



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 138
Wednesday, June 17, 2026

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 17, 2026

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1400)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem, led by the hon. member for Don Valley North.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

COAL MINING PETITION

Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, more than 3,000 volunteers helped collect over 200,000 signatures from Albertans who are determined to protect our mountains, our rivers and our drinking water from the threat of coal mining.

Albertans have spoken loudly and clearly. They know coal mining threatens critical watersheds, harms our wildlife habitat and risks contaminating the water that communities, ranchers, farmers and indigenous peoples depend upon. For years, Albertans have been fighting to stop reckless coal development in one of the most beautiful and ecologically important regions in our country. Today's achievement is proof that when governments refuse to listen, citizens will organize and make themselves impossible to ignore.

Congratulations to Corb Lund, the Water Not Coal campaign and the hundreds of thousands of Albertans who stood up for our Rocky Mountains and our shared future. I am so proud to represent them.

* * *

KINGSTON'S TOWN CRIER

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a Kingston icon and one of the most celebrated town criers in the world: our very own Chris Whyman. This year marks more than four decades since Chris first donned the regalia and stepped into the role of Kingston's official town crier in 1984. What began as a one-year appointment has be-

come a remarkable career, representing our city with pride, humour and a voice that can carry across Market Square.

Over the years, Chris has earned provincial, national and international acclaim, including multiple world championships, all while serving as an ambassador for Kingston's history, culture and community spirit. Whether he is welcoming visitors, opening festivals or representing Canada abroad, he brings an unmistakable energy that reflects the very best of our city.

On behalf of the residents of Kingston, I congratulate Chris Whyman on his extraordinary service and thank him for more than 40 years of dedication to our community.

Hear ye, hear ye. Well done, Chris.

* * *

CANADIAN PLOWING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am excited to welcome everyone to Middlesex—London this summer for the Canadian Plowing Championships in Strathroy. As the member of Parliament for this area, I am proud to extend a warm southwestern Ontario welcome to all of the competitors, families and visitors who have come from across Canada to take part in this national event.

This championship is a wonderful celebration of the skill, precision and innovation of Canadian farmers. Whether someone is a returning competitor or attending for the first time, they will enjoy exciting plowing competitions, hands-on exhibits and demonstrations of the latest agriculture techniques, all in the spirit of our rural community and hospitality.

I want to thank the volunteers, organizers and board members whose dedication makes this event possible.

Welcome to Strathroy. I hope everyone has a fantastic time at the Canadian Plowing Championships this summer.

* * *

• (1405)

ACCESSIBILITY ADVOCACY

Juanita Nathan (Pickering—Brooklin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize a constituent and disability advocate from Pickering—Brooklin, Onila Miranda.

Statements by Members

Onila, who lives with cerebral palsy, has launched an advocacy campaign called “Love is a Human Right” to raise awareness about ableism and call for greater dignity, inclusion and respect for people with disabilities. His message is clear. Accessibility is more than ramps and infrastructure. It is about ensuring that every Canadian can participate fully in their community, pursue opportunities, build relationships and live with dignity.

Let us recommit to breaking down every barrier, because a truly strong Canada is one where every person can fully participate and belong. Ableism is discrimination, ableism is injustice and ableism does not belong in Canada.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when Canadians think of Skeena—Bulkley Valley, they think of LNG and the port of Prince Rupert. These projects are important, but they are only part of the story.

Our region is home to tremendous economic potential, from the port of Stewart to the industrial lands being developed around Kitselas and Terrace and emerging opportunities in mineral processing and refining in communities like Houston. Resource development is also creating new opportunities across the northwest, with projects such as the reopening of coal operations near Telkwa, helping to support jobs and local economies.

The people of Skeena—Bulkley Valley are ready to build, invest and grow. What we need is recognition and support from the government, not more barriers or delays. Our region has the resources, the workforce and the determination to help drive Canada's economic future. If we unleash the full potential of communities across the northwest, we can get Canada building again, growing again and back on track.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ORGANIZATIONS IN TERREBONNE

Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Terrebonne, the most beautiful riding in Lanaudière, is full of organizations that carry out vital work for our community. I have had the privilege of marking several milestone anniversaries: the 10th anniversary of the Orchestre classique de Terrebonne, which enriches our cultural life; the 15th anniversary of the visual arts symposium of the Association des artistes en arts visuels de Terrebonne, which showcases our local talent; the 25th anniversary of Éducazoo, which delights and educates young and old alike; the 40th anniversary of A.B.C. des Manoirs, which makes education and literacy accessible and promotes personal empowerment; and the 40th anniversary of Habitat Lanaudière, a pillar of mental health for families in my riding.

These organizations are the pride of Terrebonne. I wish them a happy anniversary, and I thank them for their exceptional commitment to Terrebonne and the entire Les Moulins region.

[*English*]

TOURISM IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, summer is just around the corner, and there is no better place to be than on the Rock. Whether people want to go to Swift Current to see a world-class car collection, to Bonavista to see the icebergs, to the Burin Peninsula to hear the great stories of the famous pirates or to Lumsden to experience the best beaches north of Cuba, we have something for the whole family. If people cannot swim, they can take a boat ride to experience the whales in Port Rexton or the puffins in Elliston, or explore the secret underground bunkers.

No matter where people go, I am sure they will experience the warm hospitality of my fellow Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. They will hear great jokes and eat delicious meals. This summer, they might even be able to catch a cod on a Wednesday afternoon. To end their trip, they can cool down and grab a brewski in the famous town of Dildo.

Come on out. Catch the ferry or take a flight and come on home to the Rock.

* * *

[*Translation*]

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BEAUPORT DOJO

Steeve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark an important anniversary in my riding of Beauport—Limoilou: the 60th anniversary of the Beauport Dojo. Founded in 1965, the Beauport Dojo is now recognized as one of the largest Japanese martial arts dojos in Quebec city.

For six decades, it has held a very special place in our community. Aside from teaching sports, the Beauport Dojo teaches important life values like respect, discipline, perseverance, confidence and personal achievement. Generations of young people, families and athletes have learned these values thanks to the work of passionate coaches, dedicated volunteers and supportive parents. I want to commend the entire team at the Beauport Dojo for their 60 years of commitment, mentoring and influence.

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

MEL ZAJAC

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour the life of Mel Zajac, a remarkable British Columbian whose compassion and generosity left an enduring imprint.

Mel's life was marked by a profound tragedy that ultimately inspired a legacy of extraordinary philanthropy. In July 1986, he lost his son Mel Jr. in a tragic accident on the Chilliwack River. Just eight months later, his son Marty was killed in an avalanche near Blue River in the Cariboo.

In their memory, Mel founded The Mel Jr. and Marty Zajac Foundation in 1987, dedicating himself to helping others. Through his work, including the creation of Zajac Ranch, he ensured that children of all abilities could experience the joy, inclusion and confidence that come from summer camp. Because of his vision, countless children and families, many of whom face major medical challenges, have been given opportunities that might otherwise have been out of reach.

At the age of 98, we have lost a truly extraordinary Canadian. I extend my sincere condolences to the Zajac family and to all those who mourn Mel's passing while celebrating his remarkable legacy.

* * *

[Translation]

JEAN-FRANÇOIS TREMBLAY

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, July 1 is fast approaching and, when it comes to tackling the housing crisis, there is a prominent local figure who stands out from the crowd and refuses to give in to fatalism. Jean-François Tremblay, an impact real estate investor—but more importantly, a man of compassion—is demonstrating that it is possible to innovate and take concrete action to meet a fundamental need like that of having a decent home. His project, Domicile Fixe, offers 30 highly affordable homes in Vieux-Iberville, while meeting a wide range of criteria, including LEED, WELL and universal accessibility standards.

Even more remarkable is that these homes, which are untouchable by speculators, are based on a financial structure that receives no subsidies from any level of government. Jean-François Tremblay is a builder who dreams bigger than the others. His dreams are never an end in themselves, but rather the starting point for great achievements.

As he prepares to welcome a new addition to his family, I send him my warmest wishes for happiness. Just like his projects, this new adventure holds great promise for the future. I would like to thank Jean-François.

* * *

[English]

AHMADIYYA MUSLIM COMMUNITY

Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, “Love for All, Hatred for None” is the motto of our Ahmadi community here in Canada. This is not simply an ideal. This is an action that the community practises every day. Its commitment to service, compassion and interfaith dialogue continues to make a positive impact in communities across our country.

