment already exist for the leased Parks Canada lands adjacent to the Rideau Canal within the Smiths Falls municipal boundary, and, if so, can the assessment be shared with the municipality, in its capacity as a leaseholder; (b) what triggers the requirement for an archaeological assessment, including for low-impact projects, including, but not limited to, pathway installation and landscaping; (c) who determines the scope of an archaeological assessment; (d) is the municipality, in general or in its capacity as a leaseholder, responsible for conducting and funding this work; (e) what are the review timelines and implications if archaeological resources are identified; (f) what federal policies govern the use, enhancement or activation of Parks Canada lands under lease to municipalities; (g) what types of improvements are permitted on Parks Canada lands under lease to municipalities, including, but not limited to, permanent structures, landscape enhancements and events; and (h) who within Parks Canada holds the final decision-making authority for development proposals on leased lands?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), some portions of the Parks Canada-administered lands along the Rideau Canal in Smiths Falls have been subject to archaeological assessment. More detail about specific properties and types of agreements is required to provide a full response. A manual search of non-digitized records would also be required. Parks Canada has determined that producing and validating a comprehensive response is not feasible within the allotted time frame and could result in the disclosure of incomplete and misleading information. Assessments that have been conducted can be shared with the municipality.

With regard to (b), any activities that include soil disturbance trigger an archaeological assessment.

With regard to (c), the scope of the assessment is determined by the archaeologist conducting the assessment, based on the scope and potential impacts of the proposed project.

With regard to (d), the municipality, as the proponent of the project, is responsible for the funding, as well as for engaging a professional archaeologist to conduct this work. All archaeological work on Parks Canada land requires a Parks Canada research and collection permit and is reviewed by Parks Canada's archaeology team.

With regard to (e), the review timelines and implications vary depending on the scope of the project and the nature and extent of the archaeological resources.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to (f), Parks Canada's standard on realty agreements outside of national park boundaries, which includes requirements set out in the Treasury Board "Directive on the Management of Real Property" and the "Rideau Canal and Merrickville Blockhouse National Historic Sites of Canada Management Plan, 2022", govern the use, enhancement or activation of Parks Canada lands under lease to municipalities.

With regard to (g), the national parks of Canada land use planning regulations provide a general framework for consideration of the authorization of any improvements in Parks Canada-protected spaces. Improvements of any type on Parks Canada lands under lease to municipalities may be considered on a case-by-case basis but can only be undertaken in accordance with an authorization or permit issued by the appropriate authorized superintendent responsible for the protected space in question.

As per the national parks of Canada land use planning regulations, the director of Ontario waterways holds the delegated authority to permit or decline development applications on Parks Canada lands adjacent to the Rideau Canal within the Smiths Falls municipal boundary and exercises that authority in consultation with the appropriate internal and external subject matter experts.

Question No. 208—Gord Johns:

With regard to the Canadian Armed Forces: (a) since 1914, how many Regular Force members and Reserve Force members have lost their lives in non-combat roles during peacetime in Canada; and (b) since 2013, how many Regular Force members and Reserve Force members have died by suicide?

Hon. David J. McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), since 1914, approximately 2,000 Canadian armed forces members have lost their lives in non-combat roles during peacetime in Canada. This information is based on a manual search, and some older records may vary due to incomplete information in archives.

From 2013-2024, the Department of National Defence has recorded that a total of 177 regular force members and 36 reserve force members have died by suicide.

Since reserve force members receive much of their health care in the provincial system, the cause of death, including a confirmation of whether it was a suicide, is sometimes not reported to the Canadian Armed Forces. As a result, despite efforts to retrieve data concerning all deaths from suicide, the Department of National Defence may not have full data on reserve force suicide mortality.

As part of National Defence's suicide prevention strategy, employees and members holding supervisory positions have been given direction in three distinct areas of focus: prevention, intervention and postvention. This ensures that the Canadian Armed Forces continue to reduce stigma; educate, engage and support members at all levels; and ensure that leaders facilitate awareness of, and access to, education and supports.

Question No. 210—Steven Bonk:

With regard to government measures to open agricultural markets in Southeast Asia to Canadian products: what is the quantity and dollar value of Canadian agricultural products that the government projects will be exported from Canada for each of the next five years, broken down by product and country?

Hon. Heath MacDonald (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, in-

cluding the Canadian Pari-Mutuel Agency, does not possess the projected information requested related to Southeast Asia.

Question No. 213—Billy Morin:

With regard to the government's proposed capital gains tax increase which was cancelled in March 2025: (a) prior to the cancellation, how much was spent by the Canada Revenue Agency on implementing the increase, in total and broken down by type of expenditure; (b) prior to the cancellation, how many tax filers paid extra tax as a result of the proposed increase and what was the amount of extra tax paid; (c) of the extra tax paid in (b), how much has been refunded to date and to how many tax filers; (d) why did the Canada Revenue Agency continue to collect this tax after it became clear in 2024 that it would not receive parliamentary approval; (e) is it the position of the Canada Revenue Agency that it can take action, with the full knowledge that Parliament does not approve and, if so, who at the Agency is responsible for this position; and (f) if the position in (e) is not the Agency's position, why did it act that way in this instance?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what follows is the response from the CRA as of June 17, 2025, the date of the question.

With regard to part (a), the CRA is unable to respond, as its financial system does not capture the information in the manner requested.

With regard to part (b), prior to cancellation, the CRA received 1,120 T2 returns declaring additional taxable capital gains directly related to the proposed increase in the capital gains inclusion rate. The total additional amount of taxable capital gains reported on the Schedule 1 forms was approximately \$8.9 million. The CRA is not able to confirm whether incremental tax associated with capital gains reported was paid, either in full or partially, as taxpayers normally pay tax liability based on their total tax obligation.

With regard to part (c), all 1,120 returns have been adjusted to reflect the original inclusion rate.

With regard to parts (d), (e) and (f), as noted in chapter 18 of House of Commons Procedure and Practice, it is the long-standing practice of Canadian governments to put tax measures into effect as soon as the notices of the ways and means motions, or NWMMs, on which they are based are tabled in the House of Commons.

The proposed changes were tabled in a notice of ways and means motion on September 23, 2024. As such, in November 2024, the CRA indicated its intent to begin its administration of these changes on the basis of the NWMM and took steps to update its forms and systems. Generally, the CRA will not change its administration position until the government formally indicates its intention has changed.

Routine Proceedings

On January 31, 2025, the government announced that it intended to defer the implementation of the change to the capital gains inclusion rate. As such, the CRA reverted to administering the currently enacted capital gains inclusion rate of one-half. On March 21, 2025, the Government of Canada subsequently announced that it does not intend to proceed with a proposed increase to the capital gains inclusion rate.

Question No. 215—Jamil Jivani:

With regard to grants and contributions provided by Heritage Canada during the 2024-25 fiscal year: (a) what was the total (i) number, (ii) value, of grants and contributions; (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by federal riding and by census metropolitan area; (c) what was the total (i) number, (ii) value, of grants and contributions provided to entities outside of Canada; and (d) what is the breakdown of (c) by country?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a)(i) and (a)(ii), the total number of grants and contributions provided by Heritage Canada during the 2024-25 fiscal year was 28,129 and the total value was \$1,859,294,977.

With regard to (b), the departmental financial system does not track transfer payment information by federal riding and/or census metropolitan area.

With regard to (c), two payments were made to entities outside of Canada for a total value of \$8,034,896.

With regard to (d), one payment was in France, for TV5 Monde, in the amount of \$7,945,511, and one was in Germany, for the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, in the amount of \$89,385.

Question No. 216—Dalwinder Gill:

With regard to measures taken by the government and the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission to implement the Online Streaming Act (formerly Bill C-11): (a) what are the total expenditures to date related to the implementation of any measures contained in the Act, in total and broken down by related measures and by type of expenditure; (b) how many employees or full-time equivalents have been assigned to work on items related to measures contained in the Act; (c) how many new employees had to be hired in order to implement or maintain measures contained in the Act; (d) what are the government's projections as to how much it will cost each year to maintain the systems or items mandated by the Act; (e) how much has been collected in revenue from streaming services to date as a result of the Act; and (f) of the money collected, how much has been distributed to date, broken down by type of recipient?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian Heritage was responsible for the research and policy work underlying the development of Bill C-11, the Online Streaming Act, including its passage through the parliamentary process. However, the Department of Canadian Heritage is not responsible for the implementation of the framework once the parliamentary process is complete. The implementation of the framework is the responsibility of the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, the CRTC.

With regard to (a), the Online Streaming Act amended the Broadcasting Act. As of March 2025, the CRTC's total expenditures to implement these amendments have been approximately \$15.2 million (\$11.9 million in salaries and \$3.3 million in operational and maintenance costs), of which \$9 million was spent in fiscal year 2024-25.

With regard to (b), employees or full-time equivalents are not assigned to work specifically on items related to measures contained in the Online Streaming Act, as they are interconnected with other provisions in the Broadcasting Act. All the measures contained in the two bills are applied jointly and concurrently.

With regard to (c), the CRTC has hired 59 full-time equivalents to implement and maintain measures contained in the Online Streaming Act. These employees also work on maintaining the measures contained in the Broadcasting Act.

With regard to (d), the CRTC projects that the cost to maintain the systems and items mandated by the Online Streaming Act will be approximately \$9.7 million annually.

With regard to (e), as a result of the Online Streaming Act, the CRTC has invoiced streaming service fee payers \$19.9 million for the 2024-25 fiscal year and \$22.9 million for the 2025-26 fiscal year so far.

With regard to (f), the CRTC uses a cost recovery model wherein the fees it collects from streaming services are used to cover the costs of applying the regulatory framework established through the Online Streaming Act. These funds are not considered revenues and therefore are not distributed. Once fully implemented, the Online Streaming Act will see streaming services make financial contributions directly to the Canadian media and broadcasting ecosystem.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 219—Connie Cody:**

With regard to the government's Assault-Style Firearms Compensation Program: (a) is a site related to the program operational on Shoemaker Street in Kitchener, Ontario, and, if so, on what date did it become operational and what is being done at the site; (b) which department or agency authorized the site's operation; (c) what organizations are in contract to oversee the site; (d) did the government enter into a contract with Colt Canada to receive goods and services regarding the program, and, if so, what is the summary of the terms of this contract; (e) what is the total volume and type of the firearms and magazines received at that site as of June 17, 2025; (f) is the destruction of firearms occurring on site; (g) what is the total dollar value of the items (i) surrendered, (ii) destroyed, at the Shoemaker Street site; (h) how many dealers have disposed of weapons; (i) has the government paused intake at this site since it became operational, and, if so, what are the details of each instance, including the dates it was paused and the reason for the pause; (j) what compensation rates are being offered for each type of surrendered firearms, firearm parts and accessories, including any per-unit incentives beyond previously published rates; (k) how many participating dealers received compensation to date; (l) for dealers who have not yet been paid, when is compensation expected; (m) does Colt Canada have a relationship with the program through contracted goods or services, technical support, compensation, memorandums of understanding, bids on requests for proposals or equivalents; (n) has the government conducted any audits, oversight or verification of items being surrendered, to prevent fraud or abuse of the program (e.g. large-volume shipments of magazines), and, if so, what are the details; (o) what communications strategy has the government undertaken to inform the public of the buyback site in Kitchener, including its operational status; and (p) is Colt Canada currently under contract to assist with the federal firearms buyback program in any capacity, and, if so, what are the details of each contract, including (i) the date, (ii) the vendor, (iii) the amount, (iv) the description of the goods or services provided, (v) whether the contract was awarded through a sole-sourced or competitive bidding process?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, regarding parts (a) to (d) and (p) to (v) of the question, due to security and safety issues, the names and locations of the contractors involved in the assault-style firearms compensation program, ASFCP, cannot be disclosed.

On December 7, 2023, Public Services and Procurement Canada, PSPC, launched a competitive process to procure services for the collection, storage, verification, validation, transportation and destruction of firearms in support of a compensation program for assault-style firearms that were prohibited.

On September 26, 2024, PSPC awarded a contract for one year, with a one-year extension option, for the business component of the ASFCP. The total value of this contract is \$9.04 million. The name of the company will remain confidential for security reasons.

With regard to parts (e) to (m) of the question, the ASFCP is a voluntary program, and as of April 30, 2025, 190 businesses had claimed over 12,000 firearms and over 14,000 parts and components for compensation. As of July 3, \$13.04 million in compensation has been paid.

The ASFCP provides a way for firearms businesses to safely dispose of their prohibited firearms and receive compensation. Firearms businesses can also dispose of firearms through other means, for example, deactivation without compensation, export or return to the manufacturer. Some businesses have privileges on their licences allowing them to retain firearms for purposes such as sale to police.

The compensation amounts for firearms prohibited in May 2020 were determined following in-depth research, including a review of manufacturer prices, Canadian dealer and retailer prices, foreign retailer prices, pricing guidebooks and auction listings; and consultation with the Canadian Sporting Arms and Ammunition Association,

CSAAA, which served as an intermediary with businesses and confirmed that compensation amounts reasonably reflected what businesses may have paid in 2020 for affected ASFs.

Further information on compensation amounts is provided in the "List of firearms: for businesses" on Canada.ca.

As firearms are processed, compensation will be issued to remaining participating businesses. As stated on the program's website, once firearms have been received, payment will be issued within 45 business days, provided that all required validations are successfully completed and no additional review is required.

Regarding parts (n) to (o) of the question, verification and validation activities are performed on firearms as they are received in order to ensure that claims meet the terms and conditions of the program, that is, that firearms are legally owned by licensed businesses to which they are properly registered. Firearms are also validated at the facility to ensure that firearms, devices, parts and components received at the facility match what was submitted in the claim, including quantities, makes, models and serial numbers, if applicable; firearms and devices are "complete" and assembled in order to be eligible for compensation; parts and components are in their original packaging; and all deactivation and shipment records submitted as part of the claim are accurate.

The government has communicated regarding the ASFCP for businesses through a variety of channels, including publicly available information online as well as communications to licensed firearms businesses via the Canadian firearms program, as administered by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Public Safety Canada continues to make progress towards a launch of the program for individuals, details on which will be shared in due course.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 224—Dean Allison:**

With regard to the Public Health Agency of Canada and the government's future health approach: (a) which agency, entities or ministries are involved in (i) the pandemic prevention, preparedness and response protocols, (ii) the One Health approach; (b) what is the One Health approach and where or how did it originate; (c) which bills are currently tabled or have been passed which would operationalize (i) Canada's pandemic prevention, preparedness and response protocols, (ii) the One Health approach in Canada, (iii) any other World Health Organization or United Nations international health or pandemic treaties or agreements; (d) have staff already been hired or will staff be hired and trained to integrate the One Health approach into Canadian policy and legislation; (e) if the answer to (d) is affirmative, (i) where and under which department or agency will these employees work, (ii) where are these positions posted, (iii) what are the hiring criteria for these staff; (iv) who selects the staff, (v) how many positions exist or will be created; (f) what is the budget allocation to integrate the One Health approach; (g) are there training programs for nongovernmental professionals in One Health and, if so, where are they located; and (h) if the answer to (g) is affirmative, (i) how are the training programs funded, (ii) what are their goals, (iii) who instructs these courses, (iv) what are the requirements to instruct these courses, (v) how did the instructors obtain these requirements?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a) of the question, the federal health portfolio, including Health Canada, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and the Public Health Agency of Canada, leads a whole-of-government approach to pandemic prevention, preparedness and response protocols. The health portfolio takes a whole-of-government approach to addressing One Health threats and reducing their potential wide-reaching impact, particularly managing diseases found in animals and other sources before and after human-to-human transmission occurs.

With regard to part (b), information on the One Health approach is available at <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/emergency-preparedness-response/rapid-risk-assessments-public-health-professionals/one-health-approach-risk-assessment-executive-summary.html>.

Regarding part (c), no bills have tabled or passed related to pandemic prevention, preparedness and response protocols, the One Health approach in Canada, or any other World Health Organization or United Nations international health or pandemic treaties or agreements. Legislation was not required for Canada to join the United Nations system, including the World Health Organization. If Canada were to sign any such treaties, it would follow all required legislative steps, including parliamentary ratification if required.

With regard to parts (d) and (e), while Public Health Agency of Canada staff carry out a wide range of duties related to zoonotic diseases, antimicrobial resistance, food safety, climate change and wildlife health to protect the health and safety of Canadians, the Public Health Agency has no current or planned dedicated staff for the One Health approach.

Regarding part (f), the Public Health Agency of Canada has no budget allocation dedicated to the One Health approach.

With regard to part (g), the health portfolio, including Health Canada, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and the Public Health Agency of Canada, has no training programs for non-governmental professionals in One Health.

Question No. 225—Dean Allison:

With regard to Health Canada's review of the manufacturing data, quality control and safety of lipid nanoparticles in the mRNA COVID-19 vaccines including all versions of Moderna's SpikeVax, Pfizer-BioNTech's Comirnaty and the boost-

ers, and Onpattro (patisaran): (a) was the purity of the starting materials for the lipids, such as residual halogenated solvents and elements, including metals, assessed for mutagenic risk in accordance with established norms and guidelines, and, if so, what were the results, and, if not, why not; (b) was the total amount of observed impurities assessed for mutagenic risk, and, if so, what were the results, and, if not, why not; (c) were any individual element impurities considered mutagenic; (d) if the answer to (c) is affirmative, was this assessed with respect to multiple doses and with respect to the nature of transfection of the lipid nanoparticles; (e) was any assessment of the lipid nanoparticle as a nanoparticle performed; (f) if the answer to (e) is affirmative, did this include an assessment of the polyethylene glycol moiety; (g) was an assessment of the risk of complement activation-related pseudoallergy due to the polyethylene glycol moiety performed, and, if so, what were the results, and, if not, why not; and (h) were any complement-related assays requested from the manufacturer, and, if not, why not?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Health Canada exercises stringent regulatory oversight over all pharmaceutical and biologic drugs, including vaccines. Before a drug is authorized in Canada, Health Canada conducts a rigorous scientific review of its safety, efficacy and quality.

For the quality of the mRNA COVID-19 vaccines, Comirnaty and Spikevax, impurities in lipid nanoparticles, LNPs, are assessed according to guidelines from the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use, or ICH. These guidelines include ICH Q3C "Impurities: Guideline for Residual Solvents" and ICH Q3D "Guideline for Elemental Impurities".

Assessment of the risks associated with potential and known impurities in the mRNA vaccines was performed using common industry software that is accepted as part of the ICH M7 guideline: "Assessment and Control of DNA Reactive (Mutagenic) Impurities in Pharmaceuticals to Limit Potential Carcinogenic Risk".

Impurities from the lipid excipients were below the limits set in the ICH Q3D and ICH Q3C guidelines. All solvents assessed were classified as non-mutagenic. Assessment of elemental impurities concluded that levels were below the permitted daily exposure, PDE. The methodologies used by the manufacturer to assess mutagenic risk from solvents and elemental impurities and their conclusions were considered acceptable.

Routine Proceedings

LNPs in the mRNA vaccines were characterized and controlled using a variety of tests. The polyethylene glycol, PEG, moiety is conjugated to the lipid excipient and was assessed as part of the lipid. Residual unconjugated PEG is considered a process-related impurity in the manufacturing process of the lipid excipient and must be present below established limits. The PEG moiety itself is also classified as non-mutagenic according to ICH M7 guidelines. Each lot of drug product is tested to ensure that it conforms with approved specifications. The control strategy for the LNPs was considered acceptable.

Non-clinical safety studies were performed for the novel lipid excipients. Complement-related assays were not requested from the manufacturer as there is no established assay that can be performed to assess hypersensitivity to PEG.

For Onpattro, impurities are assessed according to guidelines from the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use, ICH. These guidelines include ICH Q3C “Impurities: Guideline for Residual Solvents”, ICH Q3D “Guideline for Elemental Impurities” and the ICH M7 guideline: “Assessment and Control of DNA Reactive (Mutagenic) Impurities in Pharmaceuticals to Limit Potential Carcinogenic Risk”.

Impurities from the lipid excipients were below the limits set in the ICH Q3D and ICH Q3C guidelines. All solvents assessed were classified as non-mutagenic or unlikely to be present. LNPs in the drug product Onpattro were assessed using a pharmacologically inactive short-interfering RNA, or siRNA, encapsulated in the same lipid particle as the one with the active siRNA, patisiran. The LNP comprised two novel excipients which were fully characterized with a complete toxicology evaluation.

Question No. 228—Chris d'Entremont:

With regard to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and its funding allocations since January 1, 2020: (a) how much funding has been distributed by the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, broken down by federal riding and year; and (b) what projects received funding, broken down by federal riding, year, recipient organization, project description, and amount?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and its funding allocations from January 1, 2020, to June 18, 2025, the agency does not track this information by riding. Producing a comprehensive response would require manual collection and validation of information, which is not possible in the time allotted and could lead to the disclosure of incomplete and misleading information.

Information on the agency's grants and contributions can be found on the Open Government Portal at the following link: <https://search.open.canada.ca/grants/>.

Question No. 229—Dean Allison:

With regard to information arising from an access to information request from the Public Health Agency of Canada – A-2023-000165, which stated that the Chief Public Health Officer Dr. Theresa Tam and “quite a few” pandemic managers at the Department of Health, the Public Health Agency of Canada, the Department of Industry, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development and the Department of National Defence were required to sign a secret oath promising never to divulge information that “may result in embarrassment”: (a) which specific individual or individuals initiated the requirement for staff to sign a confidentiality agree-

ment; (b) which divisions of which departments did the individual or individuals in (a) work in; (c) who was asked to sign this confidentiality agreement and what positions did they hold in their respective departments; (d) which divisions of which departments did the individuals in (c) work in; (e) what were the details of the confidentiality agreement; (f) why did the government feel such a confidentiality agreement was necessary; (g) did the government conceal or attempt to conceal any information from the public and media that could result in embarrassment; (h) if the answer to (g) is affirmative, what was the specific information that the government concealed or attempted to conceal from the public and media that could result in embarrassment; (i) what specific criteria do Department of Health officials use to determine whether it's more important to not embarrass the government versus the requirement to be open and transparent with Canadians; (j) are the staff who signed this confidentiality agreement still under a legal obligation to meet the demands as outlined in the confidentiality agreement; (k) under what other circumstances are these types of confidentiality agreements required of bureaucratic staff; (l) how did this confidentiality agreement differ from the Values and Ethics Code for the Public Sector; (m) who specifically wrote the confidentiality agreement and which division and which department do they work in; and (n) who approved the requirements of the confidentiality agreement?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is committed to transparency. Information that is not shared publicly is withheld only in compliance with applicable legislation. The access to information release package in question does not reference a “secret oath” in connection with the vaccine contracts, nor were confidentiality requirements themselves a secret. Section 54 of the Public Service Employment Act, PSEA, requires employees in the core public service to affirm as a condition of employment that they will not, without due authority, disclose or make known any matter that comes to their knowledge by reason of such employment. Public servants are also subject to the Treasury Board Secretariat's “Values and Ethics Code for the Public Sector”, the code of conduct applicable to their particular organization, and other statutory and policy obligations of confidentiality in accordance with the security clearance or status required of their position.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, Public Health Agency of Canada, PHAC, officials worked closely with Public Services and Procurement Canada, PSPC, and other departments to ensure vaccines were available for Canadians.

In the context of COVID-19 vaccine procurement, confidentiality agreements and/or non-disclosure agreements, NDAs, initially were required as a precautionary measure to reinforce the importance of protecting confidential business information that was shared during contract negotiation discussions. Subsequently, it was recognized that public servants' existing obligations that are a condition of their employment were sufficient and an additional agreement was not needed. It is expected that public servants are to meet their obligations to maintain confidentiality of commercially sensitive information and to adhere to their organization's standard procedures for reporting conflicts of interest. This is documented in the referenced access to information release package.

Routine Proceedings

Employees who were asked to sign confidentiality agreements and/or NDAs included those who worked closely with PSPC on the procurement of COVID-19 vaccines, or required access to the agreements to support planning for subsequent distribution, management and administration of the vaccine. This approach mirrored industry practices and reflected the requirement to manage confidential business information by all signatories. Requests for signature of the confidentiality agreements and/or NDAs to support COVID-19 contract negotiations and discussions were overseen by PSPC.

Question No. 234—Scott Aitchison:

With regard to the government's announcement in Budget 2024, in which it outlined its intention to amend the Food and Drugs Act to grant the Minister of Health the authority to "rely on information or decisions from select foreign regulatory authorities in specific instances to satisfy requirements in the Food and Drugs Act or its regulations", since the enactment of this new authority: (a) how many times has this authority been exercised; (b) which foreign regulatory authorities have been relied upon under this authority, including the details of each case; and (c) which therapeutic products, foods, medical devices or other regulated products were involved for each case in (a), including the nature of the reliance and how it contributed to meeting Canadian regulatory requirements?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health has never exercised the authority granted in budget 2024 to put in place targeted exemptions from regulatory requirements.

If the authority were to be exercised, it would be done in situations where a situation requiring immediate action has been identified, such as improving access to needed health products that are not currently on the market in Canada, and where legislative pre-conditions have been met. Exemptions would still require that Canada's high scientific, safety, and regulatory standards were met, and the development of a ministerial order for this purpose would be developed transparently and informed by public consultation.

Question No. 236—Scott Aitchison:

With regard to the National Pharmacare Program: (a) what is the average cost since the program's inception, broken down by patient and year; (b) what is the projected average cost for each of the next five fiscal years, broken down by patient and year; (c) what is the total number of prescription drug claims submitted to date, including a breakdown by province; (d) what is the number of claims that have been denied, along with a breakdown of the reasons for denial; and (e) what is the total administrative cost of delivering the National Pharmacare Program since its inception, including payments to third-party administrators and technology platforms?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), (b), (c), and (d), provinces and territories have primary responsibility for delivering health care services, including the implementation and delivery of the national pharmacare program, and they are responsible for gathering the requested information. Recipient provinces and territories are required to provide annual reports that demonstrate how federal funding was used to increase existing public coverage for the prescription drugs and related products specified in the agreement.

More information on national pharmacare program agreements can be found at <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/corporate/transparency/health-agreements/national-pharmacare-bilateral-agreements.html>.

In response to (e), Health Canada used only existing internal resources to manage national pharmacare bilateral agreements, and made no payments to third party administrators or technology platforms. Per section 4.8 of the bilateral national pharmacare program

agreements, provincial and territorial governments could use a portion of their federal funding allocations to pay for administrative costs related to delivering the commitments in the agreement. Recipient provinces and territories are required to provide annual reports that demonstrate how federal funding was used in delivering the program.

Question No. 238—Gérard Deltell:

With regard to the government's electric vehicle battery manufacturing facility agreement with Volkswagen: (a) how much funding has been distributed to Volkswagen to date in relation to the agreement; (b) what were the dates and amounts of each funding instance; (c) what is the schedule for future funding under the agreement; (d) how have the developments related to the \$370 billion funding commitment in the United States as part of the 2022 Inflation Reduction Act impacted this agreement, and what are the details of the specific changes that the government has made to this agreement following the developments associated with the Inflation Reduction Act; and (e) is the Parliamentary Budget Officer's 2023 report stating that the deal will cost the government \$16.3 billion consistent with current governmental financial projections associated with this deal, and, if not, what numbers are different and how does the government explain the difference?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a), no funding has been provided to date. The company has a strategic innovation fund contribution agreement for up to \$700 million in support. In addition, Canada and Ontario have committed to providing production-based support of up to \$13.2 billion.

In response to part (b), no funding has been provided to date.

In response to part (c), once the PowerCo/Volkswagen plant is operational, production support funding will be disbursed on a quarterly basis, based on battery cells produced and sold.

Capital expenditure support funding from the strategic innovation fund will be disbursed on a quarterly basis, based on claimed eligible project expenses.

In response to part (d), Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada continues to monitor developments closely, including any changes to the advanced manufacturing production credit, AMPC, through the U.S. legislation "One Big Beautiful Bill."

In response to part (e), the government announced up to \$13.9 billion in support for the PowerCo electric vehicle battery manufacturing plant in St. Thomas, including \$700 million in capital expenditure support through the strategic innovation fund, and up to \$13.2 billion in production support to match the U.S. Inflation Reduction Act's advanced manufacturing production credit, of which one-third is to be paid by Ontario.

Routine Proceedings

The Parliamentary Budget Officer's report is consistent with these financial commitments. There are some minor differences in methodology between the government's analysis and the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report. For example, in its calculation of the costs, the Parliamentary Budget Officer has included foregone tax revenue, which was not included in the government's estimation.

Question No. 240—Kelly Block:

With regard to the extreme cold weather sleeping bag system, as a replacement for the general purpose sleeping bag system, which was contracted by Public Services and Procurement Canada: (a) as the extreme cold weather sleeping bag system's request for proposal closed on October 28, 2024, what was the result of the request for proposal; (b) what are the details of any resulting contracts, including, for each, (i) the amount, (ii) the vendor, (iii) the date and duration, (iv) the description of the goods or services provided, (v) whether the contract was sole-sourced or awarded through a competitive bidding process; (c) which companies were contracted for the general purpose sleeping bag system, including, for each contract, (i) the amount, (ii) the vendor, (iii) the date and duration, (iv) the description of the goods or services provided, (v) whether the contract was sole-sourced or awarded through a competitive bidding process; (d) in which country will the extreme cold weather sleeping bag system's products be manufactured; and (e) how many of these systems are contracted to be manufactured in total?

Jenna Suds (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement and Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Defence Procurement), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, please note that the extreme cold weather sleeping bag system is not a replacement for the general purpose sleeping bag system; it is complementary. To better support operations in all weather conditions, the Canadian Armed Forces is expanding the thermal protection of the general purpose sleeping bag system with the addition of an alternative inner bag, the extreme cold sleeping bag, into its sleep system.

In response to (a), Public Services and Procurement Canada, on behalf of the Department of National Defence, received six bids from five bidders. Following the bid evaluation process, a contract was awarded to Fellfab Limited of Hamilton, Ontario, on June 4, 2025.

In response to (b), the details of the resulting contract are as follows. The amount is \$1,782,008.30. The vendor is Fellfab Limited of Hamilton, Ontario. The date and duration are as follows: The contract was awarded on June 4, 2025, including optional quantities and special sizes to be ordered for up to 84 months from contract award. The description of the goods or services provided is as follows: extreme cold weather sleeping bag systems. The contract was awarded through a competitive bidding process.

In response to (c), Logistik Unicorp Incorporated was the only company contracted for the general purpose sleeping bag system with the following details: the amount of \$34,824,728.23, current total estimated contract value; the vendor, Logistik Unicorp Incorporated of Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, Quebec; the date and duration, contract awarded September 26, 2019, for a period of five years; the description of the goods or services provided, general purpose sleeping bag system; the contract was awarded through a competitive bidding process.

In response to (d), the extreme cold weather sleeping bag system's products will be manufactured in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

In response to (e), the contract has a firm quantity of 1,000 units, with a possible additional optional quantity of 9,000 units and as-and-when requested special sizes in quantities of 20 units.

Question No. 241—Pierre Paul-Hus:

With regard to Bill C-202, An Act to amend the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Act (supply management): (a) is it the government's position that this bill, upon receiving royal assent, will become a law of Canada; (b) if the answer to (a) is affirmative, is it the government's position that the law would bind His Majesty in right of Canada; (c) if the answer to (b) is negative, (i) why not, (ii) is this position backed by a legal opinion; and (d) if the answer to (c)(ii) is affirmative, what are the particulars of the legal opinion, including the (i) date it was given, (ii) person who approved it, (iii) person who requested it?

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following reflects a consolidated response approved on behalf of Global Affairs Canada ministers.

With regard to Bill C-202, an act to amend the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Act regarding supply management, it is the government's position that the bill, upon receiving royal assent, became a law of Canada. The government is fully aware of the importance of this law, and that it must abide by its requirements.

In processing parliamentary returns, the government applies the principles set out in the Access to Information Act and does not disclose information that is subject to solicitor-client privilege.

Question No. 242—Ellis Ross:

With regard to Health Canada's exemption granted to British Columbia under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, which allows for adults to possess up to 2.5 grams of certain substances: has the government received a request from British Columbia to extend the exemption past the January 31, 2026 expiration date, and, if so, (i) what are the details of the request, (ii) does the government plan to approve British Columbia's extension request?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Health Canada has not received any request from British Columbia to extend its requested exemption beyond the January 31, 2026, expiration date.

Question No. 243—Ellis Ross:

With regard to national data on opioid-related harms, since January 2021, broken down by year and by province or territory: how many opioid-related (i) deaths, (ii) hospitalizations, (iii) emergency department visits, have occurred?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, national data on opioid data since January 2021 is available at <https://health-infobase.canada.ca/substance-related-harms/opioids-stimulants/>. Data broken down by year and by province or territory is available at <https://health-infobase.canada.ca/substance-related-harms/opioids-stimulants/maps.html>. Note that data may be withheld in provinces or territories with low numbers of cases in order to comply with confidentiality rules.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 244—Eric Lefebvre:**

With regard to the Housing Accelerator Fund: (a) how much of the allocated \$900 million has been released to municipalities in the province of Quebec; (b) what is the municipality, the date and the amount of each disbursement; and (c) how many housing units, funded by the Housing Accelerator Fund, have been completed within the province of Quebec, broken down by (i) municipality, (ii) number of bedrooms, (iii) building type, (iv) year of completion?

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in November 2023, Canada and Quebec announced an agreement to implement the housing accelerator fund in the province of Quebec. This agreement included a total federal contribution of \$900 million, aimed at creating tens of thousands of housing units and implementing regulatory reforms in Quebec. A subsequent agreement was signed for an additional \$92 million, bringing the total federal contribution to Quebec under the housing accelerator fund to \$992 million. The contribution corresponds to nearly 23% of the total federal funding, the aim of which is to add at least 112,000 residential units over and above historical averages across Canada by 2028.

The Quebec government matched this investment with an additional \$992 million, bringing the combined total to over \$1.9 billion. This funding is set to directly create 8,000 social and affordable housing units, with 500 units specifically allocated for individuals who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Canada's financial contribution, which is delivered by Quebec, supports the provincial initiatives to accelerate the construction of residential units to meet its housing needs.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation has no housing accelerator fund agreements with municipalities in Quebec. Federal funding of \$992 million to Quebec over five years started in 2023-24. To date, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation has advanced \$721 million of the \$992 million to the province through two payments.

Project selection, commitment and disbursements are the sole responsibility of the province. In choosing projects, the province has committed to selecting those that meet the objectives of the housing accelerator fund and the requirements of applicable Quebec programs and initiatives. To the extent possible, project selection takes into account regional distribution in conjunction with regional needs.

Question No. 246—Eric Lefebvre:

With regard to the preparation of Budget 2025, broken down by month, since January 2025: (a) what is the cost incurred, broken down by government department; (b) what is the number of employee hours used; (c) what is the number of full-time equivalent employees who spent more than 75% of their time preparing the budget; and (d) what were the internal projected budget dates within the (i) Department of Finance, (ii) Office of the Prime Minister, (iii) Privy Council Office?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Finance Canada has a broad mandate helping the Government of Canada develop and implement strong and sustainable economic, fiscal, tax, social, security, international and financial sector policies and programs.

Over the time period in question, from January 1, 2025, to June 18, 2025, the government, supported by the public service, was focused on responding to fast-changing and unjustified trade actions by the United States. The Department of Finance supported the

government in the development of its tariff response plan and discussions with provinces and territories, U.S. counterparts, international partners, and industry stakeholders. The Department of Finance also played an important role in the planning and execution of the G7 leaders and finance ministers' meetings and the finance minister's participation in the G20 finance track process. This time period also saw the government deliver on major policy actions, including ceasing the application of the consumer carbon price; delivery of a middle-class tax cut; and GST relief for first-time homebuyers on new homes up to \$1.5 million.

The number of employee hours used in preparation of budget 2025 and the number of full-time equivalent employees who spent more than 75% of their time preparing the budget are not tracked separately from these other activities. Given the department's broad mandate and ongoing work in the areas mentioned above, this information is impossible to isolate. Although governments often face economic uncertainty, the current situation differs when it comes to scale, complexity, and immediacy of the risks, and the way they interact. Given the significance of these developments, the government committed to tabling a budget this fall that reflects the full economic and fiscal context and provides a stable, forward-looking economic plan.

Question No. 249—Mel Arnold:

With regard to federally-funded salmon hatcheries in British Columbia, the Maritimes and Newfoundland and Labrador culturing Pacific or Atlantic salmon for commercial aquaculture purposes: (a) how many federally-funded salmon hatcheries are currently in operation in (i) British Columbia, (ii) the Maritimes, (iii) Newfoundland and Labrador; (b) what has been the yearly amount of federal funding spent on hatcheries, broken down by each of the last five years, in (i) British Columbia, (ii) the Maritimes, (iii) Newfoundland and Labrador; (c) how many salmon smelts were produced in total by these hatcheries, broken down by each of the last five years, in (i) British Columbia, (ii) the Maritimes, (iii) Newfoundland and Labrador; (d) for each of the next five years, how many additional hatcheries are planned for (i) British Columbia, (ii) the Maritimes, (iii) Newfoundland and Labrador; (e) for each of the next five years, how many additional salmon smelts will be produced in (i) British Columbia, (ii) the Maritimes, (iii) Newfoundland and Labrador; and (f) for each of the next five years, how much additional spending will be required for the additional hatcheries, broken down by each region in (d)?

Ernie Klassen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are no federally funded salmon hatcheries in British Columbia, the Maritimes or Newfoundland and Labrador that culture Pacific or Atlantic salmon for commercial aquaculture purposes.

Question No. 252—Cheryl Gallant:

With regard to Sustainable Development Technology Canada, as of June 10, 2025: (a) what was the amount of Sustainable Development Technology Canada's funding held back from innovators due to the certifier's absence for each milestone; (b) what is the total amount still outstanding to all innovators combined, for each milestone; (c) what is the total amount outstanding to innovators due to the transfer of the program from Sustainable Development Technology Canada to the National Research Council of Canada; and (d) how many innovators' milestones could not be certified or have had their certification delayed, due to the certifier being on an extended paternity leave?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as to part (a), in early October 2023, federal funding for Sustainable Development Technology Canada was paused following allegations against Sustainable Development Technology Canada and a subsequent fact-finding exercise by Raymond Chabot Grant Thornton. Sustainable Development Technology Canada project funding resumed in October 2024, under enhanced practices and governance, to strengthen project eligibility reviews and manage conflict of interest deviations. Claims made against active agreements during this time totaled \$39,344,498.29.

As to parts (b) and (c), 167 agreements were novated to National Research Council Canada, of which 97 were active agreements. All payments against milestones were up to date based on submitted reporting at the point of novation, so there were no outstanding amounts from submitted claims owed at the point of transfer to National Research Council Canada. The amounts still to be disbursed by National Research Council Canada against future milestones was \$157.5 million.

As to part (d), project funding agreements with project proponents under Sustainable Development Technology Canada programs were managed directly by Sustainable Development Technology Canada, as an arm's-length organization. Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada is unaware of any situations that fit the description in the question.

Question No. 253—Adam Chambers:

With regard to the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, since 2016 and broken down by year: (a) how many awards were provided by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada to individuals and organizations located outside of Canada and what was their total value; (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by country; and (c) what are the details of each award in (a), including, for each, the (i) recipient, (ii) amount, (iii) location, (iv) project description?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as to part (a), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council provides awards in the form of scholarships and fellowships to Canadian students and postdoctoral researchers. Scholarships and fellowships are awarded to individuals not organisations.

Doctoral and post-doctoral award holders can hold their awards abroad under certain conditions depending on the funding opportunity.

To be eligible to apply to the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council postgraduate scholarships doctoral program or the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council postdoctoral fellowships program, candidates must be a Canadian citizen, a permanent resident of Canada or a protected person under subsection 95(2) of Canada's Immigration and Refugee Protection Act as of the application deadline.

Award holders may take their doctoral postgraduate scholarships up at an eligible foreign institution, provided they have received a previous degree from a Canadian institution.

Award holders may hold a post-doctoral fellowship abroad only if they have received their doctorate from a Canadian institution.

Likewise, to take their award to an institution outside of Canada, Banting post-doctoral fellowship award holders must be Canadian citizens or permanent residents of Canada and have obtained their Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Philosophy equivalent or health professional degree from a Canadian university.

As to parts (b) and (c), these awards are proactively disclosed and published at <https://search.open.canada.ca/opendata/> and <https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/c1b0f627-8c29-427c-ab73-33968ad9176e>.

Details on these awards can also be found at https://www.nserc-crnsng.gc.ca/ase-oro/index_eng.asp.

Question No. 263—Frank Caputo:

With regard to Correctional Service Canada: since January 1, 2021, what are the details of all documents, including electronic emails, sent or received by any Correctional Service Canada employee which contain the name Frank Caputo or any abbreviation, acronym or other code name referring to the name of the member of Parliament from Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) sender, (iii) recipient, (iv) type of document, (v) title, (vi) summary of the contents, (vii) file number?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, CSC currently employs over 18,000 people, who work across the country and in a variety of different positions. The level of detail of the information requested is not systematically tracked in a centralized database. Similarly, it is not possible to complete a search of all CSC employees' records within the time allotted. An access to information request for these types of inquiries can be submitted at <https://atip-airpr.tbs-sct.gc.ca/en/Home/Privacy>.

Question No. 268—Pat Kelly:

With regard to energy efficiency requirements in the National Building Code of Canada 2020, between January 1, 2024, and June 15, 2025: how much did compliance with each respective requirement add to the cost of construction for (i) detached houses, (ii) semi-detached houses, (iii) townhouses, (iv) apartment-style condominiums, (v) stacked condominiums, (vi) rental apartments, broken down by province or territory?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the National Research Council's construction research centre provided technical support for the development of the 2020 edition of the national model codes by the Canadian Commission on Building and Fire Codes. In developing provisions to address core objectives of safety, health, accessibility, the fire and structural protection of buildings, and impact on the environment, the Canadian Commission on Building and Fire Codes committees considered the costs and benefits of proposed changes. By considering cost implications, code development committees balance the needs of authorities having jurisdiction over regulation that addresses core code objectives with affordability of dwellings for Canadians. Given the variation of codes adopted by provinces or territories, the National Research Council is not able to accurately calculate additional costs of construction due to changes in the national model codes. Determination of costs are dependent on a given province or territory and which tiers of the building and energy codes the province or territory adopted. Therefore, this data is not available within the allotted time for responding. Going forward, the Canadian Board for Harmonized Construction Codes, a federal-provincial-territorial managing body that has led code development since 2022, is working on developing a cumulative impact analysis approach that will calculate the total costs of the edition of a code for different archetypes, by region, starting with the 2030 national model codes.

