



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 103
Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1400)

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem, led by the hon. member for Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

ERIN DANIELS

Doug Eyolfson (Winnipeg West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, a cancer diagnosis shook a school community in Winnipeg West. It also sparked something extraordinary. At École Charleswood School, students and staff rallied around their teacher-librarian Erin Daniels. What began as a simple act of support has grown into a decade-long tradition of generosity that has raised more than \$31,000 for CancerCare Manitoba, including over \$7,200 this year alone.

Erin Daniels was the kind of educator who shapes an entire community. Even after her diagnosis, she returned to the school she loved, continuing to inspire students and colleagues alike. Though she is no longer with us, her presence is still felt in the halls she once walked and in the lives she touched. Each year, this campaign reflects her spirit by bringing people together through creativity, compassion and shared purpose.

This year, as the campaign marked its 10th anniversary, the school also dedicated its library in her name. It is a lasting tribute to her kindness, courage and unwavering commitment to others. Her legacy lives on, not only in the funds she raised, but also in the compassion she inspired and the community she helped build.

* * *

OPIOIDS

Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a landmark scientific study was released detailing the failures of the Liberals' so-called safe supply of hard drugs. It confirms what Conservatives al-

ready knew: Drug consumption sites are not the answer to Canada's addiction crisis.

Since the closure of the consumption site in Red Deer, new data confirms that there has been a significant increase in opioid treatment, with no increase in emergency room visits or mortality. The findings are clear. Enabling those suffering from addiction to continue to be poisoned is not the answer. Instead, we must support these individuals with real treatment.

The Liberal government is responsible for approving these sites by granting exemptions under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. If it really wants to help those suffering from addictions, it must repeal the failed policies that have killed more Canadians than World War II. Only then can we bring our loved ones home drug-free.

* * *

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S MERITORIOUS SERVICE MEDAL

Brendan Hanley (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I send my congratulations to Yukoners Dr. Alex Poole and Ms. Josianne Gauthier, who recently received the Governor General's Meritorious Service Medal in recognition of their groundbreaking work on the treatment of severe frostbite.

[*Translation*]

It comes as no surprise that frostbite is one of the risks of living in the north. As a doctor, I have seen many cases of it.

[*English*]

I remember my colleagues' frequent updates on how they were researching and piloting a drug called Iloprost, and they ultimately developed a protocol that can dramatically reduce tissue injuries and amputations from frostbite.

[*Translation*]

This prestigious award for meritorious service recognizes their outstanding professionalism and innovative spirit.

*Statements by Members**[English]*

As Dr. Poole said, people in a small northern place figured out a problem after scouring the planet for solutions. A local change in practice has now been adopted around the world. I send my congratulations to these two remarkable Yukon practitioners for showing the spirit of northern innovation, research and medical care.

I ask members to remember that time is tissue. They can visit frostbitecare.ca to learn what we can do to recognize and treat frostbite.

* * *

• (1405)

FORMER MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, CPC): Mr Speaker, seven years ago, the Hon. Rob Nicholson announced his retirement after a distinguished 24 years in public service representing the communities of Niagara Falls, Niagara-on-the-Lake and Fort Erie.

Having worked for Rob, I considered him my political mentor and viewed his dedication, integrity and character in public office as the embodiment of what is good in politics.

This past fall, the City of Niagara Falls renamed a community trail after him. During his remarks, he said, “Public service has been one of the greatest privileges of my life. Every step of the journey was meaningful because of the people I had the chance to represent”. These incredible words demonstrate Rob's commitment to service above self, an attribute all members in this place should carry and exercise when representing and serving their constituents.

At the end of the month, Rob will celebrate his 74th birthday. I wish Rob a happy birthday. He is a great friend. Our community was lucky to have him serve as its federal representative.

* * *

SUDAN

Sameer Zuberi (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, three years ago today, a wave of extreme violence broke out across Sudan. What began as a power struggle has become the world's largest humanitarian crisis, with 13 million being forced from their homes, half the population facing food insecurity, and women and girls being deliberately targeted with sexual violence.

Today our government announced new funding for life-saving aid in response to this crisis, more than \$120 million to support the most vulnerable.

[Translation]

At the Subcommittee on International Human Rights, we heard from members of the Sudanese community. Their message was clear: The violence has to stop.

[English]

The Sudanese community is working with the government to save lives by providing refuge in Canada. This immigration program is critical and must continue.

[Translation]

This devastating war must come to an end.

* * *

*[English]***THE ECONOMY**

John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, finally the Liberals have acknowledged that they are indeed the reason for and the cause of the affordability crisis Canadians are enduring. For years, the Liberals have tried to blame everyone else for the cost of living crisis that lays at their feet, and they know it.

Donald Trump is not the one who asked them to increase the industrial carbon tax by 16% on April 1, driving up the cost of food and fuel. COVID did not ask them to put an escalator tax on beer, wine and spirits, which is devastating our wine growers, brewers and distillers and taking \$1.2 billion out of the pockets of Canadians. The Middle East conflict did not ask them to put a 35% tariff on imports of fertilizer, causing a cost-of-input crisis for Canadian farmers.

No, these are Liberal policies that they themselves put on Canadians, and now they have finally admitted that Conservatives have been right all along, but the contrition is not complete. The industrial carbon tax is still here and the GST on fuel is still here. Will the Liberals cleanse their conscience, go the entire way, ask Canadians for forgiveness and remove all the taxes on all the fuel?

* * *

*[Translation]***LA VOIX DES AÎNÉS**

Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, seniors are the living memory of our communities, our families and our society. They are an invaluable asset and a source of wisdom, and we can never thank them enough. However, far too often, isolation and loneliness cast a shadow over seniors' daily lives. That is why, today, I want to commend La Voix des Aînés for the extraordinary work that it does in giving seniors back the place they deserve with kindness, compassion and generosity.

Through its presence, its willingness to listen and its initiatives, this organization combats isolation, forges ties and reminds our seniors that they matter, that they have a place and that they help to enrich our society. I also want to mention the recognition and engagement brunch that was held on April 12 in Montreal, an important event designed to promote this wonderful mission.

I want to thank everyone involved in the organization for their caring and hard work, as well as for coming here to Ottawa.

Statements by Members

Congratulations and continued success to La Voix des Aînés.

* * *

[English]

WORLD AUTISM MONTH

Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, April is World Autism Month, and it has now been 28 years since my son Jaden was diagnosed. Today Jaden is 30 and an enthusiastic extrovert, but back then he seemed almost completely stuck in his own world.

Our instinct at the time was to try to help him by pulling him into our world, and it did help. I have since gravitated to a slightly different approach. These days I spend more time in Jaden's world, getting down close to him, looking at what he is looking at and tuning in to what holds his attention in the moment. When I intentionally pause, put the phone away and just sit still with Jaden, I experience things I normally miss, like the sense of wonder gazing out a train window, the value of non-verbal communication or the strength of connection through physical contact: a hug, a tussle, a tickle or Jaden's famous high-five.

We too often default to defining people like Jaden by the help they need, but in my experience, I have learned many of the most important things in my life from him. Jaden has helped me, I hope, to be a better person than I would have been without him, and for that, I am truly thankful.

* * *

● (1410)

[Translation]

CASSANDRE PROSPER

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a Quebecker is once again proving that Quebec produces the best basketball talent.

Cassandra Prosper is the first player from Quebec to be drafted to the WNBA in nearly two decades. The Washington Mystics selected the young 20-year-old guard 19th overall last night at the annual draft in New York. The Rosemère-born athlete will be able to help her new team make the playoffs. I certainly would not bet against the captain who led the University of Notre Dame's team to the quarter-finals of the U.S. college tournament known as March Madness.

Quebec is becoming a global basketball powerhouse, and Cassandra Prosper is our new icon.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I want to congratulate Ms. Prosper and wish her a long and successful career. May she win many WNBA championships.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL CANADIAN FILM DAY

Jean Yip (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is National Canadian Film Day. This year, there are more than

2,000 free screenings taking place across Canada and in 50 countries around the world.

Canada is home to exceptional screen talent, including award-winning actors Shamier Anderson and Stephan James, brothers who grew up in my riding of Scarborough—Agincourt. People may recognize them from films like *John Wick* or *Selma* and from series like the new Canadian comedy *Hate the Player: The Ben Johnson Story*. When the brothers co-founded their production company, they named it Bay Mills Studios after their Scarborough neighbourhood. When others called Bay Mills “at risk”, their mother said it was only at risk of being excellent, a sentiment her sons clearly took to heart.

Their story captures what Canadian film does best: reflecting who we are, where we come from and the excellence we produce when talent is given the chance to shine.

* * *

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, forestry directly and indirectly supports workers and families in rural communities all across Canada. It is a proud part of our heritage, and in my riding, it is a major economic driver that sustains local jobs, businesses and communities.

With mill closures and ongoing challenges facing the sector, communities where forestry is the heart of the local economy are facing growing uncertainty. Each closure hits close to home, and a year into the Prime Minister's leadership, that uncertainty has only grown. Despite the Prime Minister's rhetoric, tariffs remain. There is still no softwood lumber deal, costs are rising and investment is flowing elsewhere instead of supporting growth right here at home.

Forestry workers need more than speeches and empty promises. They need expanded market access and a deal that provides the stability to grow, attract investment, and protect their livelihoods and communities.

* * *

● (1415)

CARPENTERS' REGIONAL COUNCIL

Leslie Church (Toronto—St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to recognize the leadership of the Carpenters' Regional Council, Tom Cardinal and the entire leadership team here in Ottawa today, who proudly represent more than 60,000 members across the country.

Statements by Members

Canada is a nation of builders, and carpenters are at the heart of that story. My own grandfather Malcolm MacLeod was a proud member of Carpenters' Regional Council Local 1325 in Edmonton. I remember growing up with the smell of fresh sawdust and running along the 2 x 4s as a project came together.

Our government is building Canada strong, from community projects and new homes to the defining nation-building projects of our time. None of this happens without the men and women who show up every day, tools in hand, with their expertise. These are the folks who build careers, train apprentices, strengthen communities and support families across the country.

Working together and standing on the shoulders of generations of carpenters before them, we will ensure that Canada is strong, united and ready to build.

* * *

FUEL TAXES

Eric Melillo (Kenora—Kiiwetinoong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, fuel costs are soaring, and people in Northern Ontario who must travel great distances for essential trips are paying the price. To make matters worse, Canadians are paying 20% more for fuel than our American counterparts. That is why Conservatives have a plan to remove the GST on fuel, the fuel excise tax, the industrial carbon tax and the clean fuel standard for the rest of the year. Our plan would cut costs at the pump by 25¢ per litre and save a family of four over \$1,200 this year.

The Liberal Prime Minister has already admitted that Conservatives have the right solutions for Canada, but what he is offering will not be nearly enough for people who are struggling. He is going to remove only the excise tax, and only until Labour Day. This half-baked measure will not provide the real relief that Canadians are looking for. It is just another one of the Prime Minister's illusions.

Conservatives are calling on the Liberals to vote for our motion to remove all federal taxes on fuel for the rest of the year so Canadians can afford to keep their tanks filled and can have more money in their pockets.

* * *

CANADIAN VICTORIA CROSS

Pauline Rochefort (Nipissing—Timiskaming, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we are joined in Ottawa by veterans; representatives from Valour in the Presence of the Enemy, True Patriot Love, the Royal Canadian Legion; retired general Rick Hillier; and the family of Private Laroche. They are calling for an independent review of Afghanistan-era acts of valour, where new evidence suggests that the criteria for the Victoria Cross may have been met. The issue matters to over 20 million Canadians, as is reflected in motions of unanimous support from the Senate and three provincial legislatures, with two more on their way.

Canada created its own Victoria Cross in 1993, yet it has never been awarded, despite more than 40,000 Canadians having served in Afghanistan. Our closest allies recognize such acts. Canada has not. That absence continues to weigh on veterans and many other

Canadians. The case of Jess Laroche has come to symbolize this concern.

I am honoured to be presenting a petition on this matter later today, and I urge all members of the House to support this important request.

* * *

FUEL TAXES

Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals want applause for knocking a few cents off at the pump for the next few summer months, yet they keep the rest of their fuel taxes in place. That is not relief. That is a coupon.

Canadians have already been getting squeezed by higher oil prices, and then the Liberals pile on with yet more taxes. That is why people in this country are paying far more at the pump than our neighbours to the south are. Families do not fill up their tank with talking points. They fill it up with money, and right now they simply do not have enough of it. However, Conservatives have a real plan. We will axe the fuel excise tax and the GST on gasoline and diesel for the rest of the year. We will also axe the industrial carbon tax and the clean fuel standard permanently. That means 25¢ less per litre and over \$1,200 back for a family of four.

Now the Liberals are celebrating as if they had scored the golden goal at the Olympics, even though they are still down by five. They call it relief. Canadians call it too little, too late.

* * *

● (1420)

[*Translation*]

ARTEMIS II MISSION

Karim Bardeesy (Taiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, humanity reached the far side of the moon for the first time. It was an awe-inspiring and incredibly proud moment for Canada.

[*English*]

Humanity has gone to the far side of the moon. It is a moment of awe and a moment of pride. Artemis II did not just happen. No one just gifts Canada a seat. We are there because of decades of commitment to our space program. At home, millions of people watched the lift-off and landing in gatherings across Canada, breaking through the doomscrolling to celebrate together as we watched Canadian Space Agency astronauts Colonel Jeremy Hansen and Dr. Jenni Gibbons carry out their mission. What we say about Artemis is one thing, but what it says about us and what it says about Canada and Canadians is multitudes.

How big we are, and how small. In the images the astronauts sent back to Earth, some people were reminded of their love and care for the planet, our own fragile home. Others saw their faith in God or in the great cosmos affirmed. We all saw new beauty to behold and new mysteries to explore.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

TAXATION

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there are three federal and Liberal taxes on gasoline: the excise tax, the Liberal Prime Minister's new carbon tax that they call the clean fuel standard and the GST, which is charged on both of those.

Despite skyrocketing prices and the rising cost of living, the Prime Minister only wants to suspend one of these taxes, and that is the result of pressure from the Conservatives.

Why not follow the Conservative plan to save consumers 25¢ a litre by getting rid of all the Liberal taxes for the whole year?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has a comprehensive plan to make life more affordable for Canadians, and that includes suspending the excise tax on gasoline, lowering taxes for the middle class and providing the Canada groceries and essentials benefit and other programs. All of that amounts to \$20,000 per family per year.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a year into this Liberal Prime Minister's mandate, the poor and the middle class are suffering. That is according to Statistics Canada, which published a report indicating that the gap between the rich and everyone else is greater than ever.

This Prime Minister prints money, which causes inflation, and inflation makes billionaires richer and drives up the cost of living for everyone else. The gas tax is a tax on the poor. It is a tax on groceries, a tax on people in need.

Why does the Prime Minister not want to get rid of all Liberal gas taxes so as to help the poorest people in Canada?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am the Prime Minister of Canada, not the Premier of Ontario, the Premier of Quebec or the Premier of British Columbia. The biggest gas taxes are provincial taxes.

Second, Canada's inflation rate is lower than the Bank of Canada's target. Moreover, Canadians' wages have gone up by 4.7% per year, which is about double the inflation rate.

[*English*]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there are three Liberal taxes on gasoline. There is the excise tax and the new Liberal carbon tax that they call the fuel standard, and then they charge the GST on those other taxes. Because of Conservative pressure, the Prime Minister—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Oral Questions

The Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas is far too loud during question period.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition may start from the top.

• (1425)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, there are three Liberal taxes on gasoline. There is the excise tax and there is the new Liberal carbon tax they call the fuel standard, and then they charge the GST on those other two taxes. With Canada having the highest grocery price inflation in the G7 and paying 20% more at the pumps, we put pressure on the Prime Minister, and he has partially backed down, removing only one of those taxes and only for a third of the year.

Why does the Prime Minister not follow our full plan to reduce gas prices by 25¢ a litre by getting rid of all the taxes for all the year?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the government is proposing is to cut the excise tax, 10¢ a litre for gasoline and four cents on diesel. We have already cut the consumer carbon tax, 18¢ per litre. We are recycling all the excess revenues from higher oil prices to Canadians.

What we are not doing is what the Leader of the Opposition is proposing, which is to substantially increase the deficit, something he is regularly against, by more than \$3 billion, because the government can count.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what he is not doing is increasing the deficit? It is only up by 100% since he took office. Does he even read his own budget, or does he want Canadians not to know what is inside? In fact, there is all the money printing that he does, because he is famous for causing inflation and has made a career out of it.

Statistics Canada has made it clear that the gap between rich and poor is now greater than it has ever been, in a report published just this week. One of the biggest taxes on the poor is the gas tax. Instead of just removing a third of the tax for a third of the year, why not get rid of the entire Liberal tax on gas for the whole year?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one thing I have learned in my economics education is that one has to study history and look at numbers. My record as a central bank governor is inflation less than 2% at the Bank of Canada and inflation less than 2% at the Bank of England.

Let us get back to where we are today, which is that wages in this country are growing at more than twice the rate of inflation. I will spell it out for the member opposite: That means Canadians are getting ahead.

Oral Questions

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Prime Minister has learned all the wrong lessons. Not only did he cause the housing crisis in London and not only did he cause the worst inflation in the G7 when he was the bank governor over there, he advised Justin Trudeau to print money here, causing inflation. Since arriving in Canada, he has given us the worst food price inflation in the G7, the worst investment in the G7, the worst housing costs in the G7 and the worst household debt in the G7.

Why does the Prime Minister not learn his lesson from all the failed economic experiments that only benefit insiders with tax havens like him, and get rid of all the taxes on gas for all of the year?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, oh dear, oh dear, oh dear, I feel like I am in the presence of students. On that account, I do not think the Leader of the Opposition would pass the exam with those answers.

As the IMF confirmed yesterday, Canada will have the second-fastest growth in the G7 this year. As the IMF confirmed yesterday, we have the best fiscal position in the G7, *point final*. As we have confirmed, we have the highest foreign direct investment per capita in the world.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, oh, the Liberal arrogance. We could cut through it with a knife. This is someone—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition may continue.

• (1430)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, what we have over there is inflation of Liberal arrogance. Right now, the Prime Minister wants to tell Canadians that they have never had it so good, when food prices are rising faster in Canada than in any other country in the G7, when Canadian households are the most indebted in the G7, when Canadian housing costs are the most elevated in the G7 and when, just today, RBC reported that we have the worst investment in the G7.

The question again is this. Canadians cannot afford gas at the pump. Why not get rid of all the taxes for all the year?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Teach us a lesson, oh great one.

Right Hon. Mark Carney: Mr. Speaker, to learn a lesson, one has to have ears to hear. There are some on the benches opposite who have been listening, and they will notice that wages are growing at more than twice the rate of inflation in this country. They will notice that rents have gone down relative to incomes for 33 straight months. They will notice that I am out of time.

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was elected because of his economic expertise and because he was going to protect Canada from tariffs.

However, the White House has just changed the way it is calculating its already illegal tariffs on steel and aluminum. From now on, derivative articles of steel and aluminum will be subject to a 25% tariff on their full customs value, rather than to the already illegal tariffs on the value of the metal inputs.

I assume that the government has raised this change with the United States. Is Canada going to get the Donald Trump and the White House to do away with this method of calculating tariffs?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes, we are working on that and we are working with our corporations, businesses, workers and unions to build Quebec strong and build Canada strong.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, could the Prime Minister be any less specific?

Literally hundreds and hundreds of Quebec businesses that depend on the American market will have to cut shifts, cut production and, in some cases, perhaps even shut down. This morning, *Le Journal de Montréal* reported that BRP has lost a third of its stock market value.

I want to know what the Prime Minister is going to do right now to help the businesses and workers who are victims of President Trump's latest whim.

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are currently negotiating with the Americans to renew CUSMA. The most important sectors are the aluminum, steel, softwood lumber and automotive sectors. Negotiations will continue, but our starting point is the world's best trade agreement with the United States.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is okay for people to admit that there are things they do not know.

Since early 2025, we have heard a lot of talk but seen very little action. Tariffs are making every one of the White House's moves worse. The Prime Minister cannot just wave his resumé around, give speeches and recruit floor crossers.

What does the Prime Minister have to say to Quebec and Canadian businesses that are suddenly facing a sharp increase in tariffs on their products and that could be forced to shut down if there is no meaningful government intervention?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the U.S. tariff rate for Canada has gone down since last April, since the election. The rate was over 10%, but it went down to 5.5% and is now sitting at 4.4%. We have made progress, but we want more. We are working hard on all this.

I believe the message from Terrebonne was clear. We must work to build Quebec strong and Canada strong.

• (1435)
[English]

TAXATION

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 35% is how much more Canadians are paying because of rising global oil prices.

In Newfoundland and Labrador, fuel is not a choice; it is a necessity. Truckers need it to deliver goods, and families need it just to get through the week, yet Liberal taxes are driving prices even higher, while the Liberals pretend that a partial tax cut is real relief. Their plan applies to only a fraction of the taxes they collect, while they take billions from struggling Canadians.

When will the Liberals stop punishing Canadians and finally remove all federal taxes on gas so that Canadians can save 25¢ a litre for the rest of the year?

Hon. Joanne Thompson (Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand today and talk about what this government is doing for Canada and for Newfoundland and Labrador. Eight billion dollars are going to 5 Wing Goose Bay, and \$12 million to Newfoundland and Labrador for companies that are invested in long-term defence capacity building and Bay du Nord.

While the member reads her prepared notes, on this side of the House, we are doing the hard work.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Single Parent Association of Newfoundland and Labrador in that member's riding reported that the high gas prices are driving single parents to make impossible decisions, such as whether to heat their home or put food on the table, yet \$10 billion is how much this Liberal government will still collect in fuel taxes this year, while people in Newfoundland and Labrador pay some of the highest gas prices at the pump in Canada. The Liberals' plan saves just pennies, while costs hit rural and remote communities the hardest. Conservatives have a plan to cut 25¢ a litre for the rest of the year.

Will they stop these half measures and deliver real relief for hard-working Canadians?

Hon. Joanne Thompson (Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while this member from Newfoundland and Labrador continues to read the same tired notes, on this side of the House we are working to support rural communities with infrastructure available for roads, schools and hospitals. We are working to support families with the Canada child benefit, school nutrition programs, \$10-a-day child care, and on and on the list goes. By the way, the Conservatives voted against all of it.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as always, the Liberals are claiming collaboration but delivering obfuscation. They are accepting the Conservative argument that the gas prices in this country are too high, but, as always, they give a half measure, not even half, delivering a third of the proposed tax cut the Conservatives have offered, and for a third of the year.