Recently I had the honour to attend the international peace symposium hosted by His Holiness Mirza Masroor Ahmad, the caliph and worldwide leader of the Ahmadiyya Muslim community. The peace symposium brought together leaders from around the world to discuss actions to achieve peace, dialogue, justice and mutual understanding in an increasingly uncertain and dangerous world. I also had the distinct honour to have a personal meeting with His Holiness, the Caliph, during which we discussed a range of challenges that all Canadians are facing every day.

Statements by Members

I sincerely thank the community for inviting me, for its service to Canada and, most importantly, for not only preaching the words “Love for All, Hatred for None” but practising them.

* * *

100TH BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 100 years is a century of memories, service and stories. In Newmarket—Aurora, we are preparing to celebrate a very special milestone as our friend and local Second World War veteran Mr. Jeffrey Reynolds turns 100 years old on June 29.

At just 18 years old, he enlisted in the North Staffordshire Regiment, joining a generation that answered the call when freedom itself was under threat. Like so many who served, Jeff rarely speaks about his sacrifices. Instead, he is full of stories of growing up as a young boy, stories that remind us how much the world has changed over the last century and stories that connect us to a generation whose sacrifices shaped the country we know today.

Turning 100 years old is an extraordinary achievement, but it also carries even greater meaning when that life was dedicated to serving others before it had fully begun. I ask all members of the House to join me in wishing Jeffrey Reynolds a very happy 100th birthday.

* * *

• (1415)

MARC PINIZZOTTO

Maggie Chi (Don Valley North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today with deep sadness to advise the House that Constable Marc Pinizzotto of the Toronto Police Service emergency task force was killed in the line of duty.

For 18 years, Constable Pinizzotto served with courage and commitment, putting himself in harm's way to make Toronto a safer place. Constable Pinizzotto was doing what police officers do every day, and these tragedies remind us of the danger that they face.

As Constable Pinizzotto's family and colleagues across the service carry an unimaginable loss, we honour the memory of a hero in life, a police officer who dedicated nearly two decades in service to his community. I extend my deepest condolences to the Pinizzotto family, the Toronto Police Service and all members of the policing community. May his loved ones find strength in one another in the difficult days ahead, and may we honour him as a hero in service to others.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Prime Minister has said affordability is the best that it has been in decades, even though some Canadians are crowdfunding their way through this cost of living crisis. He is so out of touch.

Statements by Members

The costly Liberal Prime Minister is the only G20 leader to drag his nation into a recession. While families spend over 120% of their income on food and rent, new data shows the Liberal Prime Minister spent nearly \$1 million in luxury inflight catering over just 14 trips. That could feed a family for 55 years. Two in five Canadians are struggling to put food on the table. In Newfoundland and Labrador, one in 10 people are unemployed, and many do not know how they are going to make it through this winter.

It is not global forces. It is Liberal choices. Every dollar spent on lavish Liberal catering is a dollar stolen from lowering taxes for Canadians. Conservatives would end this wasteful spending, cut the bureaucracy and restore common sense for Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF TROIS-RIVIÈRES

Caroline Desrochers (Trois-Rivières, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 250th anniversary of the battle of Trois-Rivières, a historic milestone that occurred on June 8, 1776, in my beautiful riding.

At the time, the American colonies were trying to make Canada and Quebec their fourteenth colony. However, they suffered a crushing defeat at Trois-Rivières and retreated. That battle marked a turning point. It helped to preserve our identity, our territory and our ability to stand up for ourselves. In many ways, this is where it all began for the sovereign and independent country that we are today.

[English]

This battle helped shape the destiny of what would become Canada and reminds us that my region played a defining role in our country's history.

[Translation]

Two hundred and fifty years later, we are commemorating not only this historic event but also the rich heritage of Trois-Rivières and the work of those who preserve our collective memory.

I therefore invite everyone to come visit our region this summer and discover this important chapter in our history.

* * *

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 11 years under the Liberal government, Canadian families and businesses are under growing economic strain. Households are seeing wages fail to keep pace with inflation and with the cost of essentials such as housing, groceries and transportation, leaving less room in family budgets and less opportunity to get ahead. Businesses are facing weaker demands, higher costs and declining confidence to invest and expand, for five consecutive quarters.

Canada is in a full-scale recession, reflected in sustained weakness and investment, failing real income and reduced economic mo-

mentum across key sectors of our economy. Liberal policy responses are not adequately addressing the root causes: productivity, competitiveness and long-term affordability.

The task before this House is not to manage decline but to restore growth; to rebuild investment confidence, strength and productivity; and to ensure Canadian families and businesses can move forward with stability, dignity, security and opportunity.

* * *

DEPARTING MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Eric St-Pierre (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize five colleagues who collectively have given more than 50 years of service to Canadians and are now moving on from federal politics.

First, I recognize the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie for his unmatched environmental and climate advocacy.

● (1420)

[Translation]

I also commend the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton for his work as an opposition member and, if I may, for his great taste in ties. I also want to thank the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie for his work as an opposition member and for his impressive commitment to his riding.

[English]

I also recognize the member for Beaches—East York for his thoughtful and powerful voice in this House.

Finally, I recognize the member for North Vancouver—Capilano for his steadfast commitment to climate, natural resources and the environment.

[Translation]

I thank them for their service to democracy.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is time once again. All of the G7 leaders are gathering together, and our Prime Minister has lots to talk about. He can brag that he is the only one of them to lead his country into a recession in the time he has been in office. In fact, he is the only leader in the G20 to do that. The fact that Canada is in a recession is just one measure of the way things are not going well for so many Canadians. We have families living in RVs in parking lots, we have seniors sleeping in Tim Hortons because they have nowhere else to go, and we have food bank usage at record highs, yet the Prime Minister says affordability is the best it has been in years.

If this is the best, will he tell us what the worst would look like?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the G7 wraps up in France, I know Canadians are very proud to be represented by the Prime Minister on the world stage and will be very proud to learn, as he returns, that he returns with 13 new agreements that will generate over \$5 billion of investments in our country, new contracts for critical minerals, new contracts for Canadian defence firms as part of the SAFE arrangement and new partnerships to build a stronger, more self-reliant Canada in a troubled world.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Prime Minister's announcements before. What we have not seen is real action. Again, the Prime Minister has travelled around the world and failed to deliver a single new free trade agreement, while Canadians suffer. Even the Liberals' so-called surveillance pricing announcement yesterday will not even be in effect until at least 2028, meaning it is yet another announcement that is not delivering results for Canadians. Of food bank users in Canada, 2.2 million in a single month last year, one-third are children.

When will the Prime Minister reverse course and stop driving Canadians into the food banks?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservatives are busy making videos, our Prime Minister is busy bringing deals. Members have heard it: 13 deals and \$5 billion. That is what leadership is about. That is what Canada in the world is about. We are busy building the strongest economy in the G7. We have exports that are going to overseas markets. We are attracting a record level of foreign direct investment. Every day is a good day to fight for Canadians.

[Translation]

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister claimed that the cost of living is the best it has been in decades, but I have some news for him: We are in a recession.

Along with my Conservative colleagues, I travelled across Quebec last week to hear from entrepreneurs. In Beauce, Bellechasse, the Lower St. Lawrence, Saguenay and Quebec City, the conclusion

Oral Questions

is always the same: Investments are being postponed, planned expansions are on hold and some companies are moving their operations outside of Canada.

Does the Prime Minister understand that his greatest failure has been creating a climate in which businesses prefer to produce elsewhere?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague will be pleased to hear that the Canadian economy ranks second in the G7 in terms of growth. Not only are we seeing growth, but we are also seeing investment; Bombardier is a perfect example of that. Quebec's aerospace industry is thriving.

We have always been there to defend our industries. We have always been there to defend our workers. Together, we will build the most resilient economy in the G7. I hope that one day, the Conservatives will stand up to congratulate our entrepreneurs, our businesses and our workers. On this side of the House, we will do so every day.

• (1425)

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Finance is out of touch with reality. What we see on the ground, what we have observed, is that this is not working at all. What is more, a poll shows that 60% of Canadians are anxious because they do not have enough money and do not know how things will turn out.

Then there are our entrepreneurs. As I said when I asked the first question: they have stopped investing. Those who are already in the United States are sending all their business there. That means job losses in Canada. Where is the good news in all this? Everything has come to a standstill. Nothing is moving forward.

Does the Prime Minister realize that?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we hear the Conservatives talk against the economy. On this side of the House, we are proud.

We are proud to have the most skilled workers in the world. We are proud to have an auto industry, a maritime industry, and an aerospace industry. We are proud to have critical minerals for the 21st century. We are proud to have abundant energy, renewable energy and nuclear energy. We are proud to be the only G7 country to have a free trade agreement with all the other G7 countries.