Question No. 269—Pat Kelly:

With regard to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation's collection of information on housing availability across Canada, between January 1 2024 and June 15 2025, broken down by province or territory: how many (i) detached homes were completed, (ii) semi-detached homes were completed, (iii) townhouses were completed, (iv) apartment-style condominiums were completed, (v) stacked condominiums were completed, (vi) rental apartments were completed?

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation's collection of information on housing availability across Canada, between January 1, 2024, and June 15, 2025, please find the latest statistical housing information on starts and completions on the following web page: <https://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/professionals/housing-markets-data-and-research/housing-data/data-tables/housing-market-data/starts-completions-intended-market-canada-provinces>. The data is organized by geography, both Canada and provinces, and is broken out by home ownership, rental units, condos and co-ops.

Question No. 273—Alex Ruff:

With regard to the conditions set in place after *R. v. Jordan* (2016) or the "Jordan Decision": (a) is there a plan to address the sharp rise in cases exceeding the Jordan Limit since 2019-20; (b) if the answer to (a) is affirmative, what is the government's plan to address the sharp rise in cases exceeding the Jordan Limit since 2019-20; (c) if the answer to (a) is affirmative, what is the government's target percentage of total cases exceeding the Jordan Limit; (d) is there a specific plan to prioritize cases resulting in (i) bodily harm, (ii) death, (iii) drug trafficking, (iv) drug production, (v) drug importation, (vi) drug exportation, (vii) domestic violence, (viii) sexual assault, and to prevent them from exceeding the Jordan Limit; and (e) how many plea bargains have been reached since the Jordan Limit was implemented, broken down by (i) year, (ii) province or territory, (iii) type of offence as listed in (d)(i) to (d)(viii)?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as to parts (a), (b) and (e), criminal justice system delays have neg-

ative impacts on all persons affected by crime, including victims, families and the broader community in which the crime took place. Addressing delays requires concerted action by all levels of government.

Since 2019, the federal government has introduced, and Parliament has enacted, the following legislative measures to address delays in the criminal justice system.

Former Bill C-75, which received Royal Assent on June 21, 2019, introduced measures to reduce delays and modernize the criminal justice system. These reforms included restricting the availability of preliminary inquiries, expanding judicial case management powers and streamlining the classification of offences. More information is available on the Justice Canada website at <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/csj-sjc/jsp-sjp/c75/p3.html>.

Former Bill S-4, which came into effect on January 14, 2023, introduced targeted amendments to the Criminal Code to help address the challenges faced by criminal courts caused or highlighted by the COVID-19 pandemic, and to give courts increased flexibility in how they hold criminal proceedings and issue orders. More information is available on the Justice Canada website at <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/csj-sjc/pl/ocjs-asjp/index.html>.

The federal government has also contributed significant funding to support operational improvements to combat criminal justice system delays. For example, budget 2024 committed \$440 million over five years, starting in 2024-25, to support access to legal aid in the criminal justice system, which can help reduce court delays. This funding involves \$80 million in 2024-25, followed by \$90 million for the four years that follow.

Federal officials continue to work closely with the provinces and territories to understand and address issues involving delays, given the shared jurisdiction over the criminal justice system and their responsibility over the administration of justice. This includes responsibility for investigating, charging and prosecuting most criminal offences in Canada.

Routine Proceedings

Data on plea bargains are not collected by Justice Canada. However, data on guilty and not guilty pleas have been recently made available by Statistics Canada through the integrated criminal court survey, or ICCS. The ICCS collects data from adult criminal courts and youth courts across the provinces and territories. Please see below a summary of national data from the ICCS for the period of 2016-17 to 2022-23, which are the most recently available data.

From 2016-17 to 2022-23, after the Jordan decision was released, adult criminal courts across Canada completed 842,413 cases. The majority, or 81%, of accused persons in these cases submitted a guilty plea for their final plea, totalling 680,353 cases.

Between 2016-17 and 2022-23, the submission of a guilty plea by accused persons in adult criminal courts for the final plea was more common among administration of justice offences, at 88%, property offence, at 87%, and drug-related offences, at 85%, than for sexual assault, at 50%, and other violent crimes, including but not limited to homicide, attempted murder, assault and robbery, at 70%.

At 96%, Ontario had the highest proportion of guilty pleas submitted at the final plea of all jurisdictions between 2016-17 and 2022-23. The second highest was British Columbia, at 89%, followed by Prince Edward Island, at 88%. The jurisdiction with the lowest proportion of guilty pleas was New Brunswick, at 51%, followed by the Yukon, at 63%, the Northwest Territories, at 65%, and Nova Scotia, at 65%.

These issues are complex. In collaboration with our provincial and territorial partners, the government is committed to exploring ways to respond to delays to ensure the effective functioning of the criminal justice system.

As to parts (c) and (d), the Department of Justice is unable to respond concerning the target percentage of total cases exceeding the Jordan limit and the plan to prioritize cases involving various types of offenses, as the administration of justice falls within the purview of provinces and territories.

Question No. 275—Grant Jackson:

With regard to the Parks Canada Information Bulletin issued on May 16, 2025 on the "Watercraft management for Clear Lake 2025": (a) who did Parks Canada directly inform of the decision prior to the bulletin being posted, including the (i) name and organization of the individual, (ii) date each entity in (i) was informed by Parks Canada, (iii) name and title of the Parks Canada official who provided the notice to the entity in (i), (iv) method of communication used to inform the entity in (i); (b) who did Parks Canada directly consult with, from March 1, 2025 to May 15, 2025, on the decision to restrict watercraft access on Clear Lake, including, for each instance, the (i) name of the organization and individual, (ii) date each entity in (i) was consulted by Parks Canada, (iii) name and title of the Parks Canada official who hosted the consultation with the entity in (i), (iv) method of communication used to consult with the entity in (i); and (c) of the individuals in (a), were any of them a (i) Mayor, (ii) Reeve, (iii) Councillor, (iv) Member of the Legislative Assembly, (v) Member of Parliament, and, if so, what was their name and title?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as to part (a), Parks Canada directly informed the following people of the decision.

Chief Dwayne Blackbird and others of the Keeseekoowenin Ojibway First Nation were informed on May 9, 2025, by Leanne Cooper, field unit superintendent, at an in-person meeting.

James Plewak of the Coalition of First Nations with Interests in Riding Mountain National Park was informed on May 9, 2025, by Leanne Cooper, field unit superintendent, at an in-person meeting.

Julia Tetrault, director of strategic priorities at Manitoba Sport, Culture, Heritage and Tourism, was informed on May 13, 2025, by Jonah Mitchell, executive director, via phone call.

Jeff Long, director of the aquatic invasive species program at Manitoba Environment and Climate Change, was informed on May 15, 2025, by Jonah Mitchell, executive director, via phone call.

John Gunter, chairman of the board of the Tourism Industry Association of Manitoba, was informed on May 15, 2025, by Jonah Mitchell, executive director, via phone call.

Kelsey Connor, from the Clear Lake Marina, was informed on May 16, 2025, by Tom Sheldon, acting field unit superintendent, at an in-person meeting.

Lynne Tovell, from the Cottage Owners Association, was informed on May 16, 2025, by Jim Avram, acting townsite manager, via phone call.

Christian Robin, from the Cabin Owners' Association, was informed on May 16, 2025, by Jim Avram, acting townsite manager, via phone call.

Ian Drul, from the Municipality of Harrison Park, was informed on May 16, 2025, by Borden Smid, resource conservation manager, via phone call.

Tamara Sellman, from the Municipality of Harrison Park, was informed on May 16, 2025, by Borden Smid, resource conservation manager, via phone call.

Karly McRae, from Clear Lake Country, was informed on May 16, 2025, by Tom Sheldon, acting field unit superintendent, via phone call.

George Hartlen, from the Friends of Riding Mountain and the Wasagamung Chamber of Commerce, was informed on May 16, 2025, by Tom Sheldon, acting field unit superintendent, in person.

Michael Kreshewski, from the office of member of Parliament for Riding Mountain Dan Mazier, was informed on May 16, 2025, by Tom Sheldon, acting field unit superintendent, via phone call.

Routine Proceedings

Jeff Long, director of the aquatic invasive species program at Manitoba Environment and Climate Change, was informed on May 16, 2025, by Borden Smid, resource conservation manager, via phone call.

Brendan Spearin, aquatic invasive species regional coordinator at the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Government of Canada, was informed on May 16, 2025, by Borden Smid, resource conservation manager, via phone call.

As to part (b), during the specified period from March 1, 2025, to May 15, 2025, Parks Canada directly consulted with representatives from Keeseekoowenin Ojibway First Nation, including Larry Beatson, James Plewak and Chief Dwayne Blackbird, regarding the planned watercraft management measures for Clear Lake. This was done on April 15, May 2 and May 9, 2025, by Leanne Cooper, field unit superintendent; Borden Smid, resource conservation manager; and Mireille Kroeker, acting external relations manager, in person.

As to part (c), the answer is yes. Part (i) is not applicable. Part (ii) is Ian Drul, Reeve, Municipality of Harrison Park. Parts (iii) and (iv) are not applicable. Part (v) is the office of Member of Parliament for Riding Mountain Dan Mazier.

Question No. 276—Gabriel Ste-Marie:

With regard to housing programs and initiatives and federal housing transfers to Quebec and the provinces: (a) what is the breakdown of the amounts and data, for the provinces and Quebec, for the projects under the various programs managed or financed by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and Housing, Infrastructure and Communities Canada since October 1, 2023; (b) what is the updated estimate of the housing supply necessary to reach an adequate level of affordability, as described in the September 2023 report of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and of the supply gaps under the various population growth scenarios, broken down by province and Quebec; (c) what is the breakdown of the main expenditure items in the budget of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, including all programs funded in 2024–25; (d) what is the breakdown of the main expenditure items for the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation in 2025–26; and (e) what priorities did the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada set in the wake of his mandate letter of May 21, 2025?

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what follows is with regard to housing programs and initiatives and federal housing transfers to Quebec and the provinces.

With respect to part (e), the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada is developing a path forward to deliver on the priorities outlined in the Prime Minister's mandate letter and the Speech from the Throne, including “[m]aking housing more affordable by unleashing the power of public-private cooperation, catalyzing a modern housing industry, and creating new careers in the skilled trades.” Activities currently under way include launching build Canada homes to allow the Government of Canada to scale up the construction of new affordable homes by leveraging public lands, by providing predictable, low-cost financing to affordable home builders and by catalyzing a modern, innovative housing industry powered by Canadian technology, materials and skilled labour; and engaging with provinces, territories, municipalities and stakeholders on moving forward to reduce the burden of development charges for multi-unit housing.

With respect to parts (a) and (c), information on the breakdown of the amounts and data and on the breakdown of the main expendi-

ture items in the budget is available on the following website: <https://housing-infrastructure.canada.ca/housing-logement/ptch-csd/reports-rapports/prog-nhs-march-2025-mars-snl-eng.html>.

With respect to part (b), the updated estimate of the housing supply necessary to reach an adequate level of affordability, as described in the September 2023 report of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and of the supply gaps under the various population growth scenarios, broken down by province and Quebec, can be found on the following website: <https://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/professionals/housing-markets-data-and-research/housing-research/research-reports/accelerate-supply/canadas-housing-supply-shortages-a-new-framework>. Please note that the information is tracked by city.

With respect to part (d), the breakdown of the main expenditure items for the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation in 2025–26 can be found at the following website: <https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/planned-government-spending/government-expenditure-plan-main-estimates/2025-26-estimates.html#ToC7>.

* * *

• (1530)

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the government's responses to Questions Nos. 1, 2, 4, 6 to 9, 11 to 14, 17 to 25, 27, 28, 30 to 33, 35 to 38, 40, 45 to 49, 52 to 56, 60 to 65, 68 to 74, 78 to 80, 82 to 96, 98, 99, 101, 104 to 109, 112 to 117, 119, 121, 123 to 125, 127, 128, 131, 134 to 137, 139 to 147, 150, 152, 154 to 157, 159, 160, 162, 164, 165, 168, 169, 171, 172, 174 to 176, 178, 180, 183, 185 to 189, 191, 192, 194 to 196, 198 to 200, 202 to 206, 209, 211, 212, 214, 217, 218, 220 to 223, 226, 227, 230 to 233, 235, 237, 239, 245, 247, 248, 250, 251, 254 to 262, 264 to 267, 270 to 272, 274, and 277 to 283 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled in electronic format immediately.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Routine Proceedings

[Text]

Question No. 1—Dan Muys:

With regard to government information on stolen motor vehicles illegally exported from Canada: (a) how many stolen motor vehicles has the Canada Border Services Agency retrieved at (i) the Port of Montreal, (ii) the Port of Halifax, (iii) the Port of Vancouver, (iv) multi-modal hubs in Toronto, before they were illegally exported from Canada, broken down by year from 2021 to 2025; (b) how many vehicles does the Canada Border Services Agency estimate have been illegally exported from Canada via (i) the Port of Montreal, (ii) the Port of Halifax, (iii) the Port of Vancouver, (iv) multi-modal hubs in Toronto, broken down by year from 2021 to 2025; and (c) what percentage of outgoing containers from (i) the Port of Montreal, (ii) the Port of Halifax, (iii) the Port of Vancouver, (iv) multi-modal hubs in Toronto, have been scanned for goods being illegally exported from Canada, broken down by year from 2021 to 2025?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2—Dan Muys:

With regard to high-speed internet access and the Universal Broadband Fund: (a) what percentage of Canadians have access to download speeds of at least 50 Mbps, as of May 2025, broken down by census metropolitan area; (b) what percentage of Canadians have access to download speeds of at least 50 Mbps, as of May 2025, broken down by census agglomeration; (c) what percentage of Canadians living outside any census metropolitan area or census agglomeration have access to download speeds of at least 50 Mbps, as of May 2025; (d) what is the number of applications submitted to the Universal Broadband Fund that have not been selected for funding, broken down by census metropolitan area; and (e) what are the details of the applications in (d), including (i) how many were denied funding in total and broken down by targeted geographic area, (ii) how many targeted communities have fewer than 1,000 residents, (iii) the breakdown of denials by reason for denial, including what criteria were not met, if applicable, (iv) the breakdown of denied applications by the proposed internet speed upgrade associated with the application?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 4—Dan Muys:

With regard to flight delays in Canada: (a) broken down by year from 2016 to 2025, what was the number of flight delays in Canada categorized by (i) delay within carrier control (excluding safety), (ii) delay within carrier control (safety), (iii) delay outside carrier control (Air Traffic Control/National Air System), (iv) delay outside carrier control (weather), (v) delay outside carrier control (other), (vi) delay outside carrier control (security); and (b) what was the total number of delayed flights?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 6—Xavier Barsalou-Duval:

With regard to the expenditures of the Office of the Secretary to the Governor General, the Department of National Defence, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development, the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for the royal family's visit to Canada on May 26 and 27, 2025, as of April 28, 2025, broken down by department and visit: what was the (i) cost of air and ground transportation, (ii) cost of meals during transport and at destination, including the list of meals, (iii) number of accompanying persons who made the trip and their role, (iv) cost of transportation and security staff and their number and role, (v) cost of accommodation and the list of locations, (vi) cost of travel arrangement fees, (vii) value of receipts submitted by the various staff and accompanying persons, (viii) amount of expenses incurred for the Prime Minister, the Governor General, and their accompanying persons, (ix) amount of all other costs related to the trips?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 7—Xavier Barsalou-Duval:

With regard to government expenditures associated with the monarchy: (a) for the Office of the Governor General, the Department of National Defence, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development, the Department of Canadian Heritage, the National Capital Commission and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, for the years 2022-25, as of May 28, 2025, what is the (i) cost of operating the Office of the Governor General, (ii) salary of the Governor General, (iii) cost of support provided by the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, (iv) cost of Royal Canadian Mounted Police support for protecting the governor general, (v) cost of federal assistance to organizations of former governors general (the Michaëlle Jean Foundation, the Rideau Hall Foundation and the Insti-

tute for Canadian Citizenship), (vi) cost of the Rideau Hall residence (National Capital Commission), (vii) cost of pensions for all former governors general (and their surviving spouses), (viii) cost of the governor general's visits abroad; (b) since Governor General Mary Simon took office on July 26, 2021, what are the total expenses incurred by her office or any other department for French language training; and (c) for each trip outside the province of Ontario, what is the total cost of the trip, specifying the number of accompanying persons each time?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 8—Cheryl Gallant:

With regard to government usage of Palantir hardware, software or other technology, and broken down by department, agency, Crown corporation, or other government entity, since January 1, 2016: (a) has the government ever owned or used any Palantir technology, directly or indirectly (e.g. Palantir drivers being used in SAP Concur programs), and, if so, what are the details, including (i) what elements are owned or in use, (ii) how each element in (a)(i) is used; (b) what are the details of all contracts signed by the government directly with Palantir or with other companies for items that include Palantir technology, including, for each, (i) the date, (ii) the amount, (iii) the vendor, (iv) the description of the goods or services, (v) what the goods or services are used for; (c) what safeguards, if any, does the government have in place to ensure that any Palantir technology used by government entities is not used by Palantir for unauthorized data mining or analytics; (d) which applications or technology, which contained Palantir elements in any way, involved data mining or analytics; and (e) for each application in (d), what measures are in place to ensure that the data is secure and safe from threats both internal and external, as well as from hacking?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 9—Cheryl Gallant:

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation / Société Radio-Canada story from November 14, 2024, titled "CRA launched 'witch hunt' against whistleblowers who exposed millions in bogus refunds": (a) why did the Canada Revenue Agency launch a witch hunt or similar type of investigation against whistleblowers; (b) who ordered the investigation; (c) what resources is the Canada Revenue Agency using to conduct the investigation, including the number of employees or full-time equivalents who are involved in the investigation; (d) has the Canada Revenue Agency taken any action against those employees who authorized the issuing of the bogus refunds, and, if so, what are the details, including the number of employees who were reprimanded or fired; (e) if the Canada Revenue Agency has not taken action against those employees in (d), why not; (f) has the Canada Revenue Agency contacted the Ontario Provincial Police's Anti-Rackets Branch or requested they conduct an investigation, and, if so, when were they contacted; (g) is the Canada Revenue Agency aware of any instances where Canada Revenue Agency employees have altered taxpayers' banking information, and, if so, how many taxpayers' banking information was altered; (h) did the Canada Revenue Agency contact the Royal Canadian Mounted Police regarding any of the instances in (g), and, if so, on what date; (i) since the story broke, has the Canada Revenue Agency implemented any additional security precautions to protect the banking information of taxpayers, and, if so, what measures have been taken and on which dates; (j) what specific security measures related to protecting banking information did the Canada Revenue Agency have in place prior to the story; (k) was the system used to monitor those who prepare tax returns' (e.g. H&R Block) access to bank account information also in place to monitor Canada Revenue Agency employees, and, if not, why not; (l) following the incidents which led to the story, has the Canada Revenue Agency conducted a complete audit of all logins which included Canada Revenue Agency employees changing taxpayers' banking information; (m) has the Canada Revenue Agency checked reports of fraud against the records of Canada Revenue Agency employee logins, and, if so, what were the results; and (n) if the answer to (m) is no, why has the Canada Revenue Agency not checked this?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 11—Branden Leslie:**

With regard to the Canada Border Services Agency Asset and Revenue Management system, since December 1, 2016: (a) what are the total expenditures related to the program, broken down by year; (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by type of expense; (c) what are the details of all contracts signed by the government related to the system, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) value, (iv) description of the goods or services provided, (v) manner in which the contract was awarded (sole-sourced or competitive bid), (vi) title of the government official who approved the contract; (d) for each contract in (c) that was awarded through a competitive bid process, how many bids were received; (e) what is the target accuracy rate for information contained in the Canada Border Services Agency Asset and Revenue Management system; (f) what is the cloud compute consumption in terms of graphics processing units for the Canada Border Services Agency Asset and Revenue Management system; (g) broken down by month, and week if available, since 2016, how many hours was the Canada Border Services Agency Asset and Revenue Management system (i) online, (ii) offline; (h) broken down by year and month, how many complaints were received, and at what rate; and (i) broken down by year, how many times have costs or cost estimates related to the program been revised and what are the details of each instance, including the (i) date, (ii) previous cost, (iii) revised cost, (iv) reason for the revision?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 12—Clifford Small:

With regard to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, excluding the Canadian Coast Guard, since January 1, 2021: (a) what was the total value of all consulting contracts signed in (i) 2021, (ii) 2022, (iii) 2023, (iv) 2024, (v) 2025 to date; and (b) what are the details of all consulting contracts, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) initial value of the contract, (iv) current value of the contract, (v) type of consulting conducted, (vi) start and end dates of work, (vii) purpose of the contract and description of the work completed, (viii) reason for the increase in the contract's value, if applicable?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 13—Dan Albas:

With regard to government buildings obtaining Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design certification and broken down by department, agency, Crown corporation, or other government entity: (a) what was the total expenditure related to obtaining or maintaining Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design certification, broken down by year, for each of the last five years; (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by type of expenditure; (c) what are the details of all contracts entered into by the government related to obtaining or maintaining Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design certification since 2019, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) amount, (iv) description of the goods or services, (v) manner in which the contract was awarded (sole-sourced or competitive bid); (d) what are the details of any payments made by the government to the Canada Green Building Council since 2019, including, for each, the (i) amount, (ii) type of payment (grant, loan, contract for services), (iii) date, (iv) purpose; (e) what are the details of any payments made to any international organization since 2019, such as the US Green Building Council, related to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design certification, including, for each, the (i) amount, (ii) type of payment, (iii) date, (iv) purpose, (v) recipient organization; (f) how many government buildings currently have Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design certification; (g) what are the details of the buildings in (f), including, for each, the (i) name, if applicable, (ii) address, (iii) location (city, province), (iv) type of building; and (h) for each building in (g), how much has the government paid to date for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design certification?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 14—Marilyn Gladu:

With regard to government information about crime for the year 2023: how many suspects who were charged or deemed chargeable with homicide (i) were on bail or another type of remand, (ii) were on house arrest, (iii) were on parole, (iv) were subject to another type of community service broken down by type, (v) had an arrest warrant for a different crime at the time they were charged or deemed chargeable?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 17—Tako Van Popta:

With regard to Pacific Economic Development Canada and Small Business British Columbia: (a) is Pacific Economic Development Canada aware of the ap-

pointment of any of its employees to the employee Small Business British Columbia board of directors (board); (b) if the answer to (a) is affirmative, (i) what was the name of the employee, (ii) what was their position at both Pacific Economic Development Canada and Small Business British Columbia, (iii) what was the purpose of their appointment to the Small Business British Columbia board, (iv) what was the length of their appointment to the board, (v) what financial information did the employee relay to Pacific Economic Development Canada regarding the financial health and strategies of Small Business British Columbia; (c) since January 1, 2016, how much money, broken down by (i) full date, (ii) contract number, (iii) amount per contract, has Pacific Economic Development Canada awarded Small Business British Columbia; (d) what were the results, broken down by contract, of Pacific Economic Development Canada's financial performance review in considering Small Business British Columbia applications for funding; (e) what questions must applicants to Pacific Economic Development Canada funding programs answer in their applications; (f) broken down by question in (e), what metrics does Pacific Economic Development Canada use in considering the merit of each question; (g) what were the reasons for the suspension of payments of the latest \$2.7 million in funding awarded to Small Business British Columbia by Pacific Economic Development Canada; (h) in considering the application for funding from Small Business British Columbia in (g), what were the findings of Pacific Economic Development Canada regarding Small Business British Columbia's financial health and strategies; and (i) was Pacific Economic Development Canada aware of Small Business British Columbia's financial circumstances that led them to declare bankruptcy shortly after being approved for the latest \$2.7 million in funding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 18—Kelly McCauley:

With regard to funding provided through special warrants by the Governor General since Parliament was dissolved on March 23, 2025: (a) what were the dates and amounts of the funding provided through each warrant; (b) what is the detailed breakdown of how the funding in (a) was spent, including how much each department, program or government initiative received from each warrant; and (c) did any of the funding provided through the warrants go to any new government programs or initiatives, which were announced after January 1, 2025, and if so, what are the details of each instance, including the (i) amount, (ii) date of the funding, (iii) name or description of the program or initiative, (iv) date of the announcement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 19—Kelly McCauley:

With regard to contracts for the provision of research or speechwriting services to the Office of the Secretary to the Governor General, since April 1, 2021: (a) what are the details of all contracts, including the (i) start and end dates, (ii) contracting parties, (iii) file number, (iv) nature or description of the work, (v) value of the contract; and (b) for speechwriting contracts, what is the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) audience or event at which the speech was, or intended to be, delivered, (iv) number of speeches written, (v) cost charged per speech?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 20—Kelly McCauley:**

With regard to all expenditures made by the Office of the Secretary to the Governor General since April 1, 2023: (a) what was the total amount of expenditures, broken down by fiscal year; (b) what are the details of all expenditures made, including, for each, (i) the date, (ii) the amount, (iii) the vendor or payee, (iv) the description of the goods or services, (v) the line item or object code used, (vi) the justification or purpose of the expenditure, (vii) whether the expenditure was for operational, ceremonial, hospitality, travel, maintenance, or other purposes; (c) what were the total expenditures, broken down by category, including but not limited to (i) travel, (ii) hospitality, (iii) maintenance and repair, (iv) professional services, (v) personal or non-professional services, (vi) clothing or uniform expenses, (vii) dry cleaning and laundry, (viii) office supplies, (ix) IT or equipment, (x) furniture or décor; (d) what is the breakdown of expenditures by type of item (furniture, curtains, personal clothing, etc.) and by type of service (dry cleaning, traditional laundry, etc.); and (e) what are the details of all expenditures over \$1,000 that were made under code 0819 (non-professional personal service contracts not elsewhere specified), since April 1, 2023, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) vendor, (iv) description of the goods or services?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 21—Kelly McCauley:

With regard to funding provided through the Canada Fund for Local Initiatives program in the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem since January 1, 2016, and broken down by year: what are the details of each such Canada Fund for Local Initiatives grant, including the (i) amount, (ii) recipient, (iii) file number, (iv) description of the local initiative, (v) date, (vi) location?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 22—Brad Vis:

With regard to the Prison Needle Exchange Program: (a) how many federal institutions across Canada are currently participating in the program; (b) are there plans for additional institutions to implement the Prison Needle Exchange Program in the future, and on what date will each institution implement the program, broken down by location; and (c) how many inmates have (i) applied to, (ii) been accepted into, the Prison Needle Exchange Program, in total and broken down by institution, security level, and violent or non-violent offender status?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 23—Kerry Diotte:

With regard to Sustainable Development Technology Canada's 2022 Leadership Summit: (a) what are the total costs incurred from the summit, broken down by type of expense, including the amount spent on (i) meeting spaces, (ii) travel claims, (iii) hospitality expenses, (iv) honorariums, (v) other expenses; (b) what are the details of all meeting space expenses incurred, including the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) location, (iv) vendor, (v) description; (c) what are the details of all hospitality expenses incurred, including the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) location, (iv) vendor, (v) description; (d) what are the details of all travel claim expenses incurred, including the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) location, (iv) vendor, (v) description; (e) what was the total amount paid out in honorariums or other similar types of payments to attend the summit and how many individuals received such payments; and (f) what are the details of all payments related to (e), including the (i) recipient, (ii) amount, (iii) reason for the payment?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 24—Kerry Diotte:

With regard to contracts provided by the government to Brookfield Asset Management or Brookfield Corporation since January 1, 2020, broken down by department, agency, Crown corporation, or other government entity: (a) what is the total amount spent on contracts, broken down by year; and (b) what are the details of all such contracts, including (i) the amount, (ii) the vendor, (iii) the date and duration, (iv) whether the contract was sole-sourced or awarded through a competitive bidding process?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 25—Kerry Diotte:

With regard to contracts for the provision of research or speechwriting services to ministers, since January 1, 2021: (a) what are the details of all contracts, including the (i) start and end dates, (ii) contracting parties, (iii) file number, (iv) nature or description of the work, (v) value of the contract; and (b) for speechwriting contracts, what is the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) audience or event at which the speech

was, or was intended to be, delivered, (iv) number of speeches written, (v) cost charged per speech?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 27—Laila Goodridge:

With regard to contracts provided by the government to McKinsey & Company since January 1, 2023, broken down by department, agency, Crown corporation, or other government entity: (a) what is the total amount spent on contracts; and (b) what are the details of all such contracts, including (i) the amount, (ii) the vendor, (iii) the date and duration, (iv) the description of the goods or services provided, (v) the topics related to the goods or services, (vi) the specific goals or objectives related to the contract, (vii) whether or not the goals or objectives were met, (viii) whether the contract was sole-sourced or awarded through a competitive bidding process?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 28—Arnold Viersen:

With regard to spending by the government related to the production of cricket protein, since January 1, 2016: (a) how much funding has been provided for projects supporting the production of cricket protein, broken down by year; (b) what are the details of each project in (a), including the (i) location, (ii) project description, (iii) amount of funding originally announced, (iv) amount of funding distributed to date, (v) date on which the funding was transferred to the recipient, (vi) recipient, (vii) current status, (viii) original projected completion date for the project, (ix) actual completion date for the project, if applicable, (x) current projected completion date for the project, (xi) reason for the project delay, if applicable, (xii) type of funding (grant, repayable loan, etc.), (xiii) amount repaid to date, if applicable; (c) for the announcement on June 27, 2022, to invest up to \$8.5 million for Aspire to support the building of a commercial facility to produce cricket protein, (i) what was the reason for exceeding the AgriInnovate Program's maximum contribution amount of \$5 million, (ii) how many jobs were expected to be generated, (iii) how many jobs initially were generated, (iv) how many jobs are currently supported by the grant; (d) has Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada or Health Canada conducted studies or analyses on the production of cricket protein or the human consumption of cricket protein, and, if so, what are the details, including findings of any studies or analyses; (e) did Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada consider any negative impact on agriculture that the production of cricket protein would have, and, if not, why not; (f) did Health Canada seek any feedback on the human consumption of cricket protein, and, if so, what are the details, including what feedback was given; (g) what is the government's official position on the human consumption of cricket protein; and (h) for each year since 2016, what was the annual amount of cricket protein produced in Canada, in total and broken down by (i) domestic versus exported usage, (ii) human consumption versus animal consumption?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 30—Arnold Viersen:

With regard to the Sex Offender Information Registration Act for each year since 2015: (a) how many sex offenders in total leave the country; (b) how many sex offenders fail to report their absence; (c) how many notifications have been received under Section 6(1), broken down by each subsection; and (d) how many notifications have been received under Section 6(1.01), broken down by each subsection?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 31—Arnold Viersen:

With regard to the government's provision of goods and services to irregular border crossers seeking asylum, since 2015: how many claimants have been provided accommodations in Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada operated hotels or similar types of accommodations, broken down by month and province?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 32—Blaine Calkins:**

With regard to firearms regulations: (a) how many and which makes, models and variants of the firearms classified as prohibited on May 1, 2020, fire rifle cartridges; (b) how many and which makes, models and variants of the firearms classified as prohibited on May 1, 2020, fire centrefire cartridges; (c) for the firearms in (b), how many are chambered in (i) .223, (ii) 5.56 NATO, (iii) .308, (iv) 6.5 Creedmor, (v) 30-06; (d) for each firearm in (a), how many individual units does the government believe are in the possession of individuals in Canada; and (e) for each firearm in (b), how many individual units does the government believe are in the possession of individuals in Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 33—Blaine Calkins:

With regard to firearms regulations: (a) how many and which makes, models and variants of the firearms classified as prohibited on December 5, 2024 and since, fire rifle cartridges; (b) how many and which makes, models and variants of the firearms classified as prohibited on December 5, 2024, fire centrefire cartridges; (c) for the firearms in (b), how many are chambered in (i) .223, (ii) 5.56 NATO, (iii) .308, (iv) 6.5 Creedmor, (v) 30-06; (d) for each firearm in (a), how many individual units does the government believe are in the possession of individuals in Canada; and (e) for each firearm in (b), how many individual units does the government believe are in the possession of individuals in Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 35—Jenny Kwan:

With regard to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada's Special Immigration Measure to facilitate temporary resident visas for certain extended family of citizens and permanent residents in Gaza, which began on January 9, 2024: (a) how many applications have been received under the Special Immigration Measure and how many individuals are accounted for in total among these applications; (b) how many of these applications have been accepted into processing and how many individuals are accounted for, in total, among these applications; (c) how many applications have been refused, broken down by reasoning for their refusal; (d) how many temporary resident visas have been issued to individuals under the Special Immigration Measure since its inception; (e) how many temporary resident visa applications have been made by Palestinian passport holders in Gaza outside of the Special Immigration Measure, since October 7, 2023, broken down by (i) how many have been accepted into processing, (ii) how many temporary resident visas have been issued outside the Special Immigration Measure and how many of these individuals have landed in Canada, (iii) how many temporary resident visa applications outside the Special Immigration Measure have been refused, broken down by reason for refusal; (f) for how many individuals covered by the Special Immigration Measure has the government successfully facilitated exit from Gaza; (g) what diplomatic efforts, if any, have been undertaken by the government to negotiate safe passage for individuals covered under the Special Immigration Measure with the governments of Israel and Egypt; (h) has the department conducted any evaluations or received reports on how the Special Immigration Measure for Gazans compares to other temporary public policies, such as the 2022 special immigration measures for Ukrainians, in terms of accessibility and outcomes, and, if so, what are the key findings; (i) what measures have been implemented to ensure that anti-Palestinian racism is not influencing the design or administration of the Special Immigration Measure for Gazans, and how does this align with the government's broader anti-racism strategy; (j) what policy considerations led to the specific dimensions of the temporary public policy that opened on January 9, 2024, including the 1,000-visa quota, the gradual and slow issuance of access codes, selection of applicants that were prioritized to receive access codes, and information requested on screening forms; and (k) has the government engaged with Canadian or international human rights organizations to address criticisms of the Special Immigration Measure for Gazans and identify opportunities for improvement, and, if so, (i) which organizations have been consulted, (ii) to what extent were these organizations consulted, (iii) what has been the outcome of these engagements?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 36—Jenny Kwan:

With regard to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada's pathway for Colombian, Haitian and Venezuelan nationals: (a) how many individuals have been admitted to Canada under this special immigration measure to date, broken down by nationality; (b) what are the initial settlement locations of individuals admitted under the special immigration measure, broken down by province and territory; (c) what specific eligibility criteria were applied to assess applicants under this policy, specifically regarding evidence of displacement or vulnerability to displacement;

(d) was there any mechanism implemented to verify whether applicants had been displaced or forcibly displaced or otherwise affected by conditions cited as justification for this policy; (e) why did the government reduce its initial commitment for this humanitarian measure from 15,000 persons to 11,000 persons, and what were the factors that influenced this decision; and (f) did the government consult with international organizations, humanitarian organizations, or Canadian civil society in the development of this policy, and, if so, (i) which organizations were consulted, (ii) what was the extent of those consultations, (iii) what feedback or recommendations from those consultations were incorporated?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 37—Ben Lobb:

With regard to professional and special services spending by category, in 2022-23, as listed in table 1 of the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report titled "Fiscal cost of task-based IT contracting": (a) what is the total amount spent on contracts for management consulting; and (b) what are the details of all such contracts, including for each (i) the amount, (ii) the vendor, (iii) the date and duration, (iv) the description of the goods or services provided, (v) the topics related to the goods or services, (vi) the specific goals or objectives related to the contract, (vii) whether or not the goals or objectives were met, (viii) whether the contract was sole-sourced or awarded through a competitive bidding process?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 38—Ben Lobb:

With regard to professional and special services spending by category, in 2022-23, as listed in table 1 of the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report titled "Fiscal cost of task-based IT contracting": (a) what was the total amount spent on contracts for (i) engineering and architectural services, (ii) business services, (iii) informatics services, (iv) health and welfare services, (v) other services, (vi) legal services, (vii) protection services, (viii) training and educational services, (ix) scientific and research services, (x) construction services, (xi) interpretation and translation services, (xii) special fees and services; and (b) broken down by each category in (a), what are the details of each such contract, including (i) the amount, (ii) the vendor, (iii) the date and duration, (iv) the description of the goods or services provided, (v) whether the contract was sole-sourced or awarded through a competitive bidding process?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 40—Luc Berthold:

With regard to the government's Net Zero Accelerator initiative: (a) how many emissions have been directly reduced by the program to date, if any; (b) does the government measure the direct emission reductions from each contribution agreement, and, if not, why not; and (c) how many emissions have been directly reduced by the program to date, broken down by contribution agreement recipient?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 45—Dan Mazier:

With regard to expenditures on consultants by Health Canada, the Public Health Agency of Canada, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board, and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, since January 1, 2023, broken down by year: (a) what is the total amount of expenditures incurred by each on consultants; and (b) what are the details of all such contracts under object codes 0431 (Scientific consultants), 0446 (Training consultants), 0473 (Information technology and telecommunications consultants), 0491 (Management consulting), 0422 (Engineering consultants – Construction), or 0423 (Engineering consultants – Other), including, for each, (i) the amount, (ii) the vendor, (iii) the date of the contract, (iv) the duration of the contract, (v) the description of the services provided, (vi) the reason or purpose of the contract, (vii) whether the contract was sole sourced?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 46—Brad Redekopp:**

With regard to the 2025–2027 Immigration Levels Plan and the statement in the background that “the plan will reduce the housing supply gap by approximately 670,000 units by the end of 2027”: (a) how was that number arrived at; (b) were any empirical studies done to corroborate this figure, and, if so, (i) what were the names of these studies, (ii) what specific conclusion did these studies reach with respect to that figure; (c) does the government have an algorithm to determine the appropriate number of temporary immigrants per year, per category, in relation to housing demands, and, if so, does the formula vary province by province; (d) if there is an algorithm, (i) what is the formula, (ii) when was it last adjusted, (iii) when were the two previous adjustments, if any, (iv) when is the next anticipated adjustment; (e) does the development of the formula require approval by the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship; and (f) given that, prior to the release of the plan, the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities said that he “would urge caution to anyone who believes the answer to our housing challenges is to close the door on newcomers,” does this plan take into account this statement, and, if so, what specific accommodations were made in the plan with regard to this statement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 47—Brad Redekopp:

With regard to the various changes made by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada to the international student program: (a) how does the government plan to measure the effectiveness of these changes in reducing fraud and improving student experiences; (b) how does the government plan to monitor the implementation of the letter of acceptance verification process to prevent fraud; (c) what type of oversight or quality checks on Designated Learning Institutions participating in the “recognized institution” framework currently exists or will exist in the near future; (d) what specific measures are in place to prevent Designated Learning Institutions from over-enrolling beyond their support capacity; (e) what criteria will be used to assess the adequacy of housing and support services provided by Designated Learning Institutions; (f) does the government have plans to make new funding available to the provinces for affordable student housing in response to the intake cap; (g) how will the intake cap for study permits ensure fairness across provinces with varying demand for international students; and (h) how was the new cost-of-living requirement calculated, and does it account for regional differences in living expenses across Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 48—Brad Redekopp:

With regard to the electoral district of Saskatoon West: what are the details of all the grants, contributions, loans and any other payments from Government of Canada departments, agencies, and Crown corporations, but excluding the Canada Revenue Agency, to all other levels of government within and outside of Canada, First Nations, corporations, non-governmental organizations, and charities, from April 1, 2024, to March 22, 2025, inclusively?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 49—Lianne Rood:

With regard to Canadian funding for education in developing countries: (a) how much was spent annually for each of the last five fiscal years; (b) what was the breakdown by country and by education level (primary, secondary, post-secondary); and (c) how many girls and women were direct beneficiaries of these education programs in total and broken down by country and education level?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 52—Luc Berthold:

With regard to government spending related to the Lac-Mégantic Rail Bypass project: (a) how much has been spent to date by the government on the project, in total and broken down by type of expense; (b) how much is expected to be spent in the future, from the present until the completion of the project, in total and broken down by type of expense; (c) what are the complete expected expenditures of the government, from the beginning of the project through to its completion, in total and broken down by type of expense; and (d) what are the details of all contracts over \$1,000 signed by the government related to the project, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) amount, (iv) description of the goods or services, (v) manner in which the contract was awarded (sole-sourced or competitive bid)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 53—Michael Kram:

With regard to the Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage Investment Tax Credit and the requirement to submit a project plan to Natural Resources Canada and be issued an initial project evaluation for each qualified Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage project: (a) how many project plans have been submitted to Natural Resources Canada to date regarding the Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage Investment Tax Credit qualification process; (b) how many initial project evaluations have been issued by Natural Resources Canada regarding Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage projects; (c) for each project plan submitted to date, how long did the process take between the submission of the project plan and the issuance of the evaluation; (d) for each plan which has been submitted that has yet to receive an evaluation from Natural Resources Canada, on what dates were the plans received by Natural Resources Canada; (e) of project plans which have (i) received an evaluation, (ii) not yet received an evaluation, how many required additional information or revisions beyond what was included in the original submission; (f) how many project plans have been rejected or otherwise denied an initial project evaluation; and (g) what is the projected dollar value of the Investment Tax Credits claimable against projects which have already received an initial evaluation?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 54—Michael Kram:

With regard to processing times for Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada: what is the current average processing time for (i) temporary residence - Seasonal Agricultural Worker, (ii) temporary residence - International Experience Canada, (iii) economic immigration (all subcategories), (iv) family sponsorship (all sub-categories), (v) refugees - dependents of Protected Persons, (vi) humanitarian and compassionate case, (vii) citizenship, (viii) permanent resident card applications, broken down by the applicant's country of origin?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 55—Dan Albas:

With regard to the \$5 billion in funding through the Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements to British Columbia, committed in the 2021 Fall Economic Statement, in response to extreme weather events: (a) how much of this commitment has been delivered to British Columbia to date, in total, and broken down by specific project funded; (b) when will the outstanding amount be delivered; and (c) what is required before the outstanding amount is provided to British Columbia?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 56—Fred Davies:

With regard to government departments' and agencies' use of in service flame-resistant garments produced using meta and para-aramid fibres that include fibres such as Nomex, Conex, Kermel, Kevlar and modacrylic fibres: (a) what type of flame-resistant garments are being used by the respective departments, and what is their fibre content; (b) what is the quantity or volume of flame-resistant garments used for each respective garment type each year; (c) how many flame-resistant garments or non-flame-resistant garments, used by government agencies, have been treated with water repellency coatings, like durable water repellent, that contain perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances; and (d) where are used flame-resistant and non-flame-resistant garments contaminated by perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, including fire-fighting turnout gear, broken down by location across Canada, including the (i) location of the entity responsible for storage, (ii) total number of garments stored at the location?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 60—Shelby Kramp-Neuman:**

With regard to government statistics on violence against women, broken down by year since 2015: (a) how many criminal acts of violence against women were reported, in total and broken down by province or territory and by major metropolitan area; (b) of the acts of violence in (a), how many were homicides or deadly assaults; (c) how many individuals were charged in relation to the crimes in (a); (d) how many individuals were charged in relation to the crimes in (b); and (e) what is the breakdown of (c) and (d) by whether the individuals charged were (i) already wanted for other crimes, (ii) out on bail, (iii) on parole at the time of being charged?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 61—Bob Zimmer:

With regard to the Department of National Defence and North American Aerospace Defense Command modernization: (a) how much of the \$38.6 billion announced for the modernization has been spent to date, in total, and broken down by project; (b) of the 20 project timelines announced in June 2022, which ones are (i) on track for the completion of the definition phase or to be finished within the stated time, (ii) delayed; and (c) for each project which is delayed, (i) what is the new projected completion date, (ii) what is the reason for the delay?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 62—Bob Zimmer:

With regard to Public Services and Procurement Canada, acting as the contracting agent for the Giant Mine remediation project: (a) what are the details of all contracts related to the Giant Mine overseen by Public Services and Procurement Canada, in this capacity, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) vendor, (iv) description of the goods or services, (v) manner in which the contract was awarded (sole-sourced or competitive bid); (b) how much of the \$800 million received by Public Services and Procurement Canada related to this role has been spent on the contracts in (a); and (c) for any of the \$800 million that was spent in a manner other than on the contracts in (a), how was the money spent, broken down by expenditure?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 63—Bob Zimmer:

With regard to the Project Finance for Permanence initiatives and the \$800 million announced by the Prime Minister in December 2022 to support up to four Indigenous-led conservation initiatives: (a) how much of the \$800 million announced for the projects has been spent to date, in total and broken down by project; and (b) what are the details of all funding provided to date resulting from the \$800 million announcement, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) recipient organization, (iii) type of funding (grant, loan, etc.), (iv) location and amount, in square kilometers, of related protected area, broken down by land area versus water area?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 64—Rhonda Kirkland:

With regard to the sponsorship of podcasts, webinars and similar types of productions, since 2019, and broken down by year and by department, agency, Crown corporation or other government entity: (a) what was the total amount spent on such sponsorships; and (b) what are the details of all such sponsorships, including the (i) start date, (ii) end date, (iii) amount or cost, (iv) name of the production, (v) topic or description of the show, (vi) reason for the sponsorship?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 65—Ned Kuruc:

With regard to contracts that have been cancelled by the government since January 1, 2023, broken down by department, agency, Crown corporation or other government entity: (a) how many contracts have been cancelled; (b) what is the total amount paid out in cancellation fees or penalties; and (c) what are the details of all such cancellations, including, for each, the (i) date on which the contract was signed, (ii) date on which the contract was cancelled, (iii) vendor, (iv) value, (v) description of the goods or services, (vi) reason for the cancellation, (vii) cancellation fee or other similar type of cost to the government?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 68—Fraser Tolmie:

With regard to legal costs incurred by the government in relation to litigation against the Information Commissioner since January 1, 2021: what is the total expenditure on outside legal counsel, broken down by legal costs paid out to date and

by legal costs scheduled to be paid out, for (i) Attorney General of Canada v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1623-22), (ii) Export Development Canada v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1793-22 and Federal Court of Appeal file A-345-23), (iii) Minister of Public Services and Procurement v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-125-23), (iv) Clerk of the Privy Council v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1090-23), (v) Clerk of the Privy Council v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1091-23), (vi) Information Commissioner of Canada v. President and Chief Executive Officer of the Trans Mountain Corporation (Federal Court file T-1399-23), (vii) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1606-23), (viii) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1607-23), (ix) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1608-23), (x) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1653-23), (xi) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1680-23), (xii) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1728-23), (xiii) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1764-23), (xiv) Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-2022-23),

(xv) Information Commissioner of Canada v. Minister of National Defence (Federal Court file T-2683-23), (xvi) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-272-24), (xvii) Minister of Transport v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-280-24), (xviii) Information Commissioner of Canada v. Minister of National Defence (Federal Court file T-333-24), (xix) Information Commissioner of Canada v. Minister of National Defence (Federal Court file T-334-24), (xx) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-342-24), (xxi) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-344-24), (xxii) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-371-24), (xxiii) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-397-24), (xxiv) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-970-24), (xxv) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1054-24), (xxvi) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1060-24), (xxvii) Information Commissioner of Canada v. Minister of National Defence (Federal Court file T-1226-24), (xxviii) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1433-24), (xxix) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1434-24), (xxx) Minister of Indigenous Services v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-1556-24),

(xxxi) Information Commissioner of Canada v. Chairperson of the Immigration and Refugee Board (Federal Court file T-1822-24), (xxxii) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-2013-24), (xxxiii) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-2681-24), (xxxiv) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-2709-24), (xxxv) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-2720-24), (xxxvi) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-2779-24), (xxxvii) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-2909-24), (xxxviii) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-3028-24), (xxxix) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-3029-24), (xl) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-3049-24), (xli) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-3259-24), (xlii) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-111-25),

Routine Proceedings

(xliii) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-112-25), (xliv) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-220-25), (xlv) Minister of Canadian Heritage v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-221-25), (xlvi) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-332-25), (xlvii) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-418-25), (xlviii) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-422-25), (xlix) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-423-25), (l) The Information Commissioner of Canada v. Minister of National Defence (Federal Court file T-496-25), (li) The Information Commissioner of Canada v. Minister of National Defence (Federal Court file T-601-25), (lii) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-636-25), (liii) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-657-25), (liv) Minister of National Defence v. Information Commissioner of Canada (Federal Court file T-797-25)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 69—Colin Reynolds:

With regard to recommendations made by the Information Commissioner of Canada, pursuant to section 37 of the Access to Information Act: what has been done to address and implement each recommendation made in each of the following reports of the Information Commissioner of Canada, broken down by report and recommendation, (i) Canadian Heritage (Re), 2020 OIC 10, (ii) Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (Re), 2021 OIC 11, (iii) Library and Archives Canada (Re), 2022 OIC 17, (iv) Canadian Security Intelligence Service (Re), 2023 OIC 11, (v) Global Affairs Canada (Re), 2023 OIC 43, (vi) Canada Border Services Agency (Re), 2024 OIC 15, (vii) National Defence (Re), 2024 OIC 31, (viii) National Defence (Re), 2024 OIC 32, (ix) Environment and Climate Change Canada (Re), 2024 OIC 33, (x) National Defence (Re), 2024 OIC 34, (xi) Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (Re), 2024 OIC 39, (xii) Canada Revenue Agency (Re), 2024 OIC 52, (xiii) National Defence (Re), 2024 OIC 54?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 70—Michael Cooper:

With regard to special ballots issued for the 45th general election: (a) how many special ballots were sent to electors residing outside Canada, broken down by country of current residence and further broken down by Canadian electoral district; and (b) how many special ballots were returned from electors residing outside Canada, broken down by country of current residence and further broken down by Canadian electoral district?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 71—Jamie Schmale:

With regard to spending on informatics services, in 2022-23, as listed in table 2 of the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report titled "Fiscal cost of task-based IT contracting": (a) what is the total amount spent on contracts for all departments, agencies and Crown corporations; and (b) what are the details of all such contracts, including, for each, (i) the amount, (ii) the vendor, (iii) the date and duration, (iv) the description of the goods or services provided, (v) the topics related to the goods or services, (vi) the specific goals or objectives related to the contract, (vii) whether the goals or objectives were met, (viii) whether the contract was sole-sourced or awarded through a competitive bidding process?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 72—Jamie Schmale:

With regard to Sustainable Development Technology Canada: (a) what are the costs incurred by the (i) board of directors, (ii) executive team, since January 1, 2016, broken down by year and month; (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by type of expense, including the amount spent on meeting spaces, travel claims, hospitality bills, honorariums, etc.; (c) what are the details of each travel expense incurred by the board or executive, including the (i) travel destination, (ii) date, (iii) total expenditures, (iv) name and title of the traveller; (d) what are the details of all hospitality expenses incurred by the board or executive, including the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) location, (iv) vendor, (v) event description, (vi) names and titles of the attendees; and (e) how much was paid in honorariums to the board, broken down by year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 73—Jenny Kwan:

With regard to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada's settlement and resettlement services: (a) what is the national budget for settlement services for each fiscal year starting from 2024-25 and the subsequent three years to 2027-28, aligned with the three-year Immigration Levels Plan, broken down by (i) category or type of service (i.e. language training, information and referrals, integration support services, employment related support services, etc., including Francophone, rural and remote targets), (ii) municipality, (iii) Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada region, (iv) province or territory; (b) what are the projected national budgets for settlement services for the following five fiscal years, broken down by (i) category or type of service, (ii) municipality, (iii) Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada region, (iv) province or territory; (c) what is the current Settlement Allocation Model and permanent residency data used for the last five years and next three years to allocate funding to each region; (d) have there been any modifications to the Settlement Allocation Model since 2022, and, if so, what are the changes and how did they impact funding levels, broken down by (i) category or type of service, (ii) municipality, (iii) Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada region, (iv) province or territory; (e) if there haven't been any modifications to the Settlement Allocation Model since 2022, does the department intend that this model remain in use to determine the funding allocations in 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28; (f) how many new service providers received funding in the most recent Call for Proposals in comparison to Call for Proposals 2019, broken down by (i) category or type of service, (ii) municipality, (iii) Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada region, (iv) province or territory; (g) was funding for new service providers added to the existing national settlement budget, or was the budget increased to include new providers; (h) regarding the most recent Call for Proposals, how many existing service providers experienced funding reductions, broken down by (i) category or type of service, (ii) reduction by percentage, (iii) municipality, (iv) Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada region, (v) province or territory; (i) regarding the most recent Call for Proposals, how many service providers did not receive funding as a result of not having their contracts renewed, broken down by (i) category or type of service, (ii) municipality, (iii) Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada region, (iv) province or territory; (j) what strategies has the department implemented to transition clients from one service provider to another, in instances where contracts have not been renewed or funding has been reallocated, including settlement supports to displaced Ukrainians on Canada-Ukraine Authorization for Emergency Travel visas that must transition out of support by March 31, 2025, broken down by (i) service delivery model (i.e. in-person, remote, online), (ii) when it will be operationalized; (k) what policy changes is the department undertaking to the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada in the 2025-28 funding period; and (l) will the government continue to offer Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada first and second stage classes to permanent residents wishing to enter the labour market?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 74—Eric Melillo:

With regard to the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario: what is the total value of the agency's grants and contributions for the fiscal years 2023-24 and 2024-25, broken down by federal electoral district?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 78—Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:

With regard to the approval rate for French-speaking international students: how many study permit applications, other than extension applications, has Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada processed since January 1, 2023, broken down by (i) country of residence, (ii) number of people, (iii) year?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 79—John Brassard:**

With regard to government travel, broken down by minister's office since January 1, 2021: (a) which ministers or exempt staff have rented vehicles, including, but not limited to, car and driver services, limousine services or car services, within Canada or elsewhere; (b) for each use identified in (a), what was the (i) date of the rental, (ii) pick-up location of the rental, (iii) drop-off location of the rental, (iv) nature of the official business, including any events attended, (v) cost of the rental, (vi) vehicle description, including the type and model, if available, (vii) name of each passenger, if known, (viii) name of the vendor, (ix) duration of the rental; and (c) for each rental listed in (a), was a driver provided?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 80—John Brassard:

With regard to clothing allowances and expenditures on clothing, for use by the Prime Minister, the Governor General or other ministers, since January 1, 2023, and broken down by year: (a) which individuals have received a clothing allowance and, for each, how much was the allowance; and (b) what are the details of all expenditures by the government on clothing or outerwear which was provided to any of the individuals in (a), including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount spent and the value of the item, (iii) description of the item, (iv) title of the individual?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 82—Anna Roberts:

With regard to the Canada Pension Plan, and broken down by year, for each of the last five years: what was the number and percentage of new Canada Pension Plan recipients, broken down by their age at the time that they received their first Canada Pension Plan payment, starting at age 60?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 83—Anna Roberts:

With regard to government action taken following the concerns raised by the Auditor General in Report 11 "Programs to Assist Seniors": (a) what specific changes is the government making to the New Horizons for Seniors Program in response to the concerns; (b) how will the government measure the number of seniors benefitting from each of the grants provided under the New Horizons for Seniors Program and what benefits are seniors receiving; (c) what follow-up checks has the government done to ensure that New Horizons for Seniors Program grant money was spent appropriately and in accordance with the terms of the funding agreement; and (d) since January 1, 2024, how many instances have there been where the government found that New Horizons for Seniors Program grant money was not spent appropriately, and what are the details of each such instance, including the (i) recipient, (ii) location, (iii) amount of funding provided, (iv) purpose of the funding, (v) summary of how the funding was inappropriately spent, (vi) action taken by the government in response, (vii) amount of funding recovered, if applicable?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 84—Tony Baldinelli:

With regard to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada transferring refugees to Niagara Falls, Ontario, between January 1, 2024 and June 1, 2025: (a) how many have been transferred to Niagara Falls in total; (b) what is the monthly breakdown of the number of refugees transferred to Niagara Falls; (c) which hotels is the government using to lodge refugees in Niagara Falls; (d) how many hotel rooms are currently being occupied by refugees in Niagara Falls; (e) what is the capacity of each hotel room that is being occupied by refugees in Niagara Falls; (f) how many refugees are staying in each hotel room in Niagara Falls; (g) what is the average length of time Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada expects (i) an individual refugee, (ii) a refugee family, to be lodged in a Niagara Falls hotel room; (h) for all refugees being lodged in government-funded Niagara Falls hotel rooms, without identifying names or other personal information, how many days has each refugee stayed; (i) what is the average cost per night that Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada pays per refugee staying in a Niagara Falls hotel room; (j) for the night of June 1, 2025, what was the total cost Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada paid hoteliers to house refugees located in Niagara Falls; (k) what is the average cost that Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada pays per refugee who lives in a Niagara Falls hotel room for daily meals and refreshments; (l) for the month of May 2025, what was the total cost Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada paid hoteliers to feed refugees located in Niagara Falls; (m) what are the countries of origin for refugees who have been accommodated in Niagara Falls; (n) what is the breakdown of refugees transferred to, or accommodated in, Niagara Falls, by each country of origin; (o) how much funding

was transferred by the federal government to the municipality of Niagara Falls to deal with the influx of refugees in the city; (p) how much funding has been transferred by the federal government to the Region of Niagara to deal with the influx of refugees in the region; (q) how much funding was transferred by the federal government to local not-for-profit, charitable and non-governmental organizations in Niagara Falls to deal with the influx of refugees in the city; (r) what are the names of the specific not-for-profit, charitable and non-governmental organizations in (q) who have received federal government funding; (s) what is the breakdown of funding for each organization to date; (t) how many more refugees does Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada currently plan to transfer to, or accommodate in, Niagara Falls; (u) how many refugees have moved out of government-funded hotel rooms in Niagara Falls and into personal accommodations; (v) when does the federal government plan to stop paying for refugee hotel rooms in Niagara Falls; and (w) what are the terms and conditions of the financial agreement that Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada has with each hotelier located in Niagara Falls that houses refugees and receives federal monies to provide this service?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 85—Tony Baldinelli:

With regard to the federal Tourism Growth Fund that was announced by the Minister of Tourism and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec on November 20, 2023: (a) how much of the \$108 million from the Tourism Growth Fund has been spent as of June 1, 2025; (b) what is the spending breakdown for each of the seven regional development agencies, including the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Prairies Economic Development Canada and Pacific Economic Development Canada; and (c) within each of the seven regional development agencies, (i) what is the spending breakdown between for-profit and non-profit tourism projects, (ii) what is the name of each tourism project that received money from the Tourism Growth Fund, (iii) what is the date of each project funding announcement, (iv) how much money did each tourism project receive from the Tourism Growth Fund, (v) in what federal riding is each tourism project located, (vi) what is the description of each project that received funds from the Tourism Growth Fund?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 86—Tony Baldinelli:

With regard to asylum claimants who qualified under the four exception categories to the Safe Third Country Agreement, from 2019 to 2025: (a) how many claimants qualified under each of the following exception categories, broken down by year, including 2025 to date, (i) family member exceptions, (ii) unaccompanied minors, (iii) document holders (valid visa, work permit, study permit, etc.), (iv) public interest exceptions; (b) broken down by each of the exception categories in (a), how many claims (i) were approved, (ii) were denied, (iii) are still under review, (iv) were withdrawn or abandoned; (c) what was the average processing time for claims under each of the exception categories in (a), broken down by year; (d) how many claimants in (a) were from each country of origin, broken down by year; (e) how many claimants in (a) were processed in each province or territory, broken down by exception category and year; and (f) what measures are currently in place to ensure the timely processing of claims under each of the exception categories in (a)?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 87—Tony Baldinelli:**

With regard to asylum claimants who qualified under the over-14-day exemption to the Safe Third Country Agreement, from 2019 to 2025: (a) how many claimants qualified under the over-14-day exemption, in each of the past five calendar years, broken down by year; (b) how many claims from (a), were processed in each province or territory, broken down by year; (c) how many claims from (a), were from each country of origin, broken down by year; (d) how many claims under the over-14-day exemption (i) were approved, (ii) were denied, (iii) are still under review, (iv) were withdrawn or abandoned, broken down by year; (e) what was the average processing time for claims under the over-14-day exemption, broken down by year; and (f) What measures or processes are in place to verify that claimants meet the requirements of the over-14-day exemption?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 88—Fraser Tolmie:

With regard to the government's agreements with Volkswagen and PowerCo, to build a battery assembly plant in St. Thomas Ontario, and with Stellantis-LG to build a battery assembly plant in Windsor Ontario: (a) in relation to each agreement, how many battery production subsidy claims have been received by the government, from each party, pursuant to the agreement being made; and (b) what are the details of each individual claim, including, for each, the (i) period the claim covers, (ii) number of batteries produced that are covered by the claim, (iii) date the claim was received, (iv) date the claim was approved?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 89—Fraser Tolmie:

With regard to government funding for electric vehicle battery plants, since November 4, 2015: (a) how much funding has the government provided for the (i) Northvolt electric vehicle battery manufacturing plant, in Montreal, (ii) Volkswagen electric vehicle battery manufacturing plant in St. Thomas, Ontario, (iii) Stellantis LG electric vehicle battery manufacturing plant in Windsor, Ontario, (iv) Honda electric vehicle assembly, battery manufacturing, and cathode processing plant, in Alliston Ontario, (v) General Motors CAMI assembly plant and refurbishment of the Oshawa plant, (vi) Asahi Kasei electric vehicle battery component plant, (vii) E-One Moli Energy lithium-ion battery cell production plant, in Maple Ridge BC; and (b) what is the breakdown of (a)(i) to (a)(vii) by type of subsidy (construction, production, etc.) and by manner in which it was provided (direct payment, tax credit, etc.)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 90—Rosemarie Falk:

With regard to government grants and contributions to telecommunication companies since January 1, 2016: (a) what are the details of all loans, grants, or other financial contributions that the government has provided to Rogers (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) type of contribution (loan, non-repayable grant, etc.), (iv) repayment terms, if applicable, (v) amount repaid to date, (vi) purpose; (b) what are the details of all loans, grants, or other financial contributions that the government has provided to Videotron (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) type of contribution (loan, non-repayable grant, etc.), (iv) repayment terms, if applicable, (v) amount repaid to date, (vi) purpose; (c) what are the details of all loans, grants, or other financial contributions that the government has provided to TELUS (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) type of contribution (loan, non-repayable grant, etc.), (iv) repayment terms, if applicable, (v) amount repaid to date, (vi) purpose; (d) what are the details of all loans, grants, or other financial contributions that the government has provided to Bell (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) type of contribution (loan, non-repayable grant, etc.), (iv) repayment terms, if applicable, (v) amount repaid to date, (vi) purpose; (e) what are the details of all loans, grants, or other financial contributions that the government has provided to Shaw Communications (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) type of contribution (loan, non-repayable grant, etc.), (iv) repayment terms, if applicable, (v) amount repaid to date, (vi) purpose; and (f) what are the details of all loans, grants, or other financial contributions that the government has provided to Corus Entertainment (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) type of contribution (loan, non-repayable grant, etc.), (iv) repayment terms, if applicable, (v) amount repaid to date, (vi) purpose?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 91—Rosemarie Falk:

With regard to government contracts with telecommunication companies since January 1, 2016: (a) what are the details of all contracts with Rogers (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) description of the goods and services, (iv) manner in which it was awarded (competitive or non-competitive), (v) location of services for all, if applicable; (b) what are the details of all contracts with Videotron (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) description of the goods and services, (iv) manner in which it was awarded (competitive or non-competitive), (v) location of services for all, if applicable; (c) what are the details of all contracts with TELUS (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) description of the goods and services, (iv) manner in which it was awarded (competitive or non-competitive), (v) location of services for all, if applicable; (d) what are the details of all contracts with Bell (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) description of the goods and services, (iv) manner in which it was awarded (competitive or non-competitive), (v) location of services for all, if applicable; (e) what are the details of all contracts with Shaw Communications (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) description of the goods and services, (iv) manner in which it was awarded (competitive or non-competitive), (v) location of services for all, if applicable; and (f) what are the details of all contracts with Corus Entertainment (and subsidiaries) including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) description of the goods and services, (iv) manner in which it was awarded (competitive or non-competitive), (v) location of services for all, if applicable?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 92—Kurt Holman:

With regard to board of directors' meetings at any of Canada's Regional Development Agencies, and broken down by agency: what are the details of each meeting in which a declaration, conflict, potential perception of conflict, abstention or recusal was noted in the meeting minutes from December 1, 2022, to June 1, 2025, including, for each, (i) the decision in question, (ii) the amount of funding tied to the decision, (iii) the name of the entity receiving funding because of the decision, (iv) the name of the board member for whom a declaration, conflict, potential perception of conflict, abstention or recusal was noted, (v) the reason for which the declaration, conflict, potential perception of conflict, abstention or recusal was divulged by the board member, (vi) whether the board member held a private interest in the decision, (vii) the date of the meeting?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 93—Cheryl Gallant:

With regard to the Canadian Armed Forces and the Canadian Forces Housing Agency, during each of the last five fiscal years: (a) how much money was deducted from Canadian Armed Forces members to pay for the rent of their accommodations on military bases; (b) of the money in (a), how much went to the Canadian Forces Housing Agency; (c) of the money in (a), how much was spent on repairs for accommodations on military bases, by the (i) Canadian Forces Housing Agency, (ii) Canadian Armed Forces; (d) what is the breakdown of the money spent in (c) by military base and by type of repair on each base; (e) what is the breakdown of the money deducted in (a) by military base at which the Canadian Armed Forces member was located; (f) for each base, what metrics were used to determine (i) the market value of the rental property, (ii) the rate that the Canadian Armed Forces member must pay for accommodation; (g) for each base, what metrics were used to establish whether the quality of accommodations on the base was similar or better than the local market; (h) what procedures are supposed to take place in years when the Canadian Forces Housing Agency runs a surplus, or takes in more money from Canadian Armed Forces members than it spends on repairs or housing; (i) if the Canadian Forces Housing Agency runs a surplus, how is this amount displayed in the (i) Estimates, (ii) Public Accounts, (iii) other publicly available financial reports, and what is done with the surplus; and (j) what is the link, the specific page number and the line item associated with each amount in (i)(i) to (i)(iii)?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 94—Todd Doherty:**

With regard to expenditures by government departments or agencies on cloud services, broken down by fiscal year since 2021-22: (a) what was the total amount spent on cloud services from (i) Amazon, (ii) Amazon Web Services, (iii) Microsoft, (iv) Google; and (b) broken down by vendor in (a)(i) to (a)(iv), what is the nature and criticality of the government functions and data that rely on their cloud services?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 95—Andrew Scheer:

With regard to bonuses paid out at Crown corporations for the 2024-25 fiscal year, broken down by Crown corporation: (a) what was the total amount paid out in bonuses; (b) how many and what percentage of officials (i) at or above the executive level or equivalent, (ii) below the executive level or equivalent, received bonuses; and (c) of the amount paid out in bonuses, how much went to officials (i) at or above the executive level or equivalent, (ii) below the executive level or equivalent?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 96—Andrew Scheer:

With regard to bonuses paid out at government departments or agencies for the 2024-25 fiscal year, broken down by department or agency: (a) what was the total amount paid out in bonuses; (b) how many and what percentage of officials (i) at or above the executive level or equivalent, (ii) below the executive level or equivalent, received bonuses; and (c) of the amount paid out in bonuses, how much went to officials (i) at or above the executive level or equivalent, (ii) below the executive level or equivalent?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 98—Laila Goodridge:

With regard to incidents involving Microsoft's cloud services referenced in the "National Cyber Threat Assessment 2025-2026" and, specifically, the compromise of Microsoft Exchange Online during the summer of 2023, the breach of Microsoft's cloud-based enterprise service by Russian state-sponsored actors in January 2024, and the Azure disruption in July 2024: (a) which government departments or agencies were impacted by the compromise of Microsoft Exchange Online in the summer of 2023; (b) which government departments or agencies were impacted by Russian state-sponsored actors accessing Microsoft's corporate email accounts in January 2024; (c) which government departments or agencies were impacted by the Microsoft Azure cloud service disruption in July 2024; and (d) for the incidents in (a), (b), and (c), what was the (i) nature, (ii) date, (iii) duration, of the impact on government operations?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 99—Jeremy Patzer:

With regard to the government's response to the recommendations outlined in the 21st Report of the Standing Committee on Finance, presented during the 44th Parliament: (a) what is the government's position on recommendation 430 of the report, to amend the Income Tax Act to provide a definition of "charity" which would remove the privileged status of "advancement of religion" as a charitable purpose, and what is the rationale for the position; (b) for how many charitable organizations does the Canada Revenue Agency list "advancement of religion" as a purpose; (c) how many organizations does the government estimate would be impacted by this change; and (d) has the government started drafting any potential legislation or notes for potential legislation related to the topic, and, if so, on what date did this process begin?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 101—Michael Barrett:

With regard to Veterans Affairs Canada in the last fiscal year: (a) how much was spent on service dogs for veterans; (b) how many veterans received service dogs; (c) how much was spent on cannabis for veterans; (d) how many veterans received cannabis; and (e) how much was spent on drugs and substances, other than cannabis, which are listed under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, in total and broken down by amount spent?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 104—Scott Anderson:

With regard to the grants for Capacity Building under the Growing Canada's Forests 2 Billion Trees initiative, as mentioned in the Main Estimates, 2025-26, since its inception: (a) how many trees have been planted to date, broken down by (i) province or territory, (ii) year; (b) what is the total amount of funding allocated and spent on the initiative to date, broken down by fiscal year; and (c) for each recipient of the grant money, what are the details, including, for each, the (i) name of the recipient, (ii) type of recipient (e.g., company, non-profit organization, government entity), (iii) amount received, (iv) location, (v) number of trees expected to be planted, (vi) location where the trees are expected to be planted?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 105—Scott Anderson:

With regard to federal procurement: (a) how many cases of suspected invoicing fraud by Information Technology subcontractors have been submitted to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or any other law enforcement agency for investigation, since May 2024; and (b) for the cases in (a), which departments are involved?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 106—Andrew Lawton:

With regard to usage of the government's fleet of Challenger aircraft, since October 1, 2024: what are the details of the legs of each flight, including the (i) date, (ii) point of departure, (iii) destination, (iv) number of passengers, (v) names and titles of the passengers, excluding security or Canadian Armed Forces members, (vi) total catering bill related to the flight, (vii) volume of fuel used, or an estimate, (viii) amount spent on fuel?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 107—Andrew Lawton:

With regard to usage of the government's fleet of Airbus and Polaris aircraft, since October 1, 2024: what are the details of the legs of each flight, including the (i) date, (ii) point of departure, (iii) destination, (iv) number of passengers, (v) names and titles of the passengers, excluding security or Canadian Armed Forces members, (vi) total catering bill related to the flight, (vii) volume of fuel used, or an estimate, (viii) amount spent on fuel, (ix) type of aircraft?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 108—Mike Lake:

With regard to hotels and accommodations paid for by the government for asylum seekers, since January 1, 2022 and broken down by month: (a) what are the names and locations of the hotels and other accommodations which the government has paid to accommodate asylum seekers; and (b) what are the details of each hotel or accommodation in (a), including, for each, (i) the owner, (ii) the monthly amount paid by the government for accommodation, (iii) how many asylum seekers were accommodated?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 109—Marilyn Gladu:

With regard to the distribution of fuel charge proceeds to small and medium-sized businesses, through the Canada Carbon Rebate for Small Businesses, as authorized under section 165 of the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act and section 127.421 of the Income Tax Act: (a) what is the total amount distributed to small and medium-sized businesses under the Canada Carbon Rebate since the program's inception, broken down by (i) province or territory, (ii) year, (iii) industry sector (e.g., manufacturing, retail, hospitality), (iv) type of payment or credit provided; (b) for each fiscal year since the inception of the program, what (i) amount was allocated by the government to be returned to small and medium-sized businesses through the Canada Carbon Rebate, (ii) amount was ultimately distributed, (iii) is the explanation for any discrepancies between the amounts allocated and the amounts distributed; and (c) what explains the \$108 million difference between the \$3.3 billion intended to be returned to businesses based on net fuel charge proceeds for the 2019-20 to 2023-24 years, as reported in the 2024 Public Accounts (Volume I, page 16) and the \$3.192 billion attributed to the Canada Revenue Agency for this same purpose, as reported in the Main Estimates?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 112—Jamil Jivani:**

With regard to the government's approach to dealing with labour shortages: (a) how much was spent in the last fiscal year, by the government, in relation to retraining Canadian workers in industries with labour shortages, in total and broken down by industry; and (b) what specific incentives, if any, are currently in place to encourage businesses in industries with labour shortages to retrain and hire Canadian workers to fill these positions?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 113—Gérard Deltell:

With regard to tax fraud and bogus refund schemes identified by the Canada Revenue Agency for each of the last five years: (a) what is the total estimated amount lost to such schemes, broken down by year, and by type of scheme; (b) how many people have been criminally charged in relation to such a scheme conducted in the last five years; and (c) broken down by type of scheme, what specific policy or technological changes have been implemented to stop the fraud or scheme from occurring in the future?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 114—Gérard Deltell:

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency's Quantum 2.0 project: (a) what is the current total cost of the project, to date, overall and broken down by type of cost; (b) what is the current estimate of the final cost of the project; (c) what was the original completion date; (d) what is the current expected completion date; (e) what are the primary reasons for the delay and any cost overruns; and (f) have any independent third-party review or audits of the project been conducted, and, if so, what are details of each, including their findings?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 115—Gérard Deltell:

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency and the tax gap: (a) why has the Agency not released any tax gap data more recently than 2018; (b) what is the Agency's current estimate of the federal tax gap, for each of the last five years; (c) what are the top three contributing categories to that gap in each of those years; (d) what is the government's position on requiring the Agency to report the federal tax gap on a regular and ongoing basis; (e) what specific performance metrics does the Agency currently use to evaluate the effectiveness of its modernization initiatives and fraud detection strategies; (f) how are these metrics in (e) reported to Parliament and made accessible to the public; (g) what percentage of the total fraud cases detected in each of the last five years were identified through manual review versus digital tools; and (h) does the Agency have any plans to reduce the number of manual reviews and increase the number of files reviewed by automated or artificial intelligence based screenings, and, if so, what are the details of such plans?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 116—Rob Morrison:

With regard to government employees who were on "other leave with pay" (699) during the 2024-25 fiscal year, and broken down by department, agency, or government entity, and by month: (a) what was the total number of hours or days of "other leave with pay" utilized; (b) what is the total number of public servants who have utilized "other leave with pay"; and (c) what is the total number of employees who were on 699 leave and the total number of hours attributed to 699 leave, for reasons related to (i) work or technology limitations, (ii) the inability to work remotely while diagnosed with, experiencing symptoms of or self-isolating because of, COVID-19, (iii) caregiving responsibilities resulting from school or daycare closures, or COVID-19 illness or isolation requirements, (iv) the inability to work remotely while at high-risk, or while having someone in one's care who is at high-risk, of severe illness from COVID-19?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 117—Rob Morrison:

With regard to the Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat: (a) since January 1, 2022, what is the total number of meetings supported by the Secretariat, and for each meeting, what are the details, including, the (i) date of the meeting, (ii) nature or subject of the meeting, (iii) total cost, broken down by type of expense (e.g., travel, accommodation, personnel, venue rental, etc.); (b) what is the detailed proof of the "significant cost efficiencies and economies of scale" referred to in the Main Estimates, 2025-26, and attributed to the Secretariat; (c) what is the annual budget specifically allocated for salaries at the Secretariat, since January 1, 2022; and (d) what are the details of any consulting or similar service contracts signed by

the Secretariat, since January 1, 2022, to maintain and improve its services since its creation, including, for each contract, the (i) date it was signed, (ii) vendor, (iii) value, (iv) description of the goods or services provided, (v) manner in which the contract was awarded (sole-sourced or competitive bid)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 119—Ned Kuruc:

With regard to the renovations of Centre Block on Parliament Hill: (a) how much steel has been purchased to date in relation to the project; (b) of the steel purchased to date, what are the details, including the (i) manufacturer, (ii) country of origin; and (c) what is the project's policy with regard to prioritizing the purchase of Canadian steel, if any, and on what date did said policy come into effect?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 121—Jeremy Patzer:

With regard to costs associated with the legal proceedings and investigations resulting from the Freedom Convoy protests in Ottawa in January and February 2022 and the associated declaration of a public order emergency: (a) what are the total legal costs incurred to date; (b) what is the breakdown of the costs by year in which they were incurred; and (c) what is the breakdown of the costs by (i) type of expenditure (lawyers, investigators, prosecutors, etc.), (ii) type of proceedings associated with the expense (Public Order Emergency Commission, criminal prosecution, civil proceedings, etc.)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 123—Kyle Seeback:

With regard to expenditures related to the Prime Minister and his accompanying delegation's trip to Europe in March 2025: (a) what are the total costs incurred by the government to date, broken down by type of expense (accommodation, per diems, hospitality, etc.); (b) what are the details of all accommodation expenses incurred by the government, including, for each, the (i) name of the hotel, (ii) room rate, (iii) number of rooms booked at each rate, (iv) dates of the booking, (v) number of nights for which each room was booked, (vi) total accommodation expenses incurred at each property; (c) were there any hospitality expenditures incurred, and, if so, what are the details, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) event description, (iii) location, (iv) cost, in total and broken down by item, (v) event description, (vi) number of attendees; (d) are there any costs incurred or expected to be incurred by the government that are not included in the response to (a), and if so, what are those costs or expected costs, broken down by item and type of expense; (e) excluding security, what were the names, titles and organizations represented by the delegation members; and (f) what was the detailed itinerary of (i) the Prime Minister, (ii) other Ministers who were on the trip?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 124—Kyle Seeback:

With regard to expenditures related to the Prime Minister and his accompanying delegation's trip to Europe in May 2025: (a) what are the total costs incurred by the government to date, broken down by type of expense (accommodation, per diems, hospitality, etc.); (b) what are the details of all accommodation expenses incurred by the government, including, for each, the (i) name of the hotel, (ii) room rate, (iii) number of rooms booked at each rate, (iv) dates of the booking, (v) number of nights for which each room was booked, (vi) total accommodation expenses incurred at each property; (c) were there any hospitality expenditures incurred, and, if so, what are the details, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) event description, (iii) location, (iv) cost, in total and broken down by item, (v) event description, (vi) number of attendees; (d) are there any costs incurred or expected to be incurred by the government that are not included in the response to (a), and, if so, what are those costs or expected costs, broken down by item and type of expense; (e) excluding security, what were the names, titles and organizations represented by the delegation members; and (f) what was the detailed itinerary of (i) the Prime Minister, (ii) other Ministers who were on the trip?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 125—Kyle Seeback:**

With regard to expenditures related to the Prime Minister and his accompanying delegation's trip to Washington in May 2025: (a) what are the total costs incurred by the government to date, broken down by type of expense (accommodation, per diems, hospitality, etc.); (b) what are the details of all accommodation expenses incurred by the government, including, for each, the (i) name of the hotel, (ii) room rate, (iii) number of rooms booked at each rate, (iv) dates of the booking, (v) number of nights for which each room was booked, (vi) total accommodation expenses incurred at each property; (c) were there any hospitality expenditures incurred, and, if so, what are the details, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) event description, (iii) location, (iv) cost, in total and broken down by item, (v) event description, (vi) number of attendees; (d) are there any costs incurred or expected to be incurred by the government that are not included in the response to (a), and if so, what are those costs or expected costs, broken down by item and type of expense; (e) excluding security, what were the names, titles and organizations represented by the delegation members; and (f) what was the detailed itinerary of (i) the Prime Minister, (ii) other Ministers who were on the trip?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 127—Andrew Lawton:

With regard to the Public Order Emergency Commission: (a) what are the commission's total expenditures to date; (b) what is the breakdown of the expenditures incurred by the commission, by type of expense (lawyers, witness travel, staff salaries, etc.); and (c) what are the total expenditures to date of each government department or agency related to the commission, including but not limited to those who participate in or monitor the commission's proceedings, in total and broken down by type of expenditure?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 128—Michelle Rempel Garner:

With regard to promotional items, for each department, agency and Crown Corporation, since January 1, 2022: (a) what is the total amount spent on promotional items; (b) what types and brands of promotional items were purchased, including, for each, a description; (c) what is the total amount spent on each type or brand of promotional item; (d) what is the total volume purchased of each type of promotional item, broken down by date of purchase; (e) what is the current inventory level of each type of promotional item; and (f) at which events or situations were the items given out?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 131—Ellis Ross:

With regard to the Northwest Regional Airport Terrace-Kitimat's request to the Canada Border Services Agency to be designated as an Airport of Entry: (a) what is the current status of this request; (b) when will the Canada Border Services Agency make a decision regarding the request; (c) has the Canada Border Services Agency, Pacific Economic Development Canada, or Destination Canada conducted any studies related to the benefits of designating the airport an Airport of Entry, and, if so, what were the results; and (d) what is the Canada Border Services Agency's rationale for not yet designating the airport as an Airport of Entry?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 134—Alexandre Boulerice:

With regard to government contracts with vendors providing IT services to departments operating under the Treasury Board of Canada, broken down by fiscal year, since 2022-23, and by department: (a) what is the total number of contracts signed; (b) what are the details of all contracts signed, including the (i) vendor contracted, (ii) value of the contract, (iii) number of IT workers provided, (iv) duration of the contract; and (c) what is the total amount of extra costs incurred as a result of relying on IT vendors instead of employing IT workers directly?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 135—Jasraj Hallan:

With regard to the Statement of Transactions of the Government of Canada, for fiscal years 2025-26 to 2029-30, broken down by year: what are the most up to date projections for (i) budgetary revenues, (ii) program expenses, excluding net actuarial losses, (iii) public debt charges, (iv) total expenses, excluding net actuarial losses, (v) budgetary balance before net actuarial losses, (vi) net actuarial losses, (vii) budgetary balance, (viii) total liabilities, (ix) financial assets, (x) net debt, (xi) non-financial assets, (xii) federal debt, (xiii) budgetary revenues as per cent of gross domestic product, (xiv) program expenses, excluding net actuarial losses as per cent of

gross domestic product, (xv) public debt charges as per cent of gross domestic product, (xvi) budgetary balance as per cent of gross domestic product, (xvii) federal debt as per cent of gross domestic product, (xviii) personal income tax revenue, (xix) corporate income tax revenue, (xx) non-resident income tax, (xxi) goods and services tax revenue, (xxii) customs import duties revenues, (xxiii) other excise taxes/duties revenue, (xxiv) employment income premium revenues, (xxv) other and enterprise Crown corporations revenue, broken down by program or Crown corporation, (xxvi) the cost of indemnifying Bank of Canada losses?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 136—Connie Cody:

With regard to government advertising since March 14, 2025: how much has been spent on advertising relating to the carbon tax, the price on carbon, or the Canada carbon rebate, in total and broken down by subject of advertisement, by type of advertising (broadcast, internet, etc.) and by platform, if applicable?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 137—Helena Konanz:

With regard to equipment to fight forest fires and wildfires purchased by the government since January 1, 2024: (a) what are the details of all purchases, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) amount or value, (iv) quantity, (v) description of the equipment; and (b) for each item of the equipment purchased in (a), against which fires have they been used to date?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 139—Jim Bélanger:

With regard to the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario's 2024-25 planned spending for internal services, totalling \$4,512,390: (a) what was the total amount spent on internal services in 2024-25; (b) what is the breakdown of internal services spending by category; and (c) what are the details of any contracts over \$1,000 related to internal services, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) amount, (iv) description of the goods or services, (v) manner in which the contract was awarded (sole-sourced or competitive bid), (vi) location of the vendor?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 140—Ted Falk:

With regard to expenditures on consulting services by the government in the 2024 calendar year, broken down by department, agency or other government entity: (a) what was the total amount spent on (i) training consultants (code 0446), (ii) information technology and telecommunications consultants (code 0473), (iii) management consulting (code 0491), (iv) other types of consultants or consulting, broken down by type and object code; and (b) for each response in (a), what is the total value of the expenditures that were (i) awarded competitively, (ii) sole-sourced?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 141—Ted Falk:

With regard to the Vaccine Injury Support Program: (a) what are the total expenditures to date related to the program, broken down by year since the program was formed; (b) what is the yearly breakdown of expenditures by type of expense, including (i) compensation payments, (ii) overhead, excluding salaries, (iii) lawyers, (iv) salaries, (v) other types of expenditures, broken down by type; and (c) what are the details of all contracts over \$5,000 signed in relation to the program, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) value or amount, (iv) description of the goods or services, (v) type of contract (consulting, payments for goods, etc.), (vi) manner in which the contract was awarded (sole-sourced or competitive bid)?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 142—Glen Motz:**