If the Liberal government is serious about affordability, why not do what the Conservatives have been proposing to save Canadians

Oral Questions

25¢ a litre on gas, \$1,200 a year, cut the GST on fuel, cut the fuel excise tax and cut the Liberal fuel standard?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me help the member opposite. We have already cut taxes on gasoline by 28¢ a litre since becoming the new government. We have reduced taxes for the middle class. We have cut the GST. We have eliminated development charges, which would reduce the price of a home by \$200,000 in my riding. This is what affordability looks like.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if my car ran on hot air, I would not care about the tax cut after that answer. However, most Canadians do not have the ability to do what these Liberal insiders are doing and weather all of this. The Liberals blame Iran, neglecting the fact that 25¢ a litre goes directly into government coffers. This is a very real suggestion. People in Elgin, St. Thomas and London do not view driving as a luxury. They know it is a necessity to get around, to get to work, to drive the kids to school.

Why will the Liberal government not take these concerns seriously and drop 25¢ a litre right now?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am confused. Is 28¢ cents a litre hot air? Twenty-eight cents—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The noise is not just coming from the right corner in the back. There is a lot of it coming from here.

The hon. minister may start from the top.

Hon. Tim Hodgson: Mr. Speaker, I am confused. Is a 28¢-a-litre cut on gasoline hot air? Is \$200,000 on a new home hot air? If that is what he thinks is hot air, maybe he needs to go back to school.

• (1440)

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after years of Conservative pressure, the Liberals have announced a watered-down version of our Conservative plan. The Liberals are only removing a third of the fuel tax for a third of the year, all while still collecting up to \$10 billion more from taxpayers. I have heard from the community I represent in Hamilton, and that is not enough. Conservatives would remove the whole tax for the full year.

Will the Prime Minister listen to Canadians, vote with us and bring real relief at the pumps?

Oral Questions

Hon. Adam van Koevorden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, try as they might, the Conservatives are not fooling Canadians, and that member is not fooling Hamiltonians. They know that fuel is too expensive because of the war in the Middle East, and they also know that our Liberal government is meeting the moment with a tax cut for 22 million Canadians, with affordable child care and dental care for families, and with the groceries and essentials benefit to deliver up to \$1,800 for families with a modest income. As a result of this week's affordability announcement, we are letting Canadians keep \$2.4 billion in their hands, in their pockets after they earn that hard-earned money, at the gas pumps. Canadians can see right through the Conservative bluster on this issue.

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister confirmed that Conservatives have the solution for Canadians, but he is delivering only a third of our plan. Liberals are keeping the GST and the clean fuel standard. It is time to cut all the tax for a full year. Our plan will cut an extra 25¢ per litre, which will save families \$1,200 per year. This is what Hamilton wants. Let us make it a great day for Canadians.

Will the Prime Minister vote with us and bring real relief at the pumps?

Hon. Evan Solomon (Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the party of “no” cannot seem to take yes for an answer. We just cancelled the excise tax on gas, saving 10¢ a litre for a family, 28¢ since we became the government, which puts \$2.4 billion in the pockets of families. What do these guys say? They say no. They say no to all our affordability issues, no to the groceries and essentials benefit. They do not say yes to Canadians. We are building a real plan for real families and real affordability.

Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 11 years of Liberals, affordability is getting worse for northerners, despite what they tell us. I quote from their own recent nutrition north report: In the Northwest Territories, 60.7% of Inuit are food-insecure. In Nunavut, 76% of Inuit experience food insecurity.

Will Liberals vote for our Conservative motion to remove all federal taxes on gas and diesel, so that Canadians can save 25¢ a litre for the rest of the year, or will they keep voting for half measures?

Hon. Rebecca Chartrand (Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs and Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are making life more affordable in the north, not just in big cities but across northern indigenous communities. We have cut taxes for 22 million Canadians so that northern families can keep more in their pocket. The permanent national school food program is saving families \$800 a year. We are also cutting costs for jet fuel, which is going to impact communities throughout north of 60. We are tackling food costs and building all-season infrastructure in the north and the Arctic. We are building for all of Canada.

[Translation]

NEWS MEDIA INDUSTRY

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, regional news in Quebec is in jeopardy, especially now that the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, the CRTC, has added 15 Global News stations to the independent local news fund without increasing the funding. There are more media outlets, but they are all sharing the same amount of funding.

Yesterday, when we alerted the minister to this, he accused us of pitting francophones against anglophones. On the contrary, we want all regional news media to receive adequate funding. The reality is that in the current context, French-language media outlets in Quebec are losing half of their funding.

Will the Prime Minister increase the fund to fix this problem?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member knows full well that through measures like the journalism labour tax credit, the Canada Media Fund and the local journalism initiative, we on this side of the House will always provide strong support for the French-language media sector.

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is time to take action.

Of course, the solution also requires big tech to contribute. In the meantime, our media outlets are shutting down and Ottawa is not doing enough to prevent that. Right now, big tech is in court fighting to avoid having to co-operate. That is why the government needs to boost the independent local news fund. It needs to make radio and television stations eligible for the journalism labour tax credit, as Quebec has done. It needs to stop rewarding advertising on platforms owned by big tech.

There are plenty of things to be done, but now the need for action is becoming quite urgent. When will the Prime Minister take action?

● (1445)

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course big tech must do its fair share, but if the Bloc Québécois members truly believed what they are saying, they could have supported budget 2025, which included an investment of \$127 million.

TAXATION

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Prime Minister chose to reduce gas taxes by a measly one-third. As a result, Canadians are still paying 15¢ in federal tax per litre of gas. The Liberal inflation of the last 11 years is costly for Canadians, the people of Beauce, workers and businesses. This is a sign that the government does not respect its citizens and is completely out of touch.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Will he vote in favour of our Conservative motion, which will suspend all federal taxes on gasoline?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Quebeckers and Canadians woke up to some good news. It was important to find ways to help Quebeckers cope with the effects of the inflation caused by the war in Iran. That is why we decided to suspend the excise tax on gasoline. This measure has been very well received in Quebec and across the country.

This follows significant investments made by the government to support families across Quebec and the country. For instance, there was the tax cut we announced a few months ago, as well as the Canada groceries and essentials benefit.

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, four cents per litre of gas is not going to make any difference. What a joke.

Canadians are suffocating thanks to the Liberals' inflationary cost of living. The government has collected an extra \$10 billion in federal gas tax. That is ten thousand million dollars. Instead of padding Ottawa's coffers and making their rich buddies billions of dollars richer, can the Liberals help real people in our communities?

My question is straightforward. Will the Prime Minister stop picking Canadians' pockets and lower the cost of living?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here in Ottawa, we are doing our job. We are doing what has to be done. We suspended the excise tax on gasoline, we lowered income tax for Quebeckers and Canadians, and we have taken steps to help people offset the effects of food inflation at the grocery store.

My colleague and I are both from Quebec, and he is well aware that Quebec also has a contribution to make. We are going to work with Quebec's new premier, whose platform promised to fight food inflation and the cost of living in Quebec.

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a fact: The Liberal government is set to pocket an extra \$10 billion as a result of rising gas prices for Canadians. Yesterday, the Liberals announced a measure that amounts to a third of our proposal and is set to end in September.

This amounts to an extra \$10 billion that was not budgeted for. Why not use the \$5 billion in additional tax revenue to eliminate all taxes on gas for the whole of 2026 and finally give Canadians some breathing space, as the Conservative Party is proposing?

Oral Questions

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement and Quebec Lieutenant, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is true that we do not control oil prices, which have risen due to geopolitical tensions in the Middle East and the war in Iran, as my colleague mentioned. However, what we do control is what we do to help Canadians.

I am pleased to reiterate that, as of Monday, Quebeckers will see a reduction of 10¢ per litre, which will help families cope with the cost of living.

Another thing we control is the votes we cast in the House. In my colleague's constituency, 32,456 of his constituents have access to the Canadian dental care plan. Why does he constantly refuse to stand up for his constituents?

* * *

HOUSING

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, home ownership is a priority issue for Canadians, but that dream feels out of reach at the moment. Everyone here agrees on that. The average selling price for a home in Quebec has increased by 6.9%. More specifically, prices in Quebec increased by 6.3% for a single-family home, 5.3% for a townhouse or home in a multiplex and 7.7% for a condo.

When will the Liberal government adopt our plan to boost residential construction and eliminate the GST on all new homes?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement and Quebec Lieutenant, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House that one of the first things this government did when it took office was to eliminate the GST on new homes for first-time homebuyers.

We did not stop there. With Build Canada Homes, we have a plan to build at an unprecedented scale across the country. I am very proud to remind my colleague that Quebec was the first province to reach an agreement under the Build Canada Homes program.

This program will make it possible to build homes across the country and increase the housing supply to ease pressure on prices, but what is truly remarkable is finally seeing the Conservatives show even the slightest interest in housing.

● (1450)

Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals would have us believe that they listen to people's concerns, but Canadians' reality suggests otherwise. In Saguenay, the price of a duplex has climbed 24% in the past year, and a Desjardins study suggests that things are going to get worse.

Young people want to own their own home, but they see no light at the end of the tunnel. When will the Liberal government put more money back in young Quebeckers' pockets so they can buy their first home?

Oral Questions

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I like and respect my colleague very much. We will work together to reduce the cost of rent in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean.

We know that access to property ownership is important too, which is why we eliminated the GST on first home purchases. Our plan is working. We have to do more, and we are also going to work to bring good investments in housing construction to his riding.

I know there are a lot of projects happening in his riding and the region, and that is a priority for the government.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during this time of geopolitical volatility, we never know when the next major shock is coming. We need serious leadership and a real plan to build a strong and more independent Canadian economy. Since the conflict in the Middle East began, this global volatility has impacted the wallets of Canadians. We need more direct support for them. Yesterday morning, we saw just that.

Can the Secretary of State inform Canadians how our new government is bringing down costs for essentials at home in the face of instability abroad?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong for that great question and for her determination to do what is right for Canada.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister announced that we will be suspending the excise tax on gasoline and diesel, meaning Canadians will save 10¢ per litre on gasoline, putting more money in Canadians' pockets as they face higher gas prices and global uncertainty. On this side of the House, we are focused on making life more affordable for Canadians. The other side continues with the rhetoric.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us get serious. Folks in Oshawa are reaching their breaking point. Seventy-four per cent of Canadians say the cost of food and gas is crushing them. Forty-three per cent of Canadians are just \$200 away from not paying their bills. Families are cutting back and putting off major decisions, while young people are losing hope that they will ever get ahead.

Despite all this, the Prime Minister stands here and has the audacity to claim that affordability is the best it has ever been and “Canadians are getting ahead”. Why will the Prime Minister not fully cut taxes on gas and food so that Oshawa families can actually get ahead?

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, far be it from any member on this side of the House to deprive the Conservative leader of driving the Conservative bus deep-

er down into the valley of unpopularity. They can rest assured that we will save the Conservatives money at the gas pumps along the way, with savings of 10¢ per litre with the excise tax having been suspended for the next four months and 28¢ per litre since this government got into power. That is in addition to the Canada groceries and essentials benefit. That is in addition to a tax cut for 22 million Canadians. We are the party that is making affordability a reality.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Oshawa and Durham Region families cannot pay their bills or put food on the table with these Liberal half measures and talking points. After years of the Liberal government spending, 61% of Canadians say that they are facing financial whiplash.

Conservatives have put forward a real plan to suspend all federal gas taxes through to the end of 2026. However, once again, the Liberals are taking a great Conservative idea and watering it down. Will the Prime Minister stop the half measures, deliver real relief and fully cut taxes on gas and food for Oshawa families and all Canadians?

● (1455)

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 hard to take this member seriously when she has voted against every affordability measure that impacts families in Durham Region. She stood up in this House and voted against the groceries and essentials benefit. She has voted against a tax cut for 22 million Canadians. The Conservatives say they want us to cut taxes at the pump. That is exactly what we are doing and yet they are opposed to it. We are making life more affordable.

Where was the member when we announced a major project to give jobs to 21,700 members of the Durham Region community for the SMR project—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Terra Nova—The Peninsulas.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Liberal Prime Minister claimed he was going to have responsible budgets and fix Canada's economy. Instead, he actually spent more in reckless spending than Justin Trudeau, and now Atlantic Canadians are having to spend more and struggle more. Atlantic Canadians are working harder, and yet they are not making any headway.

Nearly a third of Canadians say they do not even have enough to cover their bills. We are in serious trouble. When will the government get serious about affordability?

Hon. Joanne Thompson (Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the the opposition member from Newfoundland and Labrador that Bay du Nord is a way that we support Newfoundland and Labrador with jobs and money in the economy. That is \$8 billion in 5 Wing Goose Bay and \$12 million to support local companies. I also want to remind this member, who has fishing and harvesters in his riding, of the renewal of the Atlantic fisheries fund and Atlantic wild salmon fund. We are doing the work. We are not reading tired notes and we are not following poor politics.

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I just asked a question about affordability and I cannot believe I did not hear anything about affordability. I guess that is no surprise, considering this fisheries minister voted against my bill that would have allowed struggling Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to fish for food seven days a week, so on Wednesdays, to go out in their small boats, take a fish for food and bring down their grocery bills. Will this fisheries minister allow Newfoundlanders to fish seven days a week to help with their grocery bills?

Hon. Joanne Thompson (Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we debated the private member's bill and it was defeated for very good reasons.

What I will remind this member from Newfoundland and Labrador is that we followed due diligence with an open consultation on what the recreational fishery needs to look like. A “what we heard” report will be coming out very shortly. We will follow with select consultations and then, based on what I have heard, I will put a plan together for this season. That is how we set policy that actually aligns with the needs of communities. Again, it is not just tired notes and rhetoric.

* * *

TAXATION

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he makes promises, but the Prime Minister fails to make life more affordable. Canadians are experiencing financial whiplash under the Liberal government. Nearly three-quarters say rising prices for essentials like food and gas are straining their finances. Unpredictable conditions mean cutting back on spending and delaying major financial decisions.

Canada is less affordable under the current Prime Minister. Will he help Canadians by adopting our Conservative plan to cut all federal taxes on gas and food?

Hon. Eleanor Olzewski (Minister of Emergency Management and Community Resilience and Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I hear when I travel through Alberta is how supportive people are of the government's advancing priorities for Albertans, the things that matter most to them: affordability, energy and economic growth. The announcement to temporarily remove the federal excise tax on gas will help families, farmers, truck drivers and business operators throughout the province. We are working hard to

build a country where Albertans and all Canadians can have greater prosperity.

* * *

[Translation]

ETHICS

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance recused himself last September from the Alto high-speed rail project, and yet no one was informed. From 12 to 16 times, he debated and defended the project, answered questions, promoted it and even voted on it. I looked up the meaning of the word “recuse” and listen carefully to this: To recuse is to remove oneself from a matter due to a conflict of interest or incompetence.

I do not know what the Liberals are going to make of that sentence, but if conflicts of interest come to mind, why does the Minister of Finance not explain himself to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics? Quebeckers have a right to know.

• (1500)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this question was properly answered by the Minister of Finance and the member knows full well that we carefully follow the strictest ethics rules in the world.

Concerning Alto and high-speed rail, I can assure the member that Quebeckers have noticed the Conservative leader's opposition to this major, unifying national project that is set to be a game-changer for mobility in Canada.

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are about to begin the 12th hour of Liberal monologues at the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy, and Ethics, by the same members who talk to us about everything except the motion under consideration. The motion simply asks that the Minister of Finance, Alto and the Ethics Commissioner come to answer questions regarding recusals or potential conflicts of interest. We have heard about the Trans-Canada Highway and the St. Lawrence River. We have even heard reports of wild turkeys on Highway 50, but nothing related to the motion.

Could the Prime Minister tell his minions to stop obstructing the committee's work and send the Minister of Finance to answer questions?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member heard about Highway 50 because I was thanking my colleague from Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation for constantly bringing our attention to the issue of Quebec's most dangerous highway. As for my colleague the Minister of Finance, he is meticulous and strictly adheres to ethical guidelines.

Oral Questions

Again, when it comes to high-speed rail, we will not take any lessons from the Conservative Party on mobility or on this generational investment that is set to be a game-changer for mobility in Canada.

[English]

Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the law is clear that ministers must not use their position to further the personal interests of their family members, but the finance minister is championing the multi-billion-dollar Alto project where his partner is a vice-president. It was the finance minister who told the Prime Minister that he was concerned about a conflict of interest because of that relationship and said that he needed to recuse himself, and Canadians agree. The problem is, that is not what he did. Now the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics wants to review the matter and have the minister come to clear the air. Instead, we have a Liberal filibuster.

Will the minister end the filibuster and come to committee?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, who is championing high-speed rail in Canada? It is the 173 Liberal MPs on this side of the House, who are going to build major nation-building projects, including high-speed rail. It is a major project for national unity, a major project for mobility in our country and a project that will favour the building trades, men and women, and steel, aluminum and lumber. We are going to put people to work using Canadian materials, and we are going to move that train as fast as we can.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the problem for the Liberals is that even their Liberal candidates in the area know this is so unpopular that they are speaking out against this boondoggle. Canadians want accountability from the Liberals. It is \$90 billion. The minister is refusing to come to committee, and there is this Liberal filibuster that persists.

My question is to the chair of the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics. Can he tell the House why the minister has not been scheduled to appear to testify on this conflict of interest scandal?

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member is quite right. If the minister had nothing to hide, he would have nothing to fear in coming to the ethics committee. The ethics committee will be heading into its 12th hour with the Liberals filibustering an amendment that Conservatives actually support. The motion calls on the finance minister to explain his claim that he has recused himself from decisions on Alto when it is clear he has not.

Yesterday the Liberal Prime Minister promised Canadians they would see less showboating, more relevance and substantive debate at committee. If the Prime Minister truly believes that, why does he not tell his members to stand down and have the finance minister appear?

• (1505)

[Translation]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Eric St-Pierre (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-22 is being debated again in the House today. This is a vital bill that will help combat serious crimes such as extortion and that will move police investigations forward. Law enforcement agencies across the country are calling for this measure, as is the member for Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner.

Can the Minister of Justice explain to the House why Bill C-22 is important for the safety of all Canadians?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Honoré-Mercier for his question. Crime is moving online and is becoming increasingly organized and sophisticated. Criminals are using the digital environment to exploit children and to engage in extortion and human trafficking. Bill C-22, an act respecting lawful access, gives police officers the tools to investigate, disrupt organized crime and protect our communities. Our police officers across Quebec and Canada are calling for these tools. We are listening to them.

I urge all of Parliament to support this bill, which is so important for our country.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, once again, the Liberals are giving to our troops with one hand but taking with the other. The Prime Minister and Minister of National Defence love to brag about their fake raise they gave to the forces. The reality is that many of our troops are taking home less on their paycheques because of Liberal policy changes. Sadly, military families were only given one week's notice before the change to their out-of-pocket, out-of-country living allowances, in some cases reducing their take-home pay by up to \$1,500.

Why are the Liberals shortchanging frontline troops who are putting their lives on the line to defend Canada?

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is nothing fake about 8%, 13% and 20% pay raises. That is the first thing. The member knows better than to raise this subject matter, which is important, this way. Ninety thousand members of the forces are getting a pay raise. He is aware of that. We have invested in hundreds of new housing units on and off bases, 800 homes are being constructed today, and we have modernized the application process.

We are making progress. I am looking forward to thoughtful and earnest suggestions for improvement. That was not one of them.

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, all that bragging is just talk and no action.

It is the Minister of National Defence's job to fight for the best interests of those who put on the uniform to fight for each and every one of us. These brave Canadians are deployed to Latvia and other places around the world without hesitation. They sacrifice months away from their loved ones in the name of Canada because the minister tells them they have to. It is his job to make sure they are treated as the best that this country has to offer.

Instead of making excuses or bragging, will the defence minister take responsibility and help our military families make ends meet?

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): That is a bit rich, Mr. Speaker. The member has voted against every single proposal to look after our forces. He has no ground to stand on.

The members of the Canadian Armed Forces carry out important work on behalf of Canada here at home and around the world. We have introduced a suite of cost of living supports to support them and their families: that is, a well-deserved pay raise, \$100 million for additional child care and \$3.7 billion for 7,500 new housing units. Our work to support the members of the Canadian Armed Forces and their families continues each and every day.

Scott Anderson (Vernon—Lake Country—Monashee, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister is telling us half the story about the pay raises. What he is forgetting is that overseas, reductions of over \$1,500 a month are being taken back from living allowances. These are real families putting their lives on the line abroad who were given just six days' notice and are now scrambling to adjust.

The Liberal government increases pay only to claw it back. The headlines all scream about increased military pay, but why are so many frontline soldiers deployed overseas actually being forced to take a pay cut?

• (1510)

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Once again, Mr. Speaker, let us be factual: 8%, 13% and 20% pay increases; annual retention bonuses based on years of service; instructor benefits and special incentives to allow folks to move from the practising of their trades in the forces to become instructors.

We are making progress. We are, all together, collectively rebuilding the Canadian Armed Forces. The members on both sides of the House are aware of this. I would welcome their thoughtful input.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Parm Bains (Richmond East—Steveston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, global conflicts and chaotic and irrational decision-making with critical oil supply chains have led to increased global prices. While these events seem distant, they are already pushing prices higher at the pump and the grocery store and causing Canadians to rethink where they are booking their summer holiday.

Oral Questions

Budget 2025 laid out how Canada's new majority government will create a more independent and resilient Canadian economy. Can the secretary of state lay out how our government is supporting Canadians day to day?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes indeed, yesterday we paused and suspended the excise tax on fuel, which is 10¢. We cut the consumer carbon tax. That is another 18¢, which is 28¢ in total. We cut taxes for 22 million Canadians. The groceries and essentials benefit is \$1,900 per family this year and \$1,400 per family for the next four years.

On this side of the House, we are going to continue to focus on bringing costs down for Canadians and making life more affordable for Canadians. The members on that side continue with the rhymes and the rhetoric.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on April 6, the U.S. government imposed section 232 tariffs that threaten nearly 60,000 Canadian jobs and hit an industry worth \$6 billion that feeds our manufacturing sector, which is worth over \$100 billion. These new tariffs are hammering our mould-makers right now. Some companies are thinking of moving to the U.S., unfortunately. Canadian mould-makers are in Washington today trying to negotiate on their own because the Liberal government is refusing to do that.