On this side of the House, we will continue to support our entrepreneurs and our workers. We will continue to be proud of the Canadian economy.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said that affordability is the best it has been in a decade, but full-time workers are living in RVs and trailers because they cannot afford a home. Families are spending over 120% of their income on rent and food alone. People are even skipping surgeries and other major life events just to survive.

The Liberals' inflationary spending, red tape and antidevelopment policies created this recession and cost of living crisis. It is not global forces; it is Liberal choices. When will the Prime Minister reverse his costly policies that caused this crisis so Canadians can afford to live again?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the real question is this: When will the Conservatives stop voting against the very constituents they claim to stand up for and support? Here in Ontario, for example, a family can be saving up to \$13,000 per child per year in early learning and child care fees, which is something that helps people ensure they can get to work and keep those good-paying jobs that these guys keep talking about, but they obviously do not understand how an economy works.

On this side, we are doing everything we can to make sure that families, workers, people who are struggling and people who are entering the workforce have the supports to build this economy strong. Maybe the Conservatives should get on board.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we cannot make this up. The Prime Minister says affordability is the best it has been in a decade. Then ministers in the House rise and take credit for programs they implemented to address all the damage they caused. Their promised surveillance pricing legislation to lower grocery costs will not even take effect before 2028. While millions of Canadians cannot afford to eat, the Prime Minister spent nearly \$1 million on inflight catering, and all of that on the taxpayers' dime.

When will this Prime Minister stop making Canadians pay for a crisis he built, a recession he caused and dinner that he put on their tab?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while I know the member across does not want to help us build Canada, let us talk about who does want to help us build Canada. Today, we announced \$5 billion in new investment from Japan, Italy, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, France and Portugal. They want to help us build.

Why do the Conservatives not try and help build?

* * *

*[Translation]***DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS**

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are confusing their parliamentary majority with the right to do what they want, when they want. The time allocations never seem to stop, which is especially odd considering that their bills are certain to pass.

Yesterday, it was Bill C-30, which authorizes the government to approve the use of previously banned pesticides. Today, it is Bill C-22, which authorizes the invasive surveillance of Canadians. That comes on top of lots of other legislation, like the legislation arising from Bill C-5, under which the Prime Minister is giving himself the power to circumvent laws.

Are the Liberals so quick to resort to time allocations because they want to keep the public in the dark about the scope of their abuse of power?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what Quebeckers and Canadians see is that we have a lot to get done.

I am pleased to speak to Bill C-30, a bill that is going to help families and workers, and that contains important measures for advancing Canada's economy. I am sure that our Bloc Québécois colleagues want to contribute to building a more prosperous Quebec.

On this side of the House, we will always stand up, we will always be ready to work, and together, we are going to drive the economy of this country and the economy of Quebec forward.

● (1430)

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, our Prime Minister has nothing but contempt for the work of Parliament. He is ramming through draconian laws using closure. He is concentrating all powers in hands of cabinet. He is using those powers to deregulate industry for the benefit of primarily American companies or to suspend certain laws.

On the international stage, he says that he wants to form an alliance of middle powers against Donald Trump, but in real life, he is making concession after concession to the U.S. President.

The Liberals promised Quebeckers a green banker. They promised a strongman who would stand up to Washington. How have we ended up with neither?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement and Quebec Lieutenant, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we listen to the Bloc Québécois, we have no trouble understanding why Quebeckers made the wise choice to send 44 Quebec members to this side of the House.

Our members are firmly focused on building our economy while protecting our environment. They are idealists and pragmatists who know how to build one Canadian economy, as we are doing in Contrecoeur, at the port of Quebec and with the high-speed rail project between Quebec City and Toronto.

We know the members of the Bloc Québécois and their political masters in Quebec City would set us back 30 years. They think an independent Quebec would not need to be connected to its main economic partner, Ontario. In the words of one PQ intellectual, it is disheartening to—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon.

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this government is subverting democracy by shutting down the debate on Bill C-22. Even though it has a majority, integrity demands proper scrutiny before we pass a bill that allows the surveillance of all citizens, the seizure of data without authorization and the tracking of phones. To add insult to injury, the closure motion also imposes a retroactive deadline for the submission of amendments. What a coincidence: The deadline was precisely when the Liberal members proposed their amendments. This is an utterly reprehensible case of parliamentary insider trading.

Will they stop this shift toward authoritarianism?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois should know that Quebecers are just as concerned about crime, especially crimes involving coercion and child pornography. For a long time now, law enforcement agencies, police officers and municipal police forces in Quebec have been asking us to provide them with the tools they need to apprehend criminals and prevent this type of crime.

The Bloc Québécois opposes these measures, but the government is determined. We will fight crime both in Quebec and everywhere else.

* * *

[English]

SMALL BUSINESS

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we are incredibly worried. Statistics Canada reported on May 29 that “business capital investment fell 0.7% in the first quarter of 2026, the fifth consecutive quarterly decline”.

After years of policies that have left small business owners struggling, will these Liberals reverse their policies so businesses can get ahead?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is not the only person with good news. The Prime Minister today announced \$5 billion of new investment in this country from Japan, Italy, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, France and Portugal.

We are focused on bringing capital to this country and investment into this country to create jobs. They are focused on talking down Canada.

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal member for Eglinton—Lawrence badgered the CFIB as to why his own government's policies were not reaching Canadian small businesses. The CFIB says three in four entrepreneurs do

not feel supported by the government, and many would not start a business today.

Why will the government not lower costs and give small businesses a real chance to compete, so we do not continue losing capital to other countries?

Hon. Rechie Valdez (Minister of Women and Gender Equality and Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, small business investment is up by 10%. The first thing our government did in terms of action was to bring down federal trade barriers across provinces and territories so small business goods could flow across the country. We are also diversifying trade, making sure that we are able to secure investment. We heard many references today. Do colleagues know who is going to benefit from that? It will be small and medium-sized enterprises. Through our buy Canadian policy, federal procurement opportunities are going to be opened up so that small and medium-sized enterprises can take advantage of this.

We have invested \$60 million for a small and medium-sized business export readiness program that will help ensure that we can secure—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Beauce.

• (1435)

[Translation]

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, according to the the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, or CFIB, Canadian SMEs and entrepreneurs are still being overlooked by the Liberal government. Businesses in Beauce do not need empty promises. They need a government that stands up for them. Liberal policies have been dragging us down for 10 years. Canada cannot have a strong economy if our SMEs are not investing here.

Does the government realize that it is the main obstacle to investment in Canada?

Hon. Nathalie Provost (Secretary of State (Nature), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the research chair in taxation and public finance said today that Canada is still resilient in spite of everything. It is true that Quebec has been deeply affected by the trade war with the United States, but we have managed to pivot. We have succeeded in redirecting exports that used to go to the United States towards European countries, and the same is true for Quebec. Our businesses have taken matters into their own hands; they have seized the opportunities we have given them and they are growing. That is good news.

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, according to the CFIB, four in 10 businesses say that economic uncertainty, and especially political uncertainty, is discouraging investment in our country. In Beauce, we are fortunate to have extraordinary companies such as Beauce Atlas and Bois Hamel creating jobs, investing in our communities, and creating wealth in our regions. However, over the past 10 years under the Liberals, with all the colossal deficits, instability, and lack of leadership in particular, investment in Canada has stalled.

Oral Questions

Do the Liberals realize that they are part of the problem facing Canadian businesses?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement and Quebec Lieutenant, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, speaking of a lack of leadership, Canadians have been looking for the Conservative Party's economic plan for at least two years. No one has found it yet, because it does not exist.

I would invite my colleague to look at the superdeduction in budget 2025, for example. Accelerated depreciation will encourage businesses to invest and increase their productivity. That is exactly what our government's strategy is, but that is not all; it also includes diversifying our markets.

Today, the numbers speak for themselves, as my colleague said. We have increased our exports to the European Union by 23% and to the United Kingdom by 62%, and we are investing in our infrastructure, at the ports of Quebec and Montreal, for instance, in order to boost productivity across the country.

[English]

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, despite big promises from the Prime Minister to bring generational economic change and move at speeds never before seen, our small businesses, the backbone of the Canadian economy, are struggling under this high-tax, big-deficit-spending Liberal government. Over half of small businesses in this country have said they would not recommend starting a business in Canada today. This is devastating news. After a decade of Liberals, Canada has become an unwelcome place to do business, and under the Prime Minister, it is not getting any better.

When will the Liberals reverse their harmful policies so that businesses can get ahead?