With regard to Elections Canada and the 2025 general election: (a) what is the full breakdown of the processing of special ballots, including how and when they are counted; (b) does Elections Canada record a distinction between special ballots in person and special ballots used to vote by mail; (c) what is the full breakdown of the processing of advance polling and the counting of those ballots, including the transportation of ballot boxes used in advance polling locations to their storage and counting locations; (d) who processes vote-by-mail ballot requests and what are the criteria to accept or reject requests to vote by mail; (e) where are vote-by-mail ballots counted; (f) is Elections Canada aware of any instances of voters being told at the poll that they had already voted by mail-in ballot when they had not, and, if so, how many instances are they aware of, broken down by riding; (g) what is the process for poll workers to notify Elections Canada when the situation outlined in (f) occurs; (h) how does Elections Canada define (i) voting kit, (ii) special ballot, (iii) vote-by-mail, and have any of these definitions changed in the past 10 years, and, if so, what are the details, including the date of the change and the previous definition; and (i) on what date will the "raw data" of the 2025 Canadian federal election be made available online?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 143—Glen Motz:

With regard to Elections Canada and special ballot data, for each of the 2019, 2021 and 2025 general elections, in total and broken down by electoral district, for each part of the question: (a) how many special ballots were issued to electors living (i) in their riding and voting by mail from inside their riding, (ii) in their riding and voting at an Elections Canada office inside their riding, (iii) in their riding and voting by mail from outside their riding, (iv) in their riding and voting at an Elections Canada office outside their riding, (v) outside of Canada and voting by mail from outside their riding; and (b) what is the breakdown of (a)(i) to (a)(v) by each of the five types of special voting rules for electors?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 144—Glen Motz:

With regard to Elections Canada, for each of the 2019, 2021 and 2025 general elections, in total and broken down by electoral district, for each part of the question: (a) how many applications for vote-by-mail ballots were (i) requested, (ii) denied; (b) how many vote-by-mail ballots were (i) sent out, (ii) received, (iii) counted, (iv) rejected; (c) what is the breakdown of each part of (b) by ballots sent to voters within Canada versus those outside of Canada; and (d) for Canadian citizens residing outside of Canada, what is the process for determining what riding they vote in, and how does Election Canada verify the accuracy of the information used to determine the riding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 145—Raquel Dancho:

With regard to Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and the Canadian Intellectual Property Office: (a) what is the current wait time between when a patent application is received and the patent is issued; (b) what is the current backlog of patent applications in terms of the number of applications and projected wait time; (c) what is the breakdown of (b) by province or territory and by application country of origin; and (d) for each of the four options listed under "four options to expedite patent examination" on the government's websites, what is the current backlog in terms of the number of applications and projected wait time?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 146—Branden Leslie:

With regard to warrants under the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act, broken down by year since 2015: (a) how many warrants were approved by the Minister of Public Safety; (b) how many warrants were denied by the Minister of Public Safety; (c) how many warrants were informally canvassed with the Minister of Public Safety and subsequently not approved; (d) for those warrants referred to in (a), broken down by year since 2015, what is the average time between making the minister aware, formally or informally, of the subject matter of the warrant and the approval of the warrant; and (e) for those warrants referred to in (a), broken down by year since 2015, how many warrants were (i) approved in one week or less, (ii) approved in more than one week but less than one month, (iii) approved in more than one month but less than two months, (iv) approved in more than two months?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 147—Eric Duncan:

With regard to restitution agreements related to overbilling or fraudulent billing practices in government contracts, as mentioned during the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts on November 6, 2024: (a) since January 1, 2022, what is the total number of restitution agreements that have been reached with suppliers or subcontractors; (b) what is the total dollar amount involved in these restitution agreements; (c) which departments, agencies, or Crown corporations, were involved in these agreements; (d) for each restitution agreement, what was the dollar value of the original contract associated with the overbilling; (e) what are the details for each supplier or subcontractor involved in a restitution agreement, including, for each, the (i) number of government contracts received prior to January 1, 2022, (ii) number of contracts received since the restitution agreement was reached; (f) who approved each restitution agreement, including the specific position; and (g) for each agreement, what were the specific terms or conditions negotiated?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 150—Dan Albas:

With regard to Air Passenger Protection Regulations complaints filed with the Canada Transportation Agency: (a) what is (i) the number of complaints, (ii) the length of the current backlog of complaints; (b) for current outstanding complaints, what is the breakdown by airline; and (c) in the last two years, in cases where the Canadian Transportation Agency has made a ruling, how many and what percentage of complaints have resulted in a ruling that (i) required the airline to pay compensation, (ii) did not require the airline to pay compensation, in total and broken down by airline?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 152—Brad Vis:

With regard to the \$5 billion in funding through the Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements to British Columbia, committed in the 2021 Fall Economic Statement, in response to extreme weather events: (a) how much of this commitment has been delivered to British Columbia to date, in total, and broken down by specific project funded; (b) when will the outstanding amount be delivered; and (c) what is required before the outstanding amount is provided to British Columbia?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 154—Ted Falk:

With regard to communications between the Minister of Justice, or Attorney General of Canada, or their office, and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, or that office, since March 2020: what are the details of all such communication, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) format, (iii) sender, (iv) recipient, (v) title, (vi) subject matter, (vii) decisions made, if applicable?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 155—Michelle Rempel Garner:

With regard to the implementation of measures in anticipation of the passage of previous Bill C-63, An Act to enact the Online Harms Act, to amend the Criminal Code, the Canadian Human Rights Act and An Act respecting the mandatory reporting of Internet child pornography by persons who provide an Internet service and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts, from the 44th Parliament: (a) which departments and agencies were responsible for implementing the measures contained in the bill, and which specific measures were to be implemented by each; (b) for each measure of the bill, how many officials or full-time equivalents were working on preparations for its implementation; (c) how many officials or full-time equivalents continue to work on the implementation of any of the measures contained in the previous Bill C-63, broken down by measure; (d) what was the estimated budget for (i) implementing, (ii) maintaining, each measure contained in the bill; and (e) for each measure in (b) through (d), which ones were related to combatting misinformation online, and what is the current status of each measure?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 156—Michelle Rempel Garner:**

With regard to government measures taken in order to protect Canadians from online harms or misinformation: (a) which departments and agencies are responsible for implementing such measures; (b) which measures is each department or agency responsible for implementing; (c) what are the details of each measure, including, for each, the (i) project description and purpose, (ii) number of officials or full-time equivalents assigned to work on it, (iii) projected implementation date; and (d) what is the estimated budget for (i) implementing, (ii) maintaining, each measure?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 157—Greg McLean:

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency and corporate income tax return data from 2015 onwards, broken down by year: (a) how many corporate income tax returns were filed on paper and, of those companies, how many companies had a gross revenue threshold (i) exceeding one million, (ii) under one million; (b) how many corporate income tax returns were filed electronically and, of those companies, how many companies had a gross revenue threshold (i) exceeding one million, (ii) under one million; (c) how many companies have been fined under subsection 162(7.2) of the Income Tax Act for not filing their corporate income tax returns electronically and, of those, how many fines were issued to dormant companies; and (d) how many (i) paper returns, (ii) electronic returns, were submitted by dormant companies?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 159—Garnett Genuis:

With regard to labour market impact assessments, broken down by each of the last five years: (a) how many applications were there in the (i) high wage stream, (ii) low wage stream; (b) how many high wage stream applications were (i) approved, (ii) rejected, (iii) withdrawn; (c) how many low wage stream applications were (i) approved, (ii) rejected, (iii) withdrawn; (d) what percentage of applications were subject to integrity review, broken down by year and stream; (e) for applications subject to integrity review, why were they selected for review, broken down by year and stream; (f) for applications subject to integrity review, what percentage had problems identified, broken down by year and stream; and (g) for applications where problems were identified, what were the names of the companies, the specific infractions, and the consequences imposed in each case?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 160—Garnett Genuis:

With regard to job and skills training programs funded through Employment and Social Development Canada: (a) how does the government assess the effectiveness of these programs; (b) for each program funded, what is the completion rate for participants of the program; (c) what proportion of participants, in each program, are (i) Indigenous, (ii) living with a disability, (iii) experiencing long-term unemployment, (iv) recent immigrants to Canada, (v) formerly incarcerated; (d) what are the completion rates of each program, broken down by the groups in (c)(i) to (c)(v); (e) what percentage of participants who have completed such a program are able to find jobs which use the skills they have learned, broken down by each program; and (f) for each group in (c)(i) to (c)(v), what percentage of participants who have completed a program are able to find jobs which use the skills that they have learned, broken down by each program?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 162—Garnett Genuis:

With regard to information accessed and used by the government for decisions about immigration and credential recognition, and using the most up to date figures available: (a) how long does it take for each licensing body in Canada to provide an answer to an internationally trained professional on whether or not their credentials will be recognized in Canada; (b) for each licensing body, do they offer competency-based testing, multiple choice testing, or another form of testing; (c) for each response in (b), what is the cost of testing, and how much of that cost is borne by the individual seeking to be licensed; (d) what percentage of new immigrants who earned credentials overseas are able to use those credentials in Canada; and (e) what percentage of Canadians born in Canada who earned credentials overseas are able to use those credentials in Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 164—Ted Falk:

With regard to the Canada Border Services Agency, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, and the COVID-19 pandemic: (a) how many migrant workers entered Canada between (i) April 1, 2020, and October 31, 2020, (ii) April 1, 2021, and October 31, 2021, (iii) April 1, 2022, and October 31, 2022, broken down by province; (b) what are the details of the quarantine period, including (i) how many migrant workers were quarantined, by province, (ii) when they were quarantined, by month and year, (iii) the length of the quarantine period, (iv) who paid for their quarantine accommodations, (v) the overall cost to the government; (c) how many migrant workers received their COVID-19 vaccine in Canada, upon their arrival in Canada between (i) April 1, 2020, and October 31, 2020, (ii) April 1, 2021, and October 31, 2021, (iii) April 1, 2022, and October 31, 2022, broken down by province; (d) in cases where the migrant worker was already COVID-19 vaccinated in his or her country of origin, did Canadian immigration authorities document the date of vaccination and the vaccine brand for migrant workers, and what is the data; (e) in cases where the migrant worker received an unapproved COVID-19 vaccine brand prior to entry, would they require receipt of a Canadian approved brand upon entry; (f) following COVID-19 immunization, how many migrant workers (i) sought medical attention, (ii) were determined too ill to work, (iii) were hospitalized, (iv) died while in Canada; (g) for each case in (f)(i) to (f)(iv), how many occurrences were there between (i) April 1, 2020, and October 31, 2020, (ii) April 1, 2021, and October 31, 2021, (iii) April 1, 2022, and October 31, 2022, broken down by province; (h) in cases where a migrant worker died following immunization, what were the causes of death; (i) with regard to persons in (h), were any autopsies performed on any deceased migrant workers; (j) if the answer to (i) is affirmative, how many autopsies were performed and what were the findings; (k) how many deceased bodies or their cremated remains were sent back to their country of origin between (i) April 1, 2020, and October 31, 2020, (ii) April 1, 2021, and October 31, 2021, (iii) April 1, 2022, and October 31, 2022; and (l) in cases where a migrant worker had an adverse event following their COVID-19 vaccination in Canada, would they qualify for Canada's Vaccine Injury Support Program?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 165—Michael Cooper:

With regard to special ballots issued for the 43rd, 44th and 45th general elections, nationally and broken down by riding for each election: (a) how many mobile voting requests were made for home visits pursuant to section 243.1 of the Elections Act, broken down by (i) total number of home visits at residential addresses, further broken down by type of home (house, assisted-living facility, etc.), if known, (ii) total number of home visits at hospitals or healthcare facilities; and (b) in numbers, what were the methods by which mobile voting requests were made under section 243.1, broken down by method (phone, mail, email, online, in-person delivery, etc.)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 168—Rachael Thomas:

With regard to the Interim Federal Health Program and its expenditures: (a) what were the total annual expenditures under the program, for each fiscal year from 2016 through 2024, broken down by (i) basic health services, (ii) supplemental health services, (iii) prescription drugs, (iv) dental services; (b) how many individuals were enrolled in the program or received the program coverage, for each fiscal year from 2016 through 2024, broken down by (i) basic health services, (ii) supplemental health services, (iii) prescription drugs, (iv) dental services; (c) what was the total number of individuals covered under the program, for each fiscal year from 2016 through 2024, further broken down by (i) province or territory of residence, (ii) gender, (iii) age group (under 18, 18-64, and 65+), (iv) country of origin; (d) what were the total payments made to health care providers under the program, for each fiscal year from 2016 through 2024, broken down by (i) physicians, (ii) hospitals, (iii) pharmacies, (iv) dental providers, (v) province or territory; (e) what were the total administrative costs of the program, for each fiscal year from 2016 through 2024, broken down by (i) costs associated with claims processing, (ii) costs associated with oversight and program management, (iii) fees paid to members of the Canadian Association of Blue Cross Plans; and (f) what measures have been implemented since 2016 to ensure transparency and accountability in the allocation and expenditure of funds under the program, including any audits, reviews or evaluations conducted, and what were the findings of such audits or reviews?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 169—Rachael Thomas:**

With regard to the Interim Housing Assistance Program and its expenditures for each fiscal year since 2019: (a) what were the total annual expenditures under the program, broken down by (i) federal contributions, (ii) provincial or territorial contributions, (iii) municipal contributions; (b) what percentage of total expenditures under the program was allocated to (i) operating costs for interim housing facilities, (ii) payments to third-party service providers, (iii) administrative costs, including oversight and claims processing; (c) how many individuals received interim housing assistance under the program, broken down by (i) province or territory, (ii) gender, (iii) age group (under 18, 18-64, and 65+), (iv) immigration stream or program of entry; (d) what was the average duration of stay in interim housing facilities for individuals under the program, broken down by province or territory; (e) broken down by fiscal year, (i) what is the name of every facility participating in the program, (ii) who is the beneficial owner, (iii) what is the street address, city, province or territory, and postal code, (iv) what is the total capacity, (v) what is the corporate name of the entity managing or owning each location, if any; (f) how many housing units or spaces were added to the program inventory; and (g) what steps have been taken to track and report outcomes for individuals and families receiving interim housing assistance under the program, including their transition to longer-term housing solutions?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 171—John Williamson:

With regard to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada's temporary public policy, first introduced in May 2020, and renewed in March 2025, which allows foreign nationals in Canada on closed work permits to change employers or occupations prior to receiving a new work permit: (a) how many foreign nationals have received temporary authorization under this public policy to change employers, or occupations, each year since its inception, broken down by (i) province or territory of employment or residence, (ii) National Occupation Classification code of the original job, (iii) National Occupation Classification code of the new job; (b) what is the average and median processing time for Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada to issue an interim authorization email or authorization letter or approval to applicants under this policy in (i) 2020, (ii) 2021, (iii) 2022, (iv) 2023, (v) 2024, (vi) to date in 2025; (c) what is the average time elapsed between receiving interim authorization and the final decision on the underlying work permit application for each month since 2020; (d) how many applications under this policy have been refused or denied since 2020, and for what reasons, broken down by year and month; (e) how many foreign nationals working under this interim policy were later found to have violated the terms of their work authorization or status, and what enforcement actions, if any, were taken by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada or the Canada Border Services Agency; (f) has Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada or Employment and Social Development Canada conducted any economic, labour market, or program integrity analysis of the temporary public policy that allows foreign nationals on closed work permits to change employers or occupations prior to receiving a new permit, including, but not limited to, assessments of (i) its impact on job availability or displacement for Canadian citizens and permanent residents, (ii) its effect on wage levels and working conditions in affected sectors, (iii) any evidence of program misuse, fraud, or employer non-compliance, (iv) any implications for the integrity of the Temporary Foreign Worker Program or International Mobility Program, and, if so, what were the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of these assessments, and will the government table the reports or summaries of findings in the House; (g) what consultations, if any, were conducted prior to the extension of the policy in March 2025, and with which stakeholder groups; (h) on what dates were consultations in (g) held, through what formats, and what feedback was provided, broken down by each group; (i) how many foreign nationals who applied under this temporary public policy subsequently submitted asylum claims in Canada, broken down by (i) those whose applications under the policy were refused, (ii) those whose applications under the policy were approved and who were later issued a new work permit, (iii) calendar year and month from 2020 to 2025 to date, (iv) country of citizenship, (v) province or territory where the asylum claim was made, (vi) the status or outcome of each claim, categorized as pending, accepted, or rejected?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 172—Kelly DeRidder:

With regard to the recipients of funding from the Strategic Science Fund, since 2019: (a) what are the details of each company that received funding from the fund, including, (i) the name of the recipient, (ii) the amount of funding received to date, (iii) the total amount of funding awarded, (iv) a description of the project; (b) what are the stated details in their application, including the (i) proposed objectives that

were clearly linked to federal priorities and responsibilities, (ii) listed value added to existing federal government investments, (iii) reason why no alternative federal sources of funding could be accessed by the recipient, (iv) previous federal funding sources that the applicant attempted to access prior to their application, (v) listed efforts made by the applicant towards equity, diversity and inclusion, (vi) listed performance indicators suggested by the applicant to measure their impact; (c) when the department is monitoring the performance indicators of the funding recipients, (i) how does the department determine whether the recipient is meeting their listed performance indicators, (ii) what efforts have been made by the department to monitor these indicators; and (d) what intellectual property or pre-commercial science has been developed as part of the funding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 174—Fred Davies:

With regard to funding applications received by the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario since 2019, and broken down by year: (a) how many applications were (i) received, (ii) granted funding; (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by federal riding in which the recipient organization is located; (c) what is the breakdown of (a) by federal riding in which the associated project or proposed project is located; (d) what is the breakdown by federal riding and by municipality of the amount of funding provided to projects located in the riding or municipality; (e) what is the breakdown by federal riding and by municipality of the amount of funding provided to organizations located in the riding or municipality; and (f) what is the breakdown of (a) through (e) by funding program or stream?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 175—Cathay Wagantall:

With regard to the findings of the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities with respect to Canada's implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: (a) what is the position of the government regarding these findings; (b) is the government considering changing any previous policies or positions in response to this report; (c) is the government considering repealing or making changes, in particular to Track 2 Medical Assistance in Dying, in response to this report, and, if so, what is the government considering repealing or changing; and (d) what are the government's legal obligations in light of the findings of the committee, in light of the fact that Canada is a signatory to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 176—Helena Konanz:

With regard to lease agreements between the government and third parties: what are the details of all lease agreements cancelled between January 1, 2023 and June 13, 2025, including, for each, the (i) date of the original agreement, (ii) date of the cancellation, (iii) location, (iv) party whom the lease was with, (v) reason for the cancellation?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 178—Heather McPherson:

With regard to Canada's transfer of F-35 Joint Strike Fighter components to the United States, and the subsequent transfer of some of those components to the Israeli Air Force following their integration into the aircraft: (a) what is the current approximate value of Canadian technology integrated into each F-35; (b) what is the approximate value of Canadian technology integrated into each F-35 destined for the Israeli Air Force under production lots (i) 17, (ii) 18, (iii) 19; (c) which Canada-based manufacturers are sole-source or single-source suppliers of components to the F-35 program; (d) what mechanisms can Canadian officials utilize to ensure that Canadian components integrated into U.S.-built F-35s are not later transferred to Israel; (e) has Global Affairs Canada or the Canadian Commercial Corporation conducted any form of risk assessment, regarding the transfer of F-35 components to the United States which could later be transferred to Israel; and (f) if so, what were the findings of those assessments?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 180—Heather McPherson:**

With regard to supply chain due diligence legislation and the office of the Canadian Ombudsperson for Responsible Enterprise: (a) by what date will the government release the results of the five-year review of the Canadian Ombudsperson for Responsible Enterprise, and what is the government's plan for parliamentary input on this review; (b) by what date will a new Ombudsperson be appointed; (c) during the mandate of Interim Ombudsperson Masud Husain, how many (i) new complaints were received, (ii) complaints in (c)(i) met the intake criteria, (iii) initial assessments were completed, (iv) initial assessment reports were completed, (v) new investigations were undertaken, (vi) investigations in (c)(v) were joint fact finding, (vii) investigations in (c)(v) used independent fact finding, (viii) mediations were undertaken, (ix) mediations were completed, (x) final reports were completed; (d) what steps have the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development and Export Development Canada taken to respond to recommendations made by the Canadian Ombudsperson for Responsible Enterprise in March 2024, in particular, (i) has the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development withdrawn trade advocacy support provided to Dynasty Gold Corporation at any time since March 2024, and, if not, why not, (ii) has Export Development Canada withheld financial support to Dynasty Gold Corporation at any time since March 2024, and, if not, why not; (e) by what date will the government meet its commitment to equip the Canadian Ombudsperson for Responsible Enterprise with the power to compel documents and witness testimony necessary to effectively investigate complaints brought by impacted workers and communities, and will this involve legislation or regulations; (f) what is the status of the supply chain due diligence legislation committed to in the 2024 Fall Economic Statement and in the previous government's mandate letter to the minister; (g) what concrete steps will the government take to ensure that the legislation in (f) is gender responsive, addressing the disproportionate risks faced by women, Indigenous and marginalized workers in global supply chains; (h) what concrete steps will the government take to ensure directly impacted people have access to remedy in Canadian courts; (i) which departments and agencies, and specifically which directorates, sectors and branches, have been involved in drafting legislation and budget proposals on supply chain due diligence; (j) by what date will the government implement the promised measures to improve enforcement of the forced labour import ban; (k) which departments and agencies, and specifically which directorates, sectors and branches, have been involved in drafting legislation and budget proposals on the issue in (j); (l) what measures is the government considering to increase the onus on importers to demonstrate their supply chains are free of forced labour; and (m) what additional resources will be allocated to the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development and to the Canada Border Services Agency, and will these resources be announced in budget 2025?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 183—Rob Moore:

With regard to audited contributions by department, agency, and Crown corporation, since January 1, 2024: (a) what is the total number of contributions audited; (b) for each department, agency, and Crown corporation, what is the (i) total number of contributions, (ii) number of contributions that were audited; (c) of those audited contributions, what number and percentage were found to be abiding by the terms of their contributions; and (d) for those audited contributions where the recipient was not abiding by the terms or conditions, what is the breakdown by type of incident or non-compliance?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 185—Rob Moore:

With regard to findings of inadmissibility for misrepresentation under section 40 of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, since 2014 to 2025 to date: (a) how many findings of misrepresentation under section 40(1) have been made by Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada each year, broken down by type of application (e.g., study permits, work permits, visitor visas, sponsorship applications); (b) how many findings of misrepresentation under section 40(1)(b) have been made each year, and how many were subject to ministerial review under section 40(2)(b); (c) how many cases of misrepresentation under section 40(1) resulted in a five-year inadmissibility ban as per section 40(2)(a), broken down by year; (d) what are the most common forms of misrepresentation detected under section 40(1)(a), including falsified documents, fraudulent job offers, and concealment of prior refusals, broken down by year; (e) how many cases of misrepresentation under section 40(1) each year have been linked to thirdparty representatives, consultants, or agents, and what measures have been put in place to address this issue; (f) how many removal orders under section 40(2)(a) were issued each year, and what measures are in place to enforce them; (g) what was the geographic distribution, by country of origin, of misrepresentation findings under section 40(1) each year; and (h) how many ap-

peals or challenges to findings of misrepresentation under section 40(1) have been made each year, and how many of these resulted in findings being overturned?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 186—Brad Redekopp:

With regard to section 243 of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations, which requires foreign nationals removed from Canada to repay the removal costs under subsections (a) and (b) if seeking re-entry: (a) what is the total amount recovered by the government for removal costs, broken down by the amounts set out under sections 243(a) and 243(b) and by calendar year since 2016; and (b) how many foreign nationals who were removed at government expense have been denied re-entry for failing to repay removal costs, broken down by sections 243(a) and 243(b) and by calendar year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 187—Michelle Rempel Garner:

With regard to the removal of persons by the Canada Border Services Agency, since January 1, 2016: (a) how many persons subject to removal have departed or been removed from Canada, broken down by year; (b) what is the number of 'high-priority foreign nationals' subject to removal orders on grounds of serious inadmissibility, broken down by year and relevant Immigration and Refugee Protection Act section on inadmissibility; (c) of those in (b), how many were actually removed from Canada, broken down by year and relevant Immigration and Refugee Protection Act section on inadmissibility; (d) how many persons who are subject to removal orders on grounds of serious inadmissibility have not yet been removed, broken down by year, reason for non-removal, and relevant Immigration and Refugee Protection Act section on inadmissibility; and (e) regarding those in (d), how does the Canada Border Services Agency plan to find and remove these persons from Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 188—Scott Reid:

With regard to CORCAN agriculture and agribusiness spending since fiscal year 2015-16: (a) what is the total amount of operational spending related to CORCAN agriculture and agribusiness, broken down by fiscal year; (b) what is the total amount of capital spending related to CORCAN agriculture and agribusiness, broken down by fiscal year; (c) what is the total amount of revenue related to CORCAN agriculture and agribusiness, broken down by fiscal year; (d) what is the total amount of operational spending related to CORCAN penitentiary farms, broken down by fiscal year; (e) what is the total amount of capital spending related to CORCAN penitentiary farms, broken down by fiscal year; (f) what is the total amount of revenue related to CORCAN penitentiary farms, broken down by fiscal year; (g) what is the total amount of operational spending related to CORCAN penitentiary farms, broken down by fiscal year and institution; (h) what is the total amount of capital spending related to CORCAN penitentiary farms, broken down by fiscal year and institution; and (i) what is the total amount of revenue related to CORCAN penitentiary farms, broken down by fiscal year and institution?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 189—Scott Reid:**

With regard to expenditures for reestablishing the Correctional Service of Canada's prison farms at Collins Bay and Joyceville Institutions: (a) since 2015, broken down by fiscal year, what is the total amount, including taxes, paid to (i) Taylor Hazell Architects, (ii) WSP Canada Engineering, (iii) Tacoma Engineers, (iv) Lashley & Associates, (v) Norwell Dairy Systems, (vi) Eastern Crop Doctor, (vii) Advanced Grain Handling Services, (viii) McCann Farm Automation, (ix) Hart Acre Grains, (x) Willows Agriservices, (xi) A et R Boulet, (xii) Chris Rots Enterprises, (xiii) St. Lawrence Veterinary Services, (xiv) Colliers Project Leaders, (xv) Pen Farm Herd Co-Op, (xvi) Dairy Farmers of Ontario, (xvii) Strong Bros Construction; (b) since 2015, broken down by fiscal year, what is the total amount, including taxes, spent on (i) veterinary services, (ii) project management services, (iii) construction site security services, (iv) pesticide application services, (v) fertilizer application services, (vi) combining and trucking services, (vii) silage services, (viii) procurement services, (ix) engineering and architectural design services, (x) translation services, (xi) legal services; (c) since 2018, what is the total number of beehives purchased, the total amount spent on beehives, and the current number of beehives at each site; (d) of the total number of beehives purchased in (c), how many beehives were purchased from Correctional Service Canada and CORCAN employees, and at what cost; (e) since 2018, what is the total number of beef cattle purchased, the total amount spent on beef cattle, and the current number of beef cattle at each site; (f) since 2018, what is the total number of dairy cattle purchased, the total amount spent on dairy cattle, and the current number of dairy cattle at each site; (g) of the total number of dairy cattle purchased in (f), how many cattle were purchased from members of Correctional Service Canada's Prison Farm Advisory Panel and the Pen Farm Herd Co-Op, and at what cost; (h) since 2018, broken down by fiscal year, what is the total amount, including taxes, spent on (i) farm staff salaries and benefits, (ii) offender pay for farm work, (iii) farm equipment, (iv) demolitions and renovations at Collins Bay Institution, (v) demolitions and renovations at Joyceville Institution, (vi) new construction at Collins Bay Institution, (vii) new construction at Joyceville Institution excluding the dairy cattle barn; (i) what is the total amount, including taxes, spent on the dairy cattle barn at Joyceville Institution, including construction, modifications, procurement fees, consultancy fees (design, engineering, geotechnical, environmental, topographic, etc.), travel and meals, contingencies, project management, contract administration, and dairy equipment and technology for the cow barn; (j) on what date was final completion of the dairy cattle barn achieved and on what date was the barn handed over to Correctional Service Canada by the contractor; (k) since 2024, broken down by month, what have been the costs of operating the dairy cow barn, including staff salaries, veterinary care, feed and bedding, waste management, transportation, utilities, maintenance, internet fees, licensing, inspections, security and supervision; (l) since 2024, broken down by month, what have been the total revenues from the sale of milk; (m) since 2018, broken down by fiscal year, what have been the total revenues from the CORCAN Agribusiness business line, other than milk, broken down by the sale of (i) beef cattle, (ii) dairy cattle, (iii) crops, (iv) honey, (v) other (please identify); (n) since 2018, what is the total amount spent on offender vocational certifications directly related to the prison farm program; and (o) since 2015, including but not limited to all expenses identified in (a) to (n), what is the total amount spent to date on all aspects of reestablishing the penitentiary agriculture program, including planning, consultations, implementation, construction, operations, consultancy, procurement, inspections, assessments, regulatory fees and legal services?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 191—Gord Johns:

With regard to federal funding and the communities which comprise the federal electoral district of Courtenay—Alberni, between the 2005-06 and current fiscal year: (a) what are the federal funding and capital investments related to infrastructure, including direct transfers to the municipalities and First Nations, for the communities of (i) Tofino, (ii) Ucluelet, (iii) Port Alberni, (iv) Parksville, (v) Qualicum Beach, (vi) Cumberland, (vii) Courtenay, (viii) Deep Bay, (ix) Dashwood, (x) Royston, (xi) French Creek, (xii) Errington, (xiii) Coombs, (xiv) Nanoose Bay, (xv) Cherry Creek, (xvi) China Creek, (xvii) Bamfield, (xviii) Beaver Creek, (xix) Beaufort Range, (xx) Millstream, (xxi) Mt. Washington Ski Resort, broken down by fiscal year, total expenditure, type of funding, funding opportunity or program and project; (b) what are the federal funding and capital investments related to infrastructure, transferred to (i) Comox Valley Regional District, (ii) Nanaimo Regional District, (iii) Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District, (iv) Powell River Regional District, broken down by fiscal year, total expenditure, type of funding, funding opportunity or program and project; (c) what are the federal funding and capital investments related to infrastructure, transferred to the Island Trusts of (i) Hornby Island, (ii) Denman Island, (iii) Lasqueti Island, broken down by fiscal year, total expenditure, type of funding, funding opportunity or program and project; and (d) what are

the federal funding and capital investments related to infrastructure, transferred to (i) the Ahousaht First Nation, (ii) Hesquiaht First Nation, (iii) Huu-ay-aht First Nation, (iv) Hupacasath First Nation, (v) Tla-o-qui-aht First Nations, (vi) Toquaht First Nation, (vii) Tseshaht First Nation, (viii) Uchucklesaht First Nation, (ix) Ucluelet First Nation, broken down by fiscal year, total expenditure, type of funding, funding opportunity or program and project?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 192—Larry Brock:

With regard to ongoing lawsuits filed by the government against GC Strategies: what are the details of each, including (i) the date it was filed, (ii) the case name and number, (iii) where it was filed, (iv) the amount of damages sought, (v) the other parties named in the lawsuit, if applicable, (vi) the current status?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 194—Vincent Neil Ho:

With regard to contracts entered into by the government relating to diversity, equity and inclusion services, between March 1, 2024, and June 1, 2025, and broken down by department or agency: (a) what is the total value of such contracts, broken down by type of service provided (policy development, training, guest speaker, fee, etc.); and (b) what are the details of each such contract, including the (i) vendor, (ii) date, (iii) amount or value, (iv) description of the goods or services, (v) manner in which the contract was awarded (sole-sourced or competitive bid)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 195—Vincent Neil Ho:

With regard to grants and contributions entered into by the government that include references to diversity, equity and inclusion, in the agreement title, summary or description, since January 1, 2016: (a) what was the total value of such grants and contributions, broken down by year and by department, agency or other government entity; (b) what are the details of each such grant, including the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) title, (iv) recipient, (v) description; and (c) for each grant, what specific benefits, if any, have been achieved as a result?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 196—Vincent Neil Ho:

With regard to grants provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, since 2020 and broken down by year: (a) what was the total number and value of grants provided; (b) what was the total number and value of grants available which were (i) available to all applicants on a strictly merit based assessment, (ii) restricted to those who self-identify as members of employment equity groups or certain minorities, broken down by type of restriction; and (c) what is the breakdown of (a) by the employment equity group or minority which was self-identified by the recipient?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 198—James Bezan:**

With regard to national defence for the fiscal year 2025-26 and the Prime Minister's announcement on June 9, 2025, that stated that "This plan includes a cash increase of over \$9 billion (\$8.3 billion on an accrual basis) in defence investment this fiscal year (2025-26), bringing Canada's defence spending to 2% of gross domestic product": (a) how much total government spending is required to be defined as defence spending in order to reach 2% of gross domestic product; (b) what is the total planned budget for the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces; (c) what are the expenditures from other eligible government departments included in Canada's defence spending calculations, broken down by (i) department, (ii) type or category of expenditure, (iii) dollar value; (d) for the "new aircraft, armed vehicles, and ammunition" referenced in the Prime Minister's statement, what are the details, including the (i) type of new aircraft that will be acquired, (ii) budget for these aircrafts, (iii) type of new armed vehicles that will be acquired, (iv) budget for these armed vehicles; (e) is the budget for the new aircrafts and armed vehicles listed in (d) accounted for in the "cash increase of \$9 billion", as referenced in the Department of National Defence background; (f) how much of the "cash increase of \$9 billion" is accounted for in the Supplementary Estimates (A) tabled on June 9, 2025; and (g) what is the gross domestic product number used to calculate the Prime Minister's announcement regarding 2% defence spending?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 199—James Bezan:

With regard to the Prime Minister's announcement on June 9, 2025, that the government intends to expand "the reach, security mandate, and abilities of the Canadian Coast Guard" and the statement appearing in the National Post from the Prime Minister's Office spokesperson Emily Williams which stated that "the Prime Minister will soon initiate the process of moving the Canadian Coast Guard to the leadership of the Minister of National Defence": (a) when was the decision made to move the Canadian Coast Guard under the auspices of the Minister of National Defence; (b) was the Chief of the Defence Staff consulted on this decision, and, if so, when; (c) what is the total planned budget for the Canadian Coast Guard in the fiscal year 2025-26; (d) how much of the Canadian Coast Guard's total budget in the fiscal year 2025-26 will be considered as defence spending for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's 2% of gross domestic product spending target; (e) is the government planning to arm current Canadian Coast Guard vessels; (f) if the answer to (e) is affirmative, what (i) armaments will be installed, (ii) additional training, if any, will be provided to Coast Guard personnel, (iii) is the planned budget for each; (g) aside from current projects to build new Coast Guard vessels as part of the National Shipbuilding Strategy, does the government intend to procure new vessels for the Canadian Coast Guard; and (h) if the answer to (g) is affirmative, what are the details, including the (i) type of vessel, (ii) planned budget, (iii) date of delivery, (iv) shipyard where they will be built?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 200—Clifford Small:

With regard to Marine Protected Areas, National Marine Conservation Areas and any other form of ocean protected areas that are now fully protected or at some stage of planning and to be considered part of the 30% by 2030 that Canada agreed to protect in compliance with the 15th Conference of the Parties Biodiversity Convention: (a) what are the details of all existing maps which show ocean protected areas and the reason it became a protected area, including which activities are permitted and which are prohibited currently within each area; (b) what are the details of the maps of all ocean protected areas at all stages of the establishing process, identifying for each stage which stakeholders were consulted; (c) what are the details of all memorandums of understandings or similar types of agreements signed at any stage of the establishment process; (d) for each protected area shown on the maps, what feature, aspect or species will be protected and how will the success of the objective be measured for each area identified; (e) what is the budget to fully implement all areas that are currently under consideration for protection and to fully implement the 30X30 initiative; (f) which groups, organizations, stakeholders, municipalities, environmental nongovernmental organizations or First Nations has the government received information about their advocacy for any ocean protected areas that are currently an Area of Interest, an area at any stage of the establishment process, or a fully established protected area, and what changes was each advocating for; (g) what will be the economic cost of stopping or curtailing renewable or nonrenewable resource industries from operating in areas that are identified but not yet fully implemented protected areas; (h) what will be the economic benefits in new gross domestic product for areas adjacent to proposed new protected areas, broken down by individual area and amount benefited by region; (i) which of the protected areas will have full or partial Indigenous governance; (j) what is date by

which each new area is to become a fully established protected area; and (k) which of the proposed and established protected areas will be approved for installation of offshore wind turbines?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 202—Clifford Small:

With regard to small craft harbours, since 2022: (a) which small craft harbours have applied for funding across Canada; (b) what are the details of each application, including the name of the harbour, the location, the scope and the budget; (c) what is the landed value of catch for each harbour in (b); (d) which harbours had projects approved and what is the scope and amount of federal funding for each; (e) what is the landed value of catch for each harbour in (d); (f) what percentage of each project is complete; (g) which projects are (i) within budget, (ii) over budget; (h) for each project which is over budget, what is the projected cost overrun and the reason for it being over budget; (i) which harbours have "shelf ready" tender documents for projects and what is the estimated cost of each project; (j) what is the landed value of catch for each of the harbours in (i); and (k) how much funding has been diverted from the regular small craft harbours budget, broken down by year and by province, to rebuild or repair as a result of damage from Hurricane Fiona?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 203—Kelly Block:

With regard to government expenditures on and sponsorship of the 2025 Formula 1 Grand Prix in Montreal, broken down by department or agency: (a) how much was spent sponsoring the event; (b) how many tickets were provided to the event as part of the sponsorship deal; (c) who was given and who used the tickets provided; (d) how much did the government spend purchasing tickets to the event and how many tickets were purchased; (e) for each ticket purchased in (d), who used the ticket; and (f) were any government members or officials gifted tickets to the event, and, if so, who received the tickets and from which entities?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 204—Kelly Block:

With regard to the attendance of the Minister of Transport and Internal Trade and the Minister of Finance and National Revenue at the 71st Bilderberg meeting in Stockholm: (a) did any support staff, either ministerial staff or government officials, travel with either of the ministers to Sweden, and, if so, who went; (b) for each minister, what was their itinerary from June 12 to 15, 2025, including who they met with and the topics of each meeting; (c) what was the agenda of the Bilderberg meeting; and (d) what agreements, achievements or advancements resulted from each minister's attendance and the meeting?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 205—Gord Johns:

With regard to the Canada Dental Care Plan, since the program's inception: (a) what is the total number of approved applications; (b) how many seniors, persons with disabilities and children have benefited from the program; (c) what information is the government collecting regarding co-payments and denial of claims, preauthorization submissions and post-determination submissions; (d) how many claims, preauthorization submissions and post-determination submissions have been approved and denied; and (e) what information is communicated to clients when a claim, preauthorization submission or post-determination submission is rejected?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 206—Gord Johns:**

With regard to federal funding for ferries, broken down by fiscal year since 2015-16: what are the details of all federal grants, contributions and loans related to capital or operating costs for ferries, including the (i) name of the recipient, (ii) province or territory in which the recipient is located, (iii) date the funding was received, (iv) amount received, (v) department or agency that provided the funding, (vi) program under which the grant, contribution or loan was made, (vii) nature or purpose of the funding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 209—Jacob Mantle:

With regard to Canada's imposition of countermeasures (e.g., surtaxes, tariffs, etc.) on certain U.S. origin goods pursuant to the United States Surtax Order (Motor Vehicles 2025), the United States Surtax Order (Steel and Aluminum 2025) and the United States Surtax Order (2025-1), each as amended: (a) what is the total amount of revenue collected since March 1, 2025, reported by calendar week, according to custom's release date of the imported U.S. origin goods subject to countermeasures; (b) of the revenue reported in (a), what amounts are attributable to each Harmonized System eight-digit tariff item; (c) for each Harmonized System tariff item identified in (b), what is the percentage of the total revenue collected; (d) of the revenue reported in (b), what is the breakdown by Canadian province or territory according to the respective importer's address; (e) of the revenue reported in (b), what is the breakdown by Canada Border Services Agency region (i.e., Atlantic, Northern Ontario, Southern Ontario including the Greater Toronto Area, Pacific, Quebec and Prairie); (f) what is the number and value of claims for remission made pursuant to the United States Surtax Remission Order (Motor Vehicles) and United States Remission Order (2025), and what is the total value remitted; (g) of the claims for remission identified in (f), what is the number and value of remission (i) granted, (ii) denied, both reported according to Harmonized System tariff item of the imported goods; (h) what is the number and value of claims for remission made pursuant to the remission process established to consider requests for exceptional relief from Canadian countermeasures on U.S. origin goods; (i) of the claims for remission identified in (h), what is the number and value of remission (i) granted, (ii) denied, both reported according to Harmonized System tariff item of the imported goods; (j) what is the total number of full-time equivalent positions at the Canada Border Services Agency and Department of Finance Canada dedicated to the administration, audit, compliance and remission of countermeasures; (k) what estimates does the government have regarding the aggregate economic impact of these countermeasures, including distributional effects on Canadian producers, consumers, importers, workers and regional economies, and whether any modelling or analysis exists showing net revenue versus cost impacts by industry and region; (l) for the revenue collected since March 1, 2025, how have revenues been allocated or spent by the government, including whether any revenue collected from countermeasures has been granted, in any manner, to Canadian businesses and, if so, what is the business name, the amount granted and when was the grant made; (m) what are the revised deficit or surplus amounts for the 2025 budget year based on the government's classification of revenue from countermeasures; (n) which outside firms were hired by the government to provide position papers or any written advice on countermeasures; (o) what position did each firm listed in (n) provide to the government; and (p) what are the details of all contracts related to (n), including the (i) name of the firm, (ii) initial contract amount, (iii) final contract amount, (iv) goods or services delivered, (v) start and end dates of the contract, (vi) date the position paper was delivered to the government?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 211—Grant Jackson:

With regard to Elections Canada and international electors: (a) how does Elections Canada verify the validity of the electors' last listed address before leaving Canada when they file a vote by mail application; (b) with regard to vote by mail applications received from international electors, broken down by year since 2011, what is the total number of (i) applications received, (ii) applications fully processed, (iii) applications fully processed and finalized, (iv) rejected applications, (v) rejected applications due to issues verifying the last listed address; (c) what is the total number of electors in the International Register of Electors; and (d) what is the breakdown of (c) by electoral riding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 212—Grant Jackson:

With regard to employees of government departments, agencies, Crown corporations and other government entities: (a) how many employees currently work with a job classification or in an occupational group where the salary range minimum is

higher than \$150,000 per year (such as EX-04, DM-02, etc.); and (b) what is the breakdown of employees in (a) by job classification or occupational group?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 214—Billy Morin:

With regard to Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey statement that "[e]xcluded from the survey's coverage are persons living on reserves and other Indigenous settlements in the provinces": (a) why does the Labour Force Survey exclude such persons; (b) does Statistics Canada track or study the employment statistics on reserves and settlements by another method and, if so, what is the alternative method; and (c) what is Statistics Canada's projection or estimate of what the most recent national labour force data is, including the employment and unemployment rates, without this exclusion?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 217—Andrew Scheer:

With regard to the Canadian Thalidomide Survivors Support Program: (a) how much has the government paid Epiq Class Action Services Canada Inc. related to the program to date; (b) how much is Epiq scheduled to be paid in each of the next five years; (c) how much has been paid out and to how many survivors through the program, broken down by year; (d) how many survivors receive ongoing payments, and what is the annual value of those payments; (e) for applications received between June 3, 1999 and June 3, 2024, how many applications (i) were received, (ii) were accepted, (iii) were denied, (iv) are still awaiting a decision; (f) of applications denied, what is the breakdown by reason for denial; (g) what audits or oversight has the government done on Epiq's administration of the program to ensure that value for money is being received; and (h) what was the average time between when an application was received and when a decision was made?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 218—Cathay Wagantall:**

With regard to the recommendations in Health Canada's publication through the National Advisory Committee on Immunization titled, "Vaccination and pregnancy: COVID-19": (a) how do these recommendations differ from the May 27, 2025, announcement by the United States of America's Health and Human Services, stating the COVID-19 vaccine would no longer be included in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's recommended immunization schedule for healthy pregnant women and healthy children (herein referred to as "cohort") citing "mixed data" on booster safety and efficacy for pregnant women while seeking stricter clinical trials for vaccine approvals in healthy individuals under 65; (b) did communications occur, related to the Health and Human Services announcement, between Health Canada, the National Advisory Committee on Immunization or the Public Health Agency of Canada and (i) Health and Human Services, (ii) the United States of America's Food and Drug Administration, (iii) the United States' Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, (iv) the United Kingdom's Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency, (v) the European Medical Agency; (c) if the answer to (b) is affirmative, what (i) were the dates of the communications, (ii) were the modes of communications, (iii) were the names and titles of people included in the communications, (iv) was the outcome; (d) to Health Canada's knowledge, did the Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency or the European Medical Agency agree with Health Canada's recommendations for the administration of the COVID-19 vaccine to this cohort; (e) does Health Canada, the National Advisory Committee on Immunization or the Public Health Agency of Canada have mixed data regarding booster safety and efficacy of the COVID-19 vaccine in this cohort, and, if so, how does this impact the risk-benefit analysis; (f) is Health Canada, the Public Health Agency of Canada or the National Advisory Committee on Immunization including the same or different data than the United States of America's Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in the decision to continue recommending the COVID-19 vaccines for this cohort; (g) what clinical trials or data is Health Canada, the National Advisory Committee on Immunization and the Public Health Agency of Canada including in their decision that gives them confidence to continue recommending these vaccines that differs from the United States of America's Health and Human Services, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; (h) is Health Canada planning to request stricter clinical trials for vaccine approvals in healthy individuals under 65 in the future, and, if not, why not; (i) if the answer to (h) is affirmative, what additional vaccine clinical trial requirements will be needed for approval; (j) are there plans to change the recommendations with respect to the COVID-19 vaccine in this cohort; and (k) if the answer to (j) is affirmative, when will these recommendations be announced, and what will they include?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 220—Leslyn Lewis:

With regard to the government's road infrastructure plans and policies: (a) what is the government's current policy with regard to funding new road infrastructure; (b) what are the details of all analyses that have been conducted since 2016 by the Department of the Environment and the Department of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities with regard to Canada's road networks and future road network needs, including, for each, the (i) date of the analysis, (ii) sources of data used, (iii) methodology used, (iv) details of any third party reports or public consultations that took place to inform the analysis, (v) summary of the analysis, (vi) policy recommendations made in the analysis; (c) has the government done any analysis on the economic value of current and future road infrastructure, and, if so, what are the results of those analyses; (d) what policy decisions were made based on these analyses, including any decisions to reduce or change government investments in road infrastructure; (e) since 2016, how much has the government invested in road infrastructure across Canada, broken down by (i) year, (ii) province, (iii) type of investment, (iv) program through which the funding flowed; (f) how much is the government forecasting to spend on road infrastructure going forward, broken down by (i) year, (ii) province, (iii) type of investment, (iv) program through which the funding would flow; (g) does the government have any analysis indicating that any road infrastructure or highways under its jurisdiction are not in good condition or are not meeting safety standards; and (h) if the answer to (g) is affirmative, what is the government doing to ensure the safety and quality of federal road infrastructure?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 221—Leslyn Lewis:

With regard to the government's investments in the Aspire Food Group's cricket facility in London: (a) how much in federal funding has the government announced for the Aspire facility to date; (b) how much funding has been disbursed to Aspire

to date; (c) what is the government's analysis of the return on investment for the millions invested in the facility, both short-term and long-term; (d) what are the key government priorities and long-term objectives that are achieved with this investment; (e) what economic or business case analyses did the government undertake before investing in the facility, and what are the results of those analyses; (f) what are the government's analyses of the current market demand for insect protein, including specifically for human consumption; (g) is the government aware that Aspire has cut two-thirds of its workforce and is retooling its facility, and, if so, when did it become aware; (h) what measures, if any, has the government put in place to ensure their investment in the Aspire facility pays off for taxpayers regardless of the company's wellbeing, for example, did the government include access to the value of the property or other assets in the event of insolvency as part of the conditions of the investment; and (i) what plans does the government have to invest in other insect processing facilities?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 222—Leslyn Lewis:

With regard to Canada's obligations under the World Health Organization's International Health Regulations: (a) since 2016, what work has the government undertaken to create National International Health Regulations Focal Points in order to implement the International Health Regulations within Canada; (b) what are the details of all National Focal Points within Canada, including, for each, the (i) location, (ii) mandate, (iii) number of employees or full-time equivalents, (iv) operational budget, (v) date of establishment; (c) for National Focal Points within Canada, what is the breakdown of employees by nationality; (d) what plans does the government have to establish additional National Focal Points and what are the details, including (i) their location, (ii) their mandate, (iii) the resources (personnel, funding, assets) allocated to them; (e) what is the frequency of communications between the National Focal Points and the (i) World Health Organization, (ii) Pan American Health Organization; (f) what act, including clause and section, enabled the (i) designation of National Focal Points, (ii) relationship between the National Focal Points and the Pan American Health Organization, (iii) relationship between the National Focal Points and the World Health Organization; (g) does Canada have a regional office or National Focal Point located at the Pan American Health Organization headquarters in Washington, D.C., and, if so, what is the work of that office or focal point; (h) as per article 4 of the International Health Regulations, what measures is Canada taking, or what measures will Canada take, to implement the International Health Regulations' National Focal Points regulations, including any adjustments to domestic legislative and administrative arrangements; (i) what is the role of the Pan American Health Organization in Canada and what are the programs and initiatives that Canada and the Pan American Health Organization are working on; (j) what are the roles of other government agencies and departments in working with the World Health Organization or the Pan American Health Organization; and (k) what is the reporting hierarchy in relation to the World Health Organization, National Focal Points, the Pan American Health Organization, the Minister of Health, the Privy Council Office, the Office of the Prime Minister and the Chief Medical Officers of Health in the provinces and territories?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 223—Dean Allison:**

With regard to COVID-19 mRNA vaccine safety and efficacy: (a) has Health Canada reviewed the peer-reviewed, published scientific article by Hulscher N, Alexander P E., Amerling R, Gessling H, Hodkinson R, Makis W et al. titled “A Systematic Review Of Autopsy Findings In Deaths After COVID-19 Vaccination”, *Science, Public Health Policy and the Law*. 2024 Nov 17; v5.2019-2024; (b) what is Health Canada’s assessment of the study referred to in (a); (c) which department or agency makes the final determination about causality when a family member makes a vaccine injury death claim through the Vaccine Injury Support Program; (d) how many death claims relating to the COVID-19 vaccines have been made to the Vaccine Injury Support Program to date; (e) how many death claims relating to the COVID-19 vaccines have been accepted as being causally related; (f) how many death claims relating to the COVID-19 vaccines have been paid through the Vaccine Injury Support Program and what is that total amount paid out; (g) is an autopsy required in the case of a vaccine injury death claim; (h) if the answer to (f) is affirmative, what specialized immunohistochemistry is required to prove causation in the event of an mRNA vaccine injury death; (i) has Health Canada considered mandating autopsies with appropriate immunohistochemistry staining for sudden deaths; and (j) for the years 2019 to 2024, what is the excess all-cause mortality, broken down by year and reason for mortality?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 226—Mario Beaulieu:

With regard to the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Privy Council Office: what is the proportion of the federal public service whose first official language spoken is English or French among (i) the general public service, (ii) deputy and associate deputy ministers, (iii) positions at the EX-03, EX-04 and EX-05 executive levels, based on the most recent data available, indicating the date in each case?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 227—Mario Beaulieu:

With regard to the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Privy Council Office: how many unilingual English-speaking positions not requiring knowledge of French, unilingual French-speaking positions and bilingual positions exist in the federal public service, in Quebec, specifying the institution (department, branch, board, organization, agency, corporation, Canada Post, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, etc.) and the location (including the Outaouais region of Quebec)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 230—Leslyn Lewis:

With regard to the Action Committee on Court Operations in Response to COVID-19 (the “Action Committee”) co-chaired by Chief Justice Richard Wagner and former Minister of Justice and Attorney General David Lametti: (a) who were the originators of the idea for the Action Committee; (b) what were the terms of reference and mandate of this Action Committee; (c) given the Action Committee’s membership included high-level representatives from the executive branch of the federal government (Department of Justice Canada, Public Health Agency of Canada) and the judicial branch (Supreme Court of Canada, provincial courts), what measures were implemented to protect the separation of powers and judicial independence; (d) what measures were taken to prevent judges on the Action Committee and across Canada from being pressured to act as advocates for the federal government’s policies, as opposed to independent arbiters of fact and law; (e) given the Action Committee’s mandate centred on administrative procedures rather than judicial decision-making, why did its membership include judges, rather than just court administrators; (f) what influence, if any, did British Columbia’s Justice COVID-19 Response Group and Cross-Jurisdictional Technical Advisory Group have on the Action Committee’s formation, deliberations, and recommendations; (g) what metrics or criteria were the participating judges given in order to prevent bias on factual or legal issues surrounding COVID-19; (h) what were the procedures in place to identify and manage financial, personal or political conflicts of interest among the Action Committee’s members and direct participants; (i) what specific conflicts of interest were identified and with whom; (j) which law firms participated, either directly or indirectly, in the Action Committee; (k) did the Action Committee consider, discuss or address (i) the topics of “misinformation,” “disinformation” or “malinformation” related to court operations, judicial decision-making or any other context, (ii) the use of judicial notice in legal challenges related to COVID-19 or the pandemic response, (iii) the implementation of mandatory COVID-19 vaccination policies or restrictions for court users, staff or judges and any exemptions from such policies; (l) what actions were taken or processes put in place to ensure that legal cases related to COVID-19 were decided based on a review of all the evidence put before the presiding court, notwithstanding (i) any in-

formation or advice provided to the Action Committee by the executive branch (Department of Justice Canada, the Public Health Agency of Canada, Health Canada, the National Advisory Committee on Immunization, the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety), (ii) any information or guidance provided to the courts by the Action Committee; (m) were concerns raised at any time, either internally or externally, over any aspect of the Action Committee’s (i) creation, membership, processes, independence, politicization, bias, conflicts of interest, (ii) discussion or actions around issues of public health restrictions, mask and vaccine mandates and exemptions, or the taking of judicial notice in COVID-related cases, and, if so, what were the concerns; (n) what was the communication protocol of the Action Committee to provide direction or make recommendations to courts, regulatory bodies or associations; (o) what were those communications and their dates; (p) were cases delayed waiting for information from the Action Committee; (q) did the Action Committee recommend the restriction on access to judicial chambers based on COVID-19 vaccination status; (r) who or what entities received advice or recommendations from the Action Committee; and (s) did the Action Committee set forth any requirements or guidelines to Crown prosecutors for criminal prosecutions related to harms resulting from the government’s COVID-19 pandemic response, or for handling private prosecutions that may arise from harm, negligence or other allegations?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 231—Dan Mazier:

With regard to the Canadian Dental Care Plan: (a) what is the average cost per patient, per year, since the program’s inception; (b) what is the projected average cost per patient, per year, for each of the next five fiscal years; (c) what are the total number of claims submitted to date, and, of these, how many were denied under (i) Schedule A, (ii) Schedule B; (d) for any rejected or denied claims in (c), what is the breakdown of the (i) number, (ii) types, of treatments denied under each schedule, along with the reasons for denial; (e) what is the total number of pre-authorization requests submitted under the Canadian Dental Care Plan; (f) of the requests in (e), how many have been rejected, including the reasons for rejection; (g) what is the average time between a dental office submitting a pre-authorization request and receiving a decision (approval or denial); (h) what has been the longest adjudication time recorded to date, including the type of request; (i) how many Canadians have withdrawn from the Canadian Dental Care Plan since its launch; (j) what is the number of providers who have withdrawn from the Canadian Dental Care Plan since its launch; (k) what is the total administrative cost of delivering the Canadian Dental Care Plan since inception, including all payments to third-party administrators; and (l) what is the number of new Canadian Dental Care Plan patients approved since the program’s expansion to individuals aged 18 to 64?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 232—Jacob Mantle:**

With regard to enforcement actions and associated federal funding by the Canada Border Services Agency aimed at intercepting stolen vehicles at Canadian ports and railyards since January 1, 2022: (a) how many stolen vehicles were intercepted and detained by the Canada Border Services Agency in each calendar quarter, broken down by Canada Border Services Agency region; (b) for each quarter, how many interceptions resulted from police referrals versus Canada Border Services Agency-initiated detections; (c) what was the total value of intercepted vehicles at point of seizure, broken down by quarter and region; (d) what total amount has been allocated to the Canada Border Services Agency for vehicle-theft interdiction, including personnel, equipment, scanners, mobile units, training, intelligence stations and related measures, broken down by fiscal year and category of expenditure; (e) how much of the funding allocated in each fiscal year remains unspent, re-allocated or carried forward into subsequent fiscal years; (f) for each equipment or technology purchase, including X-ray container scanners, what are the details of each purchase, including the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) cost, (iv) description of the item, (v) volume, (vi) operation deployment date, (vii) current functionality status; (g) how many inspections have been conducted annually using newly-funded equipment, broken down by equipment type and location; (h) how many full-time equivalent Canada Border Services Agency personnel are dedicated to auto-theft enforcement, disaggregated by fiscal year, and what share of their time is tracked as active deployment versus administrative time or other time; (i) what performance metrics, including interceptions per inspection or seizures per staff-hour, are tracked by the Canada Border Services Agency and reported, whether internally or otherwise, and what are the quarterly results since 2022; (j) how many reports or audits have been conducted internally or otherwise evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of the Canada Border Services Agency's auto-theft operations, and what remedial actions or findings have been documented; (k) what steps were taken to address operational deficiencies and the issue that the Port of Montreal has only five Canada Border Services Agency agents for container inspection and frequent equipment breakdowns; (l) what accountability measures and ongoing public transparency frameworks are in place to ensure that vehicle-theft enforcement funding delivers measurable increases in seized stolen vehicles versus other expenditures; (m) of the stolen-vehicle interceptions reported in each quarter, how many were based on the Canada Border Services Agency's marine cargo targeting referrals versus rail yard targeting, and what has been the annual "resultant rate" of marine cargo examinations leading to interceptions; (n) what is the current status of the e-Manifest replacement and National Targeting Centre transformation initiatives intended to automate risk targeting, including project milestones, timelines and delays, and when this technology will reach operational readiness at enforcement sites such as Montreal and Toronto; and (o) what percentage of the Canada Border Services Agency's auto-theft funding allocated in the 2024 Estimates has been spent, and how much remains unspent or carried forward as of the most recent fiscal quarter?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 233—Jacob Mantle:

With regard to the Canada Border Services Agency's Release Prior to Payment Privilege program: (a) as at the Release Prior to Payment Privilege program's transition period end date of May 20, 2025, at 3:00:01 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time, how many importer program accounts were enrolled in the Release Prior to Payment Privilege program, including as part of the program's transition plan or after October 21, 2024; (b) of the importer program accounts reported in (a), what is the percentage of the total importer program accounts; (c) of the importer program accounts reported in (a), how many (i) provided the required financial security and thereby maintained Release Prior to Payment Privilege privileges by the program's transition period end date of May 20, 2025, at 3:00:01 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time, and what is the percentage of total importer program accounts, (ii) imported only goods not subject to duties and taxes (e.g., zero-rated goods) between October 21, 2024, and May 20, 2025, at 3:00:01 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time, and what is the percentage of total importer program accounts, (iii) imported dutiable or taxable goods between October 21, 2024, and May 20, 2025, at 3:00:01 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time but did not satisfy financial security requirements and were removed from the program, and what is the percentage of total importer program accounts, (iv) did not import any goods between October 21, 2024, and May 20, 2025, 3:00:01 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time and were removed from the program, and what is the percentage of total importer program accounts; (e) as at the Release Prior to Payment Privilege program's transition period end date of May 20, 2025, at 3:00:01 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time, how many importer program accounts were ineligible for Release Prior to Payment Privilege; (f) between October 21, 2024, and the Release Prior to Payment Privilege program's transition period end date of May 20, 2025, at 3:00:01 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time, how many importer program accounts submitted requests for a reduction of financial security amounts, and how many

were (i) granted, (ii) denied; (g) of the requests for reduction of financial security reported in (f), what was the amount of the financial security demanded by the Canada Border Services Agency and the amount of reduction requested, broken down by importer program account; and (h) of the requests for reduction of financial security reported in (f) that were denied by the Canada Border Services Agency, what were the reasons for each denial, broken down by importer program account, and what were the reasons provided to each requester?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 235—Scott Aitchison:

With regard to the use of temporary foreign workers in the healthcare sector: (a) what is the total number of temporary foreign workers employed in healthcare-related occupations each year since 2015, broken down by (i) nurse aides, (ii) personal support workers, (iii) licensed practical nurses, (iv) physicians, (v) other job categories, and further broken down by province or territory, and by country of origin; (b) what is the number of healthcare employers currently approved to hire temporary foreign workers, broken down by (i) province or territory, (ii) healthcare occupation; and (c) what is the number of known contract violations or complaints involving healthcare-sector temporary foreign workers, broken down by (i) province or territory, (ii) healthcare occupation, including the nature of the violations?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 237—Brad Vis:

With regard to the Federal Skilled Worker Program, since January 2016, broken down by year: (a) how many individuals applied to the program with the National Occupational Classification codes (i) 31102 (General Practitioners and Family Physicians), (ii) 31100 (Specialists in Clinical and Laboratory Medicine), (iii) 31101 (Specialists in Surgery); (b) of the applicants for each National Occupational Classification code in (a), how many were approved through the Federal Skilled Worker Program; and (c) of the applicants in (b), how many have been licensed by a recognized federal, provincial or territorial regulatory authority to practice medicine in Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 239—Adam Chambers:

With regard to the education of government officials: how many government officials, broken down by department, have post-secondary education from an institution other than a university, such as a college or technical school?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 245—Eric Lefebvre:

With regard to the government's effort to stabilize food prices in Canada: (a) what measures has the government taken; (b) what are the details of each measure in (a); (c) what is the cost of each measure in (a); (d) what is the breakdown of (c) by (i) operating expenses, (ii) capital expenses, (iii) transfer payments; and (e) have any consultants been contracted in relation to the effort and, if so, what are the details, including, for each contract, the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) amount, (iv) services provided, (v) specific topic the consultation was related to, (vi) recommendations provided?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 247—Eric Lefebvre:**

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency's efforts to combat tax evasion and tax avoidance since 2017: (a) which programs are currently active; (b) which programs have been cancelled; (c) what are the details of each program; (d) what is the cost of each program, broken down by year; (e) what is the amount of tax recovered from each program, broken down by year; and (f) what is the breakdown of the number of successful tax recoveries by (i) less than \$100,000, (ii) \$100,000 to \$249,999, (iii) \$250,000 to \$499,999, (iv) \$500,000 to \$999,999, (v) \$1,000,000 to \$4,999,999, (vi) \$5,000,000 to \$20,000,000, (vii) more than \$20,000,000?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 248—Mel Arnold:

With regard to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans' enforcement of the Fisheries Act and associated regulations governing fisheries, for each year since January 1, 2016: (a) how many conservation and protection personnel have been deployed for enforcement activities in each of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans' seven operating regions; (b) how many persons have been charged in each region with offences as a result of conservation and protection enforcement activities; (c) how many charges have been laid in each region as a result of conservation and protection enforcement activities; (d) how many charges in each region were related to illegal, unreported or unregulated fishing; and (e) how many persons charged with offences have been convicted of charges in each region?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 250—Mel Arnold:

With regard to the Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative announced in 2021: (a) how many personnel have been hired to work on the Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative each year since 2021; (b) how many personnel have transferred from other government departments or entities to work on the Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative each year since 2021; (c) what is the total amount of salaries and benefits for the Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative's personnel for each year since 2021; (d) how many more personnel does the Department of Fisheries and Oceans plan to hire to work on the Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative; (e) what are the locations of the Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative's personnel by region; (f) what contractors have been hired to support the Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative's activities in each year since 2021; and (g) what is the total value of each contract supporting the Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative's activities?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 251—Mel Arnold:

With regard to federal funding for highway and associated infrastructure projects on the Trans-Canada Highway between Kamloops, British Columbia and the British Columbia-Alberta border since 2016: (a) what projects received federal funding; (b) in what year did each project occur; (c) what was the amount of federal funding allocated to each project; (d) what was the amount of provincial funding allocated to each project; and (e) what was the amount of federal funding allocated to planning and engineering for future projects on the Trans-Canada Highway within federal parks between Kamloops and the British Columbia-Alberta border?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 254—Adam Chambers:

With regard to the Canada Student Financial Assistance Program: (a) what is the total amount of outstanding student loans; and (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by academic discipline and level (undergraduate, doctoral, etc.)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 255—Adam Chambers:

With regard to the National Research Council of Canada's Industrial Research Assistance Program funding, since January 1, 2016: (a) how many firms in the program's database have left Canada; (b) how many different firms received financial support, broken down by year; (c) of the recipients in (b), how many have since either left Canada or been acquired by foreign owners; and (d) for each National Research Council of Canada Industrial Research Assistance Program recipient firm that has left Canada or been acquired by foreign owners, what are the details, including (i) the recipient, (ii) the amount of original funding, (iii) the project description or purpose of the funding, (iv) how much of their contribution agreement funding has been paid back to date (total dollars and percentage of total obligations)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 256—Jacob Mantle:

With regard to the Canada Border Services Agency's Courier Low Value Shipment Program and the implementation of the E-commerce Low Value Inspection System: (a) what is the status of the E-commerce Low Value Inspection System platform, including whether it is still operating in a pilot phase; (b) what is the original planned implementation date for full E-commerce Low Value Inspection System deployment, and on what date did the department first become aware that this target would not be met; (c) how many days, months or years behind schedule is the project as of June 15, 2025; (d) what are the updated timelines for full deployment and stabilization of the E-commerce Low Value Inspection System platform; (e) how much has the department spent to date on the E-commerce Low Value Inspection System project, broken down by (i) the contractor or vendor name, (ii) the amount paid, (iii) the description of services rendered, (iv) the contract start and end dates, (v) whether each deliverable has been met; (f) how much has been paid to GC Strategies for work related to the E-commerce Low Value Inspection System, broken down by fiscal year; (g) what are the specific roles, deliverables and responsibilities assigned to GC Strategies in relation to the E-commerce Low Value Inspection System, and have any of these deliverables been completed, delayed or deemed deficient; (h) has the Canada Border Services Agency issued any penalties to, or sought clawbacks from, GC Strategies in connection with the E-commerce Low Value Inspection System project; (i) have any internal investigations, reviews or audits been launched regarding the performance of GC Strategies or the delays associated with the E-commerce Low Value Inspection System, and, if so, (i) how many, (ii) what are their findings, (iii) what disciplinary or remedial measures have been recommended or taken; and (j) on what date or prospective date will the current Canada Border Services Agency moratorium on new entrants to the Courier Low Value Shipment program be lifted?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 257—Chris d'Entremont:

With regard to the entry of internationally trained healthcare professionals into Canada: (a) what is the number of (i) physicians, (ii) nurses, (iii) other healthcare workers, who have entered Canada each year since 2016 under the Express Entry system, disaggregated by occupation and province of destination; (b) what is the number of (i) physicians, (ii) nurses, (iii) other healthcare workers, who have entered Canada in each year since 2016 through a Provincial Nominee Program, disaggregated by occupation and province; and (c) what is the number of (i) physicians, (ii) nurses, (iii) other healthcare workers, who have been granted a Labour Market Impact Assessment-based work permit in each year since 2016, broken down by occupation and province of employment?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 258—William Stevenson:

With regard to the Climate Action Incentive Fund, broken down by province and year: how much money was returned through the Climate Action Incentive Fund's Municipalities, Universities, Schools and Hospitals Retrofit stream, broken down by (i) municipality, (ii) university, (iii) school, (iv) hospital?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 259—David McKenzie:**

With regard to all goods and services procured by the government and its agencies through Public Services and Procurement Canada from January 1, 2024, to the present: (a) what is the itemized list of all United States-based companies that were awarded contracts during this period, including, for each contract, (i) the name of the company, (ii) the product or service provided, (iii) the total contract value, (iv) the date the contract was awarded, (v) the department or agency for which the procurement was made, (vi) the state and city in which the company is headquartered or principally based, (vii) whether the procurement was conducted through an open competition, sole-source or another procurement method, (viii) whether any Canadian company submitted a bid, (ix) whether any Canadian company was invited to bid; (b) what is the itemized list of all companies headquartered in the People's Republic of China that were awarded contracts during this period, including, for each contract, (i) the name of the company, (ii) the product or service provided, (iii) the total contract value, (iv) the date the contract was awarded, (v) the department or agency for which the procurement was made, (vi) the province and city in which the company is headquartered or principally based, (vii) whether the procurement was conducted through an open competition, sole-source, or another procurement method, (viii) whether any Canadian company submitted a bid, (ix) whether any Canadian company was invited to bid; (c) what is the itemized list of all contracts awarded during the same period to Canadian-based companies through Public Services and Procurement Canada, including, for each contract, (i) the company name, (ii) the product or service provided, (iii) the total contract value, (iv) the province where the company is headquartered or principally based; (d) in how many instances during this period did Public Services and Procurement Canada award contracts to a People's Republic of China-based companies despite a Canadian company submitting a compliant bid or expressing interest; (e) in how many instances during this period did Public Services and Procurement Canada award contracts to a United States-based companies despite a Canadian company submitting a compliant bid or expressing interest; (f) how many United States-based suppliers received contracts for goods or services that are (i) available from Canadian suppliers, (ii) classified as sensitive, security-related or strategic to Canadian interests in any way; (g) how many People's Republic of China-based suppliers received contracts for goods or services that are (i) available from Canadian suppliers, (ii) classified as sensitive, security-related or strategic to Canadian interests in any way; (h) what is the total dollar value of all contracts awarded to (i) United States-based companies, during this period, broken down by department or agency and by North American Industry Classification System sector code, (ii) People's Republic of China-based companies, during this period, broken down by department or agency and by North American Industry Classification System sector code; (i) what findings, conclusions or data have been generated by Public Services and Procurement Canada since January 1, 2024, through internal analyses, briefings or reports regarding the impact of awarding contracts to foreign suppliers, including United States-based and People's Republic of China-based companies, on Canadian suppliers, Canadian employment or domestic industrial capacity; (j) in how many instances were contracts awarded to United States-based or People's Republic of China-based companies that were previously held by Canadian suppliers; (k) for all the instances in (j), what rationale was provided in each case; and (l) in how many cases were contracts awarded to United States-based or People's Republic of China-based companies that ultimately subcontracted work to Canadian firms, and what proportion of the contract value did such subcontracts represent in each instance?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 260—David McKenzie:

With regard to Canada's announcement that the Canada Border Services Agency will hire over 1000 new and additional Canada Border Services Agency personnel: (a) as of June 15, 2025, how many of the new 1000 personnel that will be hired have been hired and are operational; (b) by what date will the government reach its target of hiring 1000 additional Canada Border Services Agency personnel; (c) by what date will all 1000 new Canada Border Services Agency personnel be functionally operational; (d) as of June 15, 2025, how many full-time equivalent positions within the Canada Border Services Agency are unfilled, broken down by (i) Canada Border Services Agency region, (ii) Canada Border Services Agency department or branch; and (e) of the 1000 new Canada Border Services Agency personnel that will be hired, how many does the government currently expect will be assigned to Canada Border Services Agency headquarters, broken down by headquarters branch, including the (i) president's office, (ii) Canada Border Services Agency Assessment and Revenue Management's Internal Task Force, (iii) Commercial and Trade Branch, (iv) Communications, Parliamentary and Public Affairs Branch, (v) Finance and Corporate Management Branch, (vi) Human Resources Branch, (vii) Information, Science and Technology Branch, (viii) Intelligence and Enforcement Branch, (ix) Internal Audit and Program Evaluation Directorate, (x) Legal Services,

Recourse, Standards and Program Integrity Branch, (xi) Strategic Policy Branch, (xii) Travellers Branch?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 261—Frank Caputo:

With regard to Correctional Service Canada, broken down by year since 2019: (a) how many women have participated in the mother-child program; (b) how many children have participated in the mother-child program; and (c) how many inmates who have been convicted of a sexual offence have served any part of their sentence in the same prison and at the same security level as the mother-child program?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 262—Frank Caputo:

With regard to Correctional Service Canada, broken down by year since 2019: (a) how many assaults have taken place in women's facilities; (b) how many sexual assaults have taken place in women's facilities; (c) what percentage of assaults were committed by transgender inmates or inmates assigned male at birth; (d) what percentage of sexual assaults were committed by transgender inmates or inmates assigned male at birth; (e) how many assaults have been reported to the police; (f) how many sexual assaults have been reported to the police; (g) how many assaults committed by transgender inmates have been reported to the police; and (h) how many sexual assaults committed by transgender inmates have been reported to the police?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 264—Frank Caputo:

With regard to Correctional Service Canada's women's facilities, broken down by year since 2019: (a) how many transgender women are in women's prisons, broken down by their sentence, including (i) five years and under, (ii) five years plus a day to 10 years, (iii) 10 years to life imprisonment; and (b) how many inmates in women's prisons were assigned male at birth, broken down by their sentence, including (i) five years and under, (ii) five years plus a day to 10 years, (iii) 10 years to life imprisonment?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 265—Christine Normandin:

With regard to the promotion of Canada, including contributions to third parties, between April 1, 1995, and March 31, 1996: (a) what was the total cost incurred by the Government of Canada, broken down (i) by agency and department, (ii) by month; (b) what are the details of all internal and external communications and briefing materials between Option Canada, the Canadian Unity Council, Conseil Québec, the Coalition des partenaires, Impact 95, the Conseil québécois des gens d'affaires pour le Canada, Génération 18-35, and representatives of the federal government; and (c) what federal government resources were allocated to the promotion of Canada, broken down by department?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 266—Christine Normandin:

With regard to the organization of the Unity Rally (love-in) in 1995: (a) what funding was provided by the federal government for its organization, broken down by department; and (b) what resources were allocated by the federal government and Crown corporations, especially Via Rail, broken down by department and Crown corporation?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 267—Pat Kelly:**

With regard to repayable loans issued by regional development agencies which came due in fiscal 2024-25: (a) for each regional development agency, how many loans matured; (b) what was the total dollar value of loans which matured; (c) how many loans were repaid; (d) what was the total dollar value of loans which were repaid; (e) how many loans went into full default with borrowers making no payments; (f) what was the total dollar value of loans which went into full default with borrowers making no payments; (g) how many loans went into partial default with borrowers making partial payments; and (h) what was the dollar value of loans in partial default with borrowers making partial payments?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 270—Pat Kelly:

With regard to unused or underused federally-owned buildings which can be converted to housing, as of June 15th 2025: (a) how many units of housing can be produced with (i) minimal interior renovation, (ii) extensive interior renovation (i.e. gutting), (iii) extensive interior and exterior renovation; and (b) what is the estimated cost per unit in (a)(i), (a)(ii) and (a)(iii)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 271—Alex Ruff:

With regard to the government's "Canada Strong Pass" for national parks and monuments: (a) did the government consult with communities surrounding the national parks and monuments ahead of announcing this initiative; (b) if yes to (a), when did these consultations take place, who was consulted and what are the details, including (i) the date, (ii) who was consulted, (iii) the name of the park or monument; (c) what is the projected loss of government revenue from implementing this pass; (d) how much does each park or monument collect in admission fees, broken down by (i) province, (ii) the name of the park or monument, (iii) the average yearly visitors from 2015 to present, (iv) the annual park or monument revenue; (e) has the government forecasted the estimated influx of visitors and ensured adequate staffing for the parks; and (f) how has the government prepared each park for the potential influx of visitors through the implementation of this pass?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 272—Dan Mazier:

With regard to applications for permanent residency in Canada, since January 2016, broken down by year: (a) how many individuals applied with the National Occupational Classification codes (i) 31102 (General Practitioners and Family Physicians), (ii) 31100 (Specialists in Clinical and Laboratory Medicine), (iii) 31101 (Specialists in Surgery); (b) of the applicants for each National Occupational Classification code in (a), how many were granted permanent residency; (c) of those listed in (b), how many have been licensed by a recognized federal, provincial or territorial regulatory authority to practice medicine in Canada; and (d) of the applicants for each National Occupational Classification code in (a), what immigration stream was used?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 274—Rhonda Kirkland:

With regard to Labour Market Impact Assessments, since January 2016, broken down by year: (a) what is the total number of Labour Market Impact Assessment applications received under National Occupational Classification code (i) 31102 (General Practitioners and Family Physicians), (ii) 31100 (Specialists in Clinical and Laboratory Medicine), (iii) 31101 (Specialists in Surgery); (b) of the applications for each National Occupational Classification code in (a), how many were (i) rejected, (ii) approved; and (c) what was the average time for an application, under each National Occupational Classification code, to receive an approval or rejection response?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 277—Chak Au:

With regard to the 10 properties from the Real Property Disposal Sector in the National Capital Region as claimed in the Auditor General of Canada's Report 3 titled "Current and Future Use of Federal Office Space": (a) what is the specific address of each of these 10 properties; and (b) for each property, what is its current status in the disposal process?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 278—Chak Au:

With regard to the 309 housing units built under the Federal Lands Initiative as mentioned in the Auditor General of Canada's Report 3 titled "Current and Future Use of Federal Office Space": (a) what are the specific locations (address and municipality) where these 309 units were built; (b) which department, agency or Crown corporation owned each of the properties on which these units were built prior to their transfer or lease for the initiative; and (c) what was the total cost incurred by the government broken down by department, agency and Crown corporation?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 279—Chak Au:

With regard to the construction of the fighter squadron facilities in Cold Lake and Bagotville, as mentioned in paragraph 2.19 of the Auditor General of Canada's report titled "Delivering Canada's Future Fighter Jet Capability": (a) what is the total amount spent on the construction of these facilities in Cold Lake and Bagotville to date; and (b) what are the details of all contracts, including (i) the start and end dates, (ii) the companies, (iii) the file number, (iv) the nature or description of the work, (v) the value of the contract, (vi) whether the contract was sole-sourced or awarded through a competitive bidding process?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 280—Michael Ma:

With regard to special warrants used for all grants and contributions during the dissolution of Parliament in 2025: (a) for each instance a special warrant was used to authorize grants and contributions, what was the (i) date the special warrant was issued, (ii) department or agency that received the funding, (iii) total amount of funding authorized, (iv) description of the grant or contribution program or initiative; and (b) for each grant and contribution program or initiative identified in (a), what (i) were the specific recipients of the funds, (ii) were the individual amounts received by each recipient, (iii) was the purpose of the funding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 281—Michael Ma:

With regard to all special warrants approved during the dissolution of Parliament in 2025: (a) for each special warrant approved due to "a payment is urgently required for the public good," as claimed by the government, what is the (i) date of the approval, (ii) department or agency that received the funding, (iii) specific amount approved, (iv) detailed explanation or justification provided for why the payment was urgently required for the public good; (b) for each special warrant approved for this reason, what are the details of all expenditures made under its authority, including the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) vendor or payee, (iv) description of the goods or services; and (c) what is the total amount approved via special warrants, broken down by department or agency, specifically for payments urgently required for the public good, during the dissolution of Parliament in 2025?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 282—Michael Ma:

With regard to the former residence of the Consul General of Canada in New York, located at 550 Park Avenue and currently listed for sale: (a) on what date was the property listed for sale; (b) what is the listing price of the property; (c) what is the total amount paid in condominium fees since January 1, 2020, broken down by year; (d) how many property showings have taken place since the property was listed, and what are the dates of each showing; (e) what are the names of the real estate firms contracted to represent the Government of Canada in the sale of the property; (f) what is the total amount spent to date in relation to the sale of the property, including legal, administrative, real estate and staging costs; (g) were there any maintenance or renovation expenditures on the property since January 1, 2020, and, if so, what are the details, including the (i) amount, (ii) date, (iii) description of the work, (iv) vendor; (h) have any offers been received on the property to date, and, if so, (i) what is the date of each offer, (ii) what is the amount of each offer, (iii) was the offer accepted or declined; and (i) what were the moving costs incurred by the government to relocate to the new residence?

(Return tabled)

*Privilege*Question No. 283—**Michael Ma:**

With regard to Treasury Board Vote 5 - Contingencies for the 2024-25 fiscal year: what is the total amount allocated and expended under Vote 5, broken down by department, agency and Crown corporation, and for each department, agency and Crown corporation, what is the (i) purpose, (ii) total amount, (iii) date of the expenditure?

(Return tabled)

[English]

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that I have received notice of a request for an emergency debate. I invite the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan to rise and make a brief intervention.

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada faces a deepening youth unemployment crisis, and I am rising today to request that the House of Commons hold an emergency debate on this crisis.

Parliament has not sat since June, and in that time we have had three new reports from Statistics Canada that underline the dire situation facing Canadian young people. The unemployment rate has gone to 7.1% overall. For youth, it has hit 14.5%. Clearly, youth unemployment is already at recession levels, and it continues to get even worse.

Incredibly, about one in five returning students was unemployed this summer. In August alone, the drop in jobs, if we combine employed and self-employed, was 109,000. Effectively, that is 109,000 fewer jobs. This was in just one month. That is an emergency, and that emergency calls for an emergency debate.

We have been trying to get the government to take this crisis seriously. Before the summer began, we proposed a summer study on youth unemployment at the human resources committee; Liberals blocked that study. When the July numbers came out, we again sought emergency hearings, but the Liberals refused to bring the committee back to work.

This summer, even while Liberals refused this work, I and other Conservative members criss-crossed the country to meet with young people, employers and Canadians of all backgrounds to gather feedback on the jobs crisis. The Liberals spent two and a half more months sitting on their hands.

Now Parliament is back, and the delays must end. Our youth cannot wait anymore. I have talked to young people who have put in over a thousand applications—that is over a thousand applications—and are still looking.

Liberal policies got us here. Liberal policies continue to block economic development. Liberal policies wrecked our immigration

system. Liberal policies have created a cost of living crisis. They should stop dithering and start working.

Many Canadians are struggling. Many are asking their employers for additional hours and many are working two and three jobs just to get by, and this is putting further pressure on the labour market. The jobs crisis is biting more and more Canadians.

Parliament is back. Let us finally get back to work. Let us have this vitally important emergency debate. Let us confront this generational challenge so that our young people can work again.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan for his intervention. However, I am not satisfied that this request meets the specific requirements of the Standing Orders at this time.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MEMBERS' ACCESS TO FEDERAL PENITENTIARY

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people from Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, though today I rise for the second time, in my time as a member, on a question of privilege. I do not know that members really relish rising on a question of privilege, because it means something has gone astray in the process.

I rise based on an event that occurred on July 28, 2025. I was with the member for Cloverdale—Langley City, and I visited Fraser Valley Institution, which is a women's facility in the Abbotsford area. The interference amounted, I believe, to obstruction and interference in our ability to fulfill our parliamentary responsibilities. Therefore, a breach of parliamentary privilege ensued.

On July 28 of this year, my colleague and I attended the jail, a correctional facility operated by Correctional Service Canada, in the exercise of our rights as parliamentarians under section 72 of the CCRA, Corrections and Conditional Release Act, which provides that:

Every member of the House of Commons, every Senator and every judge of a court in Canada has the right to (a) enter any penitentiary, (b) visit any part of a penitentiary, and (c) visit any inmate, with the consent of the inmate, subject to such reasonable limits as are prescribed for protecting the security of the penitentiary or the safety of persons.

This tour, or visit, had been arranged with uniformed correctional officers who were representatives of the Union of Canadian Correctional Officers. However, on arrival, we were informed that we would be accompanied throughout our visit by one of the institution's assistant wardens, Chris Szafron.

Mr. Szafron advised us that he was personally instructed by the institution's warden to accompany us throughout our visit. It is important to note here that Mr. Szafron actually told the member and I that he was not trained in security. He was not in uniform. In other words, he had no use-of-force interventions that could protect anybody, including a member of Parliament. He said he was there because he was told to be there. In fact, it came back that this was a security issue at one point, when we were speaking with the staff through my office. That was my understanding.

I have conducted dozens of penitentiary tours to date, and I have never been informed of a requirement to be escorted by a correctional service executive, and I will pause here to say this: As a member of Parliament, as a human being and as somebody whose job it is to supervise what is happening, which is why the power in section 72 is there, I have never been treated so disrespectfully by anybody in my time as a member of Parliament as I was by assistant warden Chris Szafron. I could not believe the level of disrespect he showed me and the member for Cloverdale—Langley City.