When will the Prime Minister show that he cares about Windsor workers and Canadian businesses and actually defend our country's economy and our jobs?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course we will be there for the Windsor workers affected by these tariffs. That is why, also, along with Premier Ford, I was in Windsor a month ago to open a new, important battery factory with 3,000 new jobs in Windsor.

That being said, we are well aware of what my colleague is referring to. I met with the steel industry again yesterday. I have been working the phones. My colleague the Minister of U.S. Trade has also been on this. Our entire team in Washington is also activated.

Business of Supply

We will defend our steelworkers. We will defend aluminum workers.

* * *

GROCERY INDUSTRY

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, grocery giants are ripping off Canadians again. First, they colluded to fix bread prices. Now they are committing fraud through deceptive weight labels on meat. They are literally putting their fingers on the scales to overcharge shoppers. Instead of enforcing the law, the Liberals cut Canadian food inspectors, the only way to protect consumers.

The Prime Minister said he wanted to be judged on the cost of groceries. Will he take action to stop the food monopoly from cheating Canadians?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague that we definitely do not want companies to pass costs on to consumers. We will be there to protect consumers at a time when we know that the Competition Bureau needs to do its work. That is why my team and I have engaged the Competition Bureau. We will be hawkish on competition. We will go against any form of illegal proceedings.

Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties, and if you seek it I hope you will find unanimous consent for the following motion: That, in the opinion of the House, the government should ban surveillance pricing, where personal data is used by corporations to increase the prices consumers pay, both in store and on line.

Some hon. members: No.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

● (1515)

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—FUEL TAXES

The House resumed from April 14 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3:15 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion of the member for Calgary East relating to the business of supply.

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Speaker: The question is as follows. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

● (1525)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 95*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultatif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Berthold	Bexte
Bezan	Block
Borrelli	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Chambers	Chong
Cobena	Cody
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Davies (Niagara South)	Dawson
Deltell	DeRidder
Diotte	Doherty
Dowdall	Duncan
Epp	Falk (Bathurst—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Falk (Provencher)	Gallant
Généreux	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Groleau
Guglielmin	Gunn
Hallan	Hardy
Ho	Hoback
Holman	Jackson
Jansen	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kibble	Kirkland
Kmiec	Konanz
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kronis	Kuruc
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lawton
Lefebvre	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd	Lobb
Mahal	Majumdar
Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Mantle
Martel	Mazier
McCauley	McKenzie
Melillo	Menegakis
Moore	Morin
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Poillievre	Redekopp
Reid	Reynolds
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ross
Rowe	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shiple
Small	Steinley
Stevenson	Strahl
Strauss	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Uppal	Van Popta
Vien	Vierson
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh

Private Members' Business

Williamson

Zimmer — 134

NAYS

Members

Acan
 Ali
 Anand
 Bains
 Bardeesy
 Battiste
 Beech

 Bendayan
 Blanchet
 Blois
 Boulerice
 Brunelle-Duceppe
 Carr
 Chagger
 Chartrand
 Chen
 Chi
 Clark
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Danko
 DeBellefeuille
 Deschênes
 Desrochers
 Dhillon
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fancy
 Fergus
 Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Fuhr
 Gaaney
 Gasparro
 Gazan
 Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
 Gould
 Greaves
 Guilbeault
 Hajdu
 Harrison
 Hirtle
 Hogan
 Hussen
 Idlout
 Jeneroux
 Joly
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Lalonde
 Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Lavoie
 Leitão
 Lightbound
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Maloney
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)

Al Soud
 Alty
 Anandasangaree
 Baker
 Barsalou-Duval
 Beaulieu
 Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)
 Bittle
 Blanchette-Joncas
 Bonin
 Brière
 Carney
 Casey
 Champoux
 Chatel
 Chenette
 Church
 Connors
 Coteau
 Dandurand
 Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
 d'Entremont
 Deschênes-Thériault
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Duguid
 Earle
 El-Khoury
 Eyolfson
 Fanjoy
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Fry
 Gaheer
 Garon
 Gaudreau
 Gerretsen
 Gladu

 Grant
 Guay
 Gull-Masty
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Hodgson
 Housefather
 Iacono
 Jaczek
 Johns
 Joseph
 Kelloway
 Klassen
 Kwan
 Lamoureux
 Lapointe (Sudbury)
 Lattanzio
 Lavack
 LeBlanc
 Lemire
 Long
 Ma
 MacDonald (Cardigan)
 Mallette (Bay of Quinte)
 May
 McKelvie
 McKnight
 McPherson

Ménard
 Michel
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Nguyen
 Normandin
 Olszewski
 Osborne
 Petitpas Taylor
 Provost
 Rana
 Rochefort
 Royer
 Saini
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sheehan
 Simard
 Solomon
 Ste-Marie
 Sudds
 Thériault
 Turnbull
 van Koeverden
 Villeneuve
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zerucelli

Mendès
 Miedema
 Mingarelli
 Myles
 Nathan
 Noormohamed
 Ntumba
 O'Rourke
 Perron
 Powlowski
 Ramsay
 Robertson
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Sari
 Sawatzky
 Sgro
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sodhi
 Sousa
 St-Pierre
 Tesser Derksen
 Thompson
 Valdez
 Vandenbeld
 Watchorn
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi — 192

PAIRED

Members

Bonk
 Chang
 Oliphant
 Rempel Garner
 Sidhu (Brampton East)

 Champagne
 Kusie
 Plamondon
 Sarai
 Tolmie — 10

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1530)
 [English]

YOUTH CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT

The House resumed from April 14 consideration of the motion that Bill C-231, An Act to amend the Youth Criminal Justice Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-231, under Private Members' Business.

● (1540)
 [Translation]

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

(Division No. 96)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
 Aitchison
 Albas
 Allison

 Acan
 Al Doud
 Ali
 Alty

Private Members' Business

Anand	Anandasangaree	Hogan	Holman
Anderson	Anstey	Housefather	Hussen
Arnold	Au	Iacono	Idlout
Baber	Bailey	Jackson	Jaczek
Bains	Baker	Jansen	Jeneroux
Baldinelli	Bardeesy	Jivani	Johns
Barlow	Barrett	Joly	Joseph
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Beaulieu	Beech	Kelly	Khalid
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)	Khanna	Kibble
Bendayan	Berthold	Kirkland	Klassen
Bexte	Bezan	Kmiec	Konanz
Bittle	Blanchet	Koutrakis	Kram
Blanchette-Joncas	Block	Kramp-Neuman	Kronis
Blois	Bonin	Kuruc	Kwan
Borrelli	Boulerice	Lake	Lalonde
Bragdon	Brassard	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Brière	Brock	Lantsman	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins	Lapointe (Sudbury)	Larouche
Caputo	Carney	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Carr	Casey	Lavack	Lavoie
Chagger	Chambers	Lawrence	Lawton
Champoux	Chartrand	LeBlanc	Lefebvre
Chatel	Chen	Leitão	Lemire
Chenette	Chi	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Chong	Church	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lightbound
Clark	Cobena	Lloyd	Lobb
Cody	Connors	Long	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Cooper	Cormier	Ma	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Coteau	Dabrusin	MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Dalton	Dancho	Mahal	Majumdar
Dandurand	Danko	Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Davidson	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Maloney	Mantle
Davies (Niagara South)	Dawson	Martel	May
DeBellefeuille	Deltell	Mazier	McCauley
d'Entremont	DeRidder	McGuinty	McKelvie
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault	McKenzie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Desrochers	Dhaliwal	McKnight	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Dhillon	Diab	McPherson	Melillo
Diotte	Doherty	Ménard	Mendès
Dowdall	Duclos	Menegakis	Michel
Duguid	Duncan	Miedema	Miller
Dzerowicz	Earle	Mingarelli	Moore
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Morin	Morrison
Epp	Erskine-Smith	Morrissey	Motz
Eyolfson	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Muys	Myles
Falk (Provencher)	Fancy	Naqvi	Nater
Fanjoy	Fergus	Nathan	Nguyen
Fisher	Fonseca	Noormohamed	Normandin
Fortier	Fortin	Ntumba	Olszewski
Fragiskatos	Fraser	O'Rourke	Osborne
Fry	Fuhr	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Gaheer	Gainey	Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Gallant	Garon	Poilievre	Powlowski
Gasparro	Gaudreau	Provost	Ramsay
Gazan	Généreux	Rana	Redekopp
Gerretsen	Gill (Calgary Skyview)	Reid	Reynolds
Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Richards	Roberts
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	Robertson	Rochefort
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Gladu	Romanado	Rood
Godin	Goodridge	Ross	Rowe
Gould	Gourde	Royer	Ruff
Grant	Greaves	Sahota	Saini
Groleau	Guay	Sari	Savard-Tremblay
Guglielmin	Guilbeault	Sawatzky	Scheer
Gull-Masty	Gunn	Schiefke	Schmale
Hajdu	Hallan	Seeback	Sgro
Hanley	Hardy	Sheehan	Shiple
Harrison	Hepfner	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Hirtle	Ho	Small	Sodhi
Hoback	Hodgson	Solomon	Sousa
		Steinley	Ste-Marie

Private Members' Business

Stevenson
Strahl
Stubbs
Tesser Derksen
Thomas
Tochor
Uppal
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Viersen
Vis
Warkentin
Waugh
Wilkinson
Yip
Zerucelli
Zuberi — 327

St-Pierre
Strauss
Sudds
Thériault
Thompson
Turnbull
Valdez
Van Popta
Vien
Villeneuve
Wagantall
Watchorn
Weiler
Williamson
Zahid
Zimmer

Chi
Clark
Cormier
Dabrusin
Danko
DeBellefeuille
Deschênes
Desrochers
Dhillon
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fancy
Fergus
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fuhr
Gainey
Gasparro
Gazan
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Gould
Greaves
Guilbeault
Hajdu
Harrison
Hirtle
Hogan
Hussen
Idlout
Jeneroux
Joly
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lattanzio
Lavack
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Ma
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
May
McKelvie
McKnight
McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Ntumba
O'Rourke
Perron
Powlowski
Ramsay
Robertson
Romanado
Sahota
Sari
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sodhi
Sousa

Church
Connors
Coteau
Dandurand
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
d'Entremont
Deschênes-Thériault
Dhaliwal
Diab
Duguid
Earle
El-Khoury
Eyolfson
Fanjoy
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fry
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gladu
Grant
Guay
Gull-Masty
Hanley
Hepfner
Hodgson
Housefather
Iacono
Jaczek
Johns
Joseph
Kelloway
Klassen
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Larouche
Lauzon
Lavoie
Leitão
Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Normandin
Olszewski
Osborne
Petipas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Rochefort
Royer
Saini
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sheehan
Simard
Solomon
Ste-Marie

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Bonk
Chang
Oliphant
Rempel Garner
Sidhu (Brampton East)

Champagne
Kusie
Plamondon
Sarai
Tolmie — 10

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

[English]

CONSERVATION DONATIONS

The House resumed from April 14 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 15 under Private Members' Business in the name of the member for Brome—Missisquoi.

• (1550)

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

(Division No. 97)

YEAS

Members

Acan
Ali
Anand
Bains
Bardeesy
Battiste
Beech
Bendayan
Blanchet
Blois
Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chagger
Chartrand
Chen

Al Soud
Alty
Anandasangaree
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin
Brière
Carney
Casey
Champoux
Chatel
Chenette

Routine Proceedings

St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 193

Sudds
Thériault
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

Strahl
Thomas
Uppal
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Williamson

Stubs
Tochor
Van Popta
Vierson
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer— 132

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Anderson
Arnold
Baber
Baldinelli
Barrett

Berthold
Bezan
Borrelli
Brassard
Calkins
Chambers
Cobena
Cooper
Dancho
Davies (Niagara South)
Deltell
Diotte
Dowdall
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Généreux
Gill (Brampton West)
Gill (Windsor West)
Godin
Gourde
Guglielmin
Hallan
Hoback
Jackson
Jivani
Khanna
Kirkland
Konanz
Kramp-Neuman
Kuruc
Lantsman
Lawton
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lobb
Majumdar

Mantle
Mazier
McKenzie
Menegakis
Morin
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Redekopp
Reynolds
Roberts
Ross
Ruff
Schmale
Shipley
Steinley

Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Au
Bailey
Barlow
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Bexte
Block
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chong
Cody
Dalton
Davidson
Dawson
DeRidder
Doherty
Duncan
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Gallant
Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Goodridge
Groleau
Gunn
Ho
Holman
Jansen
Kelly
Kibble
Kmiec
Kram
Kronis
Lake
Lawrence
Lefebvre
Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd
Mahal
Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Martel
McCauley
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Rowe
Scheer
Seebach
Small
Stevenson

PAIRED

Members

Bonk
Chang
Oliphant
Rempel Garner
Sidhu (Brampton East)

Champagne
Kusie
Plamondon
Saraï
Tolmie— 10

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

CORRECTION TO OFFICIAL RECORD

Kathy Borrelli (Windsor—Tecumseh—Lakeshore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to request unanimous consent to register my vote for the first vote of our CPC opposition day motion as a yea. I had technical difficulties.

• (1555)

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that, because of the deferred recorded divisions, Government Orders will be extended by 39 minutes.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the draft regulations on the use of French in federally regulated private businesses.

* * *

[*English*]

JUSTICE

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and consistent with the policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaty entitled “Treaty between Canada and Japan on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters”, done in Ottawa on December 12, 2025.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Ahmed Hussien (York South—Weston—Etobicoke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development: the sixth report, entitled “More than a Moment: Investing in Canada’s Arctic Security”, and the seventh report, entitled “Securing Ukraine’s Future”. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to each of these two reports.

INDIGENOUS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Terry Sheehan (Sault Ste. Marie—Algoma, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fourth report on the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs in relation to Bill S-228, an act to amend the Criminal Code regarding sterilization procedures. The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House without amendments.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on International Trade in relation to the motion adopted on Tuesday, February 24, regarding Canada’s involvement in rules-based international trade and investment systems, as well as the 10th report of the Standing Committee on International Trade, in relation to the motion adopted on Tuesday, April 14, regarding the Ukraine goods remission order.

[Translation]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 21st report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

[English]

The committee advises that, pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the Subcommittee on Private Members’ Business met to consider the order for the second reading of private members’ public bills originating in the Senate, and recommended that the items listed herein, which it has determined should not be designated non-votable, be considered by the House.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the report is deemed adopted.

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

PUBLIC SAFETY

Jagsharan Singh Mahal (Edmonton Southeast, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a few petitions to present today.

I rise to present a petition on behalf of the people of Edmonton Southeast. Edmontonians do not feel safe in their homes or on the

Routine Proceedings

street. They note that little is being done to combat increasing crime, social disorder and extortion within the communities of Edmonton. However, hard-working Canadians deserve safe neighbourhoods and strong laws. The petitioners call upon the government to bring home safe streets by repealing all Liberal soft-on-crime laws and bringing back mandatory minimum sentencing for violent offenders.

• (1600)

HOUSING

Jagsharan Singh Mahal (Edmonton Southeast, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of Edmontonians and residents of Edmonton Southeast with regard to the rising housing crisis. As the cost of homes skyrockets, the dream of home ownership for many Canadians is slipping away. These residents describe out-of-control rent prices, while the lack of supply increases the price of new homes.

This petition, therefore, calls upon the government to cut bureaucracy, cut the GST on new homes under \$1.3 million, work with municipalities to create more affordable homes for all generations of Canadians and let the dream of home ownership be a reality for Canadians who are left out under the Liberal government.

TAXATION

Jagsharan Singh Mahal (Edmonton Southeast, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of all struggling Canadians, especially those in Edmonton. The cost of living crisis is affecting millions of Canadians and thousands of my constituents. The residents are describing visiting grocery stores as an increasing financial burden, something Conservatives have reminded the government about for a year. Many Canadians are having to make difficult decisions on whether to buy fresh produce or skip meals.

This petition calls upon the government to repeal all taxes that directly affect food production and the supply chain, such as the carbon tax and fertilizer tax. Canadians, Edmontonians and their wallets deserve a break.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Pauline Rochefort (Nipissing—Timiskaming, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, e-petition 6661, tabled today, calls for an independent review of military decorations from the Afghanistan mission. This is not about reopening the past. It is about ensuring that when new evidence emerges, our system allows us to look again.

Canada established its own Victoria Cross in 1993. It has never been awarded, despite more than 40,000 Canadians serving in Afghanistan. Our allies have conferred their highest honours, but Canada has not. That reality weighs on many veterans.

Routine Proceedings

In my riding, Afghanistan veterans tell me their service is not fully reflected in our national remembrance. The case of Private Jess Laroche of Nipissing—Timiskaming has come to symbolize this concern, and senior officers involved have since indicated that new information warrants a review. An independent process would strengthen confidence in our honours system and not weaken it.

This petition comes forward at a time when recent remarks by Donald Trump risk distorting the records of Canadian soldiers in Afghanistan. In turn, it provides the opportunity to show with equal clarity how Canada honours its own and recognizes courage and sacrifice at the highest level.

RECREATION FACILITIES

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, petitioners in my riding note that the federal government recently gave \$64 million to a new recreation centre in Brampton, \$20 million for the Somali Centre in Toronto, \$15 million for a Montreal North athletic centre, \$7 million for an aquatic centre in Qualicum Beach and \$6 million for a new aquatic centre in New Brunswick.

Petitioners from the Wolverines field hockey club are wondering why residents of the Fraser Valley are not getting their adequate share of recreational dollars for the same types of facilities they see in other communities across this country. Therefore, they call upon the federal government to be fair and equitable with taxpayer dollars and give some money to the Fraser Valley as well.

• (1605)

SALMON FISHERY

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I would like to present today is on behalf of the recreational fishing community in British Columbia. They are very concerned about access to coho and chinook.

They note that the federal government did not consult with them in advance of its proposed changes, and they are pleading, in good faith, with the Minister of Fisheries to maintain access for all British Columbians to practise their cultural right to fish, as British Columbians have always done.

IRAN

Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am here to present two petitions on behalf of my constituents.

The first is from constituents who are calling on the government to lead an international investigation into the Iranian regime's brutal crackdown on activists. Thousands have been killed. Tens of thousands have been arbitrarily arrested. The regime has used torture and sexual violence as a tool of repression.

The petitioners are calling for the use of Magnitsky sanctions against Iranian officials and the use of all diplomatic channels to demand the immediate release of Narges Mohammadi and the staying of all pending execution orders for political prisoners.

SALMON FISHERY

Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is on behalf of British Columbians who are deeply concerned about proposed changes to the salmon allocation policy that would decimate regular recreational fishing opportunities for

coho and chinook in British Columbia. Changing this common property principle risks turning a shared public resource into an exclusive privilege, reducing access for many Canadians and undermining confidence in fisheries management.

These B.C. residents are calling on the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to leave the current salmon allocation policy alone and uphold the cultural rights and traditions of all British Columbians.

ANIMAL WELFARE

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, this is a petition that I am so honoured to present. I am always honoured to present petitions from my constituents, but this is e-petition 6955, with an extraordinarily high number of supporters. In fact, just under 24,000 people signed this. The first signatories on the petition are all scientists from around the world.

In short, the petition notes that currently, under Canadian law, animals are treated as property and not considered sentient beings, but under increasing efforts internationally from scientists around the world, there is a very strong consensus that animals are sentient beings, not mere property. The petitioners, as I said, just under 24,000 of them, are calling on the government to pass legislation to recognize animals as sentient beings and not mere property.

I present this petition and hope that the government will attend to this matter and respond appropriately.

RECREATION FACILITIES

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the residents of Abbotsford—South Langley who are concerned about the lack of adequate sports infrastructure to support local youth and athletes.

The petitioners note that inefficient training facilities for the home Wolverines field hockey club are limiting athlete development, compromising safety and restricting opportunity for training and competition. They emphasize that access to proper facilities is essential to foster athletic growth, community engagement and safe participation in sports.

Therefore, the petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to provide funding and assistance through the federal sports infrastructure program and to work in partnership with the provincial and municipal governments to support construction of a new grass field hockey facility suitable for training, development and competitive play.

SALMON FISHERY

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition, on behalf of the residents of Abbotsford—South Langley who are concerned about the future management of accessibility in our country's salmon resources. They note that for generations, salmon in Canada has been managed by the common property resource held in trust by the federal government for the benefit of all Canadians.

The current salmon allocation policy supports conservation, transparency and fair access for indigenous, recreational and commercial harvesting. However, they warn that proposed changes in the policy could remove that foundational principle, undermining public access and stewardship, weakening salmon restoration efforts and risking the concentration of access in the hands of a few.

They ask that the government revise the principal salmon allocation policy, ensuring that salmon remains publicly managed and conservation efforts stay transparent and effective, while access is also preserved for all Canadians.

Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am tabling a petition on behalf of all British Columbians who love to fish for salmon and who are also deeply concerned about the proposed changes to the salmon allocation policy that would decimate regular recreational fishing opportunities for coho and chinook in British Columbia.

Changing this common property principle risks turning a shared public resource into an exclusive privilege, reducing access for many Canadians and undermining confidence in fisheries management. Petitioners note that it would be devastating to our tourism economy and the millions of dollars that flow into conservation efforts. Constituents are calling on the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to leave the current salmon allocation policy alone and uphold the cultural rights and traditions of all British Columbians.

• (1610)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise for the 10th time on behalf of the people of Dauphin, Manitoba, to present a petition on the rising rate of crime.

Residents of Dauphin and the Parkland region are demanding that the Liberal government repeal its soft-on-crime policies that have fuelled a surge in crime throughout their communities. Since 2015, there has been a 54% increase in violent crime and a 75% increase in sexual assaults across Canada.

Petitioners are deeply concerned by what they read in the local newspapers, including a November report that the Dauphin RCMP are searching for a wanted man with three separate arrest warrants. Our once-safe communities have now turned into places where people fear for their lives because the government's catch-and-release policies have allowed violent repeat offenders to be out on bail instead of in jail.

The people of Dauphin and the Parkland region demand that the Liberal government repeal its soft-on-crime policies that directly threaten their livelihoods and their communities. I fully support the good people of Dauphin.

Government Orders

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mike Kelloway (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[For text of questions and responses, see *Written Questions website*]

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mike Kelloway (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

LAWFUL ACCESS ACT, 2026

The House resumed from April 13 consideration of the motion that Bill C-22, An Act respecting lawful access, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the Secretary of State for Combatting Crime.