Hon. Rechie Valdez (Minister of Women and Gender Equality and Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that we are experiencing global headwinds in this country, Canada is functioning from a position of strength. Our economy continues to outperform many different G7 countries, from Germany to Japan and Italy. We have secured 20 new economic partnerships. We have already heard today, thanks to the Prime Minister, that we have 13 new economic partnerships. This is going to strengthen small businesses and supply chains and support SMEs to get the opportunities they need to make sure to pivot away from the U.S. tariffs.

We are going to continue to be there for small businesses and provide support when they need it.

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, “from a position of strength”, she said. According to Statistics Canada, business capital investment has declined for five quarters in a row. Entrepreneurship is at a 25-year low and we are now in a recession. These are the devastating results under the Liberal Prime Minister. This is his record, and Canadians are the ones having to suffer the consequences.

When are they going to realize that it is Liberal economic policies that are sending people to food banks, causing job losses and driving this country into a recession? That is on them.

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that small businesses do well when consumer spending is up, and that is why we have made investments like the Canada groceries and essentials benefit. Wages are increasing faster than inflation, and we have cut taxes through measures like the superproductivity deduction to make it easier for businesses to invest.

We are taking the right approaches during this time of tariffs, which we never hear about on the other side. We are making investments in small businesses and the people who spend money with small businesses.

Dalwinder Gill (Calgary McKnight, CPC): Mr. Speaker, according to the CFIB, three in four small businesses do not feel supported by the Liberal government and more than half would not recommend starting a business in Canada, but the Liberals continue to punish small businesses with high taxes and red tape. There are 4,000 Canadian restaurants facing closure this year because of rising costs and taxes. Conservatives have a plan to cut taxes and red tape to keep our small businesses open.

Will the Liberals reverse their economic policies so businesses can get ahead?

• (1440)

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of actually running small businesses in the economy, not like the Conservative leader who has never worked a day outside of this House. Sometimes a small business or a government is faced with challenges or headwinds, and they can do one of two things. They can throw their hands up and offer no solutions or they can lead, pivot, rebuild and reinvest.

We are doing just that on this side of the House. They offer nothing but empty parking lot press conferences.

* * *

[Translation]

TRANSPORTATION

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for the first time in recent history, more than 100 people died on our roads last year in accidents involving heavy-duty trucks. There were 102 fatalities. That is nearly 20% higher than the average for the previous five years.

What has changed recently that could explain this? The answer is, of course, Driver Inc. The federal government turns a blind eye when shady companies put dangerous drivers on the road, and then acts surprised when there are consequences.

We have proposed 10 solutions to the Liberals. When are they going to take action instead of allowing more victims to be added to the list?

Oral Questions

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, road safety is, of course, a shared responsibility. I am proud to say that the federal government has stepped up to be part of the solution. We have eliminated the possibility of special treatment from the Canada Revenue Agency. We have worked to ensure that these companies cannot operate and are deemed illegitimate. We are also deploying inspectors to ensure compliance with the Labour Code.

Now it is up to the provinces and police to keep the roads safe.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us look back on the last couple of weeks.

The chair of the transport committee was the guest of honour of the Canada Truck Operators Association, or CTOA, which is a Driver Inc. lobby group. The Liberals forced the committee to go in camera to prevent any discussion about Driver Inc. CTOA members contributed more than \$100,000 to the Liberals, including more than \$20,000 from a company in the chair's riding. This week, the Liberals refused to allow the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics to investigate CTOA's ties to the Liberal Party.

Why are they protecting their friends instead of the public?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate that the government has taken action and has stepped up, as confirmed by trucking associations across the country, including in Quebec.

This is a shared responsibility. We do not employ highway inspectors. The Sûreté du Québec must continue to do its job. We need inspections. We must ensure that drivers' certifications are valid and up to date. These are examples of shared responsibility, but the federal government, the Government of Canada, has stepped up to the plate.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we will soon be adjourning for the summer and going home to our communities.

The Prime Minister says that the cost of living is the best it has been in decades. The reality is that the country is in a recession, and Canadians know it. Canadians know that grocery prices have gone up. Canadians know that food banks are overwhelmed. Canadians know that rents are unaffordable, on the eve of July 1. We know that 48,000 seniors are still waiting for their benefits because the Cúram system is a Liberal fiasco.

Will the Prime Minister admit that his first year in government has been a flop?

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know that in May, we created 88,000 jobs. Canadians know that in May, there were 154,000 full-time jobs. Canadians know that 27,000 of these jobs were in the construction sector. Canadians know that the trade surplus grew in April and May. Canadians know that, just yesterday,

the Prime Minister announced 13 contracts worth \$5 billion. Canadians know this—

• (1445)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska.

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I truly appreciate my colleague. Could he explain how the Liberal government led Canada into the only recession in the G20? This was due to a multitude of bad decisions and poor management. There are two issues I am still waiting for answers on: the \$5-billion cost overruns for Cúram and the \$200-million lease on a parcel of land.

My questions are simple. When was the minister informed? Who signed those contracts? Lastly, will the Prime Minister scrap his failed policies?

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are going to keep going. Canadians know that, under Prime Minister Stephen Harper, 5,000 small businesses closed their doors. Canadians know that the Canadian economy is under pressure from the United States. No, that is not an excuse. I heard my colleagues say that the international context is an excuse. Come on, how could that be an excuse? It is very real, very tangible. There is a trade war being waged by a partner that used to be trustworthy but is not anymore.

We in the government are helping businesses get back on track, and we are going to succeed.

Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Prime Minister claims that the cost of living has never been better. However, that is not what the CBC is reporting. More than 15,000 Canadians have set up GoFundMe campaigns to pay for their basic needs.

Meanwhile, I am not convinced the Prime Minister is tightening his belt. He spent nearly \$1 million on catering for just 14 trips, all at the expense of taxpayers who are struggling to put food on the table.

Will the Prime Minister cut back on his inflationary spending so Canadians and Quebecers can get some breathing room?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the summer adjournment is almost here, but one mystery remains unsolved. What exactly counts as inflationary spending? Does health care count? Does dental care count? Does the Canada child benefit count? Does the national school food program count?

The Conservatives keep going on and on about inflationary spending, but they cannot pinpoint which of these items constitutes inflationary spending.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know the Liberals are used to stepping over panhandlers who are shaking their coffee cups on the street, and now they can just scroll past them online. More than 15,000 fundraisers have been launched by Canadians on GoFundMe since January to cover rent, groceries and utilities. These campaigns are not from some unexpected tragedy. They are for covering the everyday cost of living under the Liberal government.

Will the Prime Minister rein in his inflationary spending so Canadians can stand on their own two feet again?

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, it is confusing to us on this side how, every day, the members of the opposition party vote against every support for Canadians, yet they raise the issue. This month, Canadians will get the groceries and essentials benefit. The Conservatives voted against it. We are taking action against surveillance pricing to stop price gouging. How could they help people do that? They could support the bill. What are they doing? They are not doing it.

For a change, I suggest they try supporting some of the measures to help Canadians instead of just talking down the economy.

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if all of these Liberal policies were working, our people would not be reduced to begging on the Internet just to get by. These programs do nothing for the millions of Canadians who are working full-time and still cannot afford groceries or rent because of the Liberals' made-in-Canada recession. That is why they are forced into using food banks, crowdfunding online and living in RVs and parking lots.

When will the Prime Minister reverse his costly policies, which have left Canadians with no other choice?

• (1450)

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that colleague has asked that question a number of times, and it has been answered.

Let me tell him what Canadians do want to know. Canadians know that the government is focused on building a stronger economy to responsibly manage migration. We have tightened our processes, and the latest numbers prove it: the temporary resident population is down 73%; asylum claims are down 63%; the non-permanent resident population has dropped for 18 consecutive months; and asking rents have dropped for 20 months. Numbers do not lie, and our plan is working.

* * *

*[Translation]***AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD**

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is one of the world's largest food producers. However, too much of the food we produce is processed abroad, and too many Canadians still rely on high-priced imports. Canadian farmers deserve more

options for selling their products, and Canadians deserve more choices about where they buy their food.

Could the Minister of Finance tell us how the first-ever national food security strategy will help us produce and process more food right here in Canada, so that more Canadian food ends up on our plates and more money—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Finance.

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the member for Hull—Aylmer for his question and for all his leadership. I am sure that my colleagues will agree with me.

He is right. Last week, we unveiled the national food security strategy, because we know that food security is a top priority for Canadians. These are flagship measures that will please everyone, even the Conservatives: \$1 billion for food infrastructure, terminals and hubs, as well as \$750 million to ensure that Canadians have access to more Canadian-grown fruits and vegetables all year long. There are also measures to spur competition—

[English]

The Speaker: The hon. member for Middlesex—London.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is the only G7 leader and Canada is the only G20 country that is currently in a recession. Full-time workers are living in RVs because they cannot afford homes. Families are spending over 120% of their income on food and rent, and two in five Canadians are struggling to put food on their tables, all while a record 2.2 million Canadians are having to rely on food banks. The recession is not global forces; it is Liberal choices.