I could not believe the condescension. He was questioning why we were there, what we would possibly have to do there and how he could possibly be getting in the way of us doing our job. I will tell how he was getting in the way of us doing our job. When people see an assistant warden, they do not necessarily want to talk to members of Parliament. They fear talking to somebody. This includes inmates, and this also includes staff members.

We are there for the protection of those inmates. Some people may not believe it, but we actually are. We are there to watch firsthand, and somebody was claiming that they had to shadow us. Is this Wayne Gretzky in the playoffs in the 1990s, where somebody had to shadow him at all times? The reality is that the reason they wanted to do this, in my view, was so that they could get ahead of the next scandal that we would be breaking.

I asked to speak to the warden to discuss this sudden unexpected development. I was informed that she was unavailable. There was nothing going on in the jail that would have precluded this, and I have never heard of a warden unavailable to speak to two members of Parliament. I asked for a supervisor, and we were told he did not have their numbers. This is obviously untenable and just an inappropriate situation, and when I couple it with the disrespect, it does amount to an intimidating environment.

• (1535)

The assistant warden dismissed our concerns and interrogated us about the purpose of our visit and what we were looking for. It is not for anybody to get in the way of what a member of Parliament is looking for, not looking for or wishing to see. We need to be able to do our jobs without encumbrance, without somebody shadowing us who could intimidate staff and inmates alike. The fact that somebody did this, showing gross disrespect and unprofessionalism at such a high level, it was as if this person were being congratulated. I wrote a letter to the Correctional Service of Canada commissioner, which took a very long time to get a response, talking about Mr. Szafron's behaviour, and the commissioner did not even address it. It is as though this person did the right thing by being disrespectful to members.

Privilege

Mr. Szafron admitted there were no safety concerns posed by our visit that were not adequately addressed by the scheduled presence of two uniformed officers. In other words, the assistant warden's presence was surplus to requirements. The discussion with staff and inmates that I had hoped to have, among other things, would have informed my work as the official opposition shadow minister for public safety, including preparing oral and written questions for here in the House of Commons, developing motions for studies at the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, and researching lines of questioning of witnesses appearing at committee.

However, the assistant warden's unprofessional behaviour, aggressive tone, authoritarian demeanour and lack of co-operation seriously led me to believe there may well be something at the institution that Correctional Service Canada's senior leadership do not want us to see and did not want us to see on July 28, or they wanted to know what we might see so that they could get ahead of these things. Certainly, the presence of a senior institution executive during our time at the jail put a damper on the flow of conversations we had during that visit.

In short, the assistant warden was there to mind us, and to inhibit and to intimidate the free and candid views of staff and inmates being shared with parliamentarians from the official opposition. That conduct amounts to obstruction and interference with my ability to fulfill my parliamentary duties.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice, third edition, at page 111, explains that:

A Member may also be obstructed or interfered with in the performance of his or her parliamentary functions by non-physical means. In ruling on such matters, the Speaker examines the effect the incident or event had on the Member's ability to fulfill his or her parliamentary responsibilities....

It is impossible to codify all incidents which might be interpreted as matters of obstruction, interference, molestation or intimidation and, as such, constitute prima facie cases of privilege.

On February 20, 1984, Mr. Speaker Francis found a prima facie case of privilege concerning allegations that an official in the office of the president of Canada Post informed an employee of Albert Cooper, the official opposition critic for Canada Post, that questions about Canada Post asked in the House of Commons had to be cleared through the president's office or else any future assistance or co-operation with Mr. Cooper would be withheld. At page 1560 of the Debates, the Chair stated:

A threat emanating from any government department or public corporation to withhold information or co-operation from a Member of Parliament would undoubtedly hinder that Member in the fulfilment of his or her parliamentary duties and therefore constitute a breach of privilege. By the same token, an offer of favourable treatment on condition that questions are first cleared with the office concerned would also violate privilege in an equally fundamental way.

Privilege

I believe that the circumstances in my situation are sufficiently analogous. I would also address an earlier ruling on July 15, 1980, at page 2914 of the Debates, where Madam Speaker Sauvé ruled that a distinction must be drawn between the parliamentary work that members of Parliament conduct and the many political and constituency-related duties we undertake. To be sure, my visit and the interference I experienced fell squarely in relation to my parliamentary duties rather than other categories of an MP's work.

Parliamentary Privilege in Canada, second edition, explains at page 222:

For just as the Member is protected for what he does during a "proceeding in Parliament," so must the Member's parliamentary work or work relating to a "proceeding in Parliament" be alleged to be improperly interfered with before the Speaker may find a prima facie case....

● (1540)

As I mentioned earlier, I had hoped to inform my work this autumn in the House of Commons as the official opposition's lead spokesperson on issues related to corrections, among other topics, and as a member of the public safety committee of the House, work which, indeed, would lead to a proceeding in Parliament. I stress this point because it is an important aspect in distinguishing it from the matter which was before Mr. Speaker Lamoureux when he ruled on April 29, 1971, at page 5338 of the Debates, concerning members' access to penitentiaries, a subject which, at the time, was addressed only through directives of the commissioner of penitentiaries, as the position was then known, rather than through an act of Parliament as it is today.

I had access to Fraser Valley Institution on July 28. That is not in dispute. My question of privilege, rather, concerns interference with my parliamentary work related to proceedings in Parliament. The concept of proceedings in Parliament lacks a clear-cut, black-and-white definition of its scope. Bosc and Gagnon, for their part, explain at page 90 that "there is no statutory definition in Canada."

● (1545)

In turn, the authors refer to how the concept has been fleshed out in our sister Parliaments.

The United Kingdom's leading authority, Erskine May, explains at paragraph 13.12 of the 25th edition:

The term 'proceedings in Parliament' has received judicial attention (not all of it in the United Kingdom) but comprehensive lines of decision have not emerged and indeed it has been concluded that an exhaustive definition could not be achieved. The primary meaning of proceedings, as a technical parliamentary term, which it had at least as early as the seventeenth century, is some formal action, usually a decision, taken by the House in its collective capacity. While business which involves actions and decisions of the House are clearly proceedings, debate is an intrinsic part of that process which is recognised by its inclusion in the formulation of Article IX [of the Bill of Rights, 1689]. Not all proceedings require debate: a motion for an unopposed return, on which there is no debate, is held to be a proceeding (see para 7.32). An individual Member takes part in a proceeding usually by speech, but also by various recognised forms of formal action, such as voting, giving notice of a motion, or presenting a petition or report from a committee.

Farther down in that paragraph, we continue to read that:

On a number of occasions, the House of Commons or a committee has endeavoured to elucidate this very broad understanding. The Select Committee on the Official Secrets Act in 1938–39 argued that 'proceedings' covered both the asking of a question and the giving of written notice of the question.... After considering the scope of the protection, the committee concluded:

'cases may be easily imagined of communications between one Member and another or between a Member and a minister so closely related to some matter pending in or expected to be brought before the House that, although they do not take place in the Chamber or a committee room, they form part of the business of the House, as for example where a Member sends to a minister the draft of a question he is thinking of putting down, or shows it to another Member with a view to obtaining advice as to the propriety of putting it down or as to the manner in which it should be framed.'

The conclusions of the committee were later agreed to by the House.

More recently, the UK Parliament's 1999 Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege wrote, at paragraph 12 of its first report, "Proceedings are broadly interpreted to mean what is said or done in the formal proceedings of either House or the committees of either House, together with conversations, letters and other documentation directly connected with those proceedings." At paragraph 113 of the same report, the Joint Committee assessed that:

Drafts and notes frequently precede speeches and questions, and members often need assistance and advice in preparing them. By necessary extension, immunity accorded to a speech or question must also be available for preparatory drafts and notes...for instance from a research assistant. It would be absurd to protect a speech but not the necessary preparatory material.... This principle must also apply to drafts of speeches, questions and the like which in the event are not used. A member cannot always catch the Speaker's eye, or he may change his mind.

Many of the conversations I had hoped to have at Fraser Valley Institution on July 28 were or would have been directly connected to my potential parliamentary proceedings this autumn. The individuals I interviewed during my visit were providing me with assistance and advice in relation to matters I had under consideration at that time.

I would pause here to note that even previously when I have gone to penitentiaries, when the management did not know I was there, through ATIP I found out that they literally followed me with their cameras to see whom I spoke with. What are they hiding? What are they so afraid of? What are they trying to get in front of or deal with?

Elsewhere, Australia has legislated its parliamentary privileges and assigned the following definition to proceedings in Parliament, in subsection 16.2 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1987:

...all words spoken and acts done in the course of, or for purposes of or incidental to, the transacting of the business of a House or of a committee, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, includes:...

(b) the presentation or submission of a document to a House or a committee;

(c) the preparation of a document for purposes of or incidental to the transacting of any such business;

● (1550)

More recently, New Zealand also legislated on parliamentary privileges, following a court decision that related to the extent of parliamentary privilege available to public servants supporting ministers with question period preparation. New Zealand mirrored Australia's statutory definition at subsections 10(1) and 10(2) of its Parliamentary Privilege Act 2014.

Government Orders

The reality is that we, as members of Parliament, have to know what is going on, and the presence of management, especially when there is an acrimonious relationship that is well documented between guards or correctional officers and their managers, or with inmates who may not want to be anywhere near a manager, inhibits my ability to speak with that person. We need to be able to do that completely in private and to completely respect it. The uniformed correctional officers have always been completely respectful in that regard, giving us the ability to do our job.

It is no surprise that Mr. Szafron acted the way he did. I have watched the work of Commissioner Anne Kelly, who did not even respond fulsomely to the letter, and we have seen that we have been stymied, that I have been stymied in doing my job as a critic and, more concretely, as a member of Parliament, just as anybody on the government bench would be permitted to do. At the end of the day, we need to do our job without harassment and without anybody following us and watching what they can see so that the government, be it the Minister, be it Commissioner Kelly or be it Mr. Szafron, can know what we are up to.

In summary, the assistant warden of the Fraser Valley Institution, at the instruction of the warden, who would not talk to us, if not more senior management in Correctional Service Canada, obstructed and interfered with my ability to prepare fully for proceedings in Parliament this autumn. That amounts, in my view, to a breach of the established privilege to be free from obstruction, interference, intimidation and molestation.

Should you agree, Mr. Speaker, I would propose a motion to refer the matter to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

The Speaker: I thank the member for his intervention, and I will come back to the chamber after studying what he has said today.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CITIZENSHIP ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-3, An Act to amend the Citizenship Act (2025), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join the discussion and the debate about Bill C-3.

This morning the bill was debated, and I listened intently to the debate back and forth, which was primarily from Conservative members. I actually did not even hear, from the members who stood, about the purpose of the bill, why we are here and the remedy that Bill C-3 is proposing. Let me start with that. Why are we here, and what is Bill C-3 all about?

First, Bill C-3 is a piece of legislation attempting to correct a wrong. It is attempting to make Canada's citizenship laws charter-compliant. In fact, Canada's citizenship laws have not been charter-compliant for decades. Why is that? It is because we have a set of archaic immigration citizenship rules.

Somewhere along the way through the history, and more specifically pertaining to the piece of legislation before us, in 2006, the Conservatives, under the Harper administration, saw fit to take away citizenship rights for those who are the second generation born abroad. The Harper government took away the rights of Canadian citizens who are the first generation born abroad to pass on their citizenship to their children who were also born abroad. If an immigrant who became a Canadian were to have a child outside of Canada, they could not pass on their citizenship to their child. That citizenship right was stripped away for Canadians by the Conservatives.

As a result, many people had to separate themselves from their families, and some children were even born stateless. Canada is a global country. We go abroad to work, to study and to travel, and, guess what, as life would have it, sometimes we fall in love. Sometimes we marry people abroad. Sometimes we have children abroad. If this happened to a second-generation born-abroad child, they would not have Canadian citizenship rights.

The matter was actually challenged in the courts. The Ontario Superior Court ruled that it was in violation of charter rights, and the government had to remedy that. In the last Parliament, there were several attempts to try to fix this. In fact, Senator Yonah Martin brought in a Senate bill to try to fix it. Through much debate, much effort and much collaboration, I, as the immigration critic for the NDP, raised the matter and worked with the government to bring forward amendments to fix the bill and fix the charter violation, and we did.

We went through a whole series of discussions, lengthy debates and committee work, and we came through with a number of amendments, which passed, but then the bill never had third reading in the House. Why is that? It is because the Conservatives filibustered the debate and used a whole bunch of rules and tactics that delayed that debate, and it never came back.

In the midst of all of that, I said to the government that if it wanted to make sure Canada's citizenship rules were charter-compliant, it needed to bring forward a government bill. It agreed. Conservatives, by the way, at the time actually said that if the government brought forward a bill, they would support it.

The government brought forward a bill, and what happened? There were more games played. The Conservatives again filibustered the House, and Bill C-71 was never actually passed.

Here we are again, with Bill C-3, for the third round, still trying to fix the situation where the judge ruled that Canada's citizenship law is unconstitutional. It is not charter-compliant. The court had to give the government multiple extensions to fix the situation. This is why we are here today.

• (1555)

If the first-generation born-abroad Canadians decide to go abroad and have a child, they cannot pass on their Canadian citizenship to their child at all, and, of course, they run the risk of rendering their child stateless.

Government Orders

The Bjorkquist decision held that the second-generation cut-off violates section 15 by discriminating against first-generation born-abroad women more particularly, stating:

[The cut-off] disadvantages pregnant first-generation born abroad women who are living abroad when they get pregnant by placing them in the position where they have to make choices between their careers, financial stability and independence, and health care on the one hand, and the ability to ensure their child receives Canadian citizenship on the other.

Women's reproductive autonomy and family planning are extremely time-sensitive, and the Conservatives' legal impediment to exercising this freedom comes at a human cost to women, parents and children. This is the reality.

An estimated 170,000 women born abroad in the age range when people often start a family are being affected by the current law. As reported, the justice said in her June decision that "these are not 'theoretical or minor constitutional violations' but ones that could lead to 'children being stateless.'"

She went on to say:

They can lead to women having to make choices between their financial health and independence on one hand, and their physical health on the other. They can separate families.... They can force children to stay in places that are unsafe for them. They can interfere with some of the deepest and most profound connections that human beings both enjoy and need.

That is why we are here today. This is what we are trying to fix.

What I heard the Conservatives talk about was the connections test, that somehow these Canadian citizenship rights are deemed not to be rights. They somehow treat it that one has to earn one's citizenship back. However, if people are Canadian, they have Canadian birthrights that are being passed on. These are not immigrants per se, trying to get their citizenship through an immigration process. These are their birthrights. The connections test in this remedy is that they have to establish and show they have a connection to Canada. The substantial connections test in the legislation requires they have some connection in Canada, having been here for 1,095 days nonconsecutively, because people travel. They move and work abroad. Therefore, they have to show a connections test of 1,095 days nonconsecutively.

I have heard the Conservatives say that there should be a criminality test. Would they apply a criminality test to Canadians who were born in Canada to say that if they commit an offence, they will lose their birthright of being Canadian? No. We have the judicial system that we can go through to deal with that. If there are criminality issues, a person would then go before a judge and the process would follow as it should.

It is time for us to fix this problem once and for all. Canada's immigration citizenship laws should be charter-compliant to respect the rights of women and women who have children abroad and to respect the rights of all Canadians who travel abroad. We are global citizens; we work and travel abroad. It is time that we honour all of our rights as equal in Canada.

● (1600)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have listened throughout the debate today on what is a very important piece of legislation. I know, in the past, the member

opposite has been very supportive of individuals who should have their citizenship today. In fact, that is universally felt. There are people who should be Canadian citizens today but are not, because the House of Commons has not co-operated in getting the legislation passed.

I wonder if the member could provide her thoughts on the mandate that all politicians of all political parties were given, which is to have a higher sense of co-operation on the floor of the House of Commons. Can she provide her thoughts on being able to see this ultimately passed to committee?

Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, in fact, I have been championing the work of the government and want to say to the government that we need to make sure Canada's immigration and citizenship laws are charter-compliant.

I have carried this file for more than a decade. The Conservatives first brought it forward in 2006, so it has been 16 years that our charter rights have been violated. I am asking the government and urging the government to fix this, working through a Senate bill and working with the government on a government-introduced bill. We are here again doing that.

It is incumbent on all members of Parliament to work collaboratively to honour the rights of all Canadians and to treat each other respectfully and equally. All Canadians are Canadians, period.

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I just heard the member for Vancouver East talk about championing the government's bill, and it made me think back to the last Parliament, in which the party of which she is a member continually, on issue after issue, championed the government's legislation. In fact, the NDP always supported it. It sounds as though, even today, its members have not learned much, and they are still continuing to blindly support the legislation being put forth by the government, even though their party does not really even exist in the House anymore.

My question for the member is, how is that working out for you? Why do you continue to support the Liberal government? How did that work out for you?

● (1605)

The Deputy Speaker: Just a reminder before I go to the member for Vancouver East that questions are asked through the chair; the member is not asking my opinion.

The member for Vancouver East.

Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, I think that is exactly the kind of politics and approach that Canadians rejected. That is why the Conservatives are sitting on that side of the House, and that is why their leader lost his own seat. There had to be a by-election for him to win his seat back.

However, I am not here for any of that. It does not matter that the NDP has only seven seats in the House. I am going to do what is right for Canadians. I will continue to champion the rights of all Canadians. A Canadian is a Canadian is a Canadian. We should all be treated equally and not in the way the Conservatives want, which is to strip away the rights of women. That is what they did in 2006, and it has been ruled by the courts to be unconstitutional. That is why I am here to champion this and to make sure that this gets fixed.

[*Translation*]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for reviewing this bill's trajectory to date. It was debated in the House at second reading, and, had it not been for the election and, to a certain extent, the systematic obstruction of the business of the House, it probably would have been passed already.

The Bloc Québécois would like to see a complete overhaul of the immigration system because it is not working well as is. To be clear, though, we do support this bill.

In my colleague's opinion, why are we still debating this bill at second reading when it has already been passed at this stage and people still want—

The Deputy Speaker: I will have to stop the member there to give the other member a chance to answer the question.

The hon. member for Vancouver East.

[*English*]

Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for his question; he is absolutely right. The NDP work collaboratively with the Bloc, and they are absolutely onside to respect the constitutional rights of all Canadians, particularly women.

We have debated this matter. In fact, this very issue went before committee for 30 hours. We debated the matter at committee at length. We already debated it in the House for not one round, but two rounds. This should be made law. There is no—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks by thanking the hon. member who preceded me. It is one thing for a member to say they have championed the bill, Bill C-3, and repairing the rights for lost Canadians, but as a leader of a different party, I want to say that the hon. member for Vancouver East is absolutely right. She has championed this and championed this and not stepped back for one minute. It has not been easy.

We have had various versions of the bill come to us. We had a court decision that made it very clear that our citizenship laws are not charter-compliant. As I have, she has worked with a citizen, Don Chapman, who has championed this, who has brought forward the concerns. He wrote a book on lost Canadians to get people to see what has happened with citizenship, which used to be seen as a right passed down from parent to child. This is not new. I learned this in conflict of laws in law school, as I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you may recall. These kinds of things are not innovative. It is just very strange and disturbing for Canadians when our citizenship laws get

Government Orders

contaminated with innovations, and citizenship is not treated as a right. That is one piece that is missing in Bill C-3. Should we have an amendment in Bill C-3 that says citizenship is a right?

However, there have been a lot of partisan jabs across the floor, even in the brief time that we have been debating this since question period. I want to take some of them up, because this is important for Canadians to know. There is another person, not in my party, whom I want to thank and make it really clear to our friends across the way in the Conservative Party. Another champion for the bill, mentioned by my hon. colleague for Vancouver East, is a Conservative, Senator Yonah Martin. She tried really hard to fix the bill. She has Korean ancestry. She has been a champion for the Canadian Korean community in many ways, including for those who suffered through the war. She is a friend of mine too, so I will admit that. Senator Yonah Martin brought this forward as a private member's bill out of the Senate to try to fix this, and as the hon. member for Vancouver East mentioned, there was a non-partisan effort among NDP members, Conservative members, Liberal members, the Bloc and the Greens to get this thing done. We were so close.

When Bill C-71 was tabled for first reading in June 2024, we gathered in the foyer with the former minister of immigration and members of families deeply affected by the unfairness of the way our citizenship laws are currently drafted. We were almost euphoric, and we were grateful to the former minister of immigration, who took this forward, who made the difference to having Bill C-71 brought forward. We were not, as an hon. member mentioned earlier, just propping up Liberals or cheering whenever Liberals did something. Again, this was the ultimate non-partisan effort led by a Conservative senator, supported by an NDP member and supported by all of us on all sides of the House. We thought we had it solved. Unfortunately, 25 bills then died on the Order Paper on January 6.

Now, it would have been nice to see the current government pick up on a suggestion I made in a written communication to the Prime Minister to please recover those bills, especially the ones that had broad, non-partisan support and had gotten this close to the finish line. Regarding the amount of waste, I imagine that millions of hours of work went into those 25 bills, many of them so close, such as Bill C-61 on first nations water sovereignty or Bill C-33 on rail safety and ports.

Government Orders

Let us celebrate this: The deceased Bill C-71 is back as Bill C-3. Let us hope we can have collaboration now. The Liberals here in the House today celebrate the collaboration they had in June; I have to say, that was not collaboration. That was the Greens, the Bloc and the NDP being bulldozed, with a new person driving the bulldozer in our new Prime Minister. I would say it was not just an unpleasant experience; it was an anti-democratic experience that was deeply troubling, and it was a bulldozer driver. It was a new coalition, the Liberals and the Conservatives, driving through a very anti-democratic piece, and the process was particularly anti-democratic. I hope we will not see that again.

I go back to Bill C-3.

● (1610)

If we are going to see this bill pass, and I hope we will see it passed expeditiously, I want to deal with some of the substantive charges that have been made in the House today in debate and put them to rest, I hope forever, so that we can return to our purpose in this place, to restore justice, to act for our constituents and to make sure we do the right thing.

[*Translation*]

This is not a partisan issue. It is about doing the right thing right now. We have a new bill before us, Bill C-3. It is almost the same as former Bill C-71, which died on the Order Paper because of the decision to prorogue Parliament on January 6.

[*English*]

We speak of things dying on the Order Paper; it is nice to see that every now and then we can have a resurrection. We have gotten Bill C-3 back, and it is close. I would love to have proper hearings and make sure that concerns that are being raised are dealt with by experts, with the ability for Canadians to see that we do not pass things with a gun to our head. That was Bill C-5. No committee was in place when Bill C-5 went to second reading on Monday, June 16. No committee was yet started. On Tuesday, June 17, the committee was put in place at 3:30 in the afternoon. All amendments were due the next day, June 18, by noon, and concerns from groups like the Canadian Cancer Society could not be heard before amendments were due. We were in a hurry.

This place should be about getting things done efficiently, but not being in such a hurry that we do not do our jobs, so let us have a proper committee review of this legislation, which I think would put to bed some concerns, for instance, the idea of costs. There are Canadians who, just through peculiarities of mistakes made in the legislative process, have been denied their citizenship. We can get through this and get the actual numbers through a committee hearing process, but most of these lost Canadians live in Canada. They are not coming here as new people, just off a boat, where we wonder who they are. Most of these people have deep ties to Canada. Most of these people are already paying taxes in Canada and getting their health care in Canada. They have just been denied citizenship through the most egregious set of quite obscure and bizarre mistakes in law.

We can fix those. We can fix them now. We can fix them for good. The remaining question, I suppose, is this: Do we want to add an amendment that says citizenship is a right? Normally, I

would not think we would have to say this, but when I look south of the border and hear that Donald Trump would like to take away Rosie O'Donnell's citizenship, I think maybe we ought to be concerned and make sure that we in Canada assert what is internationally understood law, that citizenship rights are rights.

People who are citizens cannot have their right to be a citizen taken away because someone in power has an obscure whim. Never mind. Citizenship should be a right. Under Bill C-3, we would be redressing the mistakes of many years and responding to the requirement of the court that we fix our citizenship laws to be charter-compliant.

With that, I know I still have about 90 seconds on the clock. I just want to make sure I plead with all of my colleagues, regardless of party, to take a step back and look at who the champions of this bill have been: a leading Conservative senator; a leading NDP member in this House; and all of us together, Green, Liberal, Conservative, Bloc and New Democrat, which is still a party in this House, by the way. Members can check the seating chart.

We are here to do the right thing and do it together.

● (1615)

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is great to see you back in the House, and I want to thank my hon. colleague for her comments and the fact that she really did make some reasonable comments around what it means to be a Canadian.

I am sure that the member has heard a lot of the dialogue that has been going on, and there has been rhetoric around this bill, Bill C-3, which is intended to restore Canadian citizenship to lost Canadians and not anything else, but other colleagues have been talking about crime, trying to demonize this bill and trying to demonize immigration.

Can the member comment on why we should not frame immigration citizenship in the way that it has been framed today in the House?

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my hon. colleague on her position in this place, representing the government as deputy House leader. It is wonderful to see a member who represents such an important part of Canada, young women, in Parliament.

I think it would be very, very wise for all members to reflect on our words. As members of Parliament, I urge them, all of them, regardless of party, to not listen to the boys in the backroom. They really need a lot of psychiatric help. Their main goal is power for its own sake, no matter what. This is a time for us as members of Parliament to do the right thing, and to look not for a gotcha moment but for a "do the right thing" moment.

Government Orders

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the member's speech, which conflated Bill S-245, which only deals with lost Canadians, with exactly what Bill C-3 is, which is much broader than dealing with lost Canadians, I have a hypothetical question for her.

According to my interpretation of this legislation, if a person who came to Canada from another country and got their citizenship then decided to return to the country they originally came from, which is a perfectly legitimate thing to do, and had a child, and that child came to Canada under some pretense, got convicted of a crime for which they had to serve at least 1,095 days in a federal penitentiary and then returned to whichever country they came from once that was served, they would then be eligible to have their children automatically become Canadian citizens.

Did I hear that right?

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will have a perfect opportunity to hear from experts who have looked at citizenship law. That hypothetical was a little too much like “three people get on the empty bus, five get off, and then three more get on, so my question is, how old is the bus driver?”

To answer the hon. member's question, I would like to have sensible, thoughtful discussions in committee. If the bill needs amendment, then we should make sure the government allows us to do so.

• (1620)

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as everyone is saying, we have spoken to this bill a number of times before.

Here we are again, spending another day studying this bill even though our position on it has not changed. We took a position last year, and if the House had not been prorogued and an election called, the bill would have been passed already.

Instead of doing what we are doing now and going over the same ground again, should we not completely overhaul the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act to come up with measures and provisions that are more closely aligned with the reality of Quebec and Canada in 2025?

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend, the member for Rivière-du-Nord.

He is right. We definitely have bigger issues to contend with when it comes to immigration. That being said, we still have to deal with Bill C-3. He is also right to say that if former prime minister Justin Trudeau had not decided to prorogue the House, this bill would already be law in Canada. It has been almost a year.

All the same, we need to do the work, but I agree with my friend.

[*English*]

Grant Jackson (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise again in the House of Commons, for the first time this fall session after a couple of interventions as a newly elected member in the spring. It is such an honour to be here to represent the great people of southwestern Manitoba and the Wheat City of Brandon.

Bill C-3 is an important topic. Our Manitoba Conservative caucus just completed a couple of days of caucus retreat to make sure we were hearing from different stakeholders, industry groups, etc., from the province, to make sure we are on top of issues coming back to Parliament today. We certainly heard a lot about immigration. It is top of mind for a lot of Manitobans right now. Manitoba has always been an interesting context within the framework of the overall immigration system across the country.

I recognize some comments from members opposite about immigration and that this is a citizenship bill, which is a separate conversation. However, if this bill ends up being passed in its current form, there would be a significant number of new Canadians as a result who would be eligible to be Canadian citizens and to receive all the rights and privileges that that entitles them to, which in effect still affects the number of Canadian citizens.

We are in a time when we are talking, in the broader immigration context, about the fact that all of our social services, particularly our health care system and, without question, our housing system, have not been able to compete and keep up with the number of people coming into Canada and becoming new citizens of this country. The members opposite seem to want to completely differentiate this conversation and say that it has no impact whatsoever, the context of who would be impacted by this bill. Certainly we on this side and the vast majority of common-sense Canadians understand that the two are related and that these two topics have to go hand in hand when we are talking about whether Canada is prepared to welcome these potential Canadian citizens, if they get their citizenship, back into the country and what the impact of that would be.

The member opposite also talked a lot about our colleague in the Senate, Senator Martin's Bill S-245. My colleague from Ponoka—Didsbury covered that quite well, in that that bill very specifically dealt with lost Canadians, which is certainly a challenging situation, and we supported it as Conservatives. I was not here, of course, being a newly elected member, but it is certainly something we supported. It is unfortunate that Senator Martin's bill was stalled and delayed by the Liberals and their allies in the previous Parliament. It should be law by now; it should be in effect. Unfortunately, Bill C-3 and its predecessor, Bill C-71, are dramatically expanded in the terms of their scope. We as Conservatives have some serious questions as well as some amendments to propose about exactly what we feel could improve this piece of legislation.

To be clear, we very much support the provisions that came from Bill S-245 by Senator Martin supporting section 8, lost Canadians. This is something that, as the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands mentioned, was a compounding of bad legislation that should have been addressed a long time ago.

Government Orders

We also support the equal treatment of adopted children. In a previous role, I worked for the Minister of Families in Manitoba. For those who do not have the context on that, Manitoba has one of the largest CFS systems in the country, a very tragic legacy of the treatment of children there. Too often, in both federal and provincial law, adopted children and adoptive families are forgotten about or left behind in the framework that we proceed under in supporting young families and children in this country. We certainly support that update to ensure that they are treated equally, as they should be, as true families.

However, there are lots of concerns. The member for Saanich—Gulf Islands used Rosie O'Donnell and the idea of her citizenship getting revoked by Donald Trump as an example, but Rosie O'Donnell was born in the United States, so that is not a good example in terms of the discussion we are having today. We are talking about people who were not born in Canada and their children who were not born in Canada.

● (1625)

On this discussion about the reasonable connection to the country of Canada, 1,095 days, or three years, and non-consecutive, on face value, to the majority of my constituents anyway, sounds like a long period of time. Let us look at that a little more at length. Someone who is the child of a foreign-born Canadian citizen and whose grandparents were born in Canada may have had summer breaks here as a baby, as a toddler, a couple of times in high school and a couple of times in their twenties, but then at 50, 60 or 70 decide they want to go through this process that the bill before us seeks to put in place to become a Canadian citizen. They may not have spent time in the country for decades, because there is no time frame imposed for when the 1,095 days have to be taken. Exactly when is that going to impact the systems that seniors who are Canadian citizens, quite rightly, come to rely on?

If we have thousands of people or tens of thousands, which is estimated, who are going through this process later in life, they may not have paid tax. Somebody across the way was saying that, “Oh, all these people who would be impacted by the bill are almost all paying taxes in Canada already.” Well, I am not sure why that would be the case if they are not citizens of this country now and they have never lived here. Members opposite cannot provide any evidence as to how many have paid into the OAS or GIS systems or into the health care system. In fact, their own department cannot tell us how many people the bill would make eligible for Canadian citizenship. In fact, IRCC officials were questioned on that the last time the bill, in its previous form, was up for debate, and the officials could not answer that question at committee. They have no idea how many people may now be eligible, if the bill passes, to claim Canadian citizenship after having never lived here or having spent only, at the minimum, 1,095 days here over the course of their entire lives.

I am not sure how the government can claim that it has been planning this out for years and has known about this for decades. Members opposite are very aggressive about how terrible this has been and that they needed to address it. It is coming 10 years into their mandate. They have no numbers to back up how many people this may impact, what the impact on our health care system may be

and what the impact on OAS and other income supports may be. Why have they not done any planning?

Canadians, particularly young Canadians, are frustrated with immigration and the fact that they cannot find an affordable home, or that when they are expecting a child they cannot get into an emergency room to get the health care they need. These are issues that are top of mind for the young Canadians and the rural Canadians who sent me here to represent them as their voice. They do not believe in a Liberal government that has failed to plan time and time again and that has brought hundreds of thousands of people into Canada without the proper planning, without that expectation, and without criminal record checks or language tests in place. My constituents, and I think many constituents of colleagues across the country, expect better planning by the Liberals.

The Conservative team is going to put forward recommendations to improve the bill, so that there are real standards for these folks to be able to prove a commitment. The member for Provencher said earlier that we believe that Canadian citizenship requires an investment in Canada. If a person has not lived here their entire life and has no intention of living here, we do not believe that is a stringent enough requirement in order to qualify for Canadian citizenship.

That is the Conservative Party's position, and we look forward to further debate with members opposite on this legislation as it moves forward.

● (1630)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will acknowledge right at the beginning that, at the end of the day, there is no doubt that members of the Conservative Party of Canada have amendments to make changes to the legislation. Hopefully, we will see it go to committee sooner as opposed to later. Conservatives seem to give the impression that they want to delay the passage to committee, which is unfortunate.

Having said that, my concern is with some of the wording that is being used, which is trying to give the impression, for example, that our health care issues and problems are because of immigrants and the numbers. The member, like me, is from the province of Manitoba, and whether it is the Premier of Manitoba, the Minister of Immigration or other ministers, they are saying that not only do they want to retain the people who are there today, but they want more, and they are also responsible for health care.

Can the member provide his thoughts in terms of what he believes the numbers are like in the province of Manitoba today?

Government Orders

Grant Jackson: Mr. Speaker, we are coming at this from two sides of the issue. The member seems to think we are blaming immigrants solely as being responsible for our delayed health care. That is certainly not the case, but I think he would agree that when we increase population by half a million people per year for several years, some of those hundreds of thousands of people per year are going to need health care, and all of those people are going to need housing.

The member says that increased immigration levels are having no impact on our health care delays, and it is only Canadian citizens who are having an impact on our health care lag times. Yes, health care wait times in Manitoba are out of control; they are totally unsustainable. The Health Sciences Centre—Manitoba's Hospital has been listed by the union as a grey zone for nurses to work in.

I think the member is being a bit disingenuous when he says increased immigration levels are having no impact on our health care system.

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the questions that was asked to the government in the prior Parliament was how many people this bill might affect. That was when it was in its previous form, as Bill C-71, and the Liberals did not have an answer. They had no clue, basically. They could not make an estimate, which then leads to obvious questions. The member spoke about health care, but it also raises questions about other expenses we might incur.

Speaking on behalf of the taxpayers of Canada, what does the member think about that? Should there be at least numbers of people, so that there can be estimates of costs and impacts on Canada from this issue?

Grant Jackson: Mr. Speaker, I think any reasonable person would believe the government should have at least an estimate of how many people are going to be impacted by a policy before it introduces it into law, passes it into law and proposes to implement it for Canadian citizens and the general public.

The fact is that it has not done that now, and, as many other members have mentioned, the Liberals have been on this and have been ready to introduce this legislation for 16, 19 years. They have tried to impose it two different times. They were on recess for half this year. Parliament is at the lowest record of sitting, I think, in Canadian history since the Depression.

Hopefully, they have done that homework. Maybe one of them will get up today and deliver that number for us.

• (1635)

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, welcome to the hon. member for Brandon—Souris.

There is one thing I probably should have mentioned in my speech, and it hit me as the member was speaking. In this conversation, we are leaving out what will happen if we do not pass Bill C-3 expeditiously. If it is not passed by November 20, the bar on first generation citizenship that was brought in in 2009, which has been found to be unconstitutional, will just be automatic; they will all get citizenship if we do not do this as the court has required.

We have had extensions from the court, but it is not going to give this Parliament another extension, so we will not even have, as parliamentarians, the ability to create the kind of guidance that is in Bill C-3.

Grant Jackson: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a fair comment, and that is why we are proposing amendments to make this bill better. I look forward to my colleagues' proposing those recommendations. I think some of them have made some recommendations as to how to improve this bill in their comments earlier today.

We hope the Liberal government decides to adopt them so that, indeed, we have a framework that is robust for these folks who want to apply for Canadian citizenship.

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here again after a summer in London engaging with constituents and listening to their concerns. I very much look forward to working with all colleagues in the House on matters of immigration, obviously, but, in general terms, we have a lot to do to serve our constituents and ensure that our country is on a very good footing going forward.

Today, obviously, with Bill C-3, we are debating an issue that, at its heart, speaks to our democracy, and that is citizenship. It was Hannah Arendt, the great philosopher, who said that citizenship is “the right to have rights”. That is because of the fact that from citizenship, all else follows in our democracy. There are no rights, there is no sense of belonging, without that fundamental value of citizenship and everything that means.

We know, for example, that all of us, or, I would assume, those of us who have been elected in a previous Parliament and those of us who are new in the chamber, newly elected, will go to citizenship ceremonies and see how special those ceremonies are. There is something quite valuable in that. I know that there is a debate and a discussion ongoing in Canada now about immigration levels, and I think the government is responding appropriately to that.

This is what I worry about, in fact, with the whole politicization of immigration that may be going on. I hope it is not going on, but I think it might be. When it comes to immigration, when that matter is politicized, we lose the understanding of the value of immigration and the sense of how special it is when citizenship comes through that process, but I digress.

We know that individuals, all of us, have natural inalienable rights: the right to dignity, the right to fundamental justice and the right to fair treatment. Citizenship strengthens that principle, because it codifies rights. In Canada, of course, we have the charter, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which stands at the heart of our democracy, making all else possible, including debates in the House of Commons. The document expresses, in the clearest terms, the rights of all of us and the rights that come, again, from citizenship. Without those rights, democracy cannot be said to exist.

Government Orders

The House is now considering Bill C-3. I give credit to anyone who has spoken on the matter but, in particular, the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands made a spirited speech talking about court rulings of the past. I believe the NDP has put this on record, and I believe the Bloc has put it on record as well, that the Ontario Superior Court of Justice ruling of December 2023 is something that cannot be ignored. The justices, in fact, have said that the problem that needs to be responded to by the government is the fact that citizenship is two-tiered at the present moment.

What does that mean? The court came to that decision because a Canadian who obtains citizenship either through birth or through the immigration process can freely transmit that citizenship to their children, but this is not true for a Canadian who is born abroad. Bill C-3 seeks to change this, so that Canadians born abroad can transfer that citizenship to their children if their children are also born abroad, provided that there is a substantial connection to Canada that is established. That connection is cumulative.

I heard the hon. member speak on the Conservative side, taking issue with that. One thing that he did not mention, interestingly, and I think this is key to this whole discussion, is that the 1,095 days that stands as the substantial connection test in the legislation, which is three years, is not drawn from thin air but represents and takes its cue from the requirement that permanent residents have when they seek to go through the immigration process and obtain citizenship. That is also a three-year requirement in terms of spending time in Canada.

The other point that cannot be lost on us is the fact that we live in a modern age in which mobility is crucial to so many jobs. Think of military officials or diplomats, or individuals who spend their time working abroad for non-governmental organizations. They need to be paid attention to here. We should put ourselves in their position.

● (1640)

If someone is in a position, in a role, where they were born abroad and do not have this ability to transfer citizenship, even though they have a Canadian tie, then there is an issue. The substantial connection test allows for that to be acknowledged and brought to bear in the force of law.

If my colleagues have concerns on the merits of the bill, then of course they can raise them at committee. However, I do not want to see a situation where this bill is obstructed needlessly. There is a court deadline, as we just heard. That court deadline is in November of this year. It is a deadline that must be adhered to. Otherwise, we would have a very significant gap in the law.

The reality is, if we are dealing with, as we are, a matter of citizenship and rectifying an issue that exists as identified by the court, then there is a special responsibility on all of us to work together so that the outcome ensures fundamental justice, ensures consistent citizenship and meets a particular standard. That 1,095-day period is exactly that; it is three years.

It is, as I say, not arbitrary by any means, but draws from existing Canadian law, and specifically immigration policy, relating to permanent residency, and that is why I think the bill needs to be supported. Certainly our side will be getting behind the bill. I hear the same from the Bloc. I hear the same from the NDP. I do not hear

that from the Conservatives, but I hope that, at committee, their concerns will be assuaged somehow. We will have experts there to speak to the matter on a range of points that Conservatives wish to raise.

We have something very substantive here and I urge colleagues to get behind it.

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, two points have been raised a number of times today, with the legislation as it is proposed, relating to language requirements and criminal history.

I would like to hear from the parliamentary secretary whether there is any indication, any acceptance or agreement from the government that these things should be considered. We consider them with all other types of immigrants to Canada. We do not want to bring criminals into our country. I think there is a widely established agreement among Canadians. It is the same with language. It is very important that people coming to Canada can speak either English or French. I would like to know the parliamentary secretary's thoughts on those two points.

● (1645)

Peter Fragiskatos: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the hon. member on the committee responsible for immigration.

The Conservatives continue to bring up matters of crime and tie them to this bill. Again, it opens the door to the argument, wide open in fact, that they are trying to politicize immigration. I know the hon. member is not trying to do that; he is a respected member of this House.

I will focus on the other aspects of his question, only to say that there is nothing in this bill that is inconsistent with existing citizenship requirements. The bill simply seeks to rectify an existing and very significant gap in the law. We need consistent citizenship, and this is exactly what Bill C-3 would achieve.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that this bill is a revival of a previous bill and a response to a ruling from the Ontario Superior Court dating from late 2023, which gave the government six months to comply.

My question is as follows: Has the six-month deadline passed?

Peter Fragiskatos: Mr. Speaker, the court provided its perspective on a very important matter for the House, and there is an issue.

[*English*]

For that reason, we cannot get bogged down in what has happened in the past. I am not here to speak about the past. We can spend a great deal of time on that, but the courts have recognized that there are issues. They have put it to this House to rectify and they have given extensions when that has not happened in the past. We have an opportunity to do what is right. I urge colleagues to get behind it. I know my colleague will.

Government Orders

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my colleague would provide his thoughts on how we could continue to have the debate and even look at possible amendments. The members opposite have talked about the possibility of amendments.

Could the member provide his thoughts on how we could further advance the legislation and deal with the issue of people who should be citizens not being citizens because of a sense of unfairness within the current law that the Superior Court made a ruling on?

Peter Fragiskatos: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague who is among the most dedicated parliamentarians I have ever worked with in almost 10 years of serving the people of London Centre.