Bill C-22, an act respecting lawful access, is a tool that law enforcement has been asking for for many decades, in fact, over three decades. Canada is the only Five Eyes and G7 country not to have a formalized lawful access regime. We have had a couple of court decisions that spoke to the limits of this very important issue of lawful access that people have been asking for.

Over the past 10 months or so, the Minister of Justice, the Secretary of State for Combatting Crime and I have been going around the country meeting with police chiefs, as well as those in unions, law enforcement and, across the board, individuals who have direct experience with the impediments that the inability to have a lawful access regime poses to the safety and security of Canadians.

Government Orders

Members will be aware that over the last several months, I tasked a former minister from British Columbia, Murray Rankin, to engage with different parties, oftentimes those with competing or differing views, to build an element of consensus on what a lawful access regime should look like. The parties included those in civil society, academics, law enforcement, and industry. Mr. Rankin had a number of engagements between the four groups and made some recommendations to the Minister of Justice and me. I thank him for his work.

Based on that, and based on additional consultation, we put forward Bill C-22, which, in my opinion, balances the critical need for protection of individual privacy as well as ensuring that law enforcement has the necessary tools to do its work. I want to thank many colleagues, on both sides, who have been instrumental in helping us get to this point.

There are essentially three major parts to this bill. The first part, and I want to frame this—

● (1615)

Kelly McCauley: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe when the minister introduced the motion on Monday, he would have been deemed to have spoken on this. I wonder if he is eligible to speak again, seeing as he has already spoken on it.

The Deputy Speaker: I have consulted with several clerks extensively. The minister moved the motion for another minister, and so he is deemed to have spoken. However, if the minister now seeks unanimous consent to continue speaking, he can do so.

I invite the Minister of Public Safety to determine whether he wishes to move the unanimous consent motion so that he can continue speaking.

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree: Mr. Speaker, I do seek unanimous consent.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Does the House agree to the unanimous consent motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Public Safety can continue speaking.

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his very important intervention. I will get back to the substance of Bill C-22.

The different parties came together on what is essential for law enforcement to protect Canadians, and there are three major parts to the bill. I want to frame where the first one comes from. Twenty-five years ago, there were phone books that every household had. Bell Canada would deliver phone books to virtually every household. In that phone book, we could look up somebody's name and actually find a phone number. Similarly, there is a book that was a reverse lookup. We could essentially go to that phone book and, if we had a phone number, we could seek even the address of the individual whose address is attached to that phone number.

Technology has evolved extensively in the last three decades, and right now, we are at a point where that type of information is not readily available. Part 1 of the bill would essentially enable law enforcement to have basic, timely access to data and information. It

would essentially be a confirmation-of-service demand, which means that law enforcement could go to an electronic service provider and ask it if an individual phone number is associated with the company. It would be a simple answer of yes or no. There is nothing beyond it. There are no other aspects. It is a very simple yes-or-no question.

For example, in a case of extortion, where there may be a number of telephone numbers attached to an extortion threat, very simply, the individual law enforcement agency could canvass a multitude of service providers to seek confirmation of service. It is a demand that would enable law enforcement to know which company is a service provider for that particular phone number or, in this case, ISP.

The second element is about taking subscriber information, which is also part of part 1. This would enable, again, law enforcement to get basic information about the individual. This would be email addresses, an address, perhaps, or a name that corresponds to the individual phone number or ISP, the Internet service, that would allow law enforcement to further the investigation.

Right now, what happens is that, from the time the phone number is received to the time there is the required production order to get the information, it could sometimes be eight, 10 or 12 months before that information is obtained. This is essentially handcuffing the work of law enforcement.

From there, law enforcement would be able to access additional information as the bill seeks for the ESP, for example, to have the technical capability to offer information on the subscribers' use. This is a critical component of it that is essentially part of the supporting authorized access to information act or SAAIA. It would ensure that ESPs and telecommunication companies can comply with requests to produce certain types of information, data and communications that law enforcement may seek.

● (1620)

From there, for law enforcement to get additional information on a particular case, situation or a set of circumstances, it would require warrants. Warrants are judicially authorized, judicially reviewed and subject to preparation by law enforcement agencies.

The third major component of this bill is a review process, because we know that the pace of progress and the pace of technology is moving at a speed that really is beyond what humans expect. With AI, we know there are enormous challenges and changes about to come forward. As a result, we have a review provision that would enable Parliament to do a statutory review of the legislation and be able to make necessary amendments as required.

Let me highlight some very important components of the support we have. First and foremost, NSICOP, which has members from the House as well as from the Senate, had a unanimous report to have a lawful access regime embedded in Canadian law.

I will quote the former police officer and investigator, the member for Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner. It is rare for me to quote him, but I am super impressed with his depth of knowledge on this subject. He said, “Our current legislation means police face barriers around seizure authorities, causing investigative delays, sometimes with no way to get access to the information they need.”

This is an important piece of legislation, one that law enforcement demands and one that Canadians need for their safety and security. I would ask all parties to support this bill.

• (1625)

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

There are a lot of issues in this bill that I look forward to addressing at committee. One of the questions I have is about the role of ministerial orders. I am mindful of the fact that ministerial orders require approval from the intelligence commissioner, but then they then go into what I call a “vacuum” because they are kept confidential. I understand why they may need to be confidential.

Would the minister be open to discussing amendments that would require or enable some sort of transparency, whether it be that it is reviewed by a committee or somebody else, so it is not put into this vacuum that lacks transparency when these orders are made in confidence?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree: Mr. Speaker, I will say, at the outset, that we have consulted the intelligence commissioner and the provisions in this bill reflect what is required, in our opinion, for that transparency and accountability to take place. Of course, as I have always said, we look forward to this bill proceeding to committee and a more robust conversation taking place at the committee stage.

[Translation]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yes, we agree with the minister that this bill is important.

My question is rather simple. Bill C-22 is much better than Bill C-2, and it includes more protections. That proves one thing: Bill C-2 was hastily thrown together without consultation. It is a good thing the government only had a minority. That meant that we did not have to pass that bill and that we are now able to debate Bill C-22, which is much better.

Is the minister willing to agree to amendments to further improve Bill C-22?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend the minister for his leadership in preparing this bill, which is another example of how our government is taking Canadians' safety seriously and acting accordingly.

As members know, law enforcement has long been asking us to modernize Canada's lawful access capabilities and powers. Bill C-22 has been very well received by a number of organizations that represent law enforcement. I am thinking in particular of the Cana-

Government Orders

dian Association of Chiefs of Police, which is encouraging all members to work together to pass the bill quickly.

My question for the minister is, how were the various organizations representing law enforcement consulted in the drafting of Bill C-22?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question and for his work.

[English]

We did extensive consultations, on an individual basis, with the Secretary of State for Combatting Crime, the Minister of Justice, me and other colleagues. For example, we were in Halton, where we met with the regional police. I want to thank the member of Parliament for Oakville West for her advocacy.

We have gone across Canada and consulted with law enforcement agencies. This is a critical tool that they have asked to be made part of Canadian law.

• (1630)

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I know the telecom sector is very concerned about the costs of complying with this legislation. I wonder what sort of compensation schemes, if any, the government anticipates putting into place to ensure this legislation can be complied with.

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree: Mr. Speaker, we expect compliance from telecommunication companies and other service providers. We are not contemplating compensation. This is part of the CRTC's licensing. As members are aware, these are licences that are provided to the public, and in the public interest, it is important there is compliance from those service providers, which are essentially governed by Canadian law.

* * *

[Translation]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill, to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-209, an act to restrict young persons' online access to pornographic material.

[English]

It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Edmonton Strathcona, Public Service of Canada; the hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, Carbon Pricing.

*Government Orders***LAWFUL ACCESS ACT, 2026**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-22, An Act respecting lawful access, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in an increasingly and rapidly evolving digital world, law enforcement services are having to mitigate new challenges in the face of a rising tide of criminal activity using technology. Let me give some examples that we have been hearing. Cases of extortion are on the rise, including with arson and with shootings. Pedophiles are exploiting children online, which often leads to sextortion or human trafficking. Just in 2024, we lost over \$600 million to fraud and cybercrime, and often the victims of these crimes are our most vulnerable seniors.

This bill, in fact, would help law enforcement to be able to tackle these challenges. These new challenges have created a gap in ensuring the safety and security of Canadians. This gap is between what our investigators know and what our legal framework allows them to do about it. I am pleased to say that Bill C-22 would close the gap that currently exists.

When an investigator receives a tip, a phone number linked to an extortion ring or a child exploitation case, or information about a human trafficking network, they have the grounds to investigate. They are ready to move, but before they can seek a production order from a judge, they need the answer to one foundational question: Which telecom company services the number? Under our current law, there is no clear legal tool to get that answer. Police must rely on voluntary co-operation, which may come in days or weeks, or not at all. Investigators may have to spend considerable time and resources pursuing a provider, only to learn that the phone number was never that of the suspect, and then they have to start all over again. In some cases, this completely stalls the investigation, not because the officers failed, but because the law did.

Peel Regional Police has described cases where quick confirmation from a telecom company, a simple yes-or-no answer about whether a phone number is theirs, was the centre point of an entire investigation. That confirmation allowed them to seek a production order, identify a suspect and locate the victim quickly, but that outcome depended entirely on the provider choosing to co-operate voluntarily, as there was no legal framework requiring it. The victim was found because of goodwill, not because of the law, and goodwill does not always come. Goodwill is not what the justice system should rely on.

What does Bill C-22 actually do? Let me describe the following tools that would aid law enforcement officials.

The first tool is the confirmation of service demand. Police can ask a telecom or an Internet service provider one question: "Do you service this number or IP address?" It is a yes or no only. That is all: no content, no personal information, no communications. This question alone does not require a warrant, because the Supreme Court has recognized that a yes-or-no confirmation does not carry the same privacy weight as subscriber details or content.

The second tool is a new, faster, narrower production order specifically for subscriber information, which means name, address

and account details. This would require a judge and require reasonable grounds. This process would be court-supervised at every step. It would provide a more direct path to that basic identifying information so that investigators can act quickly at the start of a case without waiting on a process designed for other, far more sensitive data.

The third tool requires core electronic service providers to actually have the technical capability to respond to lawful orders. Right now, and this is the part that is almost impossible to believe, a provider may receive a court order and be genuinely unable to comply, not unwilling but unable, because they have never built the infrastructure to respond. Investigations have stalled and in some cases gone cold for this reason alone.

● (1635)

Canada is currently the only Five Eyes G7 country without a lawful access regime. The United Kingdom has one. The United States has one. Australia and New Zealand also have them. We are not proposing something radical. We are proposing something long overdue.

The OPP commissioner and president of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, Thomas Carrique, told reporters that he and many of Canada's police leaders have been sounding the alarm about the need for lawful access for the last 30 years, before smart phones and before the modern Internet.

I want to now speak directly to those who have raised concerns about this legislation, those who believe, as I do, that protecting the privacy of Canadians is a fundamental function of government. They are not wrong to ask the hard questions. They are not wrong to be skeptical. That is what democracy is all about. This is why I want to tell them how we are balancing bringing investigative capacity into the modern era while at the same time protecting the privacy rights of Canadians.

Every ministerial order requiring a provider to build lawful access capabilities must be reviewed and approved by the independent federal intelligence commissioner before it takes effect. Annual public reports would be required under this bill. The new subscriber production order would cover basic subscriber information and nothing more: no browsing history, no content and no communications without a separate and higher judicial threshold.

Government Orders

This bill was shaped directly by feedback from numerous consultations with law enforcement, civil liberties groups, telecoms and Internet service providers. It is also shaped by Supreme Court rulings that tell us precisely where the constitutional lines are. We drew those lines, built in oversight and narrowed the scope from what was proposed before, because we understand that we cannot afford to get this wrong. Technology continues to evolve, and this is the moment. We must act now. Victims and investigators cannot wait any longer for action.

This is what I need everyone in the House to understand: The alternative to this bill is not privacy. The alternative is impunity. A legal framework where investigators cannot confirm which telecom or Internet service provider to approach, and where the first step of an investigation depends on voluntary goodwill, is not a framework that protects rights. It is a framework that currently protects criminals.

Canada was built on a promise. We are not a country that chooses between safety and freedom. We built the charter because we believe we can have both. We built our courts because we believe oversight is strength and not weakness. That is exactly what this bill reflects: not surveillance, but accountability; not a back door, but a courthouse door, one that finally works in the digital world.

Every day we delay is another day an investigator hits a wall at the very first step of a case. Every day we delay, another victim waits, while police chase down voluntary confirmations that may never come. Every day the police have to wait, victims multiply. Every day we delay, there are families somewhere in the country waiting for answers that exist but that we choose not to allow investigators to reach.

I have heard it said that we cannot let security compromise freedom. I agree completely, and that is precisely why I am standing here today. Freedom without justice is not freedom. It is a promise we made and did not keep. The law, not the gaps in it, not the limitations of outdated legislation and not the absence of a framework that our allies have had for years, is the supreme authority of this country. It is time we made that mean something in the digital age.

• (1640)

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

One question I really hope the Secretary of State for Combatting Crime can answer right here and right now is a very clear question that relates to encrypted communications: Would this bill be going after encrypted communications, yes or no?

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, the bill as it is right now does not provide for encrypted communications. I know that after the bill passes, there is a regulatory framework that is going to take place, but that, too, does not envision receiving the content of encrypted, detailed messages. What it does is connect who is sending those messages, and that is what is really important to law enforcement, so that they can catch those who are involved in criminal activity.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have been told that all police services across Canada want this. They are demanding it. We understand them. This is a tool they need, but questions have been raised. For instance, lawyers who specialize in privacy protection want to know why the government set such a low threshold for collecting information.

Perhaps the secretary of state can explain to me why the government feels that reasonable grounds to suspect a crime will be committed—rather than reasonable grounds to believe that a crime will be committed—is sufficient to make a demand for information.

In law, there is a big difference between those two thresholds for demanding information.

[*English*]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, reasonable grounds to suspect have been used in other places in the Criminal Code. I think that is completely appropriate in this case, since these are the initial steps in an investigation.

Confirmation and subscriber information provide the police the ability to eliminate or narrow down suspects, so these are the first, initial steps of an investigation. At that point, having reasonable grounds to believe would be too high of a burden and would hinder investigations and us getting to the bottom of catching criminals.

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been fortunate to have a good working relationship with Hamilton police and the Hamilton Police Association. One of the things they bring up on a regular basis is the need for the tools that are in this bill to properly investigate crimes.

The secretary of state mentioned in her speech the discussions that she has had with OPP and law enforcement. I was wondering if she could expand on that and the response that she has had from law enforcement across Canada.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I have been really pleased with the response. Law enforcement, from the beginning of Bill C-2 to now, has been actively involved in providing recommendations and assistance on making sure that this bill is tabled so that they can see it passing.

As I have said before, it has been decades in the works. Many governments and different Parliaments have brought a version of this bill forward. It is time that we get it passed, because we are falling far behind.

• (1645)

Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions.

Government Orders

I know that law enforcement has been asking for this for quite some time, and I know they are generally pleased with the start of this. I am wondering whether my colleague has heard any feedback from law enforcement that is encouraging Parliament to go further with this legislation, some specific things they are asking for that are not yet in this bill.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for his years of service, as well as his contributions. I know that the member cares greatly about getting this legislation right and making sure that, hopefully, it passes through the House.

I think law enforcement would be in agreement for maybe even a broader scope, but that is something we can work on, with this as a first step. We need to get this passed in order to take those other steps in the future. I would be open to going further in the future as well.

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-22, an act respecting lawful access. I will be splitting my time with my hon. colleague from Kitchener Centre.

I want to give a shout-out to my excellent staff here in Ottawa, Harry McGuire, Aidan Plesa and Andrew Gelok, for their great work in helping me research, both in committee and in the House, this important legislation.

Conservatives recognize that we need to ensure that law enforcement and national security agencies have the tools required to investigate serious crime in this increasingly digital age, but as members of His Majesty's loyal opposition, our job is to hold the government accountable to ensure that we can get the best legislation for Canadians. That means holding government accountable when we are talking about important issues such as expanding state powers in relation to increased surveillance. It is our responsibility as an official opposition to scrutinize, to challenge, and to ensure that any new authority is absolutely necessary, proportionate and consistent with the rights and freedoms of Canadians.

This legislation has evolved from the original Bill C-2 legislation that was brought forward in the fall. It is important to give a bit of background on that legislation and why we are here today. The first substantive piece of legislation introduced in the sitting of the current Parliament was Bill C-2, which proposed a number of significant legal changes regarding Canada's national security, to disrupt organized crime and secure the border.

Conservatives were and remain supportive of any efforts to provide law enforcement with the tools necessary to keep Canadians safe, but we could not support Bill C-2 in its original form. We know that civil liberties organizations and all opposition parties in the House felt that Bill C-2, in particular the lawful access regime in parts 14 and 15, fell short of what was needed. Bill C-22 represents the government's second attempt at enacting lawful access legislation. While I would say that there are improvements, particularly in narrowing certain provisions, some of the structural issues remain and have to be looked into further.

Law enforcement and CSIS need modern tools to deal with modern threats. The issue that the bill is attempting to address is real. Law enforcement and national security experts have long argued that they do not have the tools to effectively go after terrorists, or-

ganized criminals and child predators, who are coordinating a lot of their activity online.

Part 1 of the bill focuses on investigative authorities, and in many respects it is an improvement over what was previously proposed in Bill C-2. That said, while the direction in this legislation is more measured than Bill C-2, concerns remain, particularly with respect to the legal thresholds, scope and the adequacy of any safeguards.

I want to talk about the new powers and authorities proposed in the legislation. Part 1 proposes a number of changes that are clearly aimed at improving the efficiency of investigations in a digital environment. It would amend existing search warrant provisions to permit the examination of computer data during the execution of a warrant, and it would also introduce new information demands and production orders that could be used both by police forces and by CSIS. In addition, it would create mechanisms to facilitate access to data held by foreign-based service providers, which reflects the reality that much of the information that law enforcement and security agencies need in this country is not even being stored within our own borders.

These would be very practical changes, and they would respond to real challenges faced by investigators. However, the details of how these powers would be structured, and the limits that would be placed on them, remain critically important.

I want to talk about the confirmation of service demands. One of the proposed powers outlined in part 1 is the confirmation of service demands. This would allow authorities to ask a telecommunications provider a very narrow question, which is whether or not it provides service to a particular person or subscriber. The response would be limited to a simple yes or no. Compared to what was proposed in Bill C-2, this is a much more restrained approach. In Bill C-2, information demands could be issued to any person who provides services to the public. This would now be limited to telecom providers.

One of the more concerning elements of Bill C-2 was other subscriber data. For example, there was concern that people's medical records could be accessed. Thankfully, I believe that this has been clarified and the scope has been narrowed with the new legislation.

Government Orders

I want to talk about foreign data requests. Another significant element of part 1 of the bill is the introduction of a mechanism that would allow Canadian judges to authorize requests for data held by foreign entities. This reflects a very real challenge to modern investigation, as data is frequently being stored outside of Canada, often by companies that operate in multiple jurisdictions. Providing a judicially authorized pathway for these requests may improve co-operation and provide greater legal certainty for foreign service providers. However, it is important to recognize that this would not fully resolve the challenges associated with cross-border data access and whether there would be any way to compel foreign service providers to comply with the requests.

• (1650)

There is also a section on publicly available and voluntary information. The bill clarifies that law enforcement would be able to receive and act upon information that is either voluntarily provided or publicly available, without the need for a warrant or a production order. This appears to be a reasonable clarification, but I do wonder if it raises questions about scope, because what exactly qualifies as publicly available information? Does it include information that has been exposed through data breaches or leaks? Without clear definitions, there is a risk that this provision could be interpreted much more broadly than seems to have been intended. This is something that needs to be addressed.

I want to talk about one of the reasons the legislation was brought forward. It was partially in response to the *Bykovets* decision of the Supreme Court. In 2024, the Supreme Court ruled that IP addresses have a reasonable expectation of privacy. In that case, police had received an IP address voluntarily from a financial company that had flagged suspected fraudulent transactions to the police. However, since the IP address was not acquired using a production order, this evidence could not be used. Privacy experts have raised concerns that the provisions in the bill may not actually address the issues created by the Supreme Court of Canada's decision. That is concerning.

Part 2 of the bill would enact the supporting authorized access to information act. It is in this section of the legislation that privacy experts seem to have raised the most concerns. It would require electronic service providers to build and maintain systems capable of supporting the lawful access regime, including real-time interception when authorized. In practical terms, this means that companies would be required to design their systems in such a way that law enforcement could access communications once the appropriate legal authorization has been obtained.

With respect to the scope of the application, one of the key concerns with part 2 is the breadth and the definition of what an electronic service provider is. As the bill is currently drafted, this is not limited to traditional telecommunications companies and could extend to a very wide range of entities, including digital platforms, messaging and cloud services, and potentially businesses where communications are only an incidental part of the business.

This could create both practical and legal challenges, as well as uncertainty about who is captured by the legislation, because almost all businesses these days have some sort of electronic recording or storage. There is a possibility that smaller or non-traditional

actors would be subject to complex obligations that they are, frankly, not equipped or cannot afford to meet. If the objective is targeted modernization, then the definition needs to be more clear. Unfortunately, as was recently the case with Bill C-8, many of these specific details were left blank and have been left to regulations.

Another area of significant concern in part 2 is the retention of metadata. Under the act, ESPs could be required to retain metadata for a reasonable period of time of up to one year. This is particularly concerning since that data may reveal a person's location. While there are provisions on the retention of information that could reveal private communications and web browsing history, experts have raised concerns that Canadians who are not accused of any wrongdoing may still have their data retained that could reveal their location. It is important to note that similar provisions that were put in place in the EU were actually found disproportionate and unlawful.

In his analysis of the legislation, privacy lawyer David Fraser explained that requiring companies to create capabilities that do not currently exist within their systems to assist law enforcement could lead to creating vulnerabilities within the systems themselves. This can include the development of interception tools that resemble traditional wiretap capabilities adapted for modern environments.

In 2023 and 2024, multiple U.S. telecom companies were compromised, and hackers were able to access data from millions of customers and obtain audio recordings of calls made by senior government and elected officials. I raise this example because U.S. officials subsequently reported that the hackers exploited vulnerabilities that the companies had installed in order to comply with lawful access requests from law enforcement. We need to be very aware that we could be creating a risk if this is not done properly.