Will the Prime Minister reverse his costly policies so Canadians can afford to live?

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this member spent a half hour in a video going after Tim Hortons for converting to paper lids. Paper lids are her contribution to this discussion.

She talks about Liberal policies. Liberal policies are squarely focused on the economy, on jobs, on youth, on child care, on dental care and on pharmacare. They are focused on making sure we have a prosperous environment and a prosperous society to give back to our kids.

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Liberal claims of success are completely detached from reality. Canadians are crowdfunding their way through this cost of living crisis, and the Prime Minister has blown nearly \$1 million on luxury in-flight catering on just 14 flights, including \$175,000 on one single flight. That bill could feed a family in Middlesex—London for 55 years.

Canadians cannot afford groceries, so will the Prime Minister stop his outrageous luxury lifestyle, on the taxpayer's dime, and reverse his policy so Canadians can afford to live again?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when my Conservative colleagues see a vulnerable Canadian, they see a political opportunity to exploit. We see people who we want to help. This question has been asked and answered.

It has been fascinating to me, over the last number of weeks, how the Conservatives have completely dropped their focus on public safety in this country. Let me tell the House why. We have a legislative agenda that is going into effect. The Bail and Sentencing Reform Act is now law in Canada. Later today, we are going to vote on the combatting hate act, and by the end of the week, we are going to adopt the protecting victims act. We can balance the economic interests of the country, the needs of families and public safety at the same time. Let us not just focus on political opportunities.

• (1455)

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said affordability is the best it has been in decades, but in reality, 38% of Canadians face food insecurity. One in five say all food in the home has been eaten and there is no money left to buy more. It is no wonder Food Banks Canada gave the Liberal government an F on food insecurity.

Will the Prime Minister reverse his costly policies, which caused this crisis, so Canadians can afford to once again live?

Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk about agriculture for a moment. For the last 10 years, these folks have been here literally doing nothing.

Back home in Saskatchewan, we have Saskatchewan's back. In the last 10 years, it has doubled the value of the amount of all agricultural products without the federal Conservative caucus's help. The government stood by Saskatchewan and will continue to have Saskatchewan's back.

In the meantime, the Conservatives can sit back for another 10 years. We have this.

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this member from northern Saskatchewan is the biggest embarrassment to come out of Saskatchewan since the Riders lost the Grey Cup for having too many men on the field. Let me make a list of what this

guy has actually delivered. He cancelled the Snowbirds. He shuttered two agriculture research stations. He never delivered money for the RCMP museum in Regina.

If the Liberal government is doing so great, why are Canadians struggling so much?

Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is methodically building a vast, exciting world partnership. This front bench is dealing with some very tough issues around trade wars and international conflicts. This caucus is doing the work to assist in every way possible. What the country cannot afford is the voodoo economic plan of the Conservatives. They make no sense. They have not made any sense in the last 10 years, and I doubt very much that we will see anything that makes sense over the next 10 years.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I read a news article yesterday that said there are asylum seekers and claimants from Saint Pierre and Miquelon entering Canada through my part of the island. Are people coming from France, a G7 ally, really seeking asylum in Canada? Are these even legitimate asylum claims? Are folks just trying to navigate the globe to take advantage of our system?

To the immigration minister, if these are legitimate asylum seekers, why are they seeking asylum in Newfoundland and Labrador rather than in Saint Pierre and Miquelon, where they landed?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have good news. Here is what Canadians need to know. Our plan for responsible, sustainable immigration is working. The non-permanent resident population has declined. We are focused on attracting skilled talent, like health care workers, construction workers, researchers and engineers. The numbers do not lie. Our plan is working.

* * *

[*English*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I do not think Saint Pierre and Miquelon was even mentioned in that answer. I do not think that answer is very good for the next generation or very comforting to the next generation.

Oral Questions

Critical minerals, for example, are critical to the country's development and future. It seems that the Liberal government claims to spend millions of dollars in hard-to-reach places that require huge construction of roads, ports and highways. If these are national building projects, why does the government not invest in critical minerals in Newfoundland and Labrador, including in Port Hope Simpson, which is already at tidewater, already has highways and already has the infrastructure and everything needed to succeed?

• (1500)

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks about critical minerals. I have good news. Today we found 13 new projects to invest in critical minerals, with \$5 billion invested in Canada and in critical minerals from seven different allied countries. Maybe they should watch the news sometime.

* * *

HEALTH

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Liberal chair of the health committee suspended the meeting, with the cameras off, blocking emergency meetings from being held in public over the summer. Today, he cancelled the final health committee meeting entirely. This is a blatant abuse of power to shut the health committee down and block an investigation into the \$300-million PrescribeIT scandal. Conservatives are ready to work throughout the summer.

Why did the Liberal chair of the health committee abruptly cancel Thursday's meeting to block an investigation into PrescribeIT?

[Translation]

Hon. Marjorie Michel (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will repeat for the 50th time that we did not block anything regarding the work of the Standing Committee on Health. The Conservatives are always looking to obstruct our work. I also want to take this opportunity to thank the committee members for their hard work, and I wish them a good summer.

[English]

Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know a cover-up when they hear one. That was a cover-up. They turned the cameras off on a scheduled meeting about the \$300-million PrescribeIT scandal. They cancelled tomorrow's meeting so they can continue to cover it up.

Can they offer some fig leaf of an explanation to Canadians as to why they are playing these dirty tricks if it is not a cover-up?

[Translation]

Hon. Marjorie Michel (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not see how this can be a cover-up, because the Conservatives have been asking the same questions about Canada Health Infoway and PrescribeIT for over a month.

That means that the public is aware. We are not covering up the information.

[English]

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we need to hear from the chair of the health committee as to why he cancelled tomorrow's meeting. Hundreds of millions of health care dollars remain unaccounted for in the \$300-million PrescribeIT scandal. Why? It is because Liberal MPs keep turning off the cameras at the health committee. They turned off the cameras again yesterday. Canadians will not know what was said there for 30 years.

Will the chair of the health committee tell Canadians today why he cancelled tomorrow's meeting, blocking Parliament from investigating PrescribeIT?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as that member knows and the health minister has answered as she—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. government House leader.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, the health minister has answered that question several dozen times over the course of this session. This is a perfect example for the Canadians watching at home, as the Conservatives yell at me from across the aisle, of the obstruction and the waiting and the pointless talking. Anything they can possibly do to halt the work of Canadians that gets done in this place is what Conservatives do. They use this tactic—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. member for Mississauga Centre.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Fares Al Soud (Mississauga Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, young Canadians are eager to work, gain experience and build their careers. Whether it is a summer position, an internship or their first step into the workforce, landing that first job can make all the difference. Can the Minister of Jobs and Families update the House on how our government is connecting young Canadians with employers and creating opportunities for them to succeed?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank that member for his constant advocacy for opportunities for youth. We are proud on this side of the bench to have so many young representatives here in the government benches. We are very eager to work with them to ensure that youth have the best opportunities to succeed. In fact, this year there are 100,000 Canada summer jobs across the country, in every riding in this country. It does not matter whether the riders are Conservative, Liberal, NDP or Green, because youth all across this country have an opportunity to get that first job, those great skills and those connections in the workforce.

• (1505)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, “collaboratively” is the word used by the Minister of Public Safety as to how he would work with Conservatives on Bill C-22 amendments, and yet the government is insisting on using its manufactured majority to now ram this bill through Parliament.

Make no mistake: Conservatives want to put the bad folks in jail. We would pass part 1 of the bill swiftly, but Canadians have questions and experts have questions, and we think those questions should be answered with respect to part 2. Why is the Liberal government insistent on ramming Bill C-22 and part 2 through when we would gladly pass part 1 swiftly?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have questions, victims have questions and the police chiefs have questions as to why it has taken so long for Bill C-22, which was originally Bill C-2, to get through the legislative process.

Every day that we wait, more and more victims are created in Canada. Take, for example, the shootings at the synagogues that have just happened recently. Those shooters were paid and hired by a foreign entity, in our country, online. Had we been able to find those shooters sooner, there would have been fewer victims.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Conservatives support giving law enforcement officers the effective lawful access tools they need for investigating serious crimes and pursuing criminals. However, expert after expert has been sounding the alarm. Bill C-22 risks creating a surveillance state, more government control without accountability. If this bill is as good as the government claims, why are the Liberals using their manufactured majority to silence opposition and ram this overreaching law through Parliament instead of working with opposition parties to get it right?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, where are the Conservatives who used to care about protecting Canadians? They are not in this House. It is the government that has committed to protecting Canadians through our various bills that we have progressed through this House. Bill C-16 would protect children from child predators, and the Conservatives voted against it. It is an all-time low.