I would say to the member what I have said throughout my time as an MP looking at legislation. The place to offer amendments and address concerns is not always in the House of Commons, where one can do that through debate and discussion, of course. Committees enjoy a special place in the life of this democracy. If Conservatives, as seems to be the case, are getting ready to obstruct a very important piece of legislation for political reasons, that is not just wrong on substance. There is a place for them to raise issues, not to obstruct there too.

The committee level is where members can put forward amendments, call witnesses and do any number of things. Let us get serious about what we are doing in this place; obstructing important legislation is not being serious.

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is the first speech that I have had an opportunity to prepare for since the last election, although I did speak spontaneously a little bit, prior to the House adjourning for the summer.

I would like to use this opportunity to thank the voters of Ponoka—Didsbury. This is the seventh time I have been sent to this place. This is the third different constituency and area that I have represented, even though I have a core common area that I have represented for the almost 20 years I have been here. I do want to thank those voters who put their trust in me for the first time, those who have put their trust in me for about 10 years and those who have kept their trust in me for almost 20 years. I will do what I can to continue to earn and keep their trust and will work hard on their behalf.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank some notable campaign volunteers and people who helped me in my campaign. Larry Schmidik is someone who I just met a little while ago. He housed all of our sign equipment at his shop and was very instrumental and helpful. Brenda Steenson is not even from the constituency. She is from Red Deer and was in the constituency prior to the last boundary review. She came out and spent a lot of time on the campaign trail. Of course, I want to thank Angie Stroud, my campaign manager; Alan Marsh, who came out and did all the social media; Ross Moore, who helped with signs, Al Siebring, who came into the office and did a lot of work; Onsy Tawadrous and his daughter Laura, who came out and helped me door knock in Sylvan Lake; Sean Stroud, David Klein and Doug Will, who helped with signs; Mike

Muzicka and his partner Lisa, who helped me tremendously in Olds and did the financial books for the campaign; Daniel Schweitzer, Kirby Wollstone, Richard Bone, Lawrence McKelvey, Devin Haltzer, Dalen Kemp, Chris Thiessen, Dustin Kubelka, Wade Collins, Shad Thevenaz, Abigail Schimke, Kevin Bender and Rocky Downton. Those are some of the key people who actually helped make the campaign a tremendous success and led us to a very convincing result in the new constituency of Ponoka—Didsbury, a constituency where I am just getting to know some of the people.

I was just at Old Stoberfest, a unique Bavarian twist to a classic Alberta rodeo. If colleagues ever get a chance to come on up from Calgary to have a look at Old Stoberfest, there is nothing like having cowboy schnitzel and beer to enjoy a rodeo.

However, I do want to talk about this bill that the Liberal government has put forward. I want to talk about the reflections that I have had in meeting with my constituents recently during the election.

Being a Canadian certainly is a birthright for some of us. For some of us, it is the only birthright that we have. For those who want to become Canadian citizens, of course, once they get that right, it comes with a tremendous number of privileges but also a lot of opportunities. Canadian citizenship is a promise. It is also a duty, faithfully kept, of a shared identity and values that holds together millions of people across one of the largest geopolitical land masses on planet Earth. Citizenship is not a handout just to be given away frivolously. It is a covenant where there are rights on one hand and responsibilities on the other. When we cheapen it, we erode the trust that binds our people together and lets strangers call each other neighbours. We are, and should remain, a compassionate and welcoming nation.

Conservatives agree wholeheartedly, but compassion does not mean we dilute and cheapen our standard of what it means to be a citizen of this country. We need to ensure citizenship that is strong, fair and meaningful. Immigration done right and rooted in the merit and respect for the rule of law should be the standard gateway to receive the privilege and the right of being a Canadian citizen. Bill C-3 fails this test and opens the door to abuse that removes strong criteria for ties to Canada. It seeks to devalue what it means to be Canadian.

In 2009, under Prime Minister Harper, Parliament set a principled boundary through the first-generation limit. The principle was reasonable and necessary: end the spread of so-called Canadians of convenience while ensuring fairness for families. The first-generation limit drew a bright line and preserved the idea of citizenship by descent. Conferring a path to citizenship to those born abroad required that they have a parent who was Canadian. This preserves the idea that citizenship and the privileges and rights that come with it are earned.

Bill C-3 removes that balance and replaces it with an extraordinarily weak, substantive connection test, which is 1,095 non-consecutive days in Canada at any point in a parent's life with no criminal background check, as a precondition for passing citizenship on to people who may never have set foot once in Canada.

Government Orders

● (1650)

In practice, this bill would allow minimal presence to allow for the claiming of citizenship by people who have never lived under our laws, never contributed to our communities and may never intend to actually do so. It is an abdication of these basic standards.

Conservatives support restoring citizenship to lost Canadians and equal treatment for adopted children. Those targeted fixes are fair and consistent with the dignity of Canadian citizenship, but Bill C-3 would go far beyond these. It would effectively create an unlimited chain migration route without merit, and in doing so would cheapen the value of our national identity and what many have earned by building their life contributing to our country. I am not hearing this just from people who were born in Canada. I am hearing this largely from people who moved here and followed the law and got their citizenship the traditional way.

Why does this matter? It matters because citizenship is the gateway to our most consequential rights: voting for those who govern, accessing social programs and carrying the protection of a Canadian passport. Those rights are paid for in taxes, in service and in the daily investment Canadians make by building their lives, their families and their businesses here in Canada.

Detaching those rights from the duties that I have just outlined would be profoundly unfair. First, it is unfair to immigrants who followed the rules. The people who move here meet strict residency requirements, pass language and knowledge tests, work, pay taxes and then proudly take their oath to citizenship. It would devalue that hard-earned commitment.

Second, it is unfair to Canadians who are already stretched. Health care, pensions and housing are not infinite. They are financed by the people who live and work here. Bill C-3 would be extending full citizenship rights to those who have never lived here, without a serious test of connection and without basic security checks. Canadians see that and they are rightly frustrated.

Under the Liberals, the immigration system has been expanded in ways that outpace Canada's capacity to integrate newcomers, eroding confidence in our system. A responsible approach should work for Canadians and those who wish to become Canadian. Instead, the Liberals are opting for a system that could further strain our public services by a surge of new citizens living abroad who have never contributed to our country. That is not acceptable. Being welcoming cannot mean trading away the inheritance of the value of citizenship that makes Canada a country worth joining.

Bill C-3 says people could get the full rights of citizenship without ever living here, allowing the full bundle of citizenship rights to flow to people without having lived under Canadian law, with no contribution to our common institutions and with no demonstrated intention to build one. Many newcomers come to this country with the intention to work hard, follow the rules, pay taxes and learn our values and norms. Rightly, they are then rewarded for that commitment with citizenship. When we say that people can have that same status without having lived here or contributed, it does not make things more fair. We erase fairness and devalue the effort of those who earned their place the right way. It is a bad policy that unjustly untethers rights from obligations.

There must be significant changes to Bill C-3. For starters, it needs to require a real consecutive presence in Canada, and it must require criminal background checks. We can and should restore citizenship to lost Canadians and ensure equal treatment for adopted children, without detonating the first-generation limit that has safeguarded our system since 2009. The Liberals have claimed that they are open to constructive changes, and we intend to take them at their word. If they truly want a bill that strengthens citizenship, they will back amendments that give real substance to the law, protect security and uphold fairness for those who have put down roots here. There is a path to consensus here if we choose it. Let us keep what is rightly targeted, lost Canadians and adopted children, and stop what is reckless.

For the immigrants who chose Canada and earned citizenship the right way, we are protecting the value of what they have achieved. To those who hope to become Canadians, we welcome their commitment, and we will keep the standards high because we believe they can meet them. To Canadians who worry that the system no longer works for them, it can and must.

The government said it was open to amendments, so it can prove it. It can support a real connection test, basic security screening and targeted fixes without blowing a hole in our national fabric and the foundation of our citizenship.

* * *

● (1655)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that Thursday, September 18, shall be an allotted day.

* * *

CITIZENSHIP ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-3, An Act to amend the Citizenship Act (2025), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member across the way might have said this is the first substantive speech he has given since the last election, but he has been around for many years. He knows the importance of a minority versus a majority government. We hear constantly that the Conservatives are not feeling comfortable with the legislation. The member knows that any opposition party can prevent legislation from ultimately going to committee by just continuously talking about it.

Government Orders

Would the member not agree, as many Conservatives across the way have said this, that there are aspects of the legislation that should be dealt with so that people who are not Canadian can be deemed Canadian? We have a superior court ruling on the issue. Would he not agree that many of the discussions and debate can continue at the committee?

• (1700)

Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, of course, but it should not take away from the fact that every member in this place has the right and responsibility to speak to important legislation on behalf of their constituents. Not every member has the ability to conduct that same type of cross-examination and debate at the committee stage. It is a subset of the House, so until the House has adequately dealt with this, Conservatives who feel like speaking to this should be given the opportunity.

I wonder if the member is implying that we can expect closure at any minute.

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was born abroad. My dad was in the Canadian military in the 1960s when I was born. There were other children born in the 1950s who were not automatically Canadian, and that caused some problems. There were some important and necessary changes. Conservatives believe in these changes, but we do not believe in a free-for-all.

Former Liberal prime minister Justin Trudeau declared, “There is no core identity, no mainstream in Canada”, which makes us the first postnational state. Why is the government actively undermining the value of Canadian citizenship by handing it out to people who do not have any connection to Canada?

Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, I think Canadians are rightly frustrated with the last 10 years of governance by former prime minister Justin Trudeau and now the new Prime Minister. It is the same political party. It is the same people sitting across the aisle from me, who I have seen for the last 10 years, with the same failed approach to dealing with things.

There is nothing the government will not give away to stay in power. It has devalued the value of our dollar. It has completely increased the cost of our national debt and what it means to Canadians. It has ruined virtually all trust in almost all of the institutions we have, including our citizenship process, our national defence and so on, and now, of course, it is going to devalue citizenship.

It is ironic that one of the first things the Liberals changed when they came into power was allowing people who do not live in Canada to vote. That might have something to do with it.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to welcome back an old friend, and now I just have to learn how to say Ponoka—Didsbury. It also seems to me that the hon. member has brushed with greatness, within his own caucus perhaps, with the change of the riding name, though I do not think the map changed, as he is right next to Battle River—Crowfoot.

I would like to return to the question of whether this extends new benefits that are not automatically understood by law. As much as the hon. member praised the Conservative Party changes in 2009,

does he not think it is a problem that the Court found those changes were not charter compliant?

Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, I think the real problem lies in the fact that the government, in successive times dealing with serious issues before the nation, has not taken the issues at the provincial court level to the Supreme Court, either for a reference or a ruling. The fact that the government did not bother referring or challenging this ruling and taking it to the Supreme Court so that justices from across Canada would have been able to weigh in on the constitutionality of this is certainly a fundamental problem.

I disagree, I guess, with some of my colleagues around this place. I think Canadian citizenship, and I am married to an immigrant, actually means something to this country. It is valuable, and we should not undermine the value of that citizenship. The Canadian passport means something. Our dollar used to mean something. Our economy used to mean something. Our criminal justice used to mean something. Is there anything left in this country that is going to mean something once these guys are done with it?

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to be back in this historic chamber to represent the residents of Vaughan—Woodbridge.

I rise today to speak to Bill C-3, an act to amend the Citizenship Act, a bill that reopens some of the most important questions for any country in any society: Who gets to be a citizen, and what does it mean to be a citizen? There are a few schools of thought. One school of thought we heard from Prime Minister Justin Trudeau. When asked about Canadian identity, we were told that Canada has “no core identity, no mainstream in Canada”, and in fact, that Canada is the first postnational state. We have seen the current Prime Minister echo this theme as a self-proclaimed “elitist” and “globalist”, and he believes this is “exactly what [Canadians] need.”

In contrast, Conservatives believe Canada has a strong and unique core identity. To be Canadian is to share a genuine connection to Canada, its institutions, its traditions, and most importantly, to share a commitment to freedom, democracy and the rule of law. It holds a belief that rights are balanced with responsibilities and recognizes that citizenship comes with the responsibility to contribute to the community, to respect the laws and to uphold the values that unite us as a nation.

We believe in a Canada where citizenship is earned and respected, where newcomers embrace our shared heritage and contribute to our society, and where every Canadian takes pride in belonging to a diverse country that stands for unity, opportunity, hard work and mutual respect. Canadian citizenship should reflect a genuine connection to our country.

Government Orders

Just like countless members of my community in Vaughan—Woodbridge, and no doubt many members of this chamber, my family understood the privilege of being Canadian when they immigrated to Canada. They understood that it came with commitment. It meant, and should always mean, that we have to wake up in the morning and contribute to the country that gave us a new life and a new home. Bill C-3 casts a shadow over this fundamental need for commitment, specifically with the provision of citizenship by descent.

What is Bill C-3, and why can we not support this bill in its current form? Bill C-3 is the latest attempt by the Liberal government to rewrite Canada's citizenship laws, but this bill is not new. It was originally introduced as Bill C-71 in the last Parliament after the government took over Conservative Senator Martin's bill, Bill S-245, which was a targeted Conservative bill designed to fix a narrow gap in the law that affected a small group of what are known as lost Canadians.

To clarify, lost Canadians are people who either had Canadian citizenship and lost it, or thought they were entitled to Canadian citizenship and never received it. Notably, many individuals born between 1977 and 1981 remain without citizenship, as the first-generation limit provisions were not retroactively applied. These individuals were often raised in Canada. They attended Canadian schools, work here and started families here. They are Canadian, yet despite their strong ties to the country, they are unable to access health care, obtain passports, vote or exercise the full rights of Canadian citizens.

Bill C-3 also has a provision for adopted children, which we support. Adopted children of Canadian citizens would receive the same treatment as biological children. Conservative MPs supported extending this equal treatment to adopted children born abroad to Canadian citizens during clause-by-clause consideration of Bill S-245 in committee. Instead of respecting the original intent of that bill, the Liberals, with the support of their NDP partners, expanded it dramatically. What started as a responsible, narrowly focused piece of legislation became a sweeping change of how citizenship is passed down across generations.

The government claims these changes are necessary to respond to a court decision from December 2023, where the Ontario Superior Court ruled against parts of the first-generation limit on citizenship for children born abroad, but instead of appealing that decision or addressing the court's concern with limited rational fixes, the government chose to use it as its reason to open the floodgates.

• (1705)

Under Bill C-3, anyone born outside of Canada to a Canadian citizen could automatically get citizenship as long as that person has spent just 1,095 non-consecutive days in Canada at any point in their life. There is no requirement for recent presence in the country, no requirement for the person to have a connection to the country today and no requirement for background checks. I will say that again: There are no criminal background checks. This is ridiculous. At a time when Canada has experienced a 55% increase in crime since the Liberals took office, we must, as parliamentarians, ensure we are doing our due diligence to maintain public safety. In fact, Canadians expect us to do so.

We have seen what has happened over the last 10 years when Liberal governments do not properly consider legislation before it is enacted. Weak soft-on-crime laws have caused a wave of crimes unleashed in places like my riding of Vaughan—Woodbridge. There are shootings, home invasions, murders and car thefts, all because of an ideological approach to justice and changing bail laws, making it easier for criminals to get out of jail and reoffend. We must be very careful to ensure that background checks and conviction screenings are not overlooked. It is crucial to include this provision and make the necessary changes to this bill.

The government has not even provided a ballpark estimate of how many people would be granted citizenship under this bill. The Parliamentary Budget Officer estimates that its predecessor bill, Bill C-71, would have created 115,000 new citizens outside Canada in just five years. With no upper limit, the number could multiply for generations. Who will pay for this? Canadians would, through our health care system, our pensions and our already stretched housing market.

I cannot help but be reminded of how the government has broken the immigration system. I heard from countless people in my community of Vaughan—Woodbridge that they cannot afford an immigration system that drives up unemployment. They are tired and frustrated, and citizens want parliamentarians to apply reason and logic when enacting legislation. They want us to ensure that no more unnecessary burdens are placed on our country.

Speaking of burdens, how about the administrative burdens of the bill? IRCC officials could not even guess how many proof-of-citizenship applications would flood an already overburdened system. As immigration lawyer Krisha Dhaliwal put it, “details have not been provided regarding what kinds of evidence will be required to demonstrate the 1,095 cumulative days of physical presence in Canada.”

Government Orders

Let me be clear. Conservatives support the restoration of lost Canadians. Conservatives support equal treatment for adopted children. However, this bill goes far beyond that. Why? Why can the Liberal government not just address the issues at hand? Why expand this legislation with an ideological stance on postnational citizenship and include something that would only weaken our country? Bill C-3 would erode the value of Canadian citizenship. It would create a new system that further undermines our national identity by not requiring adequate connection to our country and would add constraint to our already broken system.

Conservatives do not want to throw this bill out. They want to fix it. Here are some things we can do. We can require consecutive physical presence in Canada. We can also require criminal background checks to prevent dangerous individuals from gaining automatic citizenship. Conservatives support targeted fixes, not ideological overreach. We are prepared to work constructively to amend and improve this bill for the good of all Canadians.

Citizenship is not just paperwork; it is a commitment to a country, its values, its people and its future. We should be proud to offer citizenship to those who love and contribute to this country, but we also have a duty to protect the value of what Canadian citizenship means. Conservatives will not support Bill C-3 in its current form, but we are ready to work in good faith to improve it.

• (1710)

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my ancestors came to Canada in the 17th century, and my children were born abroad when I was outside the country serving my country. The United States is where my children were born. We have since returned from the United States and we live here. My children go to school here. They are going to university next year. They will graduate. They plan on spending their lives here.

In the eventuality that one of my children decides to follow in my footsteps and spends some time abroad, can the member please tell me if he believes that my grandchildren should not be Canadian because they would be a threat to the national security of Canada?

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, the member's children, who were born abroad but are now here, should in fact already be Canadian citizens, so I am not sure the question applies.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will pick up where my colleague left off.

This bill is a direct response to an Ontario Superior Court ruling in a case similar to the example she gave. It involves the child of a Canadian diplomat born abroad, in Switzerland. If the diplomat's child also has a child abroad, that child will lose their citizenship.

This bill has nothing to do with security and criminals. We do need laws for those very important issues, and we need to deal with them. This, however, is about bringing the law into line with a court ruling. What exactly is the problem in the parliamentary secretary's example? I do not understand. That is exactly what Bill C-3 is about.

• (1715)

[*English*]

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, as the bill addresses, there are cases where people are abroad serving the Crown, and there should be allowances made in those instances, but they should not be broad. We should not be opening the floodgates in all cases. We are specifically talking about people who are serving the Crown abroad, and that should be applied to them.

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I participated in the debate today, and I am reminded, after listening to a number of my colleagues speak, that in my circumstance, three of my four grandparents were born in the U.K. As a first-generation Canadian, I am not entitled to British citizenship. My grandfather was born in Italy and came to Canada, but he did not become a Canadian until after my mother was born, which would have entitled her to Italian citizenship. I am not.

Italy has changed their citizenship regulations over the last number of years. The trend seems to be going in the opposite direction. I am wondering if my colleague can comment on what he sees as a trend toward postnationalism here and the trend in the other direction in other jurisdictions.

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, as I said in my speech, when it comes to Canadian citizenship, it should really reflect what it means to be a Canadian, to be committed to a country, to live within a country, to contribute to a country and to share the values of a country. It would be unfortunate to see Canada go the way of post-national identity, where citizenship is no longer connected to our country and is, in fact, multiple times removed from people who contribute and actively participate here.

Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my speech today is not merely about Bill C-3, an act to amend the Citizenship Act. It is, like my last speech, about Canadian values, and more particularly the Canadian value that I fear this bill undermines, the value of Canadian citizenship.

I have previously described to this House that my mother came to Canada as a refugee from Yugoslavia. The freedom and opportunity that this country gave her, and by inheritance to me, are of immeasurable value. This value cannot be expressed in dollars and cents. It cannot be expressed in mere words. It can only be expressed in lifetimes.

We express our gratitude for the freedom and opportunity conferred by Canadian citizenship through a lifetime of service to Canada. Every time a Canadian builds a house, plants a tree or coaches hockey, soccer or cricket, they are serving this nation. Anytime a Canadian teacher leads a class or a Canadian nurse changes a dressing in the hospital, they are serving the nation.

Government Orders

When people do their job, pay their taxes, follow our laws, learn our languages, shovel their neighbour's sidewalk and vote in our elections, they are serving the nation. When police officers catch a bad guy, they serve our nation. When a social worker or minister consoles victims, they serve the nation. Most importantly, those who join the armed forces serve the nation, not just in their life but sometimes in their death, and their service is sacred. All of that service, born out of gratitude, builds Canada and builds the value of Canadian citizenship. Canada is strong and free inasmuch as Canadians work to make it strong and free.

Canadian citizenship is not a trinket, a bauble or a collector's item to be put on a shelf, kept in its package or sold on eBay at a profit. It is a sacred bond between those who built Canada before us and those who will inherit it after us. If we do well, if we all work our whole lives to make Canada better, perhaps we can pass it on as strong and as free as it was passed on to us, and perhaps our children will enjoy all of the peace and prosperity that we in this House did.

When generations of Canadians build Canada, they build the value of Canadian citizenship. When newcomers come to Canada and follow our laws, pay our taxes, learn our languages and serve the community, they also build the value of Canadian citizenship. That is why I cannot for the life of me understand why, in this bill, the Liberals seek to give away Canadian citizenship to the grandchildren of people who left to go build some other place.

When I went door knocking in Kitchener, Ontario, I met so many wonderful people from all over the world who were so grateful for refugee status or permanent residency. They are working so hard to learn our language, to get an education, to make ends meet in a difficult economy and to pass their citizenship examinations. Many of them have fulfilled all the necessary requirements to become citizens but are still waiting months, even years, to have their applications processed by a broken and backwards immigration bureaucracy.

Why? Why would the Liberals privilege the grandchildren of someone who left to go build another country over the real, flesh-and-blood permanent residents who are in this country now working their hands to the bone to build this country? Do they not see that by letting these individuals abroad jump the queue, they effectively create a hereditary, caste-based, two-tier citizenship regime?

Immediately prior to the election campaign, the Prime Minister declared himself, bizarrely, a globalist elitist. I note that he seems to collect citizenships. He has three. Most Canadians have one. They have put all their eggs in the Canada basket. I could have obtained Serbian citizenship in my twenties. Even now, I believe I can obtain Dutch citizenship by marriage. However, it has never occurred to me that any other nation deserves my service and loyalty, and therefore I have never applied. All of my skin is in this game.

Perhaps the Prime Minister looks at citizenship differently than most Canadians. Perhaps after his years at Brookfield, he seeks to diversify his citizenship portfolio in case his investment in Canada does not quite pay off for him. Perhaps after having received a really cool appointment from the U.K. government, he is holding out for another one if being Prime Minister of Canada does not quite satiate his elitist ambitions.

If the Liberals succeed in passing Bill C-3 in its present form, they will give away citizenship to the grandchildren of those who left, to the children of those who have barely visited and to individuals who do not work here, pay our taxes, follow our laws, serve in our communities and learn our languages. They will give away value. They will invest less and spend more. They will create a deficit of value. Just like their gigantic, undisclosed fiscal deficit, the Liberals inflate away the value of our citizenship after having inflated away the value of our dollar.

Bill C-3 would create a terrible deficit in the public accounts of our citizenship. Canadian citizenship is supposed to confer the opportunity to have a decent job at a good wage so as to buy a nice home in a safe neighbourhood. It is also supposed to confer universal access to proper health care.

● (1720)

How can the government write a blank cheque for all these things to individuals abroad who have never lived here, giving away citizenship when the citizens already here cannot cash their cheques and cannot access these promises? The government's citizenship account is overdrawn. Its cheques are bouncing.

The parliamentary budget office estimated that Bill C-3 would immediately add 115,000 new citizens to Canada who live outside the country. I strongly doubt our immigration bureaucracy can even process all of these. Have the Liberals done any analysis at all to show how adding 115,000 citizens by the stroke of a pen might exacerbate our jobs crisis, our housing crisis and our health care crisis?

The Liberals are giving away tickets for a free boat ride while that boat is taking on water from a hole they have cut in the bottom. Fundamentally, they fail to understand how value is created either in the economic sense or in the citizenship sense.

● (1725)

[*Translation*]

I would like to make my final comments in French, my third language and Canada's first official language, in order to emphasize my point.

Contrary to Justin Trudeau's claims, Canada is not a postnational state. Canada is and always will be a union between two peoples, the French and the English, defined by its relationships and treaties with first nations. Of course, this union and these relationships have never been perfect. However, this is still a major project, one that is unique in the world, and it continues.

Those of us who, like my family, joined this project along the way come from all over the world. We are like branches grafted on to an old tree. We cannot change this tree the way Mr. Trudeau changes his clothes when he plays dress-up. We grow new leaves to give this tree new energy, and it brings us water from its deep roots. We give it value, and it gives us value in return. To say that Canada is postnational is like saying that a branch can grow without a tree or that a branch can be “post-tree”. I am of the opinion that the tree does indeed exist, that it is alive, and that it serves as our home.

That is why we are against setting up a two-tier citizenship system. If the children of people who have left want to rejoin our nation, let them do it after paying our taxes, obeying our laws and learning our languages. Why is the government introducing a bill without these basic guarantees? Why does it refuse to defend the value of our citizenship?

[English]

In its present form, I fear this bill makes cheap what should be sacred. I beg the members in the House to pass amendments to make this a better bill.

We can do this.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: 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 Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, Finance; the hon. member for Thornhill, Housing; and the hon. member for Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, Justice.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to the member that even Conservative voters want more co-operation taking place on the floor of the House of Commons. At the end of the day, it is a minority government that requires a majority in order to get things through, whether from second reading into committee or ultimately passed into law. If the Conservatives are so confident in their arguments, why not, at the very least, allow the debate to continue at the committee stage and bring forward amendments? If they are sound amendments and the majority supports them, and the majority could just be opposition members, they are going to pass.

Why do Conservative Party members appear to once again want to filibuster legislation?

Matt Strauss: Mr. Speaker, it is the honour of my life to present my thoughts in representing the people of Kitchener South—Hespeler in this chamber. I have no interest in obstructing any legislation. It seems to me that the Liberals want the Conservatives to give them a pass on not having done their homework. They had all summer. I understand 200 people work in the Prime Minister's Office. They could have constructed a better piece of legislation.

I am here. I was elected to be here by the people of Kitchener. I am going to tell the House what they have sent me to tell it.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for using this bill to share his vision of what Canada is. I see that he recognizes the origins of this country in three nations coming together. However, the Bloc Québécois has been criticizing the concept of a postnational Canada for a long time, first of all because it undermines the Quebec nation's struggle to have our distinctiveness recognized and respected.

If this is my colleague's vision of Canada, does he not believe that the Quebec nation should be part of the Canadian Constitution, in black and white?

[English]

Matt Strauss: Mr. Speaker, I think members on this side, back in Stephen Harper's time, indeed recognized Quebec as a nation. I do as well. I think I did in my speech. I thank the member for the consideration in that question.

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for an amazing speech. The question I have for him has been talked about today. The government has not put forward any sort of number as far as how many people this bill might affect. The PBO did an estimate, but the government has not been able to make any of those estimates with respect to the number of people, which of course then relates to the costs that are going to be incurred by Canadian taxpayers potentially.

I would be curious to know what the member thinks about that and if he has any estimates or ideas about what this might cost Canadian taxpayers.

Matt Strauss: Mr. Speaker, I can merely go off the PBO report. That 115,000 people seems like quite a bolus to try to accommodate in one day with the stroke of a pen, when the government itself realizes that total immigration numbers have to go down for the sake of our housing system and our health care system. We do not even know what the deficit is in this country. We are starting to suspect that it is massive. Certainly, on the processing, before we even talk about our overwhelmed health care system, I see no way that we have the capacity to accommodate all of this without perhaps causing a sovereign debt crisis. Therefore, I think the Liberals really need to take a second look at what they are doing. It is terribly reckless and irresponsible. The job of the Conservatives on the committee is not to bail them out. It was the Liberals' job to put a better law forward in the first place.

• (1730)

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my wonderful constituents in Canada's number one riding, Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford. It was a great summer, and I appreciate all the feedback I received from them. I am motivated to serve on their behalf and to fight for the things that were discussed during the election, namely addressing the affordability crisis, the cost of living challenges that young families are facing, rising crime and a ballooning deficit that may be out of control. We do not know because we have not seen a budget tabled.

Government Orders

The government had all summer to work on all of those priorities. In fact, the Liberal platform, on page one and two, talked about being at war, “economic war”, with the United States, yet on our first day back, we are debating a bill and a major policy provision within that legislation that will fundamentally change what it means to be Canadian. This was not in the platform. It was not in the commitments made by the Prime Minister during the summer or really any time since he was appointed and subsequently elected to the top office in our country.

For people listening in Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, the reason we have this legislation before us today is that in 2023, Justice Akbarali of the Ontario Superior Court ruled that the 2009 provisions to the Citizenship Act were unconstitutional. The Trudeau government had the opportunity to appeal to subsequent courts. Maybe this legislation or this question before us today should have gone to the Supreme Court, but the government decided we were better to leave it in the hands of a provincial court and not have the superior court of our country, the Supreme Court of Canada, make a decision on what constitutes being a Canadian.

I will note that there are some provisions in this legislation that were originally in Bill S-245, namely the extension of citizenship to restore citizenship to lost Canadians who were affected between 1977 and 1981. There are also provisions for children adopted by Canadians to ensure that their citizenship held the same quality as Canadians born on Canadian soil. I will note that I support those two provisions. They are good provisions and I want to see them passed.

However, with respect to the substantive part of this legislation, namely the substantial connection clause outlined by the Ontario justice as a recommendation, I have very many concerns, mainly around the integrity of Canadian citizenship. What does it mean to be a Canadian in the 21st century? What are the duties of citizenship? What duties does the Government of Canada have toward its citizens? All of these questions should be debated today in the House of Commons and in subsequent days because this legislation will impact how we move forward and how we see citizenship.

I hope the minister, if this bill passes second reading, will answer those questions for all Canadians. How is it fair to the immigrants who spent years building a life here? What prevents another wave of Canadians of convenience who only show up for benefits? Why is the government lowering the bar by counting non-consecutive days under the substantial connection clause when other countries in the G7, for example, require far stricter rules for family ties?

I want the minister to outline how Bill C-3 will impact Canada's security. Under the current rules for IRCC, all immigrants, all those on work visas, all refugees go through some type of security check. By extending citizenship to the grandchildren of Canadians, I believe the minister should outline how Canada's public safety will be impacted.

● (1735)

The second thing I would like to discuss as it relates to extending citizenship to possibly hundreds of thousands of people around the world is how it would impact the responsibilities of Canadians to serve in the Canadian military during a war. What impact would this have on conscription?

Right now, for example, there are over 300,000 Canadians living in Hong Kong. There are probably over a million Canadians living in the United States. There are between 40,000 and 50,000 Canadians living in Lebanon. There are probably over 20,000 Canadians living in Pakistan.

If the government were to implement conscription, how would it apply to Canadians living abroad? Would they be required, like the children born here, to bear arms for Canada, or would they be exempt?

We have seen the second aspect of obligations related to this legislation bear out in previous natural disasters and conflicts around the world, namely in Lebanon. Indeed, former prime minister Harper brought in stricter generational limits to citizenship in response to the outcry from Canadians who wondered why the Government of Canada had to send the Royal Canadian Navy to rescue hundreds of thousands of Canadians who were living in Lebanon without any real ties to our country anymore but who still held Canadian citizenship.

The government did the right thing, something I support, and went and protected those people. By extending citizenship to possibly hundreds of thousands more people, the minister needs to come clean about what obligations the Government of Canada would have to those people and how it would respond to a humanitarian crisis where hundreds of thousands of Canadians might be living.

We do not have those answers, and the minister needs to come clean about how she would respond to those situations. We only need to look to Hong Kong and the conflicts we have seen there with the erosion of democracy. How would Canada respond to the citizens of Hong Kong in an emergency or in any other major conflict that could possibly erupt in Asia?

IRCC is very slow. IRCC does not do a very good job. In fact, it places an administrative burden on every single member in the House. I have to employ a full-time staff member to make up for the inability of a government department to do its job and properly process legitimate applications to reside in Canada on a daily basis.

When we take an oath as a member of Parliament, it is not to be a satellite office for Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada. No, our job is to approve and disapprove the spending of Parliament, to be representatives and to pass legislation. The work we do is symptomatic of the failure of Canada's bureaucracy to uphold and fulfill its duties to Canadians.

With the passage of this legislation, the minister needs to be clear on what administrative burden the government will be putting on the overworked public servants at IRCC and the inability of management to fix the long-standing issues we see in the country.

Government Orders

Finally, as I am running out of time, the last point I would like to raise is on voting. If we extend citizenship to hundreds of thousands of Canadians who are the descendants of people born in Canada, their grandchildren, how will that impact elections?

Let us think about Nepean. Mr. Chandra was ousted from the Liberal Party after he ran for Liberal leadership. The Prime Minister is now the member for Nepean. What would stop Mr. Chandra from organizing all of these new Canadians in India to vote against the Prime Minister in Nepean?

Citizens living abroad get to choose whatever riding they like to vote in under the Canada Elections Act. The minister needs to come clean about how citizenship and elections would be impacted by this legislation.

• (1740)

Anthony Housefather (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Emergency Management and Community Resilience, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the Canada Elections Act requires somebody to swear that they are voting in the last riding that they lived in in Canada, and they have to disclose that address. Would that not be correct, and would that not prevent some of what the hon. member is suggesting might happen?

Brad Vis: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point I am raising. It would bring into legitimacy the ability of Canadians to uphold the integrity of the existing laws. The Elections Canada Act also provides the right for every Canadian to vote. I do not believe there would be the necessary provisions under the Canada Elections Act to prevent this from happening, and that is why I raise that point.

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member raised many important points, particularly around the changing work in our constituency offices. I know that many offices face issues similar to what he has raised where a vast majority of our work is doing immigration caseload. I was wondering if he could get into a little more detail on some of what he is seeing in his riding.

Brad Vis: Mr. Speaker, I will say one thing, which is that I have dealt with lost Canadians and the struggles they faced. I am glad that the bill includes the provisions from Bill S-245, which is very important. I want to see those people made whole, and I want to see that passed.

However, in general, there is a lot of pressure on my staff to deal with people in very precarious situations. It is the temporary foreign worker who has not had a proper work visa for the last couple of months who is now working under the table and is at risk of being trafficked. There is a lot of abuse in the temporary foreign worker program, and they come to MPs looking for help. They cannot get that help from government agencies. There is close to zero enforcement of our immigration policies in the Fraser Valley where we see a high proportion of Canada's immigrants first land.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member made an empathetic comment about lost Canadians. The issue of the lost Canadians is dealt with in this bill, yet it would appear that the Conservatives want to filibuster this legislation. Why not recognize the good that is within the legisla-

tion and allow the legislation to be discussed and debated at committee stage so that we can actually pass the legislation?

I think the Conservatives are starting to already fall into their old ways of filibustering and not letting legislation pass when Canadians want us all to co-operate more.

Brad Vis: Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had to speak on Bill C-3. It is maybe the second day of debate we have had on the bill in the 21 days of Parliament in 2025.

I would encourage the parliamentary secretary to listen to the words of the Prime Minister this morning when he spoke about all of the great women elected to the Liberal Party of Canada. Unfortunately, they do not get the opportunity to speak, because the member speaks multiple times during the day and other members of the Liberal caucus are not afforded the same opportunity to represent their constituents.

Laila Goodridge: Mr. Speaker, does my colleague have concerns about how Bill C-3 would create a bit of a two-tiered system when it comes to immigration, particularly with what is being proposed by the Liberals in that there would be no criminal record checks required for the in-perpetuity chain immigration?

• (1745)

Brad Vis: Mr. Speaker, to be very brief, I am concerned about two-tiered citizenship being created as a result of the bill. I hope that, if it moves forward to committee stage, the minister can come clean and outline, and listen to the positive feedback Conservatives have been providing in the House today to strengthen the provisions in response to the Ontario courts.

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to extend my deepest thanks to the people of Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay. Over the summer, I had the honour of connecting with so many of my constituents. I want to thank them in person, over the phone, through social media and by email.

I represent one of the most beautiful places in Canada. From Castlegar to Princeton, Grand Forks to Oliver, Midway to Penticton and all the communities in between, I heard our stories, our concerns and, most of all, I heard the pride we have for our country. I carry that with me every time I rise in the House. Today is no exception.

Today, I rise to speak to Bill C-3, an act to amend the Citizenship Act. This is not a routine adjustment to our laws. This bill proposes to change the very definition of Canadian citizenship, and that should concern every one of us. At a time when our national identity, our core values and even our sovereignty are being tested, we must be vigilant.

Government Orders

This legislation touches the heart of what it means to be Canadian and, unfortunately, it misses the mark. Bill C-3, in this form, cheapens the value of Canadian citizenship, which so many people have worked so hard for. As someone who has had the privilege of becoming a Canadian citizen more than 25 years ago, I do not speak of citizenship lightly. I speak from a place of gratitude and a deep personal commitment to the country.

Canadian citizenship is not just a part of who I am; it is an honour that my family and I carry every day. It is a bond of loyalty that I will never take for granted, as it is for everyone in the House. It is the most valuable passport in the world.

That is why I oppose Bill C-3 in its current form. At the core of the bill is what the government calls a substantial connection requirement for passing on citizenship to children who are born abroad. That sounds sensible until we read the fine print. This requirement is just 1,095 non-consecutive days spent in Canada at any point in a parent's life, even in childhood. Let me be honest. That is not substantial. It is symbolic at best, a loophole at worst. It is not a serious test of one's connection to Canada. It is a back door to citizenship through convenience.

I have an acquaintance who lives in another country and currently has four passports. I believe this would allow her to have her fifth. Is that really what we want when we are looking for a Canadian citizen? She has never lived here before. Under this bill, someone could be born here, leave at age three, live the rest of their life abroad and still pass on citizenship to their grandchild, despite never having any ties to Canada after all those years. Is that really the standard we want, in terms of what it means to be Canadian?

Canadian citizenship should not be considered a fallback plan. It is not a souvenir from a visit and not a privilege to be passed down indefinitely, without connection, contribution or commitment. It should be earned and lived and shared. It is a legal status, of course, but also so much more. It is an identity rooted in belonging, responsibility and, most importantly, participation in Canadian life, yet the bill would risk stripping citizenship of that meaning, reducing it to a piece of paper available to those with the thinnest links to our country.

There is a possibility, although we do not know for sure, that this could add 150,000 more immigrants to our shores. It could cost \$25 million or not, maybe more. Enough study has not been done. Could this buckle our health care system, our pension system and our immigration system, which is already struggling, as every member in the House will attest to through their office work?

● (1750)

Conservatives have always stood for citizenship that is fair, principled and deeply meaningful. We support restoring citizenship to those who were unjustly stripped of it in the past, the lost Canadians. We backed legislation led by Senator Yonah Martin to do exactly that. We also continue to support equal treatment for adoptive children born abroad. That is a long-standing Conservative principle and one that we have consistently defended as a party, but let me be absolutely clear: We will not support a government attempting to rewrite the rules of citizenship behind closed doors, without public debate and without a mandate from voters.

This change in citizenship was nowhere in the Liberals' 2025 election platform, so Canadians were never consulted until now, as MPs, we are debating this issue, and now this government wants to quietly reshape the future of Canadian citizenship without asking whether we as a nation are prepared for the consequences of how this would affect our health care system and our housing crisis. The committee work is going to need to be intense.

The government chose to accept the opinion of a single Ontario judge without appeal, without review and without even asking the Supreme Court for clarity. The ruling did not demand the changes we see in this bill. In fact, the judge clearly stated that Parliament retains authority to establish a genuine test of substantial connection, but instead the Liberals chose a definition so weak it could be met by a few childhood summer vacations.

I contrast us with our allies, such as the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States, all of which enforce much stricter requirements, including criminal record checks, for the transmission of citizenship. A criminal record check before receiving citizenship is necessary for the safety of the people who are living here in this country now. This bill does not even include this most basic safeguard.

Legal experts in immigration law are sounding the alarm. For example, Sergio Karas, who is a leading voice in the field, warned, "This requirement [for a substantial connection to Canada] could create a significant administrative burden [to Canada]", and, "The subjective and...manipulable nature of proving a...connection could lead to inconsistencies and legal challenges".

Canadian citizenship is the cornerstone of our national identity, and if we dilute it, we weaken the very fabric of our society. Our communities are hurting in so many ways as we speak. Conservatives are ready to do the hard work. We are prepared to collaborate in committee. We support the necessary parts of this legislation, the fair redress of those previously wronged and the recognition of adopted children as equals in citizenship laws, but we will not support a bill that weakens the very meaning of Canadian citizenship.

If the government refuses to accept amendments that protect the integrity of our laws and the value of our citizenship, then we have no choice but to oppose this legislation. Canadians deserve better. They expect their lawmakers to defend the value of being Canadian. Canadian citizenship must remain something to strive for, to earn and to cherish, not something to inherit without connection or without commitment. We will fight for that. We will defend that, because we believe in Canada.

I believe in Canada and the value of being Canadian.

Government Orders

● (1755)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will give the member a hypothetical, but real, type of situation in which Nancy, who is in the Canadian Forces, goes abroad to Europe, has a child and then returns to Canada. Then, her child, for employment opportunities, goes back to Europe. The child that she might have would then be Nancy's grandchild. Should Nancy's grandchild be entitled to have Canadian citizenship?

Helena Konanz: Mr. Speaker, I think that actually solidifies what I am talking about, in that what the member just said is so complicated. Does she deserve citizenship? She could, but I am going to have to write that down on paper and make sure. Does her grandchild's grandchild deserve citizenship? I would like to ask the member that, because this is so complicated and has not been debated properly in committee. We need to look at this clearly, and we need to make sure it is fair.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the hypothetical case that was just raised illustrates exactly what Bill C-3 aims to regulate. A court has ruled on a similar case. A couple working in the public service had a child in Switzerland. They said that if their child were then to have a child abroad while working in an embassy or elsewhere, that child would not have Canadian citizenship. Bill C-3 seeks to address that.

Citizenship must not be cheapened or devalued. Yes, we do need a complete overhaul of all operations and deficiencies at the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. All of that is important. However, I really feel like we are living on two different planets. My reading of the bill is that it applies to those cases, children and so-called lost citizens. It is about making sure they get Canadian citizenship, and that is all.