The legislation would also have practical cost considerations that cannot be ignored. We know that the compliance costs could be significant, and we do not want those costs to be borne by taxpayers.

In conclusion, I believe that Bill C-22 addresses some real and pressing challenges. It contains provisions that can include the effectiveness of investigations, but at the same time we need to ensure that these new powers would be effective and necessary, and that they would not unnecessarily infringe on the freedoms of Canadians.

Government Orders

● (1655)

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the comments from the member for Parkland were a very thoughtful review of the legislation that is before us. He brought up some really important points on the rights of privacy and freedoms, as well as the issue of cross-border data, which is something that could require additional investigation.

Of course, the purpose of the legislation is to identify, investigate and prosecute threats, including drug trafficking, terrorism and violent crimes, etc. I think we all see a priority to hold criminals responsible and to give police the tools that they need to investigate crimes and to stop crimes before they happen.

Would the member opposite agree that the discussion could continue at committee and that additional changes could be made to make the legislation before us even stronger and more effective?

Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, I think committee is a great place to hash out legislation and to hear from experts on civil liberties, privacy and law enforcement. When we have all those voices, as we saw with Bill C-8 at the public safety committee, we are able to put forward proposals to fix things.

When I was talking, in the wake of the Bykovets decision in 2024, to local integrated child exploitation teams, they were so disappointed, because a lot of the tips we receive in Canada actually come from the FBI. A lot of the child sexual abuse material being circulated is coming from Canada, but they are finding it only on computers in the United States. Under the Bykovets decision, that information could not be used, because it was not being obtained by a production order and a warrant. We need to ensure that our system is stronger so we can ensure that Canada is not a safe haven for people who produce child sexual abuse material.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on the comment and question raised earlier by my colleague from Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon.

Although Bill C-22 corrects certain aspects of last year's Bill C-2, according to the Canadian Bar Association, it falls far short of addressing all the gaps and issues raised during the study of Bill C-2. Several issues still need to be examined and addressed during the study of Bill C-22.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on that.

[*English*]

Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, this is second reading of the legislation that has been put forward. If the legislation does move forward to committee, I think that will be an excellent opportunity to hear from witnesses, possibly the Canadian Bar Association, to hear their concerns. I know that we are meeting with many different stakeholder groups to talk about various concerns with the legislation that is before us today. I think the ultimate goal is to ensure that we have the best piece of legislation, one that balances the freedoms of Canadians with the digital tools that law enforcement needs to keep Canadians safe and to keep our country a place that criminals cannot treat like their own backyard.

● (1700)

Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether my colleague would share the concerns that some Canadians have already expressed with respect to ministerial orders, requiring only the approval of the intelligence commissioner, rather than maybe adding the Privacy Commissioner or even judicial oversight onto those ministerial orders. I wonder if he shares the concerns of people who have raised that issue.

Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, ministerial orders are very powerful tools. I think we need to ensure that they are the appropriate tools and that they are the necessary tools. I do note that an improvement to the legislation is that it is very clear that judicial authorizations would be needed in the vast majority of the cases that are dealing with the legislation. I think it should give Canadians some relief to know that this would be added, but we need to ensure that these measures would be proportionate and that they would actually be effective in getting the job done in the way that we want it to get done.

Kelly DeRidder (Kitchener Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in the House to speak on behalf of Kitchener Centre residents. Today, I will be speaking to Bill C-22, an act respecting lawful access.

Let me start with the principle that has guided Conservatives for generations, which is that Canadians deserve to feel safe in their homes, their communities and their daily lives. They deserve a justice system that reflects the same values they hold, one that protects their freedoms and keeps the focus where it belongs, which is on keeping criminals accountable and victims protected. Conservatives believe in law and order. We have always stood for practical measures that keep our streets safe, protect our victims and respect the rights of Canadians. That is not new.

For the past decade, we have been warning the government that its approach to public safety and justice has been failing Canadians by putting dangerous criminals on bail and allowing them to walk on our streets, often to just reoffend again. We have been repeatedly asking the Liberals to reverse the policies that weaken the consequences for crime and leave communities feeling less safe. Instead, the current government has doubled down and allowed the situation to worsen.

This is not just theatrics. In my community of Kitchener Centre, officers are dealing with repeat calls. The Waterloo Regional Police Service has reported that a small number of repeat offenders are responsible for a large share of the calls that they get. The same names come up again and again while officers are pulled from other emergencies. Members can think about what that means. The same person can be arrested and released on bail, sometimes even on the same day, only for the police to rearrest them all over again.

Government Orders

Instead of strengthening enforcement and ensuring our frontline police officers and first responders have the resources they need, the government has gone to bat for policies that do not always reflect the realities on the ground, and Canadians can see the results in their communities. They see them in rising crime rates and in their local police forces that are stretched thin. As His Majesty's loyal opposition, it is our role to see if legislation has gone too far. It is not only our role to say so, but also our responsibility.

That is the context in which we find Bill C-22.

Nobody understands more than Canadians that our police services need the necessary tools to do their jobs and be able to keep up with the modern world. They deal with real threats and emergencies. They deserve a system that supports their work. That is not the issue. What Canadians expect and what they deserve is a respect for their privacy and freedom at the same time. However, these tools must be carefully balanced with the rights of Canadians. Public safety and civil liberties do not actually oppose one another; they work hand in hand. That is why Conservatives are approaching this with such caution.

These tools must be able to withstand scrutiny over time. Everyone benefits from clarity. For those in public safety and the general public, clarity reduces uncertainty, because once the government gains access to more of Canadians' personal information, it is not just a question of what it will do with it today, but what it will do with it tomorrow and then the day after that as well. That is why Canadians are paying attention, and the questions they are asking are about trust. They should not be difficult ones for the government to answer. Who has access to this information? Under what conditions can it be accessed? How is that access controlled? What safeguards exist to ensure it is not misused? Where is the line drawn? I think Canadians deserve to know.

When Canadians hear about lawful access, most of them are not thinking about legal definitions and technical terms. What it really boils down to is who can see their information, and why and how that data would be used. If those answers are not clear in the law itself, then it leaves too much room for interpretation and confusion later on what the law is being applied to in real situations.

So much of our lives take place online. We communicate online and bank online, some of us work online, and we store information online. We shop online, and we watch our favourite shows online. More and more of what we do in our daily lives leaves a digital trace. That does not automatically create a problem, but it does mean that the laws around access to digital information now reach further into ordinary activities than they once did.

For example, simple data, such as if someone sends a message, where they are or what device they are on, can reveal a lot about their daily life, even if the actual content of the message is never read aloud. Even something as simple as linking a name to an IP address can reveal where a person goes online, what they look at, their habits or who they talk to.

• (1705)

Good legislation is not just about intent. It is about whether the rules are clear enough that they cannot be misinterpreted. It is about whether the safeguards in place are strong enough that Canadians'

rights are protected. Once information is shared in a digital system, it can move quickly between organizations.

That is what Canadians want and, frankly, deserve to know. It is not just who can access their information, but how it is tracked and how it will be protected once accessed. If Canadians cannot see that process clearly, it becomes harder for them to trust how the system is going to work. Once they start to believe that their personal information is not fully protected, it changes things as they know it. It changes how they interact with technology, how they communicate and how confident they feel in their institutions.

We can also not ignore a particularly vulnerable group in this conversation: children and young Canadians. They are now growing up in a world where sharing information is automatic, not deliberate. Many of them do not fully understand what happens to their data once it is shared, who can access it or how long it is stored. That is precisely why the law must be written with them in mind.

Research from the Canadian Centre for Child Protection highlights that young people are more likely to make privacy decisions online without fully understanding the long-term implications of how their personal information may be collected, stored or used. Similarly, Pew Research Centre research shows that teenagers often underestimate how visible and permanent their online activity is. This falls not only under privacy legislation in general but also under what the definition of lawful access means.

The risks do not fall to everyone equally. They cling to those who are the least equipped to understand how their information is being used. We must also recognize that consent in a digital environment is not always meaningful when users do not fully understand what they are agreeing to. Conservatives want to protect kids, which is why clear rules, strict limits on access and strong accountability matters.

Canadians outside this chamber are not reading every clause of the bill, but they know that government decisions impact their daily lives. They understand what it means when privacy is weakened. They have seen before what happens when government powers grow without transparency and accountability. Really, it all comes down to trust, and right now, that trust is fragile.

Government Orders

A poll from Ipsos, as reported by Global News, shows that Canadians are increasingly worried about how their personal data is being collected and used, especially in private industry and by government. Canadians need to be able to trust that, when government is given access to sensitive personal information, it will use that authority carefully and only within clear limits set out by the law. They need to trust that those limits are not flexible or open to interpretation, but firm enough to protect Canadians in practice, not just in principle. They need to trust that, over time, these powers will not quietly expand beyond what was originally approved. Once that trust is lost, it is very difficult to rebuild. That is why clarity, restraint and accountability matter just as much as the intent behind the text itself.

Conservatives are not interested in rushing this process. We are not interested in opposing the bill just to oppose it. We are interested in getting this right for Canadians. They should not have to choose between being safe and being free. They deserve both. Conservatives will stand for both as we review Bill C-22.

• (1710)

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague expressed some concerns about public safety, and I want to reassure her. On this side of the House, we take these commitments to make our communities safer seriously. The purpose of Bill C-14 is to ensure tougher sentences for repeat violent offenders, while Bill C-16 seeks to better protect victims. Finally, the purpose of Bill C-22 is to provide law enforcement with the tools they need to properly investigate various crimes being committed using more modern technology.

Her colleague, the member for Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, even said that the bill would better assist law enforcement in their investigations and that he welcomed this legislation. He urged us to send Bill C-22 to committee. I would like to know whether the member agrees with her Conservative colleague that the bill is a step in the right direction for law enforcement in this country. Does she also agree that it should be sent to committee?

[English]

Kelly DeRidder: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully disagree that the Liberals are taking it seriously to act on public safety.

In Ontario, violent firearms offences increased by 98% last year, and instead of addressing illegal firearms or border control, the government tried to do a failed gun buy-back program, which is not taking those illegal firearms off the street and is not actually protecting Canadians. There have been other measures showing that whatever the Liberals tried to do, they failed over and over again.

While Bill C-22 is moving in the right direction, there is work to do here. We will be scrutinizing the bill, as the Conservative Party, to make sure that we get it right for Canadians.

[Translation]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her detailed speech, which provided a thorough analysis of the situation. It was very interesting. I understand that there has been some criticism.

Since the minister just said that he was open to making improvements in committee, I have the same question as the member who spoke before me. I would like to know whether my colleague thinks that this bill is worth debating and examining in committee.

[English]

Kelly DeRidder: Mr. Speaker, I do think that it is worth reviewing in committee.

Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I used to live in my colleague from Kitchener Centre's riding. It is a wonderful area. I am very glad that she is representing it.

The member brought up the point of a lack of trust in the government and a fear of a lack of transparency and accountability. The government will argue not to worry because inside the bill is a mandated comprehensive review of the legislation in three years. However, we have the same thing for the Access to Information Act, which the government has blown off; the Environmental Protection Act, which the government has blown off; the Lobbying Act, which the government has not done a review on; the Conflict of Interest Act; the Proceeds of Crime and Terrorist Financing Act; the CSIS Act; the Anti-terrorism Act; and the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act. For all of these acts, the government has blown off the legislative review.

Does my colleague trust that the government is going to do the review as mandated, or will it be just another broken promise from the Liberal government?

Kelly DeRidder: Mr. Speaker, truthfully, I do not trust the Liberal government right now to handle crime and what is happening in our communities. I will share a very personal reason why that is.

Homicide is up almost 51% in Ontario, and that is not just a statistic for me. A very close and dear friend of mine was murdered and was part of these numbers last year. She was murdered by someone who had committed repeat violent offences, including stabbing, and that is how my friend died. She was stabbed to death.

The revolving door that is our justice system is a piece that has been ignored. We have put opposition motions forward to try to reverse what is happening in this country. No, I do not have faith in this coming forward with the Liberal government, and I do not trust that it will keep its promise on this. We will continue to hold the government accountable, and we will do this right.

• (1715)

Taleb Noormohamed (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Hull—Aylmer.

Government Orders

I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-22, an act respecting lawful access.

I want to start by asking two questions that I think Canadians are rightly asking.

The first is this: Are we meeting the moment when it comes to investigating crimes in a digital world? The tools that criminals use today, including encrypted communications, cryptocurrency and transnational digital networks, did not exist five years ago the way that they do now and certainly not at the scale at which they exist now. The crimes have not changed. Child exploitation is real and still exists in our world. Organized crime has not changed, and fentanyl trafficking is still there. What has changed, however, is how these crimes are carried out and the degree to which our existing investigative tools simply cannot keep pace.

The second question is just as important: Are we doing this in a way that protects the privacy of Canadians? If the answer to the first question comes at the expense of the second, then we have not done our job.

Bill C-22 seeks to answer both questions.

I think it is important to walk through what the legislation would do because there has been a lot of confusion and misinformation about what is being proposed. Bill C-22 has two parts that would work together. Part 1 would modernize legal authorities that law enforcement and CSIS need to investigate crimes in a digital environment. Part 2, the supporting authorized access to information act, would establish the technical requirements for electronic service providers, companies like our major telcos, to be able to comply with existing court-authorized processes. I want to emphasize the word “existing”. The bill would not create new surveillance powers, new intercept authorities or back doors into any one system. It would make the court-authorized processes that we already have, warrants and production orders, which are tools that have always required judicial oversight, functional in a world that has moved online.

Right now, if a judge were to issue a production order for evidence held by a service provider, there is no regulatory framework in Canada that requires the provider to have the technical capability to comply. I would ask us all to think about that for a moment. A judge can authorize access to evidence, but the system to carry that out may not exist. That is the gap this bill seeks to close.

Folks may ask, “Why now?” The answer is simple: The gap between criminal capability and law enforcement capability is widening, not narrowing. Two Supreme Court decisions, *R. v. Spencer* and *R. v. Bykovets*, have brought important clarity to the legal landscape around digital investigations. In *Spencer*, the court confirmed that police need a warrant to obtain basic subscriber information. In *Bykovets*, the court extended that principle to IP addresses. These rulings affirmed something important: Canadians have a reasonable expectation of privacy in their digital lives. This bill would respect that.

Those decisions also made clear how outdated our existing legislative framework really is. The law as it stands was not built to function in a world where, rightly, judicial authorization is required at these stages. Without the proper tools to operate within that reali-

ty efficiently, investigations are slowing at precisely the moments when timeliness matters the most.

Here is a practical reality. When police are investigating a serious crime, such as a child exploitation case, an extortion ring or an active threat, and have a court-authorized production order in hand, they still need to know which service provider holds the relevant data. Under the current framework, they cannot even ask that question. They cannot confirm whether a provider services a particular IP address, not the subscriber's identity, just whether the provider has any connection to that address at all. If they serve the order on the wrong provider, they have to start all over again. Meanwhile, evidence degrades, trails go cold and, in some cases, kids remain at risk.

That is the gap I am talking about. It is not hypothetical; it is playing out in investigations across the country, and it is costing us time that we simply do not have.

We are the only Five Eyes country and the only G7 member without a modernized lawful access framework. What that means practically is that Canadian law enforcement has had to rely on international partners to do what we should have been able to do ourselves. That is simply not a sustainable position for a country that takes both public safety and sovereignty seriously.

We also need to have the conversation about whatever concerns exist about privacy.

● (1720)

I would ask members to look carefully at how this bill is structured, because I think that when we do, we see something that should give Canadians confidence. The principle at the heart of this bill is proportionality. The level of oversight is calibrated to the level of intrusion. The more information one is seeking and the more it touches the privacy of an individual, the higher the bar that has to be cleared. Most Canadians, I believe, would agree with that instinct.

Let us walk through what that might look like in practice. At the most basic level, there is confirmation of service demand, which is a threshold question. It asks, does this particular provider service this IP address or phone number, yes or no? There are no subscriber details, no content, no further information. This simply tells investigators whether they are knocking on the door of the right service provider. Because it reveals so little, it does not require a warrant. We are not learning anything about a person. We are learning whether a company has a connection to an identifier.

Government Orders

The next step is the subscriber information production order. Now we are asking for something that starts to identify a person, such as a name, an address, a phone number or an email address. This is more intrusive, so, appropriately, it requires the consent or the authorization of a justice or a judge. However, it is still narrower than a general production order, because we are not seeking content or communications, just the basic identifiers that allow an investigation to proceed. Then, when an investigator needs access to the content of communication or more detailed data, the full weight of the existing production order and warrant process applies, such as judicial authorization and full oversight. These are the same protections that have always existed under Canadian law.

Each step up in what the police ask for comes with a corresponding step up in the scrutiny that is applied. The oversight is proportionate to the invasiveness. I would suggest that this is not just good policy. It is in line with what the courts have told us about privacy and privacy interests in a digital context. The courts have said that these things engage privacy. This bill seeks to address the instructions of the court. It builds a system where the protections match the intrusions.

I want to speak briefly to the safeguards, because they reflect something important about how this bill came together. Earlier proposals around lawful access raised legitimate questions. The government's members heard those concerns. We went back and refined our approach. The definition of subscriber information was narrowed to basic identifiers. Ministerial orders under part 2 are now subject to approval by the intelligence commissioner. Data retention requirements are limited to metadata only and for a maximum of one year, and the bill explicitly excludes content, web browsing history and social media activity.

These are not small refinements. They are the product of careful work to get the balance right. The bill also includes mandatory public reporting in a parliamentary review three years after royal assent. I think we have an obligation to build that kind of transparency into any legislation that touches on investigative power, and this bill does exactly that.

I would like to end with what matters to me as a dad, what should matter to all of us, because what matters is at stake. The crimes that depend most heavily on digital infrastructure, such as child exploitation, extortion, human trafficking and money laundering, are precisely the crimes where law enforcement currently lack the tools to investigate effectively.

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police has called for the modernization of our lawful access regime. The Canadian Centre for Child Protection has supported the advancement of this bill. The National Police Federation has recognized that this legislation is a long-overdue modernization that protects the rights of Canadians while keeping them safe. When law enforcement and child protection organizations are telling us the same thing, we have a responsibility to act, not recklessly, but deliberately, and with the kind of care that this bill reflects. Responsible governance means modernizing our tools while respecting the rights of Canadians, not one at the expense of the other, but both together.

Bill C-22 gives law enforcement the investigative tools that they need to combat serious crimes, while ensuring that the privacy of

Canadians is protected through judicial oversight, proportioned authorities and robust accountability. It is built within the charter. It responds to the jurisprudence of the Supreme Court, and it closes a gap that has left Canada behind every one of its Five Eyes allies and G7 partners. This is how we keep Canadians safe, not by standing still while the world moves forward, but by keeping pace with the threats and the values that define us.

I urge all members to support this bill.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people from Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. When it comes to getting it right, there is no doubt that we need to address loopholes when it comes to access and when it comes to ensuring that information is available. The question is, how do we get it right? I am approaching this debate with that lens. We have ministerial orders that will not necessarily be transparent under this legislation. They will be in secret.

Does my hon. colleague have a position on that, namely whether they should all be in secret, or whether some should be in secret in order to protect vulnerabilities?

• (1725)

Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for the work he has put in, and for his advocacy on behalf of his citizens and, of course, all Canadians when it comes to matters of public safety.

The reality is that this bill works precisely within the limitations of the law. It works within the instructions of the court and ensures that the rights of Canadians are protected. That includes their privacy rights. It includes ensuring that the appropriate information is or is not disclosed within the bounds of what is acceptable in this country.

I would argue that one of the challenges we will always have in dealing with legislation like this is the question of whether seeking perfection is preventing us from getting done what is necessary and right in this moment. I believe this bill addresses those concerns and the concerns of my friend across. He should feel confident, as should Canadians, in this response from the government.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague a very simple question. Upon reading the bill, some lawyers who specialize in privacy protection said that they had a bit of a problem with the definition of essential service providers, who may be subject to injunctions relating to technical capabilities for lawful access. That would be done through regulation, which is a major problem.

Government Orders

Does my colleague agree that we need to carefully review the definition of essential service providers?

Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, the law is clear in that regard. We need to create an environment where service providers must work with and help law enforcement in a way that respects the law.

[*English*]

As the member opposite knows, it is important to make sure these definitions are clear and correct. This bill does that. It makes sure that the folks who are in the positions to provide that information, the service providers, know exactly what their responsibilities are and, within the constructs, are able to do the work and have the capacity to do what is required to address the needs of local police.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this bill represents progress. First, Bill C-2 was introduced. Then, in light of the feedback we received from members, we went back to the drawing board to redraft the proposed legislation, seeking as much consensus as possible. Consultations were then held with all political parties in an effort to reach that consensus.

Does my colleague believe that Bill C-22 accurately reflects the discussions that we had with all parliamentarians?

Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, as I said in my speech, this bill represents exactly that. It reflects the changing reality that we are currently facing. This bill is designed to protect rights while providing responsible support to law enforcement in a digital environment that has become very complex. It reflects both the desire and the need to take significant yet responsible action for Canadians.

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to this bill, which is very important for the safety of Canadians and for Canada's role on the international stage.

Usually, when I give a speech, I like to speak off the cuff, relying on only a few notes. However, I will not do that today for two reasons. First, as a member of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians, I have several obligations, including the obligation not to disclose certain information that I am made aware of in the course of my work. Second, this issue is very relevant to the work of the committee of parliamentarians, which is made up of parliamentarians from all political parties in the House and the Senate. I am therefore going to be very focused and read my speech just to make sure that I do say anything that I should not.

• (1730)

[*English*]

The world around us is becoming increasingly digital and networked, and much of our day-to-day business, means of communication and overall lives relies on the Internet. I do not have to tell my colleagues about all of our different devices, which I will not use as a prop, such as smart phones, emails and the like, and instant messaging applications. All these things easily and instantly transcend provincial, national and international borders.

Unfortunately, this equally means that malicious actors like organized crime groups and violent extremists can explore this borderless nature of cyberspace for their own benefit. Canada's law enforcement agencies and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service need modern tools to help keep communities and Canadians safe. Therefore, we must close the capability gap in current legislation that prevents law enforcement's and CSIS's lawful access to data and ensure they can properly execute their mandates and protect Canadians.

Canada maintains an international reputation as a safe and peaceful country. To sustain this reputation, we must ensure that our legislation keeps pace with modern threats and technologies used in criminal and malicious activities.