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Conservatives will take no lessons from these Liberals on tough-on-crime policies. After 10 years of these Liberals, violent crime in this country has gone up 55%. What did the Liberal government do? It brought bail, not jail for repeat violent offenders. It gutted mandatory minimums.

Canadians want to give law enforcement officers the tools they need to catch the bad guys and put them behind bars. What they do not want to see is government overreach, adding surveillance on law-abiding Canadians. Conservatives support getting part 1 of Bill C-22 passed swiftly, but we need changes to protect Canadians' privacy. Instead of listening, these Liberals are forcing this through with no further scrutiny—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice.

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada

Oral Questions

Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague says he will take no lessons from the government. Will he take lessons from the head of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, who told me that he has been working on lawful access for more than 30 years in this country? He said it is the number one tool that he needs to combat extortion in this country, to combat the scourge of child sexual exploitation and abuse material and to tackle organized crime.

The hon. member also mentioned bail. I would point out to him that as of two nights ago, Canada has new laws. We have reformed the bail system. We are reforming the sentencing system. We are implementing a public safety agenda that has not been seen in generations.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Lori Idlout (Nunavut, Lib.): *Ullukkut, Uqqaqtittiji.* June is National Indigenous History Month, a time to celebrate the cultures, languages, histories and contributions of first nations, Inuit and Métis peoples.

As we continue the work of reconciliation, would the Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs show how indigenous leadership and partnership are helping advance economic opportunity and prosperity across the north?

• (1510)

Hon. Rebecca Chartrand (Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs and Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, *qujannamiik* to my beautiful colleague for her tireless advocacy. There is so much to celebrate during National Indigenous History Month. For the first time in history, there are two first nation female ministers in cabinet, a growing indigenous caucus and opportunities to move beyond community benefit agreements to revenue sharing with indigenous people through major projects. Together, we are reducing barriers and accelerating regulatory processes in the north. Together, we are reducing all of the challenges in the north, hand in hand, and building Canada strong.

*Government Orders***PUBLIC SAFETY**

Roman Baber (York Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, part 2 of Bill C-22 would force providers to retain the metadata of all Canadians. Liberals say the data is no different than the phone book, but the phone book did not log every phone call in every location of every Canadian for the last 12 months. There are also real concerns that foreign actors would exploit a back door to encryption. Law-abiding Canadians do not want their privacy breached, but Liberals are cutting off debate and ramming the bill through.

Part 2 is not ready to be passed into law, so will the Liberals work with us to pass part 1 of Bill C-22, but pause on part 2 to allow us to fix the bulk of this bill?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, growing up, I chose the Liberal Party for a whole host of good reasons, but when I was growing up, the Conservative Party used to stand for one very clear thing. It stood with the forces in blue. It stood for law and order and for crime prevention in this country. Right now, the other side has taken over. The conspiracy theories, the rabbit holes and the tinfoil hats are all out.

Where are the law and order Conservatives? Will they stand with us Liberals and take on crime in this country?

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister tabled Bill C-37 yesterday, yet its definition of “First Nation lands” is limited to reserve lands under section 91(24) of the BNA Act. While the bill repeatedly references UNDRIP’s application, it appears restricted to reserves. Indigenous peoples have rights that extend beyond reserve boundaries into their traditional territories.

Can the minister confirm that UNDRIP, including article 25, applies throughout indigenous peoples’ traditional territories and not just on reserve, yes or no?

Hon. Mandy Gull-Masty (Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy that my colleague has asked that question. It is one of great importance, because we know that first nations have to do the work of expanding the minimum standards that are now applicable in their communities and setting the regulatory gaps for in communities and out of communities, working, negotiating and collaborating in partnership with provincial and territorial governments. For the first time ever, this government has been able to secure that in collaboration. We will support them in community and out, in partnership, at all tables, because we want to honour the work we do with them.

* * *

● (1515)

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Mike Moyes, Minister of Environment and Climate Change for the Province of Manitoba.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Rideau Hall

Ottawa

June 17, 2026

Mr. Speaker:

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Louise Arbour, Governor General of Canada, signified royal assent by written declaration to the bills listed in the Schedule to this letter on the 17th day of June, 2026, at 10:39 a.m.

Yours sincerely,

Ken MacKillop

Secretary to the Governor General

The schedule indicates the bills assented to were Bill C-225, An Act to amend the Criminal Code; Bill C-32, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2027; and Bill C-33, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2027.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

COMBATting HATE ACT

The House resumed from June 16 consideration of the motion in relation to the amendment made by the Senate to Bill C-9, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (hate propaganda, hate crime and access to religious or cultural places), and of the amendment.

The Speaker: It being 3:16, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment to the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to Bill C-9.

Call in the members.

● (1525)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 167*)

YEAS

Members

Aboulttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey

Government Orders

Baldinelli	Barlow	Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill Riv- er)	Bendayan
Barrett	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)	Bittle	Blanchette-Joncas
Berthold	Bexte	Bonin	Brière
Block	Bonk	Brunelle-Duceppe	Carr
Borrelli	Boulerice	Casey	Chagger
Bragdon	Brassard	Champagne	Champoux
Brock	Calkins	Chang	Chartrand
Caputo	Chambers	Chatel	Chen
Chong	Cobena	Chenette	Chi
Cooper	Dalton	Church	Clark
Dancho	Davidson	Connors	Cormier
Davies (Niagara South)	Dawson	Coteau	Dabrusin
Deltell	Diotte	Dandurand	Danko
Doherty	Dowdall	DeBellefeuille	d'Entremont
Duncan	Epp	Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)	Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Gazan	Genuis	Dhillon	Diab
Gill (Calgary Skyview)	Gill (Brampton West)	Duclos	Duguid
Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Gill (Windsor West)	Dzerowicz	Earle
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Goodridge	Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Gourde	Groleau	Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Guglielmin	Gunn	Fancy	Fanjoy
Hallan	Hardy	Fergus	Fisher
Ho	Hoback	Fonseca	Fortier
Holman	Jackson	Fortin	Fragiskatos
Jansen	Jivani	Fraser	Fry
Johns	Khanna	Gaheer	Gainey
Kibble	Kirkland	Garon	Gasparro
Kmiec	Konanz	Gaudreau	Gerretsen
Kram	Kramp-Neuman	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassi- nan)	Gladu
Kronis	Kusie	Gould	Grant
Kwan	Lake	Greaves	Guay
Lantsman	Lawrence	Guilbeault	Gull-Masty
Lawton	Leslie	Hajdu	Hanley
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Harrison	Hepfner
Lloyd	Lobb	Hirtle	Hodgson
Mahal	Majumdar	Hogan	Housefather
Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins— Mushkegowuk)	Mantle	Hussen	Iacono
Martel	May	Idlout	Jaczek
Mazier	McCauley	Jeneroux	Joseph
McLean (Calgary Centre)	McPherson	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Melillo	Menegakis	Khalid	Klassen
Moore	Morrison	Koutrakis	Lambropoulos
Motz	Muys	Lamoureux	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Nater	Patzer	Lapointe (Sudbury)	Larouche
Paul-Hus	Poilievre	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Redekopp	Reid	Lavack	Lavoie
Rempel Garner	Reynolds	Leitão	Lemire
Richards	Roberts	Lightbound	Long
Rood	Ross	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Ma
Rowe	Ruff	MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacDonald (Cardigan)
Scheer	Schmale	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malette (Bay of Quinte)
Seeback	Small	Maloney	Martin
Steinley	Stevenson	McKelvie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Strahl	Strauss	McKnight	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanic—Sooke)
Stubbs	Thomas	Ménard	Mendès
Tochor	Tolmie	Michel	Miedema
Uppal	Van Popta	Miller	Mingarelli
Vis	Wagantall	Morrissey	Myles
Warkentin	Waugh	Naqvi	Nathan
Williamson	Zimmer— 132	Nguyen	Noormohamed
		Normandin	Ntumba
		Oliphant	Olszewski
		O'Rourke	Osborne
		Perron	Petipas Taylor
		Plamondon	Powlowski
		Provost	Ramsay
		Rana	Robertson
		Rocheffort	Romanado
		Royer	Sahota
		Saini	Sari

NAYS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Auguste
Bains	Baker
Bardeesy	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Begum