[*English*]

Helena Konanz: Mr. Speaker, we need to help the lost Canadians, and we need to make sure that the wrongs done in the past are corrected, but does somebody's grandchild's grandchild's grandchild deserve to be a citizen if they have never lived in Canada and have never had anything to do with Canada?

We are going to have to make sure that for those immigrants who became citizens in the past, who worked so hard to do that and have become an important part of our communities and of our country, this does not devalue how hard they have worked for Canadian citizenship.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the question from the member for Winnipeg North, because he acknowledged that, even in a hypothetical scenario, the economic situation is so dire that a Canadian needs to go overseas to find employment.

I have a question for my colleague, who I think exemplifies what it means to become a Canadian when one is born elsewhere, to love this country and to adopt this country as one's own. How does she feel, as someone who does not have Canada as her birth nation, about what it means to immigrants who build a life here and become Canadians, to have that citizenship devalued by legislation like this?

Helena Konanz: Mr. Speaker, the value of Canadian citizenship is beyond what we are speaking about here. If we look at how many people have given their blood and toil to gain this citizenship, we know that it cannot be passed to somebody who has not had any tie to this country at all, or whose family for generations has not had ties.

Again, I look forward to our parties working together in committee to make sure that we really hone down on the rules for citizenship and make sure that it is fair to all citizens of Canada.

● (1800)

Mel Arnold (Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise in the House as the member entrusted to represent the good people of Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies in beautiful British Columbia.

It is important for all members to bear in mind that we, as members of the House, have a duty because our fellow Canadians, the constituents we represent, trusted us to be their voice in this place. Canadians look to us, to Parliament, to deliver good work and solutions. There is no shortage of crises facing Canadians today. We must be seized with our collective duty to deliver timely and efficient legislation to move our nation away from the crises we face. Let us never forget why we are here in this place; we are here to represent the good people who elected us.

It is good to be back in the chamber after a summer of meetings and conversations with the good people of Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies. There were many conversations about the issues that are important to the people at home, and I look forward to voicing their concerns here. Constituents shared their concerns with me, concerns about the increasing cost of living, housing shortages, rising joblessness and crime on our streets. These conversations and discussions are valuable to me as an elected representative, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle share my sentiment, because we as legislators have a duty to address these issues and make good laws for all Canadians.

Today we are debating government Bill C-3, which seeks to amend the Citizenship Act. It goes without saying that Canadian citizenship is valuable. For citizens, Canadian citizenship bestows the fundamental rights of our Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Bill of Rights that preceded it.

Government Orders

The Government of Canada carries significant responsibilities for its citizens. Whether or not the government of the day is fulfilling its responsibilities is an essential and big question. However, we are here now to examine Bill C-3, not the ongoing failures of the government. That said, the value of citizenship may be directly devalued by governments that fail to deliver sound policy and actions that uphold the fundamental rights of citizens and deliver core functions of the federal government. These are not small responsibilities; to the contrary, they are profound, which is why any legislation dealing with Canadian citizenship must strike the precise balance.

The bill before us today, Bill C-3, seeks to amend the Citizenship Act, with proposals dealing with citizenship by descent, citizenship for adopted children and citizenship for persons known as lost Canadians.

For Canadians watching at home, I must clarify that Bill C-3 is recycled legislation. It is a reiteration of Bill C-71, which was introduced by the Trudeau government in the last Parliament but failed to pass because it did not achieve the support required to become law. Despite the failure of the last bill, here we are, examining the same bill. Rather than listening to the concerns raised by members of the House, elected by Canadian citizens, the government has wilfully chosen to bring the same flawed bill back again.

The government has not changed; only the deck chairs have changed. It seems that either the government was not listening when the proposals were debated in the 44th Parliament, or it now does not care that members raised concerns and objections to those proposals. It is certainly a curious scene when a government speaks a great deal about collaboration and consensus building and then hits replay on a piece of legislation without including amendments or responding to the concerns and objections already raised by elected members.

I hope my colleagues across the way are truthful when they speak of collaboration and working together. I look forward to working with them and supporting amendments the Conservatives will likely provide so the legislation can hit the precise balance I mentioned earlier. Canadians deserve no less from their Parliament. I hope members across the way will join us in fulfilling our duties to Canadians.

● (1805)

Bill C-3, in its current form, seeks to establish Canadian citizenship by descent; Conservatives do not support this part of the bill. The legislation seeks to automatically extend Canadian citizenship to unlimited generations born abroad with only minimal connection to Canada.

Prior to 2009, Canadian citizens could pass on their citizenship for two generations born outside Canada; after 2009, it was changed to one generation and the first-generation rule was introduced to limit the extension of Canadian citizenship. Under the 2009 rule, a Canadian citizen born outside Canada could pass their citizenship to their child born outside Canada for one generation, but descendants of the next generation born outside Canada were not automatically extended citizenship. That was called the first-generation rule. Bill C-3 that we are debating today would effectively abolish that rule and replace it with a rule allowing citizen-

ship to be extended to generation after generation born abroad, endlessly, over and over.

The Ontario Superior Court of Justice has sent the first-generation rule back to Parliament to be reworked. The court also concluded that it was reasonable to apply a substantial connection test for extension of citizenship, and this is an important question for Parliament to answer as we examine and potentially amend the bill. The only test that the bill proposes for the endless extension of Canadian citizenship to persons born abroad is that they spend 1,095 days, which is three years, in Canada. These are nonconsecutive days, I might add. I believe all members agree there is a problem that requires a solution, but the current proposals in the bill must be amended. I am sure my Conservative colleagues will have amendments prepared for committee examination of the bill if it gets to committee. Conservatives will be ready to work collaboratively to balance the bill at committee, and I hope all other sides will likewise co-operate to improve the legislation and provide an appropriate solution for the problem that must be resolved.

The second provision of the bill deals with citizenship for children adopted from abroad by Canadian citizens. The bill proposes to extend citizenship to children adopted from abroad by Canadian citizens once the adoption is finalized. This proposal makes sense, and it strikes the right balance when considering who should be eligible for Canadian citizenship.

The third proposal of the bill relates to restoring citizenship for persons born in the late 1970s or early 1980s who were unintentionally prevented from applying for citizenship after the age of 28. Conservatives recognize the need for this situation to be remedied. That is why my Conservative colleague, Senator Yonah Martin, brought this very proposal forward in Bill S-245 in the previous Parliament. This measure should have passed two years ago, and I certainly hope colleagues across the way will walk the talk of collaboration to finally get this important measure finalized.

● (1810)

In closing, we must work to improve the bill, which must be balanced because citizenship by descent for endless generations is simply not sustainable, nor is it appropriate. Great damage has been inflicted on the Canadian immigration system over the past decade; this has shaken the trust that Canadians used to place in Canada's immigration and citizenship system. This damage was caused by policies that were unbalanced and reckless. Let us work together to start restoring an immigration system that works and conserves the value of being a Canadian citizen. Canadians deserve no less.

Government Orders

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously we have heard long speeches today on this bill, and as I mentioned earlier, this is not the first time that we have had to deal with this bill. Also, the opposition made a promise to lost Canadians who came here to Parliament, to our committee. The Speaker was a member of that committee and promised to make sure we would not leave any Canadians behind.

What does the member opposite have to say to those Canadians you spoke to, Mr. Speaker, and promised you would not leave behind?

Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives are not talking about leaving any Canadian citizens behind. We are concerned about who is going to become a Canadian citizen. We are not talking about leaving any Canadian citizens behind.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, could my colleague come up with an amendment to make that proposal acceptable and in line with the court's decision?

Under the current legislation, if diplomats have a child abroad and that child also has a child abroad while working as a diplomat, the grandchild will lose their Canadian citizenship. The court is telling us to fix this. The government is proposing something. In my opinion, this is a routine issue that needs to be corrected.

What legislative wording could be proposed to resolve this without causing the problems my colleague raised?

[*English*]

Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, I will leave it to my colleagues on the citizenship and immigration committee to make those specific amendments. What we see is a bill that has no limits. This goes on for generation after generation after generation with no significant tie to Canada.

I think of my grandparents. My grandfather Jesse Pullin fought in the First World War for England. He immigrated to Canada in 1925, became a Canadian citizen and went back and served for Canada in the Second World War. He fought for Canada. He fought for his citizenship and the right to live in a democratic society. We cannot diminish the value of citizenship that people like my grandfather instilled upon this country.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is great to be back. I am thankful for the opportunity to ask a question to my hon. colleague from Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies.

I recall the troubling case of Ahmed Fouad Mostafa Eldidi, who was granted citizenship despite alleged ties to ISIS. There was no vetting whatsoever. What confidence does the member have, in this bill or the system itself, that such a major blunder would not occur again?

Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the past 10 years of governance by the Liberal government have broken the trust Canadians placed in the Canadian immigration system. There are hundreds of non-citizens somewhere in this country who were convicted or are guilty of criminal offences, but the government has lost track of where they are. It has no idea. That is the type of mistrust and mismanagement that the former and now relatively unchanged

Liberal government has brought to Canada. We need to find balance, as I said in my speech.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as members know, Bill C-3 responds to a court ruling. I will provide a bit of background. In 2009, the Harper government amended the Citizenship Act to prohibit passing on citizenship beyond the second generation. On December 19, 2023, the Superior Court of Ontario struck down certain provisions of the Citizenship Act, ruling that they violated the section on mobility rights, which states: “Every citizen of Canada has the right to enter, remain in and leave Canada”. The provisions also violated a section of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms with regard to equality before and under the law and the equal protection and benefit of the law.

The parties challenging the Citizenship Act represented seven families that had been discriminated against by the legislation. The court recognized that the ban introduced in the act was unfair, particularly for women who had to choose between the birthplace of their child and the ability to pass on citizenship. Take the case of the Brooke-Bjorkquist family's child. That child was born in Geneva in 2010 to Mr. Brooke and Ms. Bjorkquist, who were working for the government abroad. Despite the fact that the child was born to two Canadian parents and returned to Canada at age one, the child could not, under the current provisions of the act, follow in their parents' footsteps by working abroad and having a child abroad, because they would not be able to pass on citizenship to their child. That is the problem that was raised in court. This is an absurd situation because the birth of that child in Switzerland is a circumstance due to their parents' work abroad in service of Canada, and practically their entire life has been and should continue to be spent in Canada.

Bill C-3 is an identical copy of Bill C-71 from the 44th Parliament, which did not pass. It is also similar to Bill S-245. In 2023, the court gave the government six months to pass legislation to fix the problems. Despite the deadline having passed, here we go again.

I would like to briefly review certain aspects of the history of Canadian citizenship. It is a relatively recent development in the country's history. When Confederation came about in 1867, Canadians were British subjects. It was not until the first Immigration Act was passed in 1910 that citizenship was first mentioned. It defined Canadians as persons born in Canada, British subjects living in Canada, or immigrants naturalized as Canadians. The objective was to facilitate their passage across borders.

Government Orders

In 1921, the Canadian Nationals Act was passed, defining Canadian nationality for immigration purposes for the first time, but without establishing Canadian nationality status. Other laws were also passed, such as the naturalization acts of 1906 and 1914 that sought to govern naturalization, as their names suggest. It was not until Mackenzie King, who became the first Canadian citizen, introduced the Canadian Citizenship Act, 1947, that Canadian citizenship was finally defined for the first time and granted to women as a matter of right.

However, the 1947 act was not perfect. At the time, citizenship was not considered a guaranteed right, but a discretionary power of Parliament. Many situations, particularly those involving naturalization and citizenship by descent, were covered incompletely or not at all. For example, under this regime, when the responsible parent took the citizenship of another country, their children lost their Canadian citizenship. Other obscure provisions, such as the requirement for Canadian children born abroad to reside in Canada during their 24th year, resulted in many individuals living in Canada not officially having citizenship.

The act was next modernized in 1977, and this iteration attempted to simplify the previous citizenship regime. However, the regime remains unfair for several groups, particularly children born abroad. For example, under the 1977 Citizenship Act, individuals who obtained citizenship by descent had to reiterate their desire to retain their citizenship before the age of 28 or risk having it revoked. Because of this little-known requirement, many individuals living in Canada lost their citizenship without even knowing it.

● (1815)

The government failed to communicate this requirement to its citizens, and it was only when the affected individuals had to prove they were citizens, to apply for a passport, for example, that they discovered that they no longer had Canadian citizenship. Some people had been living in Canada for generations. Their parents, grandparents, great-grandparents and so on had been living in Canada, yet they found themselves stateless. These people continue to experience problems, and Bill C-3 aims to fix some of these issues.

These individuals who lost their citizenship as a result of certain obscure, unfair or discriminatory rules are known as lost Canadians. It is a diverse group, consisting of military spouses, children, soldiers, second-generation children born abroad, children of immigrants, border babies, orphans, indigenous Canadians and Chinese Canadians, to name but a few.

The House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration establishes four categories of lost Canadians. The first is war brides, meaning women who married Canadian soldiers fighting for Canada in World War II and who immigrated to Canada during or after the war to join their Canadian husbands. The second is people who were born abroad to a Canadian parent before the current Citizenship Act came into force in February 1977. The third is people who lost their citizenship between January 1947 and February 1977 because they or a parent acquired the citizenship and nationality of another country. Lastly, there are second- and subsequent-generation Canadians born abroad since the current Citizenship Act came into force in February 1977.

Their plight was brought to the public's attention thanks to Don Chapman, a former United Airlines pilot who found out that he had been stripped of his citizenship when his father emigrated to the United States. By deftly showing that this problem was affecting many Canadians unbeknownst to them, he forced Parliament's hand. Even General Roméo Dallaire was affected by the problem. To address it, Canada adopted a series of legislative reforms in 2005, 2009 and 2015.

Errors and inconsistencies persisted, however, and Bill C-3 seeks to correct them. Obviously, the Bloc Québécois supports the principle of the bill before us. There will be some very important discussions in committee and amendments will be proposed to improve the bill and allay the fears and uncertainty that have been raised in the speeches in the House. For the Bloc Québécois, these are technical adjustments being made in the interest of justice that seek to harmonize the application of laws and to correct injustices committed in the past. To us, it is a matter of principle.

This bill, which I believe is technical in nature and responds to a court ruling, should, in our opinion, have been passed within six months of the ruling. When it comes to citizenship, and the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in particular, there are still a number of ongoing problems and irregularities that need to be addressed. I cannot describe in parliamentary language how this department functions. It should be thoroughly reviewed and improved.

In each of our constituency offices, we receive numerous calls, emails and requests almost every day from people asking us to speed up the process, deal with lost documents and provide assistance. In most cases, these are heart-wrenching stories. These are people who are living in uncertainty and facing challenges. Our immigration and citizenship legislation needs to be completely overhauled to simplify and clarify the process. The department needs to speed up the process, because in most cases, it is inhumane.

● (1820)

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the member's time and effort in putting on the record a number of situations that have had a fairly profound impact. That is why it is so important that we see some form of the legislation actually pass. If we were to focus, let us say, on this and Bill C-2, a couple of bills, and every member were to speak to the legislation, we would not even be able to bring in the budget until the end of November or beginning of December, or that type of thing. At the end of the day, we need to see this legislation sent to committee.

I wonder if the member opposite could provide his thoughts in terms of the important role that a standing committee of the House can play in terms of improving legislation and advancing it, keeping in mind the superior court's decision.

• (1825)

Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is important for you to rule on the rules, because the member opposite suggested that somehow debating this bill is preventing the Liberals from bringing in a budget. Would you, Mr. Speaker, be able to clarify that the amount of time we spend debating this bill has absolutely nothing to do with the timeline available to the government, and, in fact, they could have brought—

The Deputy Speaker: There is no rule being broken. This is a matter of debate.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we, as legislators, are the only elected officials in the entire system, which goes from judges and the Senate to ministers and the Prime Minister. We legislators are elected. In that sense, we are all the government's boss.

If the government introduces a bill that elicits concern or opposition from elected members, those members are duty-bound to raise those concerns in the House and launch the debate by telling the government that they are not on board and that they have doubts, concerns or issues. That is the basis of the parliamentary system we practise here.

I have no problem with debate. It is the government's job to make sure it talks to all MPs and all parties to see if there is a way to speed things up. If there is not a way, and if a lot of MPs want to talk about a bill, that may mean the government did not communicate the information properly.

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Joliette—Manawan, who will soon be celebrating his tenth year as a parliamentarian here, in the House of Commons. I want to congratulate him. I notice that there are a few of us here in the House who will soon be celebrating our tenth year.

I was extremely impressed by the quality of my colleague's fact-based speech, especially the history leading up to the current situation. I congratulate him on his expansive knowledge of Canada's history.

However, I want to remind him that, at the end of his speech, he mentioned a reality which I am sure is a common occurrence for all parliamentarians, every week, on all sides, whether they are members of the government, the official opposition, the second opposition party, independent members associated with the NDP or other independent members. Every week, as parliamentarians, we are confronted with dozens of mishandled, problematic immigration cases.

Could the member tell us how things are going in his riding? In his opinion, how much of the blame lies with the people who have been governing us for the past 10 years?

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to congratulate my colleague and friend who will also soon be celebrating 10 years in the House. We were elected at the same time on October 19, 2015, although he served as a member of the Quebec National Assembly before that, and I did not.

Adjournment Proceedings

I also want to thank him for his kind words about the history I gave on this bill. I try to learn as much as I can about the history of Quebec and Canada. However, the Bloc Québécois relies on a tremendous team of researchers who help us put what we already know into words.

The problems in my riding are growing. I would say that about half of the constituency casework that I do to help the people of Joliette is related to the Department of Immigration, and it is not as though I am serving in a downtown Montreal or downtown Toronto riding. This act should have been reformed 10 years ago to simplify the process. It is a matter of dignity.

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Joliette—Manawan for his excellent speech.

Earlier, a Conservative colleague said that if this bill were passed, people with no connection to Canada could end up becoming citizens. However, I believe that this is addressed in the wording of Bill C-3, which states that a substantial connection is required.

What I find a little more troubling is that she wondered whether people who apply for citizenship would deserve it. I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on this. Really, is a child born in—

The Deputy Speaker: I must interrupt in order to give the hon. member for Joliette—Manawan the opportunity to respond in less than 10 seconds.

The hon. member for Joliette—Manawan.

• (1830)

Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, as I read Bill C-3, its purpose is to resolve this issue. It is not a question of being deserving or not. If the parents and grandparents were temporarily abroad at birth, it should—

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings of the House.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

FINANCE

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last June I asked the minority Liberal government if it would respect the vote of Parliament and table a budget. The Minister of Transport and Internal Trade declined to answer. Instead, she praised her new Prime Minister's latest costly political gimmick.

Adjournment Proceedings

Nine months ago, that same minister resigned her position as Trudeau's finance minister. This saved her the embarrassment of tabling another broken fiscal budget. She was spared from having to admit she had broken through her fiscal guardrails by tabling a \$40-billion deficit. What should be even more humiliating is that it was only 18 months ago that she tabled the 2024 budget, which claimed the deficit for this fiscal year would be \$38 billion. Independent estimates suggest this year's deficit will be anywhere from \$80 billion to \$100 billion. That is more than double what the former finance minister promised in 2024.

The Liberals are not just crashing through their fiscal guardrails; they are nuking them from outer space. This level of fiscal recklessness is dangerous at the best of times, but we are not living in those times right now. Around the world, bright flashing warning lights are going off about governments' debt and deficits. Riots in France followed the collapse of the French government after it failed to pass a budget to reduce the deficit. The Prime Minister of Japan resigned amid growing concerns over the bond market.

One would think that a former central banker would understand that the days of governments having easy access to debt are coming to an end, yet the current minority Liberal government seems hell-bent on testing the limits of investors' patience. What is worse is that the Liberal Party is doubling down on failed economic policies. As Americans turn away from the principles of economic freedom, the Liberals seem to be adopting more and more Canadian-style protectionism. It should worry Canadians when the government brags about ignoring trade deals with Europe and Asia that require free trade in procurement. When Democrat Senator Bernie Sanders is celebrating a Republican president's move to seize a 10% stake in a private company, freedom-loving Canadians should take note.

We now have a Prime Minister who cannot stop talking about using public money to catalyze private wealth. We saw from the Prime Minister in his fake housing announcement on Friday how this works. The Prime Minister announced millions of tax dollars that would flow into a modular housing company he had invested in. The Liberals claim that these affordable modular homes will be built on federal land. Here is a quote from a news story about the Liberal housing announcement: "Canada plans to ease a housing shortage by leasing public land to developers for construction of affordable houses under a plan unveiled by Prime Minister Justin Trudeau".

I am sorry: That quote is from last year's identical Liberal housing announcement. The only new thing in the Prime Minister's announcement was a new bureaucracy the Liberals announced to duplicate the work of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Last year, when Trudeau made the same announcement, we saw the result. Nothing was built, because the Liberal regulations required homes to be multi-unit, net-zero, gender-neutral and decolonized. It is unsurprising that few developers leapt at the chance to build tiny woke homes that nobody wants to live in. Soon the Liberals will learn that Canadians do not want to raise their families in modular boxes stacked atop one another, but by then it will be too late. Liberal insiders will have pocketed the housing cash and the government will move on to announcing its next recycled housing plan to not build homes.

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is great to be back in the House. I really missed it over the summer.

I would like to point out to the members opposite that just last spring, the member who posed the question ran on an election platform whose plan of action for the first 100 days in office did not include tabling a budget. How surprising it is that we have an opposition criticizing us for the things that it does not follow. Thankfully, Canadians do not have to witness that 100-day action plan coming to fruition. That is because Canadians made it very clear they wanted a government that would take bold action to drive economic growth, create good-paying jobs and have all Canadians benefiting from Canada's unique and vast wealth and prosperity.

That is exactly what we are doing on this side of the House. We are doing it with strength, with purpose, with agility and with positivity. Canadians know that this new government has a mandate for change, which includes cutting taxes for the middle class and bringing down costs to put money back in their pockets. The government has already delivered on a plan to build one Canadian, interconnected, resilient economy that everyone can afford.

I remember the major projects list that just came out, which is creating over 10,000 jobs. In the fall, we passed legislation to introduce a middle-class tax cut for Canadians. Some 22 million Canadians from across Canada will save up to \$840 a year. That is for dual income families.

For first-time homebuyers, the government's GST relief on new homes valued up to \$1 million will save them up to \$50,000. We are also lowering GST for first-time homebuyers on homes valued between \$1 million and \$1.5 million. That is real, tangible support for Canadians on affordability in the areas where they really need it. The recent launch of build Canada homes will accelerate the construction of new builds and deeply affordable housing to further bring down housing costs by increasing availability. For everyday Canadians at the pump, we cancelled the consumer carbon price to refocus carbon pricing on large emitters.

These are just a few examples of how our government is delivering for Canadians.

Adjournment Proceedings

As Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue, I had the privilege over the course of this summer to do countless pre-budget consultations and hear from Canadians right across this country, from Iqaluit to Halifax to Vancouver Island. As part of that process, I heard from workers, industry leaders, experts, stakeholders, civil society organizations, and municipal, provincial and territorial leaders. They provided invaluable input into the budget process.

Ahead of the 2025 budget, we will continue to focus on ways to grow the economy sustainably and make life more affordable for Canadians. This includes the need to make substantial investments in priorities such as nation-building infrastructure, defence and housing, and to catalyze private investment to advance our national goals.

As we have stated, the budget will be released this fall, and it will lay out a plan for building a new industrial strategy that will transform our economy and help us access foreign markets. In a rapidly shifting global landscape, this is how the government can bring down costs and create greater certainty, security and prosperity for all Canadians.

• (1835)

Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary's response was to repeat the same Liberal talking points.

For Liberals, it is all about spending announcements, but as I said earlier, a budget is more than just about a list of Liberal spending. A budget is supposed to explain how much Canadians are going to be spending, how much the Liberals are going to be spending, what taxes the Liberals are going to hike, how much they are planning to borrow and how much they will spend on interest payments.

By hiding from Canadians for six months, the Liberals only increased economic uncertainty, and in the meantime, they failed to get a trade deal, they failed to approve a single infrastructure development and they failed to give our troops the raise they promised. Canadians just cannot afford this record of failure.

• (1840)

Ryan Turnbull: Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 will be the next step in our plan to catalyze investment and build a new Canadian economy, one that creates higher-paying careers, raises incomes and can withstand future shocks, which are ever increasing with climate change and the many global instabilities we see.

We are laser-focused on building the strongest economy in the G7. This fall, we will deliver a comprehensive, well-planned budget that advances those objectives, and we will deliver it with a new approach focused on reining in wasteful operational spending, focusing instead on capital investments in the big things that will drive this country and move us all forward.

HOUSING

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are back in the House after what seems to be a long summer vacation for the Liberal government. We still have a youth unemployment crisis, which got worse. We have chaos in our immigration system, which got worse. We have crime and lawlessness in our streets, which got worse.

The Prime Minister promised Canadians a new direction, a change in leadership, whatever it was. Instead, they got the same ideas from the same old ministers and the same predictable platitudes, which are, frankly, coming up short on results.

Before the Liberals took the summer off, I asked a question about Canadian housing. I am going to talk about the market for a second, as we saw what was going on over the summer: Buyers cannot buy and sellers cannot sell. That should be indicative of a massive policy failure.

If someone wants to own a home in Vancouver right now, it is going to cost them an average of 13.5 times their income. In Toronto, it is 10 times their income. At the same time, housing construction is down. It is down by 50% in the GTA, and it is down 13% right across the country. This is a government that promised us the most ambitious housing plan since World War II, but it is going to miss its targets this year by 50%.

It is easy to see how all of this is happening. The lofty rhetoric we hear is not really lining up with what the government is actually doing.

The person put in charge of housing in this country raised home building taxes by 141% while he was in Vancouver as mayor, and he let home prices skyrocket by 149%. That was my question. The minister is rewarding the municipalities following in the footsteps of generous handouts for cities that refuse to get new housing built. We have seen a continuation of that over the summer, and he is preserving the high-tax red tape bureaucracy in Ottawa that stops progress and keeps prices high.

In fact, what the government is doing since I have asked this question is building a \$13-billion corporation led by a former NIM-BY deputy mayor from Toronto who was responsible for keeping the private sector out of the tendering process in that city. At the very same time, the immigration minister is opening the doors to this country, pulling out a rubber stamp and adding about 20% more to the cost of a home.

Let us break down what this all means and why I asked my question, which was not answered. Forget owning a home. A person needs to make \$46 an hour just to rent an apartment in Vancouver, and \$42 an hour in Toronto. We know most jobs are not like that and do not pay that. This means half of young Canadians will now spend over 50% of their income on housing. It means 27% of homeless Canadians are now over the age of 50. What all of that means is that nobody is immune to the 10 years of housing hell that the Liberal government has created.

Adjournment Proceedings

I really hope the parliamentary secretary was in training camp this summer because it is going to take a lot of flexibility and verbal gymnastics to explain why this failure was so big and why it is getting bigger.

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is facing a housing crisis that demands bold action. That is why the Government of Canada has introduced the most ambitious housing plan in our country's history. This is a team Canada moment, when we must all come together and focus on what matters most for Canadians: housing, affordability and a resilient economy. We are working closely with all levels of government, indigenous partners and the private sector to get the job done for Canadians.

People across the country are struggling to pay their mortgage and their rent and to keep up with the high cost of living. That is why our new government has moved forward with a middle-class tax reduction, like my colleague mentioned, that will provide tax relief for nearly 22 million Canadians, saving families up to \$840 a year. It is why we are helping young families buy their first home, by eliminating the GST for first-time homebuyers.

We need to build at scale quickly and bring down the cost for home builders. That is why we are working with municipalities to cut development charges in half for all multi-unit housing projects.

Yesterday the Prime Minister launched “build Canada homes”, which will be responsible for building and financing affordable housing at scale. With an initial capital investment of \$13 billion, it will catalyze a more productive homebuilding industry and support more affordable housing options for low- and middle-income households. We have also clarified the definition of affordable housing, making it based on income rather than on median rent in the area.

We are going to do that with Canadian innovation, Canadian material and Canadian workers, and we are going to continue building on the success of programs like the \$4.4-billion housing accelerator fund. Through this program, we have signed more than 240 agreements with municipalities to cut red tape and increase housing density. That is what partnership is about. These actions are expected to support the construction of more than 750,000 new homes over the next decade.

Finally, our government is taking action to grow and protect the supply of rental housing. We have removed the GST on new purpose-built rental buildings and have committed more than \$24 billion in loans to build almost 65,000 units through the apartment construction loan program.

The federal government is using every tool at our disposal to lead transformative change in Canada's housing system and to make sure that every Canadian can find a home that meets their needs and their budget. We are taking action. We are there for Canadians. We hope the opposition can support us.

• (1845)

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary admitted one thing that I agree with, which is that Canada is facing a housing crisis, which her colleagues and the Minister she is here for actually juiced with 141% more taxes. They talk and talk, and there

is no action, which is exactly what happened before. I am not sure what it is about a technocratic central banker that always has them building a new bureaucracy, trying to convince people that more steps or more offices or more appointments are going to somehow speed things up and do them more cheaply.

If the member is really serious about fixing what her government already broke, and I will give her the opportunity now since the Minister will not answer the question, would she agree to take GST off all homes up to \$1.3 million, get rid of the capital gains tax and actually incentivize municipalities? She can answer that question right now.

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, Canadians are facing a housing crisis that touches every corner of this country. That is why our government has launched a comprehensive housing plan, which is the most ambitious in our history, the most ambitious since the Second World War.

We are working in partnership with provinces, territories, municipalities, indigenous communities and the private sector. We spent all summer talking to industry; actually, we have been talking to industry since last year, to better understand how we can do this more quickly. We spent all summer engaging with stakeholders to make sure that what we are putting forward in “build Canada homes” is flexible and can address the crisis that we are facing.

We are reducing barriers to construction and investing in new housing programs. We are supporting first-time homebuyers, like I said earlier, with the GST rebate. We are launching “build Canada homes” to accelerate the pace of homebuilding and build affordable housing at scale. We are here for Canadians.

JUSTICE

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly three months, actually a little over three months, since I asked the Minister of Justice a very important question for the people in my constituency and across the country, which was, in essence, when is the Liberal government going to stop putting the rights of offenders ahead of the rights of victims in this country?

Over the summer, we have seen a proliferation, an expansion, a continuation of crime and lawlessness in large cities and small communities all across this country. On August 29, the justice minister said, “This isn't the Wild West.” I would like to read some headlines that followed that comment.

This is from August 29: “Repeat offender charged after alleged attack on transit police officer in Vancouver”. This is from August 30: “Police say over 80 shots fired, three injured in downtown Hamilton shooting”. This is from August 31: “Police say man, 46, 'targeted' in Vaughan homicide; 3 suspects wanted”. This is from September 1: “2 men shot in Scarborough, Toronto police appeal for info”.

This is from September 2: “Shooting at Abbotsford, B.C., home leaves residents 'shaken' but uninjured”. This is from September 3: “12-year-old charged with attempted murder in Markham shooting”. Believe it or not, that 12-year-old was out on bail. This is from September 4: “Woman 'kidnapped', family member shot during yet another Ontario home invasion”. This is from September 5: two people killed and two injured in a double homicide in Vancouver.

To be respectful of the House's time, I will just skip ahead to a headline from a few hours ago: “Boy, 12, and man charged after unhoused man killed in unprovoked attack, Toronto police say”. That was a different 12-year-old.

Every single day since the Minister of Justice mocked Canadians concerned about crime, there has been yet another example, and there are many more that I did not have time to share today. Many of these cases are offenders out on bail, out on release or under conditions after previous criminality that has already been known.

This has long since passed the point where we even need to provide evidence of how the bail system and the justice system in this country have been broken. The one thing we can say for certain is that this has all happened under the Liberal government's watch over the last 10 years. There has been a series of legislative changes that have made bail easier to get and have resulted in more criminals out on the streets.

This is a government that likes to say it listens to the experts. I would like to highlight some of the thoughts that have been shared by police chiefs in my riding of Elgin—St. Thomas—London South. One comes from the police chief in London, Ontario. Chief Thai Truong says, “This kind of violence, and the total disregard for public safety, is a symptom of a larger issue”, and he said that issue is “the criminal justice system.”

Chief Kyle Johnstone of Aylmer said, “We are seeing a troubling pattern where individuals with a demonstrated history of criminal behaviour are being released back into the community, only to reoffend within days”. Chief Marc Roskamp of St. Thomas said, “The current bail approach continues to allow high-risk individuals to reoffend once released.”

My question for the Minister of Justice is very simple. When will the Liberal government accept the failure of Bill C-75 and introduce real bail reform that puts the rights of victims first?

• (1850)

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak today on the government's efforts to address crime and public safety.

Adjournment Proceedings

The impacts of crime on victims, their families, their friends and their entire community are far-reaching and long-lasting. Canadians deserve communities that are safe. The government is committed to ensuring that the criminal justice system works effectively to keep Canadians safe and to hold offenders accountable. While this Parliament is still relatively young, the Government of Canada is focused, and it is already taking action to address pressing issues facing our communities.

During the election, we promised to strengthen the Criminal Code and move aggressively to protect victims by making bail laws stricter for violent and organized crime, including home invasions, car thefts and human trafficking. The Prime Minister and Minister of Justice have both signalled the government's intention to move quickly on this legislation. Today, we heard the justice minister talk about how that legislation will be forthcoming in short order.

I share my colleague's concern, obviously, about the devastating impact that illegal drugs have had on Canadian communities, and my community is no exception. The Government of Canada has already introduced legislation through Bill C-2, the strong borders act, to ensure that law enforcement has tools to keep our borders secure, combat transnational organized crime, stop the flow of illegal fentanyl and crack down on money laundering. It will bolster our response to increasingly sophisticated criminal networks and enhance the integrity and fairness of our immigration system while protecting Canadians' privacy and charter rights.

I would encourage all of my colleagues in this place to work together to ensure that we can achieve these goals as quickly as possible. Bill C-2 builds on past investments made by the Government of Canada, notably through December 2024's border plan. The plan focuses on five key pillars: first, detecting and disrupting the illegal fentanyl trade; second, introducing significant new tools for law enforcement; third, enhancing operational coordination; fourth, increasing information sharing; and, fifth, minimizing unnecessary border volumes.

With an investment of \$1.3 billion over six years to bolster security at the border and reinforce the immigration system, the plan also targets law reform to strengthen capabilities for immediate deployment of people and equipment. The government also appointed a fentanyl czar to provide national leadership, coordinate federal efforts and strengthen the response to the escalating harms caused by fentanyl and other toxic opioids.

Adjournment Proceedings

The Government of Canada is serious about addressing illegal drugs and organized crime. While we could speak for much longer about the importance of this issue and the efforts the government is making, I will conclude by highlighting that laws on their own will not result in safer communities. We require action by those responsible for the criminal justice system to effectively implement those laws and to ensure that there are resources in place so that the system is working as intended.

That is why I am happy that the government is making significant real investments in addressing these issues through recruiting 1,000 more RCMP officers and 1,000 additional CBSA personnel, including border services officers, intelligence analysts and specialized chemists.

There is much more to talk about, but members should have no doubt that our government is focused on cracking down on crime and is addressing some of the bail reform issues we have heard about that lead to repeat offenders.

● (1855)

Andrew Lawton: Mr. Speaker, there may have been a misunderstanding here. I do not have a question about my taxes. I do not have a question about the lack of a budget from the Liberal government. I do not know why a question about bail reform was met with a response by the parliamentary secretary for finance and national revenue. Evidently, addressing bail reform is not a priority for the justice minister or even his parliamentary secretary.

I will be very clear on something: When the parliamentary secretary says that laws are not responsible for this, he is ignoring what police, provinces and municipalities across this country have said, which is that the Liberal government's bill, Bill C-75, has directly

caused there to be more of a revolving door, putting serious, sometimes violent offenders back out on the street.

Will the Liberal government commit to repealing the principle of restraint that is putting criminals out on the street, sometimes hours after they are arrested?

Ryan Turnbull: Mr. Speaker, to be clear, the Government of Canada is committed to ensuring that Canadians live in safe communities, free from the poison of toxic drugs. We are also committed to addressing bail reform issues that will help ensure that individuals are not out on bail.

The Government of Canada has already introduced laws to strengthen our borders and address illegal drug activity, and it has committed to introducing new legislation very soon to meet the specific commitments that we have made to Canadians, as well as the broader goal of maintaining a just and safe society for all. While crime continues to represent a serious challenge in our society, the government is meeting it head-on and working in lockstep with provinces and territories in this regard.

I would encourage all of us in this place to work together so that we can ensure that these efforts are successful, and that includes all opposition members. I look forward to that member's playing a constructive part in the process.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6:58 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, September 15, 2025

New Member		Rempel Garner	1519
The Speaker	1495	Deschênes-Thériault	1520
Chief Electoral Officer of Canada		Mahal	1520
The Speaker	1495	Lamoureux	1521
		Doherty	1521

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Citizenship Act	
Bill C-3. Second reading	1495
Lemire	1495
Lamoureux	1496
Rempel Garner	1497
Genuis	1497
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	1497
Kayabaga	1499
Doherty	1499
Beaulieu	1499
Chenette	1500
Deschênes-Thériault	1500
Rempel Garner	1501
Gaudreau	1501
May	1502
Steinley	1502
Lamoureux	1503
Doherty	1504
Gaudreau	1504
Block	1504
Lamoureux	1506
Lemire	1506
Doherty	1506
Davies (Niagara South)	1506
Lamoureux	1508
Lemire	1508
Kronis	1508
Falk (Provencher)	1509
Kayabaga	1510
Beaulieu	1511
Rempel Garner	1511
Bezan	1511
Lamoureux	1513
Lemire	1513
Genuis	1513
Baber	1514
Fergus	1515
Lemire	1515
Caputo	1515
Lamoureux	1517
Lemire	1517
Rempel Garner	1517
Jivani	1518
Schiefke	1519
Beaulieu	1519

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Wildfires in Courtenay—Alberni	
Johns	1522
International Day of Democracy	
St-Pierre	1522
Liberal Party of Canada	
Block	1522
Mexican Independence Day	
Dzerowicz	1522
International Trade	
Barlow	1522
René Homier-Roy	
Chenette	1523
David Berthold	
Berthold	1523
Mississauga—Erin Mills	
Khalid	1523
Public Safety	
Gill (Brampton West)	1523
Guy Rocher	
Blanchet	1524
Economic Development	
Stubbs	1524
International Day of Peace	
Lambropoulos	1524
Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada	
Barrett	1524
Adam's Ride to Recovery	
Jaczek	1525
Freedom of Speech	
Thomas	1525
Ken Dryden	
Fortier	1525
René Homier-Roy	
Ménard	1525

ORAL QUESTIONS

Government Priorities

Poilievre	1525
Carney	1526
Poilievre	1526
Carney	1526

Government Accountability

Poilievre	1526
Carney	1526
Poilievre	1526
Carney	1526

Finance

Poilievre	1526
Carney	1526

Government Accountability

Poilievre	1527
Carney	1527

Canada-U.S. Relations

Blanchet	1527
Carney	1527
Blanchet	1527
Carney	1527
Blanchet	1527
Carney	1527

The Economy

Barlow	1527
Robertson	1528
Barlow	1528
Robertson	1528
Lantsman	1528
Robertson	1528
Lantsman	1528
Champagne	1528
Berthold	1528
Guilbeault	1528
Berthold	1528
Champagne	1529
Hardy	1529
Champagne	1529

The Environment

Bonin	1529
Dabrusin	1529
Bonin	1529
Dabrusin	1529

Housing

Aitchison	1529
Robertson	1530
Aitchison	1530
Robertson	1530

Public Safety

Shipley	1530
Anandasangaree	1530

Housing

Jansen	1530
Robertson	1530
Groleau	1530
Guilbeault	1531
Fanjoy	1531
Robertson	1531

Public Safety

Caputo	1531
Fraser	1531
Caputo	1531
Anandasangaree	1531
Khanna	1531
Sahota	1532
Redekopp	1532
Fraser	1532
Roberts	1532
Sahota	1532

Labour

Rempel Garner	1532
Hajdu	1532

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Ho	1532
Diab	1533
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	1533
Diab	1533
Rempel Garner	1533
Hajdu	1533

Regional Economic Development

Joseph	1533
Champagne	1533

The Economy

Kirkland	1533
Robertson	1534
Cody	1534
Champagne	1534
Deltell	1534
Champagne	1534

National Defence

Malette (Bay of Quinte)	1534
McGuinty	1534

Marine Transportation

Albas	1534
Robertson	1535

Employment

Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	1535
Hajdu	1535

Presence in Gallery

The Speaker	1535
-------------------	------

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Foreign Affairs	
Ramsay	1535
National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians	
MacKinnon	1535
Government Response to Petitions	
Lamoureux	1535
Committees of the House	
Science and Research	
Zahid	1536
Baldinelli	1536
Petitions	
Prison Needle Exchange Program	
Vis	1536
Public Safety	
Mazier	1536
Atlantic Loop	
Blois	1536
Forestry Industry	
Johns	1536
Opioids	
May	1536
Questions on the Order Paper	
Lamoureux	1537
Questions Passed as Orders for Return	
Lamoureux	1574
Request for Emergency Debate	
Youth Unemployment	
Genuis	1600
Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker	1600
Privilege	
Members' Access to Federal Penitentiary	
Caputo	1600

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Citizenship Act	
Bill C-3. Second reading	1603
Kwan	1603
Lamoureux	1604
Redekopp	1604
Thériault	1605
May	1605
Kayabaga	1606
Calkins	1607
Fortin	1607

Jackson	1607
Lamoureux	1608
Redekopp	1609
May	1609
Fragiskatos	1609
Redekopp	1610
Ste-Marie	1610
Lamoureux	1611
Calkins	1611
Business of the House	
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	1612
Citizenship Act	
Bill C-3. Second reading	1612
Lamoureux	1612
Dalton	1613
May	1613
Guglielmin	1613
Desrochers	1615
Ste-Marie	1615
Davies (Niagara South)	1615
Strauss	1615
Lamoureux	1617
Thériault	1617
Redekopp	1617
Vis	1617
Housefather	1619
Goodridge	1619
Lamoureux	1619
Konanz	1619
Lamoureux	1621
Ste-Marie	1621
Lawton	1621
Arnold	1621
Kayabaga	1623
Ste-Marie	1623
Gill (Windsor West)	1623
Ste-Marie	1623
Lamoureux	1624
Deltell	1625
Fortin	1625

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Finance	
Gallant	1625
Turnbull	1626
Housing	
Lantsman	1627
Desrochers	1628
Justice	
Lawton	1628
Turnbull	1629

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>