“Lawful access” is a term we will hear a lot in association with this bill, and let us be very clear about what it means. Lawful access includes the tools and authorities to legally obtain certain information, data or communication during investigations. This information is often essential to generating leads on serious criminal activities and national security threats, as well as identifying and prosecuting those involved.

For decades, law enforcement and CSIS have had to operate without a legal framework requiring electronic service providers, or, as I will refer to them, ESPs, to develop and maintain lawful access capabilities. The current legal framework has not kept up with rapid advances in technology. Frankly, our laws are very much like me: They are analog in a digital world. This is the reason we have developed Bill C-22, which aims to facilitate law enforcement's and CSIS's timely access to basic subscriber information. I would like to make sure we understand it would be basic information. This is important because law enforcement and intelligence investigators need basic subscriber information, like a legal name or an address, to identify or exclude suspects, particularly during the preliminary stages of an investigation.

Bill C-22 would also establish a general legal framework to require electronic service providers to have the capability to respond to legally authorized requests, like a warrant or a production order, while respecting and protecting privacy interests and fundamental rights that all Canadians expect.

Government Orders

Bill C-22 would introduce provisions to support law enforcement agencies as they crack down on crime in an increasingly complex technological landscape, where the vast majority of evidence is on-line and in an electronic format. Law enforcement groups have sounded the alarm on the obstacles they encounter during investigations. They have sounded this alarm for years. Currently, law enforcement faces many challenges in obtaining the information it needs. Often, law enforcement does not know which service provider holds the customer account associated with the subscriber information, which also means it does not know who to serve with a production order. This challenge presently stalls and delays real-world investigations.

In many cases, law enforcement is required to seek multiple judicial authorizations to seek very basic information from different service providers, solely to confirm which provider services a phone number or an IP address. The current framework causes significant, unnecessary and harmful delays. Timely access to this basic information is crucial in all stages of an investigation and can spell the difference between securing key evidence and allowing criminals to slip through our fingers.

As another example, police could be aware that a provider holds certain information, but the company is unable to provide it because its systems do not possess the capability to do so and there is no legal requirement to carry such capabilities. We have heard many stories of law enforcement tracking a missing child or attempting to stop a terrorist attack, knowing which ESP to obtain the information from but being stonewalled by the provider's lack of lawful access capabilities. We cannot hope to fully protect Canadians and our communities if law enforcement and CSIS are unable to do their jobs. What is more, Canada may not be able to contribute meaningfully to joint investigations with its international partners or fully benefit from the support that our international partners provide to us. My colleague the parliamentary secretary spoke at length about this.

For this reason, Bill C-22 introduces new legislation to close this gap, whereby certain electronic service providers would need to develop and maintain the technological capabilities to respond to production orders. To be clear, this aspect of the legislation intentionally and explicitly would not allow for a so-called back door or any direct access for law enforcement or CSIS into electronic service providers' systems, and the legal authority to access that information would still always be required.

Bill C-22 proposes two ways by which an ESP could be asked to develop and maintain lawful access capabilities. First, those designated as core providers, such as traditional telecommunications companies, would have to abide by specific requirements set out in the regulations. Second, the Minister of Public Safety could issue a ministerial order to develop specific capabilities based on operational needs as new technologies develop.

• (1735)

We have heard the concerns from parliamentarians and stakeholders around privacy and oversight, and I want to reassure Canadians. I am actually very proud of the fact that the government took back this bill, listened carefully and amended it in ways to address the concerns that were raised. Bill C-22 now includes safeguards so

that ESPs would not have to abide by any demands that would introduce systemic vulnerabilities in electronic protections, such as encryption breaking or what I called a "back door". The bill would also require that the Minister of Public Safety obtain the approval of the intelligence commissioner before a ministerial order is valid, and it could be subject to further review by the National Security and Intelligence Review Agency, or NSIRA.

Bill C-22 is about removing harmful barriers that impede active investigations, delay justice and put Canadians in harm's way. This is about bringing our legislation up to date, finally, with modern technologies and with that of our closest allies. This is about ensuring that extortionists, child predators, cybercriminals, hostile state actors and organized criminal networks would have nowhere to hide.

This is a responsible bill that would make the necessary changes, and I hope all members can see their way to support it.

• (1740)

Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the intent of the bill and what the government is trying to accomplish, but there are a lot of concerns from Canadians about, perhaps, overreach by the government and about privacy.

I brought this up previously. There is a provision in the bill for parliamentary review after three years. We have an Order Paper question that just came back a couple of months ago that shows the government is behind on 106 legislative reviews. I have mentioned some of them. It appears the government is not actually performing the legislative reviews.

I am wondering if my colleague opposite can advise the House and Canadians on what would be done to ensure that this review would be done within the three years, as would be mandated.

Hon. Greg Fergus: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member from the Edmonton area for raising this issue. It is a very important issue and one that I fully support, and I understand what he is bringing up.

I know, for example, that the NSICOP Act is behind in its five-year review. I can assure the hon. member that I would be happy to work in partnership with him and others to ensure that this review does happen. I will also commit to working with the member on these issues. This is not easily arrived at, in terms of Bill C-22. To ensure that Canadians have confidence in it, we do have to make sure that it has those reviews in that time. I would be happy to work with the member, and he has my full commitment to do so.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since my colleague serves on the national security committee, can he tell me why the government is granting our law enforcement and intelligence agencies more power in this bill while also cutting the budget of the agency responsible for overseeing them?

The National Security and Intelligence Review Agency's budget was slashed by 15% in the name of cost-cutting measures that can only be described as penny-pinching, when this is a very important issue.

Can my colleague from Hull—Aylmer explain that?

Hon. Greg Fergus: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Shefford for her very relevant question. We introduced this bill to give our national security and intelligence agencies new tools, modern tools, they could use to conduct investigations and protect Canadians.

That does not mean that we are going to be spending money the same way as before. We can take advantage of these new tools. Rather than using paper and sorting through paper files, we can use modern tools to do the work, making it much more efficient and effective.

I think that is one way of making sure that we are protecting Canadians.

[English]

Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his great speech on Bill C-22. There are two aspects of this bill that my constituents have raised with me. One is about acknowledging that law enforcement agencies need to have these tools in order to conduct themselves effectively to protect our communities and society. The second aspect of it is about privacy and ensuring that persons like me, and the member as well, have the opportunity to just be a Canadian citizen and not be targeted based on what they look like or the religion they practise.

Perhaps the member can help reinforce that this would be a fair bill and a fair opportunity, in the tools that would be presented to law enforcement, while also making sure that people's constitutional rights and their privacy would be protected.

Hon. Greg Fergus: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member has done work in this field, and I thank her for her work.

The best way to make sure that she is protected, I am protected and everyone here is protected is to not cast a wide net. This is why there are some safeguards in this bill, for example, making sure that there would be judicial reviews of these orders and having ministerial orders approved by an officer of Parliament, the intelligence commissioner. These are safeguards that are built into this bill to ensure that there would not be any excesses, as the member rightfully would be concerned about.

I have great confidence that people doing their jobs properly will make sure that we avoid, as we say in French, *des débordements*.

• (1745)

[Translation]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, every time I rise to speak when you are in the chair, I know you have some fun pronouncing the name of my riding, as it is quite a mouthful for any chair occupant. You did a great job of pronouncing it.

As the Bloc Québécois critic for public safety and emergency preparedness, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-22. It is important to note that the government already tried once to introduce a bill on lawful access. That was Bill C-2, which was introduced last June, nearly a year ago. Bill C-2 was severely criticized, not only by civil society, but also by major organizations, which argued that the bill made no sense.

I understand that the government worked very quickly, although perhaps not responsibly enough, because it also wanted to please the American government, especially President Trump, who was threatening Canada at the time. To respond quickly, the government drafted a bill hastily without conducting all of the consultations necessary to produce a high-quality piece of legislation.

Today we are debating Bill C-22, which builds on the principles of Bill C-2 but is much more comprehensive and much better crafted, because the government sat down at the table with various groups and consulted with them. There are some groups that say they were not consulted and would have liked to be, but it does seem like the work got done. However, there is still more to do.

We cannot necessarily oppose Bill C-22, because we know that as soon as it gets its majority, the government will take steps to have Bill C-22 studied in committee and passed. I am well aware of that. However, I was truly delighted with the minister's response today. I was satisfied. He told me that he was still open to amendments. We have ideas stemming from our own consultations, and it is still possible to improve Bill C-22. I was really pleased to hear the Minister of Public Safety answer yes to my question about whether he was open to amendments. That is to his credit, because I believe he really wants the best possible bill to achieve his objectives, namely public safety and privacy protection.

I could not help but say “mon Dieu”. I was tempted to say “my God” but I will not say that. It occurs to me that, if the government had been in a majority position last June, Bill C-2 would have passed, which would have been very bad. That brings me to what the opposition can offer whether the government has a minority or a majority. When the work is taken seriously and is carried out professionally and diligently, our role is to help improve a bill by listening to experts and asking questions.

Government Orders

Bill C-22 does have some privacy safeguards that were missing from Bill C-2. However, are they enough? We are going to be asking questions about that. We still have a lot of questions on this matter.

As a reminder, “Part 1 amends various Acts to modernize certain provisions respecting the timely gathering and production of data and information during an investigation.” It amends the Criminal Code and the Foreign Publishers Advertising Services Act. It amends the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act to allow the Minister of Justice to authorize the enforcement in Canada of foreign orders requiring the disclosure of transmission data or information. It amends the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act, the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act and the Cannabis Act.

In other words, this bill amends quite a few existing statutes, so an in-depth study is needed. I have no doubt the bill will go to committee, and I am eager to see how it will be handled now that the government has a majority. I heard the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons call for collaboration and openness. I heard the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Safety talk about how open they are. I look forward to witnessing that if the bill gets the support it needs to go to committee.

● (1750)

Part 2 of the bill provides further details on how access to information will be granted and regulated, and so it creates a new law. Naturally, Part 3, as is almost always the case in bills from this Parliament, indicates that Parliament must review the legislation three years after the law comes into force. It is true: Parliament will need to take the time, take this seriously and review this legislation three years after it receives royal assent. In fact, the Bloc Québécois proposed such a review for Bill C-8 on cybersecurity. We made that proposal because cybersecurity, cyber-attacks and basically the entire digital landscape are evolving so rapidly that bills can quickly become outdated given the circumstances, the technologies involved and the ingenuity of unscrupulous individuals seeking to attack our critical systems. This is therefore a task that will require collaboration, and I look forward to our work in committee.

I can assure you that, if the bill makes it to committee, we in the Bloc Québécois will work on it with the utmost seriousness and rigour. That is why I was a little offended when the Prime Minister said that now that the Liberals have a majority, it is time to get serious. I have always taken my role as an opposition member seriously and have always taken a constructive approach. Quite frankly, I do not really fit the mould of someone who obstructs or refuses to co-operate, and I have plenty of examples to prove it.

I think the members of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security are exemplary. We studied Bill C-12 and Bill C-8, important government bills that required significant and professional contributions from the opposition parties. I will say it again: It bothered me when the Prime Minister said that now that the Liberals have a majority, the serious work can begin. It is a nice sound bite, but it could be offensive to certain members who take their work very seriously.

We do have some minor concerns about Bill C-22. Some concerns are more significant than others. In particular, there is the

whole issue of the definition of essential services. I think that needs to be clarified. We also have a problem with everything that can be changed by way of regulation. We look forward to hearing from experts, if the bill is ever sent to committee, to see how we can limit those elements that will be set through regulation and establish them in the legislation instead. I look forward to hearing the arguments.

I want to raise another point. When we compare ourselves to the Five Eyes, people always say that Canada lags behind. There was plenty of testimony at the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security to this effect, and I believe it too. However, some aspects of Bill C-22 are more invasive than they are in the other Five Eyes countries. For example, Australia has an organization similar to the National Security and Intelligence Review Agency, or the NSIRA. However, the Australian organization has a more important role than the role given to the NSIRA in the context of Bill C-22.

I hope my colleagues understand that it is with a constructive approach that we will continue to debate Bill C-22 and try to understand how we can improve it. Accordingly, I think the minister and his team can count on the usual co-operation from the Bloc Québécois.

● (1755)

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear that my colleague sees Bill C-22 as a step in the right direction. I understand that she expects it to be referred to committee soon for the next steps in the legislative process. I also see that she has studied the bill thoroughly and understands it very well.

I would like my colleague to tell us what she thinks are the main improvements in this new legislative framework that is going to be implemented.

She mentioned that Canada is the only Five Eyes country that does not have a legal framework governing access for our law enforcement agencies. This was a request made by various police forces. I would like her to explain how this constitutes a step forward for keeping Canadians safer, especially given that we know today's criminals use many different technologies.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, I would say that one of the biggest improvements has been the introduction of guardrails, since Bill C-2 had none. There is a process to follow in order to access data. That process is what may be open to criticism. Some people think it is sufficient, but others do not. I imagine that the issue will be debated further here in the House. If the bill passes this stage and gets to committee, experts will have provide their input on the matter.

Government Orders

What we have a hard time understanding is the fact that the minister and law enforcement are being given more authority. It surprises me that the only agency whose primary mission is to monitor the RCMP and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service is being weakened. As things stand, eight positions have already been eliminated after 15% of its budget was slashed. In my opinion, this seems a little inconsistent with things the government is telling us about lawful access to information.

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague and friend for her extremely thorough speech. It highlights her deep dedication to her work.

She brought up comparisons to the Five Eyes and to things being done in other countries. She also said that there would be some leeway for the committee to improve this bill. She touched on a few topics.

Can she give us a few ideas, other than the ones she mentioned in her speech, about possible improvements to this bill?

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, who always asks such good, pertinent questions. I have great respect for my colleague from Joliette—Manawan.

I would say that if we were to suggest one thing, it would be that the National Security and Intelligence Review Agency should be notified in real time of any orders to access private information. Right now, the plan is for it to receive the report one year after the fact. This would make it difficult for the agency to investigate in real time. In Australia, this type of oversight body is notified in real time, as is the privacy commissioner.

[*English*]

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think we all share the genuine desire to ensure that law enforcement has the appropriate tools to deal with crime and criminals in the digital age. That Canada is behind its peers, who are doing this, is really an indictment of the government. The Liberals have been in power 10 years and they have chosen not to address this issue until now.

That said, just because we are in the digital age and it presents challenges, that does not mean we must abandon the liberties and freedoms that this House is meant to protect, and Bill C-22, in my view, presents many concerns in that respect. I am particularly concerned about the government's ability to compel private enterprise to build systems, maintain information about Canadians and do so in secret.

I would like to ask my colleague whether she shares any of those concerns from Canadians and how she proposes to deal with them.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, yes, we share some of those concerns.

One concern I would like to highlight involves the government's decision to lower the threshold for obtaining information. It opted for the least stringent threshold. Access would be granted if there are reasonable grounds to suspect, rather than the higher threshold of reasonable grounds to believe. That may be worth amending or, at the very least, seriously discussing here in the House.

• (1800)

[*English*]

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-22 is the federal government's attempt to finally establish a Canadian lawful access regime after years of inaction. There is no doubt that law enforcement and national security agencies face real challenges in the digital world. Criminals involved in organized crime, child exploitation and human trafficking increasingly use encrypted services, burner phones and foreign-based platforms to hide their identities and evade justice. Conservatives have long recognized the need to give police the tools required to pursue criminals effectively.

However, while Bill C-22 addresses some genuine operational gaps, it also raises serious concerns about civil liberties, proportionality and ministerial overreach. As drafted, the bill risks trading Canadians' privacy and constitutional protections for administrative convenience while failing to meaningfully address the most urgent public safety issues facing the country.

My first point is that faster access comes at the cost of lower thresholds. At the heart of Bill C-22 is a deliberate shift toward faster and easier access to digital information. The bill introduces new confirmation of service demands, production orders for subscriber information and clarified emergency seizure powers, many of which operate on the low standard of "reasonable grounds to suspect" rather than "reasonable grounds to believe". Subscriber information under this bill is defined broadly, including names, addresses, email accounts, device identifiers and service history. In the modern context, this information can reveal detailed personal profiles and social connections. Lowering the evidentiary threshold for accessing this data risks normalizing surveillance at early investigative stages without sufficient justification or safeguards. While judicial oversight technically remains in place for most tools, the cumulative effect is a system where access is easier, quicker and more routine, even when the intrusion into privacy could be significant.

My second point is about the expansion of warrantless and voluntary disclosure powers. Bill C-22 codifies and expands the ability of police and public officers to obtain information without warrants in exigent circumstances. While true emergencies justify flexibility, the bill's language does risk stretching "impracticability" beyond genuine urgency and into administrative expediency.

Government Orders

Even more concerning is the bill's broad reliance on voluntary disclosure. Telecommunications companies and other service providers are explicitly encouraged to hand over information voluntarily, including unsolicited information or data required under foreign law, with full immunity from civil or criminal liability. This effectively creates, or could create, a parallel system of access outside traditional judiciary scrutiny. Canadians should not have their personal information transferred to the state simply because a company decides it is expedient or risk-free to comply in certain circumstances.

My third concern is that secrecy and delayed notice could weaken accountability. Bill C-22 entrenches secrecy as a core feature of lawful access. Non-disclosure orders can prevent service providers from revealing that they have been compelled to co-operate. In some cases, notice to affected individuals may be delayed for up to three years, with possible extensions. This erosion of transparency undermines meaningful accountability. Canadians whose data is accessed may never know it happened, making charter challenges or judicial remedies largely theoretical. Oversight that occurs only after the fact and primarily within government institutions cannot substitute for timely notice and real recourse.

My fourth point is about ministerial powers and burdens on service providers. Part 2 of the bill, the supporting authorized access to information act, introduces a new regulatory regime imposing obligations on electronic service providers. The government may designate core providers, such as a cellphone company, and require them to build and maintain technical surveillance capabilities, retain metadata for up to one year, and assist in testing access systems, all at their own expense. While the bill claims to prohibit mandatory back doors and systematic vulnerabilities, the scope of ministerial discretion remains extremely broad. Individualized ministerial orders are confidential, shielded from public scrutiny, and only reviewed for reasonableness by the intelligence commissioner. This framework risks imposing compliance costs, stifling innovation and concentrating powers in the hands of our executive.

• (1805)

My fifth point is that the bill fails to address Canada's real public safety crisis. Perhaps most troubling is what Bill C-22 would not do: It would do nothing to address catch-and-release bail, sentencing leniency or the lack of mandatory prison time for fentanyl traffickers and violent gang members. Canadians continue to face rising violent crime, organized theft and drug trafficking, problems driven not by lack of data but by judicial and policy failures. The government's focus on digital access powers, while ignoring these other key aspects of our criminal justice system, reflects, in some cases, a few misplaced priorities.

Bill C-22 contains elements that Conservatives can support in principle and that I will be voting in favour of, particularly the goal of modernizing investigative tools, but as drafted, the bill would overreach in ways that could threaten civil liberties, weaken transparency and expand ministerial power, while failing to deliver real improvements to public safety in certain cases.

In a digital era, when metadata can be as revealing as content itself, the bill's cumulative effect risks putting Canada on a path to where lawful access becomes pervasive access. A more balanced

approach would have raised access thresholds, narrowed voluntary disclosure, strengthened notice obligations and subjected the most privacy-intrusive powers to stricter, not looser, judicial control. For these reasons, I believe Conservatives should support the bill at second reading in order to send it to committee, but only with a clear expectation that amendments are required.

Any lawful access regime must strike a proper balance, equipping police to stop criminals while firmly protecting the rights and freedoms of law-abiding Canadians. I believe we can get there, and this is a step in the right direction, especially as it relates to vulnerable children and victims of human trafficking.

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleague shares this side of the House's desire to equip police officers with tools for the 21st century. He also shares our concern, and it is clear that the other side does not, based on those members' actions, for the protection of civil liberties, including the privacy of Canadians. Of course, Bill C-22 raises severe concerns with respect to the invasion of the privacy of Canadians.

The member recommended it go to committee. Could he explain for me some of the things that we would like to see changed at committee?

Brad Vis: Mr. Speaker, I think the most concerning thing is the requirement for blanket metadata retention. Under the bill, service providers could be forced to store vast quantities of Canadians' digital footprints for up to a year, regardless of suspicion and regardless of wrongdoing. I know in some cases that metadata can be utilized for nefarious purposes, and we need to make sure that the proper protocols are in place.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

NATIONAL FRAMEWORK ON SPORTS BETTING ADVERTISING ACT

The House resumed from February 12 consideration of the motion that Bill S-211, An Act respecting a national framework on sports betting advertising, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start my speech by pointing something out.

This is the 12th Senate bill to be debated in the House since the beginning of the 45th Parliament. In the Bloc Québécois's view, legislative work should be done by elected representatives. As such, members of the House of Commons should be the ones introducing bills, debating them and sending them to the Senate, which is how our system is set up. That is my opinion. I find it odd that this is now the 12th Senate bill to be debated in the House, considering that many of the elected members here have ideas for bills that we could debate, that could become law and that could, depending on one's point of view, improve society.

The order of precedence for private members' bills is determined by a draw. I may have a personal stake in this because my bill was the second last to be drawn for this Parliament. I am 258th on the list. If we continue to prioritize Senate bills, there is no chance a bill of mine will ever be studied here. I just wanted to point that out to the House before talking about Bill S-211, which would regulate sports betting advertising.

The summary of the bill states the following: "This enactment provides for the development of a national framework to regulate sports betting advertising in Canada and to set national standards for the prevention of risk for persons negatively impacted." It continues with the following: "It also provides for the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission to review its regulations and policies to assess their adequacy and effectiveness in reducing the incidence of harms resulting from the proliferation of sports betting advertising." That second part is important, and I will come back to that.

The preamble states that "the proliferation of sports betting advertising and other forms of gambling activities has become pervasive in Canadian society". That is a bit hyperbolic. It also states that "research has shown that increased exposure to advertising for gambling activities leads to increased participation in these gambling activities".

I have worked in media and marketing for most of my life, and I can confirm that the purpose of advertising is to get people to buy more of the advertised product. It is only natural that the more advertising there is, the more people will be drawn to the product. That is how it works.

Bill S-211 lists a number of things. Among them, it mentions "measures to regulate sports betting advertising in Canada, with a view to restricting the use of such advertising, limiting...the advertisements" and so on. It also mentions introducing measures to promote research, communication and information-sharing among the

Private Members' Business

provinces related "to the prevention and diagnosis...of harmful gambling". Quebec and the provinces have jurisdiction over this area, however. It further proposes establishing "national standards for the prevention of risk". Once again, this involves the jurisdiction of Quebec and the provinces.