Government Orders

Sari	Sawatzky
Schiefke	Sgro
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sodhi	Solomon
Sousa	Ste-Marie
St-Pierre	Sudds
Tesser Derksen	Thompson
Turnbull	Valdez
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld
Villeneuve	Watchorn
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zerucelli	Zuberi — 184

PAIRED

Members

Anandasangaree	Blois
Fuhr	Gallant
Godin	Joly
Kelly	Kuruc
Lalonde	LeBlanc
McGuinty	McKenzie
Shipley	Thériault — 14

The Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

● (1530)

[*English*]

The next question is on the main 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.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

● (1540)

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

(*Division No. 168*)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Alty	Anand
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Begum	Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)
Bendayan	Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas	Bonin
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Champagne	Champoux
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Church	Clark
Connors	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dandurand	Danko
DeBellefeuille	d'Entremont
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal

Dhillon	Diab
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Earle
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Fancy	Fanjoy
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Gasparro
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)

Gladu	Gould
Grant	Greaves
Guay	Guilbeault
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Hanley	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Idlout
Jaczek	Jeneroux
Johns	Joseph
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Klassen
Koutrakis	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	Lavack
Lavoie	Leitão
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Ma	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Maloney
Martin	May
McKelvie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McKnight	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
McPherson	Ménard
Mendès	Michel
Miedema	Miller
Mingarelli	Morrissey
Myles	Naqvi
Nathan	Nguyen
Noormohamed	Normandin
Ntumba	Oliphant
Olszewski	O'Rourke
Osborne	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Provost
Ramsay	Rana
Robertson	Rochefort
Romanado	Royer
Sahota	Saini
Sarai	Sari
Sawatzky	Schiefke
Sgro	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sodhi
Solomon	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Pierre
Sudds	Tesser Derksen
Thompson	Turnbull
Valdez	van Koeverden
Vandenbeld	Villeneuve
Watchorn	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zerucelli
Zuberi — 189	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Berthold	Bexte
Block	Bonk
Borrelli	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Chambers	Chong
Cobena	Cody
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Davies (Niagara South)	Dawson
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Dowdall
Duncan	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Genuis	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Goodridge	Gourde
Groleau	Guglielmin
Gunn	Hallan
Hardy	Ho
Hoback	Holman
Jackson	Jansen
Jivani	Khanna
Kibble	Kirkland
Kmiec	Konanz
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kronis	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lawton
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd
Lobb	Mahal
Majumdar	Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Mantle	Martel
Mazier	McCauley
McLean (Calgary Centre)	Melillo
Menegakis	Moore
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Reynolds	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ross	Rowe
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Small	Steinley
Stevenson	Strahl
Strauss	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Williamson	Zimmer— 128

PAIRED

Members

Anandasangaree	Blois
Fuhr	Gallant
Godin	Joly
Kelly	Kuruc
Lalonde	LeBlanc
McGuinty	McKenzie
Shipley	Thériault— 14

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Amendments read the second time and concurred in)

* * *

[Translation]

AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO BE MADE OUT OF THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND FOR THE PURPOSE OF IMPROVING HOUSING SUPPLY

The House resumed from June 16 consideration of the motion that Bill C-26, An Act to authorize certain payments to be made out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purpose of improving housing supply, 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-26.

● (1550)

[English]

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

(Division No. 169)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Auguste
Bains	Baker
Bardeesy	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Begum
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin	Boulerice
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Chang
Chartrand	Chatel
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Church
Clark	Connors
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dandurand
Danko	DeBellefeuille
d'Entremont	Deschênes
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Earle	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson	Fancy

Government Orders

Fanjoy	Fergus	Albas	Allison
Fisher	Fonseca	Anderson	Anstey
Fortier	Fortin	Arnold	Au
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Baber	Bailey
Fry	Gaheer	Baldinelli	Barlow
Gainey	Garon	Barrett	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Gasparro	Gaudreau	Berthold	Bexte
Gazan	Gerretsen	Block	Bonk
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	Gladu	Borrelli	Bragdon
Gould	Grant	Brassard	Brock
Greaves	Guay	Calkins	Caputo
Guilbeault	Gull-Masty	Chambers	Chong
Hajdu	Hanley	Cobena	Cody
Harrison	Hepfner	Cooper	Dalton
Hirtle	Hodgson	Dancho	Davidson
Hogan	Housefather	Davies (Niagara South)	Dawson
Hussen	Iacono	Deltell	DeRidder
Idlout	Jaczek	Diotte	Doherty
Jeneroux	Johns	Dowdall	Duncan
Joseph	Kayabaga	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Kelloway	Khalid	Falk (Provencher)	Geniis
Klassen	Koutrakis	Gill (Calgary Skyview)	Gill (Brampton West)
Kwan	Lambropoulos	Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Gill (Windsor West)
Lamoureux	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Goodridge
Lapointe (Sudbury)	Larouche	Gourde	Groleau
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Guglielmin	Gunn
Lavack	Lavoie	Hallan	Hardy
Leitão	Lemire	Ho	Hoback
Lighthound	Long	Holman	Jackson
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Ma	Jansen	Jivani
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacDonald (Cardigan)	Khanna	Kibble
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Kirkland	Kmiec
Maloney	Martin	Konanz	Kram
May	McKelvie	Kramp-Neuman	Kronis
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McKnight	Kusie	Lake
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	McPherson	Lantsman	Lawrence
Ménard	Mendès	Lawton	Lefebvre
Michel	Miedema	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Miller	Mingarelli	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd
Morrissey	Myles	Lobb	Mahal
Naqvi	Nathan	Majumdar	Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Nguyen	Noormohamed	Mantle	Martel
Normandin	Ntumba	Mazier	McCaulley
Oliphant	Olszewski	McLean (Calgary Centre)	Melillo
O'Rourke	Osborne	Menegakis	Moore
Perron	Petitpas Taylor	Morrison	Motz
Plamondon	Powlowski	Muys	Nater
Provost	Ramsay	Patzner	Paul-Hus
Rana	Robertson	Poillievre	Redekopp
Rochefort	Romanado	Reid	Rempel Garner
Royer	Sahota	Reynolds	Richards
Saini	Sarai	Roberts	Rood
Sari	Savard-Tremblay	Ross	Rowe
Sawatzky	Schiefke	Ruff	Scheer
Sgro	Sheehan	Schmale	Seeback
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Small	Steinley
Simard	Sodhi	Stevenson	Strahl
Solomon	Sousa	Stubbs	Thomas
Ste-Marie	St-Pierre	Tochor	Tolmie
Sudds	Tesser Derksen	Uppal	Van Popta
Thompson	Turnbull	Vien	Vierns
Valdez	van Koeverden	Vis	Wagantall
Vandenbeld	Villeneuve	Warkentin	Waugh
Watchorn	Weiler	Williamson— 129	
Wilkinson	Yip		
Zahid	Zerucelli		
Zuberi— 191			

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif

Aitchison

Anandasangaree

Fuhr

Godin

Kelly

PAIRED

Members

Blois

Gallant

Joly

Kuruc

Lalonde
McGuinty
Shipley

LeBlanc
McKenzie
Thériault— 14

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, June 16, the bill is deemed referred to a committee of the whole, deemed considered in committee of the whole, deemed reported without amendment, deemed concurred in at report stage and deemed read a third time and passed.

(Bill read the second time, considered in committee of the whole, reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

NATIONAL FRAMEWORK ON THE DURABILITY OF ELECTRONIC PRODUCTS AND ESSENTIAL HOME APPLIANCES ACT

The House resumed from June 11 consideration of the motion that Bill C-267, An Act to establish a national framework to promote the durability of electronic products and essential home appliances, 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-267 under Private Members' Business.