Although we do not support Bill S-211, we do not object to the spirit or intent of this legislation. We recognize the problematic nature of sports betting advertising and its effects on vulnerable clientele, including the risk of developing a harmful gambling problem. We also recognize that this kind of situation deserves attention.

We also agree that it is up to the government to implement measures to restrict sports betting advertising. Specifically, it is clear to me that youth and minors must be protected from illegal online gaming practices. We completely agree that it is appropriate to regulate online gaming advertising, but we categorically reject the idea that Bill S-211 will solve a problem or that the federal government is responsible for addressing this problem. Moreover, it is our firm belief that this bill violates the federal-provincial gaming agreement, which has been in effect since 1985 and gets the job done.

It is the provinces that oversee, administer, and regulate legalized gambling. Bill S-211 reflects a desire for standardization, but I think it would be a serious step backward. The current model allows Quebec and the provinces to make choices and implement policies that align with their visions, values, and local priorities.

For example, there are differences between Quebec and Ontario. Ontario has established Ontario iGaming, an organization that regulates online gaming and issues operating licenses to private companies.

● (1810)

In Quebec, it is the opposite. In Quebec, the law prohibits these operators from operating, and Loto-Québec runs a program called Mise-o-jeu, which holds a monopoly on online sports betting.

Despite all that, the law still allows bettors to use foreign platforms that are not prohibited, but are not regulated either. That is where the federal government could step in. That is where the federal government could do its job, mind its own business, and regulate what happens on the Internet, because that falls within its jurisdiction.

Private Members' Business

In 2016, Quebec tried to implement a bill, Bill 74. The idea was to block unauthorized online gambling sites. The bill aimed to force Internet service providers to adopt systems that would block gambling sites operated by foreign companies. However, the case was dismissed in superior court as unconstitutional, or something like that. It encroached on the federal government's jurisdiction. That means that Quebec cannot make laws that encroach on federal jurisdictions, but the federal government is welcome to interfere in Quebec's business as it pleases. At some point, it might be better off looking after its own affairs and minding its own business. I hear a melodious voice saying that this is one more reason for independence. It was none other than my colleague from Joliette—Manawan, and I completely agree.

In short, we are by no means opposed to the federal government amending regulations and getting involved in regulating online gambling, for example by regulating platforms and standing up to the tech giants. It seems as though the federal government is afraid to take action and get involved in this matter, too. Obviously, if Ottawa decides to regulate the presence of these foreign online gaming platforms, that would have to be done in consultation with Quebec and the provinces to ensure once again that it meets the needs of those responsible for regulating online gambling, namely Quebec and the provinces.

There is no one-size-fits-all approach for all of Canada for an issue like this. The system in place has worked well since 1985. The provinces are satisfied, and so is Quebec. The federal government should not get involved. It may have good intentions, but the result is clumsy. That is why we believe that, once again, despite having good intentions to do the right thing and protect young people and vulnerable individuals from the scourge of harmful gambling, the federal government should mind its own business and leave the provinces to deal with this. The federal government should instead focus on regulating matters within its purview, namely foreign platforms and online companies that proliferate in our ecosystem without facing any consequences or regulation. To me, that is the root of the problem.

Once again, health issues such as mental health or gambling addiction are not a federal responsibility. These are matters that fall under provincial jurisdiction. The federal government is going to meddle in this, and that will only complicate the process. The Bloc Québécois will therefore not support Bill S-211.

• (1815)

[English]

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the opportunity to speak to the bill, which is the least we can do to tackle this emerging scourge in our public life, in the lives of our kids and teens and young adults, this scourge that affects and has the risk of tainting some of the most joyous activities that we take part in as a country.

It has now been five years since Bill C-218, which allows provinces and territories, through their conduct and managing responsibilities, to enable single sports betting.

Where are we now? What has happened in those five years? We have seen a massive expansion in sports betting and betting generally, gambling generally, enabled by some very potent online tools.

Here are some examples of what is happening. I am going to focus my remarks especially on sports betting and the advertising components of that because I think that is the nub of the issue that is emerging at this point in time and that is causing so much public concern. It is a quiet concern at the moment, in households, in high schools, in university and college campuses, but it is starting to spread. We are starting to see the evidence of a real damaging phenomenon, which is being aided and abetted by ubiquitous advertising for online sports betting.

This is maybe a propitious time to have this conversation. We are about to have the NHL playoffs, in which three Canadian teams will be participating. We are about to enjoy and be one of the co-hosts of the FIFA championship. These are fundamentally positive experiences that unify and bring together millions of people around the world, millions of Canadians, especially young Canadians. It is especially pernicious that it is the joy of those activities that is subject to the advertising lure, not the activity itself but the betting on those activities, which I think really demands action.

Where are we in the last five years? Here is some information on young people and their online betting habits. According to a joint report by Greo Evidence Insights, the Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction and Mental Health Research Canada, Canadians who reported betting online in 2024 were 45 times more likely to qualify as problem gamblers than those who played the lottery exclusively. It is the toxic combination of the online tools that are available, plus the advertising lure and the great appeal of a fundamental activity that is joyous, that is resulting in some of these concerning trends.

Here is some more information from a study last month in Ontario: “The rate of young men contacting Ontario's mental health helpline for gambling-related problems has increased by more than 300 per cent after the province allowed private online gambling....The study further found that between the dawn of online gambling privatization in April 2022 and August of last year, the number of active player accounts per 100,000 people aged 15 or older increased from roughly 2,160 to more than 7,300, a 239 per cent increase.”

The stories that come out are sometimes told anonymously and sometimes told in hushed tones. There was a recent Maclean's article about the growth of online betting and online sports betting in particular, and it very well captures how it is online sports advertising that is part of the key lure. This is a story about an anonymized man named Phil.

Private Members' Business

I quote from the Maclean's story: "Phil was a fantasy football fan and, suddenly, when he researched players and teams on TSN and other sites, his screen was covered with ads for betting platforms like FanDuel and DraftKings. His friends, with whom he'd dabbled in sports betting, were all switching to the apps. It was more exciting. They could bet not just on wins and losses—"

This was the original idea of the single sports betting.

"—but all sorts of in-game happenings: the number of touchdowns or goals, how many catches a specific player got, a coin flip. They could also bet on obscure sports, like Ping-Pong. Over the next few months, they devoted more of their time and money to betting."

We know that online advertising, especially for online sports betting, has historically used celebrity likenesses. We are familiar with the use of Wayne Gretzky and Connor McDavid.

The Maclean's article continues: "One analysis by CBC Marketplace and the University of Bristol found that sports viewers in Ontario spent an average of 22 per cent of each game looking at gambling ads in some form, with the vast majority plastered directly on the court, play surface or rink itself. In one Raptors-Bulls broadcast, nearly 40 per cent of the game had sports-betting ads somewhere in frame."

● (1820)

Sports are joyous activities. They are activities we want our children to participate in. These are people and teams we identify to our children as heroes. At the same time, we are potentially subjecting them to one of the most insidious forms of addiction, which can empty their pocketbooks and destroy their families. They are specifically targeted to young men through algorithmic means and various forms of targeting.

This is something the House cannot allow to stand. I appreciate the concerns of my colleague opposite about jurisdictional issues, but the evidence is too strong. The choice that Parliament made five years ago has, yes, resulted in the growth of an industry, but at that time, we did not have the technological power to identify and lure people in this way.

I want to share a news article from today's New York Times about a police chief in New Haven, Connecticut, who resigned abruptly after his deputies saw red flags, including missing money. He has pleaded not guilty to embezzling city money to gamble on sports. In December, he asked one of his lieutenants for a \$500 loan. He took money that was to pay informants and left behind an IOU note.

Three of his deputies confronted him in January. When they gathered in his office, he explained that he was addicted to gambling. The deputies were confused. They had never seen him gambling, one said, according to an arrest warrant. The gentleman tapped his phone on a conference table and said, "It's on the app." In a year, he had wagered about \$4.46 million on DraftKings and FanDuel accounts, according to investigators. His career is over. His life is in shatters.

It is, again, the toxic combination of new technologies and the advertising that is leading to this. These are things we invite our

kids to participate in. There is a toxic combination of new technologies and new marketplaces that the choice of the House five years ago opened up. It has resulted in a tsunami of advertising, celebrity figures and others to all be exposed, including outside provinces in which these marketplaces exist.

For instance, although Ontario runs the largest privatized electronic gaming marketplace, young people in provinces outside Ontario also have the potential to be exposed. We need to protect all young people and ourselves from this. We need to preserve and hold as sacred as possible the rituals and passions that make sports beautiful.

With respect to public health spaces, when it comes to online gambling and the prospect of it having an addictive quality, people conjure up restrictions on tobacco and alcohol advertising. Indeed, that is useful guidance. However, this is an even more pernicious issue, because when it comes to advertising gambling or advertising tobacco, we know that these are known vices. Sports is not a vice. Sports is a beautiful thing. We want more participation in sports. We want our young people to actually be inspired by their female and male sports heroes in professional leagues.

It is quite concerning to see the alignment in some cases between sports betting companies, the advertisers, the leagues and the teams, but we can do something about it. We can address the online advertising marketplace and other advertising marketplaces that lure people in.

A few months ago, Jim Bradley, an important person in my life and in the lives of many people in Ontario, passed away. The member for St. Catharines eulogized him very well in a member statement around the time of his passing. Jim Bradley was a lifelong defender of public health and a lifelong opponent of the expansion of gambling. The House has made a decision to honour Jim Bradley, to honour the young people we want to protect and to honour all people who are at risk of this kind of pernicious pull into an activity which can be controlled in a safe way but is not, because of the advertising and the very specific connections through online luring into unrestricted gambling on sports.

This is something we can do. The least we can do right now in the House is to pass the bill, send it to committee and give it the consideration it deserves as we take on this scourge.

● (1825)

Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand in the House today to speak to Bill S-211, an act respecting a national framework on sports betting advertising.

Private Members' Business

This Senate bill, as we all know, seeks to develop a framework to regulate sports betting advertising in this country and set national standards for the prevention of risk for persons negatively impacted. It also provides for the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, better known as the CRTC, to review its regulations and policies to reduce the incidence of harms resulting from sports betting advertising.

Let me speak to the heart of the matter. I spoke in the House in November 2020 in support of my private member's bill, Bill C-218, an act to amend the Criminal Code, single game sports betting. In that speech, I addressed the elephant in the room, which was problem gambling and addictions. As it stood at that time, there was absolutely no consumer protection or support built into the illegal sports betting systems for those struggling with gambling addictions resulting from illegal or offshore markets.

I want to remind everyone that the bill simply removed the federal restrictions, allowing provinces and territories the right to take over the single sports betting market, stemming the illegal offshore market, and to collect the tax, the profits, to use provincially instead of letting the money go to the offshore conglomerates.

In my province of Saskatchewan, I think the province has done a good job. It has shared the money with sports, recreation and culture. Alberta has done the same. Now, they are going to set up a heritage fund. Each province and territory makes its own decisions.

The bill provided provinces and territories with the ability to regulate and collect revenue, which could be used to fund mental health programs, research and addiction treatment, and it had widespread support from the provinces and territories. I should add that in the House the day we voted, the vote was 303 to 15. All parties were involved.

As members know, the regulation and administration of gambling has fallen directly in the purview of the provinces and territories since the 1985 federal agreement that transferred the rights to gaming to the provinces and territories. However, that does not preclude us from considering a federal framework in the interest of protecting vulnerable Canadians.

I am of an age to remember gambling in the shadows. It was the Irish Sweepstakes tickets. They were sold illegally in this country. I remember going into a room and someone would say to me, "Come here, I have these Irish Sweepstakes tickets." That was back in the 1970s and 1980s.

Today, we cannot walk a block without seeing a Lotto 649 or Lotto Max sign lit up in neon. Confectioneries, gas stations, drug-stores and grocery stores all have a huge variety of scratch tickets to choose from that are shiny and colourful, right in front of our eyes. If someone wins a free play, they are rewarded with flashing lights and called a winner. Everybody in the store can hear it.

Do members remember the five-minute television segments where the lottery numbers were drawn live while millions sat watching with their ticket or tickets in hand? These forms of advertising and promotion have been unchecked for decades. The television commercials, in my opinion, preyed upon vulnerable and desperate people. Anyone can buy a ticket today for a hospital home lottery, potentially winning a home, but what are the odds? The

commercials seen today show a beautiful landscape and a lifestyle that most can only imagine.

● (1830)

In my estimation, fifty-fifty draws are the new fundraising technique. Young people are now coming door to door selling fifty-fifty tickets. We can scan the code, select how many tickets we want and then pay. We have seen the Toronto Blue Jays, especially this past year with their remarkable playoff run, reaching unheard of payouts with their fifty-fifty. Tens of millions of dollars have been raised.

It is the same thing in Western Canada with the Edmonton Oilers. They have a very successful fifty-fifty, as do a lot of teams in this country. I noticed that the Vancouver Canucks had a front page ad for a guaranteed super jackpot of \$1 million in this Saturday's Vancouver Sun newspaper. We have all seen the advertising during a live game. It is non-stop, with networks even promoting the sale of tickets several times during a game.

Gaming has been around forever. This did not just start with my bill, Bill C-218. Gaming has been present for decades in this country, sometimes disguised as entertainment or as charity. Sports betting advertising, though, took the promotion to an all-time extreme. I feel that some provinces have dealt correctly with advertising, provinces such as B.C., Manitoba and Saskatchewan. I have talked to them about their concerns and about a framework. They all agree they would listen to a framework. Others, like Ontario and Alberta, want to see it wide, wide open. I have also talked to them about what they would like to see if a framework is in the offering.

We have seen advertising on NHL jerseys. We have seen professional players doing advertising about responsible gaming. There is no national consensus about how to manage the national advertising on sports. As a former sports broadcaster, I have to admit I was surprised at the barrage of ads that were running during the sporting events since the passage of Bill C-218 in 2020. The networks, which were starved for a new source of advertising revenue, in my opinion, exploited this golden opportunity to flood the airwaves with ads. What was always an accepted practice prior to the passage of Bill C-218 quickly became an avalanche of targeted, even predatory, and excessive advertising. It came at us from all sides, and I think the public was simply blindsided.

This has put the spotlight, unfortunately, on sports betting advertising, which we are here today to talk about with Bill S-211. I am supportive of putting a spotlight on addictions. I am very supportive of putting guardrails in place to protect the most vulnerable among us. However, let us not be short-sighted. This issue did not begin with sports betting ads, and it goes way beyond the sports betting ads. If we are going to take an honest look at the harms caused by gambling advertising, we must, I believe, consider all forms, like the lottos, the fifty-fifty, the hospital home lotteries and many more.

It has been five years since my bill, Bill C-218, passed, and every province and territorial jurisdiction is renewing their agreements this year with their gaming companies. I have spoken to a number of provincial counterparts about sports betting and their vision going forward. First off, I want to give a shout-out to the many provincial governments that did an exceptional job in writing their legislation for advertising. I have looked over their legislation, and for the most part, I think they got it right. They are dealing with advertising around school zones and dealing with minors, event hosting agreements, etc. It is very thoughtful and insightful legislation.

The issue of sports betting advertising lies with the rights holders of the broadcasting companies. It is expensive now when they buy the properties of the NHL, baseball, NFL and so on. It is tough to recoup their investment, so when the gaming companies saw this opportunity to exploit the market to the broadcasting companies, they were in desperate need of revenue. Let us be honest. This is why the Senate has targeted sports betting advertising. We are not the only jurisdiction in the world rethinking new ways to improve safety.

- (1835)

It has been 40-plus years since the federal government handed over gaming authority to the provinces. Therefore, it is time that we sit down and have a discussion about the framework.

[*Translation*]

Marianne Dandurand (Compton—Stanstead, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Bill S-211, an act respecting a national framework on sports betting advertising. This bill responds to very real concerns that have become apparent since sports betting became legalized.

My colleagues will agree that sport has a unique ability to bring people together. As a Quebecker, I grew up with the fierce rivalries and historic victories of the Montreal Canadiens. Last fall, we saw Canadians from across the country rally behind the Toronto Blue Jays during their incredible playoff run. This summer, the world will gather in Canada to celebrate the love of soccer during the FIFA World Cup.

Canadians know that sports betting advertising has become ubiquitous in sports broadcasts. No matter the sport, viewers are bombarded with ads encouraging them to get in on the action by placing a bet. Canadians of all ages are exposed to these advertisements. When a child sees their favourite athlete associated with a betting platform, it sends a clear message: Betting is part of sport. This kind of message exacerbates or even creates gambling problems among both vulnerable groups and children. It can also seriously

Private Members' Business

impact the mental health of Canadians and, ultimately, the integrity of sport in Canada.

I believe it is our duty to take action to reduce these risks for the benefit of all Canadians, young and old. Bill S-211 is an excellent step towards preserving the integrity of Canada's sporting culture and Canadians' mental health in the face of sports betting advertising. It is up to us, as MPs, to ensure that this bill can bring about the positive change that lies at the heart of its objectives.

During the previous Parliament, the House passed Bill C-218, the Safe and Regulated Sports Betting Act, which was introduced by the Conservative member for Saskatoon South. The bill amended the Criminal Code to enable the provinces and territories to manage betting on races, fights and single sport events in their jurisdiction. Prior to the passage of Bill C-218, Canadians participated in illegal betting, with no consumer protection, on offshore betting sites or with black market bookmakers with ties to organized crime. These illegal practices funnelled money out of Canadian communities and into the pockets of criminals. That money was not reinvested in communities, as is the case with revenue from legitimate, regulated lotteries.

Ontario is currently the only province that allows private gaming operators, through an agency called iGaming Ontario. Gaming companies are aggressively purchasing advertising slots on regional and national sports broadcasts. As a result, these ads are now being seen across the country, not just in Ontario.

The volume and prevalence of sports betting advertising may increase the risks for Canadians who participate in it. The role that advertising plays in influencing gambling is problematic. Studying effective measures to reduce these risks is an important issue that deserves our attention.

It is estimated that viewers watching sports see roughly three gambling ads per minute. That is on television. There are more than 19.3 million active online gamblers in Canada, making it one of the fastest-growing sectors. However, despite the fact that a regulatory framework for legalized sports betting was introduced in Bill C-218, Canada ranks eighth in the world in terms of money spent on offshore gambling, totalling approximately \$4 billion per year. We need to better understand how these dynamics affect public health in order to implement measures that will reduce social harm and protect the most vulnerable from problem gambling.

Private Members' Business

● (1840)

This advertising is seen by sports fans of all ages, including children, as I mentioned earlier. Its pervasiveness during events, especially during sports broadcasts, makes it seem like a natural extension of the game. We know that most adults realize that these are sports-themed commercial ventures. Most of them remember a time when betting on sports was a crime, but the same cannot be said for the teenagers or children watching games with their parents. For young fans growing up in an age when their favourite athletes are appearing in ads for betting platforms, bets and contests on the sidelines of games have become a central feature of the sports experience.

Research has established a correlation between gambling advertising exposure, a more positive attitude toward gambling, increased gambling intention and increased gambling behaviour. The greater the exposure, the greater the risk of harm, in terms of both frequency and severity, especially among children, young adults and vulnerable individuals.

However, it is not just young people who are at risk. Older adults with mental health challenges or problems, such as cognitive decline, are also at increased risk of developing a gambling addiction. There is some evidence that suggests there is a link between exposure to advertising and the severity or intensity of gambling problems and other challenges. Regardless of our views on the place that sports betting should have in our society, we must recognize our responsibility to reduce the harms associated with activities like sports betting advertising, especially for vulnerable people.

Bill S-211 requires the federal government to establish a national framework to regulate sports betting advertising, provide tools for the prevention and identification of problem gambling, and support those affected by the harmful effects of gambling.

Responsible sports betting can have a place in our culture alongside a framework for informed and responsible gambling. Betting can be structured so that money is reinvested in our communities, rather than being siphoned off by criminals. It can be regulated so that vulnerable individuals and their loved ones do not face the very real health risks and other harms associated with gambling. We have an opportunity here to address this issue responsibly before sports betting is normalized through advertising in a way that fails to account for the risks associated with this activity.

Given the issues surrounding sports betting, and given the potential impact on children, young people, older people and vulnerable groups, I believe it is essential to address the issue of sports betting advertising which, as I mentioned earlier, has become ubiquitous. This bill will enable us to put up safeguards and provide information to help protect vulnerable groups, to have funds to reinvest in our communities and to ensure that sport remains a force that continues to unite our country.

We will be able to watch the 2026 FIFA World Cup together, safe in the knowledge that we are protecting our constituents.

● (1845)

[English]

Kelly DeRidder (Kitchener Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on Bill S-211, an act respecting the national framework on sports betting advertising.

I will begin with a simple observation. Canadians are noticing a change. Hockey games, football games, family shows, even online videos are now full of sports betting ads. What used to show up once in a while is now constant. They are tired of seeing their favourite celebrities and athletes encouraging gambling at every commercial break. For many Canadians, especially young people, these athletes and celebrities are role models. When those same public figures are used to promote gambling, it carries a level of influence that goes beyond typical advertisement.

In 2021, Parliament made the decision to legalize single-event sports betting. People were already doing it, often through unregulated sites. Bringing it into the legal system helped provinces regulate it, but since then, something else has happened: Sports betting has exploded, and Bill S-211 is trying to deal with it. At its core, this is about trying to get a better handle on this fast-growing industry.

Before we get into the contents of the bill, it is important to be clear about how things currently work. Provinces are mainly in charge of gaming, and some have stricter rules than others. They license companies, set rules and, in some cases, even operate the platforms themselves. However, advertising is different. Ads do not stop at provincial borders. We can watch the same advertisement if we are in Vancouver or Kitchener Centre. This is part of why the issue has become more noticeable. This also raises a basic question: Why is this one area of advertising so lightly regulated when so many others are tightly controlled?

We already regulate gambling differently from any other product, because it is not like other forms of advertising. This is something that can influence behaviour in ways that require extra caution. A great example that comes to mind is the limits placed on alcohol and tobacco advertisements. We have limits on when ads can run, where they appear and how they can be targeted. We need to protect our young people. It would be reasonable to ask why a similar thing would not apply here.

It is worth looking at the impact that this is having around us. In 2025, a study from the American Institute for Boys and Men found that in states with legalized sports betting, there was a clear sign of financial strain on families. Credit scores went down and more people fell into debt troubles, collections and missed payments. Bankruptcy rose by as much as 25% to 30% a few years after on-line betting was introduced.

It means that individuals struggling with addiction face constant triggers with very little protection. For someone working to regain control of a gambling addiction, constant exposure to these betting ads is not just background noise; it is a huge barrier on the path to recovery. It can be difficult to move forward when the same messaging appears during games, online and across multiple platforms. For those individuals, it is real. We need to recognize that constant exposure can make a difficult situation even harder.

Even beyond the statistics, there is a real impact here that we cannot afford to overlook. When gambling becomes more visible with constant exposure, it does not just affect the individual, but the entire household. Families feel the strain when money that should be going towards the mortgage or rent, groceries or savings is instead lost through gambling. It is also important to recognize that not all families feel this equally. For those already dealing with the rising cost of living or financial pressure, even small losses can have a much greater impact. In an economy where Canadians are already stretched thin, this is not a minor concern.

We also see the emotional toll this can take. It creates stress in relationships, arguments at home and, in some cases, it can cause a breakdown of trust within families. What may start as casual betting can turn into a pattern that becomes difficult to control. Unfortunately, that pressure is felt most by spouses, children and parents.

This is why exposure matters. When gambling is constantly promoted while the family is sitting down for Saturday night hockey, it normalizes behaviour and can carry big risks for households. It makes it much harder for those trying to step back from gambling to actually avoid it. For many fans, it is also changing the experience of the game itself. What used to be about the sports is increasingly tied to odds, bets and promotions.

We also know that protecting young people is a major concern here. A number of weeks ago, Dr. Shawn Kelly shared that in his practice, he is meeting children as young as 14 who are already struggling with gambling behaviours.

● (1850)

Dr. Kelly also shared that, even at home, his own son is starting to ask questions about the difference between over-under and plus-minus while watching hockey highlights. It is no wonder why when 21% of our sports broadcasting time is often made up of gambling advertisements. This issue is already part of our everyday conversation. When something moves from being niche to being a part of daily life so quickly, it is reasonable for us to take notice and analyze if the rules have kept pace.

At the same time, there is a broader question about responsibility. In a modern digital world, we live in a world where advertising follows people whether they are watching TV, streaming platforms or social media. The line between entertainment and promotion is becoming harder to see, especially for younger audiences. In that kind of environment, the question is not whether people should be allowed to participate in sports betting, but whether our current approach is clear, consistent and appropriate for the reality that we are seeing today.

It is also worth noting that Canada is not alone in facing this issue. Other G7 countries have already begun taking a closer look at

Private Members' Business

how sports betting is advertised and the impact it can have. In some cases, they have introduced clearer national rules around when and how these ads can appear, especially during times when young people are likely to be watching. By comparison, Canada's approach remains more broken up. We rely heavily on provinces, industry standards and evolving guidelines, all without a national picture. It does not mean that those efforts are not important, but it does highlight that we may be lagging behind when it comes to having a universal understanding of the issue. This is a great way to begin closing that gap by making sure we are looking at this in a more complete way.

Conservatives believe in personal freedom. We believe that with freedom comes responsibility. Adults should be able to make their own choices, but freedom does not mean free-for-all. It does not mean flooding every sports game with gambling ads, and it does not mean ignoring the impact that this may have on families or young people. There is a clear difference between giving Canadians the freedom to make a choice and surrounding them with constant pressure to make that choice. That distinction matters.

Right now, different provinces and groups are trying different approaches. Some have rules on advertising. Industry groups are working on codes of conduct. The CRTC has also said it may align broadcasters with certain standards once they are finalized, so there is already activity happening across this country. The question is whether it is working well enough and whether it is consistent.

This is where Bill S-211 comes in. It would not ban advertising. It would not take away provincial control. Instead, it would ask for more coordination and for government to study what is actually happening. Some will say this is not enough, and others will worry that it goes too far. What it really does is ask for a clear picture of the situation and whether our current system is working as intended. We are not trying to change the entire system overnight, but to make sure we are asking the right questions and getting the full picture of what is happening. This industry is changing rapidly. The responsible thing to do would be for us to pause, review and ensure that there are safeguards in place and that they are doing what they are meant to do.

Private Members' Business

At the end of the day, this issue is not about being for or against sports betting. It is about whether the system we have today is keeping up with the reality Canadians are living in. With constant advertising and young people at higher risk of being exposed, and with families starting to feel real financial and emotional pressure, it is fair to ask whether more coordination is needed. Bill S-211 is a step toward bringing governments together, looking at the evidence and making sure that the rules reflect what is happening on the ground. Canadians expect us to take that kind of balanced, practical approach.

• (1855)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Waterloo has five minutes for her right of reply.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to conclude the second reading of Bill S-211, an act respecting a national framework on sports betting advertising.

I would like to begin by thanking the constituents of my riding, Waterloo, as well as all those across Canada who are confirming the importance of this debate from coast to coast to coast.

[*English*]

Like many of my colleagues, I have heard and responded to many Canadians regarding the high volume of sports betting advertising, which is frankly destroying the simple joy of watching sports. As a reminder, this bill has been formally joint-seconded by members stretching across three political parties, who represent ridings from seven different provinces and one territory. This demonstrates sports betting advertising not as a partisan issue, but rather as a growing issue of concern that we need to address.

[*Translation*]

At the very least, the health and safety of Canadians is an area of shared jurisdiction. I invite my colleagues to support sending Bill S-211 to committee so we can determine the appropriate role that the federal government can play while taking jurisdictional concerns into account.

[*English*]

While some provinces have been taking appropriate steps to combat the growing harms of sports betting and its advertising, overall their approaches have been fragmented, which has created gaps for abuse and the growth of illegal markets and addiction. We must all be able to agree that we need to rid our society of these issues. We have an opportunity to work together to determine the best approach, and committee is a great avenue for this.

It has now been five years since single-game sports betting was legalized in Canada. In this short time, the data is already showing drastic results. I recognize that all levels of government and all jurisdictions have a role to play. This Senate public bill that I have sponsored in the House aims to determine the federal government's role. We all know that the health and safety of Canadian people is a top priority for all governments, which confirms that the Government of Canada needs to take seriously a national framework on sports betting advertising by working with provincial governments,

public health agencies, experts, the private sector, people with lived experiences, and so forth.

As we come to the end of second reading debate on Bill S-211, it is important to finish by reminding ourselves where the bill came from. Bill S-211 was reinvigorated by Senator Marty Deacon, a Canadian from Waterloo who has coached and led teams from the grassroots to the Olympics, the Commonwealth Games and the Pan American Games. She, like many members of the House, has witnessed first-hand what the power of sport and the opportunity of sport can be. I thank her for her leadership.

• (1900)

[*Translation*]

I also want to thank all my colleagues who worked on Bill S-211 in the hallways, by email and in the House.

I want to thank the member for Peace River—Westlock, the member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue, the member for Hamilton Mountain, the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley and the member for Northumberland—Clarke, who all spoke to Bill S-211 in the first hour of debate on this bill at second reading in February of this year.

[*English*]

I also thank the member of Parliament for Drummond, the member for Taiaiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park, the member for Saskatoon South, the member for Compton—Stanstead and the member for Kitchener Centre, who spoke this evening to conclude Bill S-211's second reading.

The calibre of debate has really demonstrated the best of this place. It shows and proves that respectful debate and dialogue is possible. I call on all colleagues to move Bill S-211 forward to committee so proper conversation and scrutiny can take place on the correct path forward and to ensure that there are suitable parameters around sports betting advertising in Canada so we can return to the joy of watching sports with our loved ones.

I would be fine with passing the bill on division, but I know there are members who want to stand in this place in support of or in opposition to the bill, so later on I will be asking for a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The question is on the motion.

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

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, as I explained in my speech, I am requesting a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, April 22, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[English]

PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA

Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for decades, governments in this country have chipped away at the public service. When the Liberals came to power, they ran on not cutting jobs of hard-working public servants who provide these services, and yet that is exactly what they are doing across the country right now.

This is about having a government that works for the people they represent. This is about whether Canadians can actually get the help that they need and access the services that they depend upon. Right now, they cannot. In my office in Edmonton Strathcona, my excellent, dedicated staff are overwhelmed, not because they are inefficient but because the system is so broken.

This is what underfunding looks like. It means a worker who lost their job cannot access EI and is facing eviction. It means a senior who applied for OAS months ago still has not received their OAS and cannot pay for groceries because their benefits have not arrived. It means that a parent loses the Canada child benefit and waits half a year for it to be fixed. These are not isolated stories. This is the daily reality for Canadians.

Instead of fixing this problem, the government is making it worse. Tens of thousands of public service workers are being cut. That means that there are fewer people to answer the phones, process the applications and fix the mistakes when the system gets it wrong. Therefore, wait times will get longer, errors will increase and Canadians will fall through the cracks.

Cuts to food inspection mean greater risk of contaminated food reaching family dinner tables. Cuts to environmental oversight mean less protection for the air we breathe and the water we drink. Cuts to indigenous services mean fewer supports for communities that already face systemic barriers. Cuts to science mean decisions made with less evidence and more guesswork. At a time when Canadians are struggling with the cost of living, the government is making it harder for them to access the very services they depend on.

Now, the government is saying that AI will fix it, that artificial intelligence is the solution. However, Canadians do not need a chatbot when they are about to be evicted. They do not need an automated response when their benefits are being denied. They do not need an algorithm deciding their future without accountability. They need a human being who will listen, who will understand and who will fix their problems.

AI makes mistakes, and when government systems make mistakes, Canadians pay the price through missed payments, lost benefits, delayed care and real harm. This is not innovation. This is downloading risk onto the people who can least afford it. They are seniors, people living with disabilities and families already stretched to the limit.

Canadians are not asking for less government. They are asking for a government that works; a government that delivers benefits on

Adjournment Proceedings

time; and a government that sees them, hears them and helps them when they need it the most. Right now, they are not getting that and these cuts are only making it worse.

We need to reverse the cuts. We need to stop the layoffs of the very people Canadians are relying upon. We need to invest in the public service so that benefits are delivered on time, calls are answered and mistakes are fixed quickly. We need to halt the reckless replacement of human services with unproven AI systems and we need to commit to building a system that is accessible to everyone. Canadians deserve that from their government.

• (1905)

Tom Osborne (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, members will recall that the government made a clear commitment to Canadians to bring fiscal discipline to the federal budget. It will spend less on government operations so that it can invest more in areas that will grow our economy and strengthen our country at this critical juncture. As part of that effort, the government launched a comprehensive expenditure review last July to meet its commitment to responsible, cost-effective spending that delivers results for Canadians. The review required federal organizations to bring forward savings, proposals to spend less on day-to-day running of government by targeting programs and activities that are not core to the federal mandate, are duplicative or are not aligned with government priorities. Organizations also considered ways to work more efficiently, leveraging existing technologies where needed.

Budget 2025, tabled last November, presented the results of the review, which identified savings across the government of \$13 billion annually by 2028-29. The size of the public service grew by over 40% in the last 10 years. It is not sustainable. This will include decreasing the size of the public service by approximately 16,000 full-time equivalents. The budget also announced a commitment to reduce 1,000 executive positions over the next two years. The reductions are being managed with fairness and compassion, relying on attrition and voluntary departures to the greatest extent possible.

Adjournment Proceedings

Organizations are also required to follow established workforce adjustment processes outlined in collective agreements or, in the case of executives, through career transition measures. Both set out clear processes and supports for employees who may be impacted. Workforce adjustment is the process organizations use in the core public administration when it has been determined that a position is no longer required. In a workforce adjustment situation, there are specific provisions governing how this is done that are codeveloped or negotiated with bargaining agents. Indeed, the government is leveraging all available tools to limit involuntary departures. This includes early retirement incentives. This program would provide an opportunity for eligible employees to retire without penalty for early departure.

These reductions are being carried out fairly and responsibly and in line with the government's obligations as an employer. They are part of the necessary and major recalibration within government spending that will redirect funds to be invested in Canada and Canadians. They are what the moment calls for, an investment in Canada's future.

Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, I have to say I am very disappointed by that response. The member spoke about the idea of fixing the system. I would like him to say that to the senior who called my office because they could not access OAS. When we call the government to get help, we are told, "Don't worry. Don't worry. This senior can wait. When they do get their benefits, they will get many months at one time." It is as if the government does not understand that people actually have to buy groceries every month. They have to pay their rent every month.

When that member of the House talked about impacts and how this is being fiscally responsible, he has to know, because I know that my office is not the only one. I understand that every member of Parliament has a constituency office dealing with the same issues, where Canadian citizens cannot access the services that the government is responsible for providing. The system is broken.

● (1910)

Tom Osborne: Mr Speaker, let me underline that the government is making responsible choices to focus on core priorities that will deliver more effectively for Canadians. This is a transformational time for the public service to revisit how it works, how it can improve services for Canadians and how it can build the future for Canada.

The government is committed to managing the reductions to its workforce with fairness and compassion. The workforce adjustment process is one way we are doing this. The early retirement incentive program, introduced in budget 2025, would also help further reduce involuntary departures subject to criteria that is set by Treasury Board should it be approved by Parliament.

Through the comprehensive expenditure review, the government is making responsible choices for Canadians to focus on core priorities and deliver more effectively for Canadians.

CARBON PRICING

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in December, I asked the Minister of Jobs and Families why the Prime Minister was increasing industrial carbon taxes during a cost of living crisis. These costs do not stay with large emitters, but are

passed down the supply chains, raising the price of groceries and transportation, and stunting economic growth. Lower fuel costs would reduce the price of shipping, building materials and essentials, making life more affordable for Canadians who are already pinching their pennies.

That is why this week the government listened to the Conservatives. However, its plan only delivers a third of the relief Conservatives propose for a third of the year. Eliminating federal taxes would also ease pressures for small businesses operating on already thin margins. The industrial carbon tax disproportionately targets energy-intensive sectors that small businesses rely on, such as fuels for shipping and electricity for day-to-day operations. According to the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, nearly two-thirds of small businesses report that they are absorbing additional fuel costs. A third have increased their prices as a result.

Taxes and regulatory burden remain among the top pressures facing small businesses in Canada today. We are already seeing the consequences. Business closures are up 19% since 2019. Small business employment dropped by 34,000 jobs in March alone. Employment declined across every region in the country. Fifty-five per cent of small businesses would not recommend starting a business in Canada's environment today.

While the government has temporarily suspended the federal excise tax on gas and diesel this week, it has doubled down on the clean fuel standards and the industrial carbon tax, which is set to increase to \$170 per tonne by 2030. It is subjecting our economy and Canadians to a death by a thousand cuts. Even the Parliamentary Budget Officer has noted that Canada's emissions reductions will have a limited impact globally, yet Canadian businesses are bearing disproportionately high costs. Temporary relief does nothing to offset permanent structural cost increases, causing our economy to hemorrhage jobs and investments and not address the affordability crisis.

The situation, unfortunately, is projected to get worse. A study by the Fraser Institute estimates that increasing the industrial carbon price to \$170 per tonne by 2030 will lead to a 1.3% reduction in our GDP nationally, reduce average incomes by \$1,160 per worker and cost Canada 50,000 jobs. The report is clear. Reduced returns on investment will lead to cancelled or delayed business expansion, less capital investment and ultimately lower long-term living standards for Canadians.

Adjournment Proceedings

Over the last decade, Canada has already lost 1,000 entrepreneurs, while our population has gone up by 10 million people. When Canadian firms face higher input costs due to carbon pricing, investment flows elsewhere. The Business Council of Canada has warned that investment is increasingly being redirected to the U.S. due to more competitive policy frameworks. For small businesses, that means fewer contracts, fewer supply chains, less growth and fewer jobs. I have been contacted by businesses from B.C. and across Canada that cannot afford to keep their doors open due to mounting financial pressures that are not just international in nature but from Canada as well. The Hub recently reported that Canadians are opening more businesses in the U.S. than at home because we have no regulatory framework to protect entrepreneurs.

The government's policies have made it impossible to meet its own economic objectives. Why is it making it harder to do business in Canada? Will it finally scrap these policies before more jobs and investment leave our great country?

● (1915)

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know my colleague from Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford proudly represents many of my extended family in the Sumas and Sts'ailes first nations, and I raise my hands to him for that, but I have to disagree with how he is painting the industrial carbon pricing.

We have said before that there is no carbon tax on food and farmers, and farmers are not subject to the industrial carbon price. Independent modelling from the Canadian Climate Institute and Navius Research shows the impact of industrial carbon pricing on agriculture is less than one-tenth of 1% by 2030. Why? It is because farmers are not the ones paying it. Industrial carbon pricing applies only to large industrial emitters: steel, cement, mining, oil and gas. Under the output-based system, facilities can cut emissions, buy credits or adopt cleaner technologies. It is a flexible and efficient framework that reduces emissions at the lowest cost while protecting business and competitiveness.

Global pressures, not federal climate policy, are driving food inflation. Disrupted shipping routes, climate-related crop losses and the impacts of international conflicts on fertilizer and energy markets are the same challenges faced around the world. That is why yesterday the government temporarily suspended the federal fuel excise tax on gasoline and diesel across Canada. Starting April 20, this measure will provide immediate relief to Canadians, reducing prices at the pump by approximately 10¢ per litre on gasoline and four cents per litre on diesel. It lowers costs for businesses and truckers across key sectors while we continue to build long-term energy security. This is in addition to our new Canada groceries and essentials benefit announced earlier this year, which will help more than 12 million low- and modest-income earners afford day-to-day essentials.

We are also investing heavily in adaptation. Since 2015, more than \$6.6 billion has supported community resilience, with new funding in budget 2025. Indigenous leadership is essential to this work and supported by over \$2 billion in indigenous-led climate initiatives since 2020. Climate action is economic action. Our policies protect families, support workers and position Canada for long-term prosperity.

Brad Vis: Mr. Speaker, I really do enjoy debating with the member for Vancouver Quadra every single time.

I will point out, in disagreement, that the suspension of the fuel excise tax proves the argument I was making, that increased regulations and carbon taxes in Canada do impact our cost of living, and that is why, indeed, the government listened to the Conservatives, in good faith and constructive parliamentary debate, and decided to remove it until Labour Day.

The member also mentioned climate change adaptation in his remarks, and I am glad he did, because he knows as well as I do that my constituents in Semá:th first nation, across Sumas Prairie and across the eastern Fraser Valley really are looking for leadership from the Government of Canada. When we come forward with a flood mitigation plan, it will require federal leadership to build the requisite climate-resilient infrastructure to prevent the next flood. The member knows as well as I do that Sumas Lake used to be a lake. Now it is farmland, but we need to fix that area for future agriculture.

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, yes, I do recognize what the hon. member has stated. I have talked with many of my family members in that area about that very topic.

I will repeat this because it matters. Farmers do not pay the industrial carbon price, and groceries are not subject to any carbon tax. Our government eliminated the consumer fuel charge back in 2025. Industrial carbon pricing applies only to major emitters and gives them practical, low-cost options to reduce pollution. Eliminating these tools would not lower food prices. It would increase pollution, undermine investor certainty and weaken Canada's competitiveness as the global market shifts to cleaner production. There is no food packaging tax, and independent analysis shows food inflation has been driven by global disruptions, not climate policy.

Canadians deserve solutions grounded in evidence, and that is exactly what this government will be delivering.

Adjournment Proceedings

• (1920)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accord-

ingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:21 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Erin Daniels		Poilievre	6950
Eyolfson	6945	Carney	6950
Opioids		Poilievre	6950
Bailey	6945	Carney	6950
Governor General's Meritorious Service Medal		International Trade	
Hanley	6945	Blanchet	6950
Former Member of Parliament		Carney	6950
Baldinelli	6946	Blanchet	6950
Sudan		Carney	6950
Zuberi	6946	Taxation	
The Economy		Anstey	6951
Barlow	6946	Thompson	6951
La Voix des Aînés		Anstey	6951
Sari	6946	Thompson	6951
World Autism Month		Lawton	6951
Lake	6947	Hodgson	6951
Cassandre Prosper		Lawton	6951
Lemire	6947	Hodgson	6951
National Canadian Film Day		Kuruc	6951
Yip	6947	van Koeverden	6952
Forestry Industry		Kuruc	6952
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	6947	Solomon	6952
Carpenters' Regional Council		Zimmer	6952
Church	6947	Chartrand	6952
Fuel Taxes		News Media Industry	
Melillo	6948	Champoux	6952
Canadian Victoria Cross		Miller	6952
Rochefort	6948	Champoux	6952
Fuel Taxes		Miller	6952
Leslie	6948	Taxation	
Artemis II Mission		Groleau	6953
Bardeesy	6948	Joly	6953

ORAL QUESTIONS

Taxation		Housing	
Poilievre	6949	Lefebvre	6953
Carney	6949	Lightbound	6953
Poilievre	6949	Martel	6953
Carney	6949	Joly	6954
Poilievre	6949	Taxation	
Carney	6949	Gladu	6954
Poilievre	6949	Long	6954
Carney	6949	Kirkland	6954
Poilievre	6949	Turnbull	6954
Carney	6949	Kirkland	6954
		Turnbull	6954

Motions for Papers

Kelloway	6965
----------------	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**Lawful Access Act, 2026**

Bill C-22. Second reading	6965
Anandasangaree	6965
Caputo	6967
DeBellefeuille	6967
Deschênes-Thériault	6967
Lloyd	6967

Message from the Senate

The Deputy Speaker	6967
--------------------------	------

Lawful Access Act, 2026

Bill C-22. Second reading	6968
Sahota	6968
Caputo	6969
DeBellefeuille	6969
Danko	6969
Motz	6969
Lloyd	6970
Danko	6972
Larouche	6972
Motz	6972
DeRidder	6972
Deschênes-Thériault	6974
Ste-Marie	6974
McCauley	6974
Noormohamed	6974
Caputo	6976
DeBellefeuille	6976

Fergus	6977
Fergus	6977
McCauley	6978
Larouche	6979
Khalid	6979
DeBellefeuille	6979
Deschênes-Thériault	6980
Ste-Marie	6981
Mantle	6981
Vis	6981
Mantle	6982

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**National Framework on Sports Betting Advertising Act**

Bill S-211. Second reading	6983
Champoux	6983
Bardeesy	6984
Wagh	6985
Dandurand	6987
DeRidder	6988
Chagger	6990
Division on motion deferred	6990

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**Public Service of Canada**

McPherson	6991
Osborne	6991

Carbon Pricing

Vis	6992
Grant	6993

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>