● (1605)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 170*)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Auguste
Bains	Baker
Bardeesy	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Begum
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin	Boulerice
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Chang
Chartrand	Chatel
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Church
Clark	Connors
Cornier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dandurand
Danko	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
DeBellefeuille	d'Entremont
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Duclos	Duguid

Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fancy
Fergus
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gladu
Grant
Guay
Gull-Masty
Hanley
Hepfner
Hodgson
Housefather
Iacono
Jaczek
Johns
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lambropoulos
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Larouche
Lauzon
Lavoie
Lemire
Long
Ma
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
Martin
McKelvie
McKnight
McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Ntumba
Olszewski
Osborne
Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski
Ramsay
Robertson
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sodhi
Sousa
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

Private Members' Business

Earle
El-Khoury
Eyolfson
Fanjoy
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fry
Gainey
Gasparro
Gazan
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Gould
Greaves
Guilbeault
Hajdu
Harrison
Hirtle
Hogan
Hussen
Idlout
Jeneroux
Joseph
Kelloway
Klassen
Kwan
Lamoureux
Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lattanzio
Lavaek
Leitão
Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
May
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Normandin
Oliphant
O'Rourke
Perron
Plamondon
Provost
Rana
Rochefort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Solomon
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 192

Routine Proceedings

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Berthold	Bexte
Block	Bonk
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 (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Falk (Provencher)	Genuis
Gill (Calgary Skyview)	Gill (Brampton West)
Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Gill (Windsor West)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Goodridge
Gourde	Groleau
Guglielmin	Gunn
Hallan	Hardy
Ho	Hoback
Holman	Jackson
Jansen	Jivani
Khanna	Kibble
Kirkland	Kmiec
Konanz	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kronis
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lawton	Lefebvre
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd
Lobb	Mahal
Majumdar	Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Mantle	Martel
Mazier	McCauley
McLean (Calgary Centre)	Melillo
Menegakis	Moore
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Reynolds	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ross	Rowe
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Small	Steinley
Stevenson	Strahl
Strauss	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Williamson
Zimmer— 131	

PAIRED

Members

Anandasangaree	Blois
Fuhr	Gallant
Godin	Joly
Kelly	Kuruc
Lalonde	LeBlanc
McGuinty	McKenzie
Shipley	Thériault— 14

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, this bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology.

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

[English]

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Moments ago, the member for Elgin—St. Thomas—London South issued a social media post that included the results of a vote that occurred earlier this afternoon in the House. He indicated in his post that the Prime Minister voted against a motion. However, the Prime Minister did not even vote at all. He is not even in the country.

I wonder if the member for Elgin—St. Thomas—London South will stand up and apologize to the House for the misinformation that he is distributing around the Internet that relates to proceedings in this House.

The Speaker: First of all, the chief government whip alluded to the possibility that the Prime Minister might not be in this chamber.

Does the hon. member for Elgin—St. Thomas—London South want to say something?

Andrew Lawton: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the whip drawing attention to the entire Liberal caucus rejecting efforts to remove Bill C-9 from the orders of the House.

Grant Jackson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think it was very audible, the government whip shouting across that a member was a “liar” in the House. You previously ruled on a heckle that called another member a “liar”, and the member was asked to retract that statement. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you hold the same standard for the chief government whip.

● (1610)

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the word is unparliamentary, and I hold myself to that standard. I retract that.

The Speaker: We seem to be done with this issue.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

PUBLIC SECTOR INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay before the House, pursuant to subsection 38(3.3) of the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act, the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner's report for the fiscal year ended March 31.

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), this report is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates.

EXPORT DEVELOPMENT CANADA

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the annual report of the 2024-25 Canada account, as prepared by Export Development Canada.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8)(a), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 14 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Richard Bragdon (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, a report of the Canadian section of the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group.

[English]

This report describes the group's congressional visit to Washington, D.C., from March 17 to 19. I had the pleasure of co-leading this delegation of nine parliamentarians alongside Senator Michael MacDonald.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

INDIGENOUS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Terry Sheehan (Sault Ste. Marie—Algoma, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs in relation to Bill C-27, an act to give effect to the Final Self-Government Agreement for the Tłeǵóhłı̄ Got'ınę and to make consequential amendments to other acts. The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House without amendments.

I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs: the seventh report, entitled "Collaborative Approaches to Enforcement of Laws in Indigenous Communities"; and the eighth report, entitled "Beyond Enforcement: Supporting Indigenous-Led Public Safety and Well-Being Initiatives".

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to each of these two reports.

I thank the committee very much for working so collaboratively.

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Shannon Miedema (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two re-

Routine Proceedings

ports of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

The first is the seventh report, entitled "Protecting Canadian Residents from Extreme Weather Events".

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

The second is the eighth report, in relation to Bill C-241, an act to establish a national strategy respecting flood and drought forecasting. The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with amendments.

David Bexte (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to table the Conservatives' dissenting report to the flood damage report.

Canadians do not need another report telling them that floods, fires, droughts and storms are costly. They see it when basements flood, roads wash out and communities are forced to evacuate. What they need are flood maps and, when they are finished, warnings that arrive on time, infrastructure that holds and disaster programs that small and rural communities can actually use.

This dissent makes one thing clear. Announcements do not stop flooding, press releases do not protect homes, and excuses do not rebuild communities. Canadians deserve results before the next disasters, not apologies.

I present the report in both official languages.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Marcus Powlowski (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Special Joint Committee on Medical Assistance in Dying, entitled "Medical Assistance in Dying and Mental Disorder as the Sole Underlying Medical Condition: A Complex and Challenging Conversation Among Canadians".

I would like to thank all members of the committee, including members from the opposite side of the House, for their valuable contribution to the report.

● (1615)

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Conservative members of the Special Joint Committee on Medical Assistance in Dying to table, in both official languages, our supplementary opinion. Conservatives welcome the committee's recommendation that individuals whose sole underlying condition is a mental illness be indefinitely excluded from eligibility for medical assistance in dying. This will save thousands of lives.

Routine Proceedings

This is the position that Conservatives have held from the beginning. Conservatives opposed the Senate amendment to Bill C-7, which set this proposed expansion in motion. We have consistently echoed the warnings of experts that the expansion cannot be implemented safely. We call on the government to accept the committee's recommendation and support Bill C-218, which is already before the House and which would accomplish the policy objective the committee recommends. Conservatives are prepared to work collaboratively with the government to that end.

Our supplementary opinion also notes that over the course of the committee study, as we were examining system readiness for expansion, many witnesses questioned the effectiveness and enforceability of the current MAID safeguards. Conservatives encourage the government to undertake a review of the current safeguards to ensure that no vulnerable Canadians fall through the cracks of a system that is supposed to protect them.

* * *

HOUSING COST TRANSPARENCY ACT

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-287, An Act to amend the National Research Council Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present my private member's bill, the housing cost transparency act.

Canada is in a housing crisis. Families, young Canadians, renters and first-time buyers are watching the dream of home ownership slip further out of reach. Before entering politics, I worked as a home builder, and I know first-hand that every added cost, delay, compliance requirement and administrative burden eventually ends up in the final price of a home.

The bill would require the National Research Council to publish clear housing cost and impact summaries for housing-related changes to the building codes. These summaries would show what a proposal does, what housing is affected, who pays, what benefits are expected and what assumptions are being made. It would also improve governance, transparency, public registry information and annual reporting. The system should have to show its work, because Canadians need homes, not hidden bureaucracy.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

PROTECTION AGAINST ONLINE FRAUD ACT

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-288, An Act to enact the Protection Against Online Fraud Act and to amend the Criminal Code.

She said: Mr. Speaker, Canadians are being robbed at home on their keyboards, and the platforms where it is happening are profiting from the traffic. Today, I introduce the protection against online fraud act.

In 2024, Canadians reported \$643 million stolen through fraud. That is nearly 300% more than in 2020 and about 5% or 10% of what is actually happening. These are seniors losing their retirements and families losing their homes. It is happening to people in

every riding right across the country. AI is making scams faster, cheaper and nearly indistinguishable from the real thing.

The platforms hosting the content know it is there, and the bill would hold them accountable. It would require digital platforms to actively remove fraudulent content. It would require them to notify users who have already been exposed. It would add a Criminal Code aggravating factor when scammers deliberately target the most vulnerable people, such as with a grandmother's life savings. That is not even fraud. It is predatory.

The U.S., Australia, the EU and the U.K. have already moved on this. Canada cannot be the last one at the table. We regulate what happens on our streets. It is long past time we regulate for the people who are getting scammed online, so I urge members of this House to support this piece of legislation.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

● (1620)

STOPPING SUPPLY TO SAVE LIVES ACT

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-289, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act and to make a related amendment to the Criminal Code.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce my first private member's bill, the stopping supply to save lives act. I hope Canadians will come to know this as Emmy's legacy, in memory of Emmy Liu, a 14-year-old girl who lost her life to a fentanyl overdose in January 2025. Since her death, her mother has shown remarkable courage in advocating for stronger action against this deadly poison.

Emmy had her whole life ahead of her. Instead, it was cut short because criminals sold her poison that had already killed tens of thousands of Canadians. In principle, those who profit from trafficking and producing large quantities of synthetic opioids should face serious consequences. Emmy's legacy can be more than a tragedy. It can be a call to strengthen penalties for the most serious drug offences and to protect Canadian families from experiencing the same loss.

In honour of all of the lives lost, I ask all members of this House to support this legislation.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

CRIMINAL CODE

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-290, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (theft of property of cultural or religious significance).

He said: Mr. Speaker, today I am tabling a new private member's bill, an act to amend the Criminal Code regarding theft of property of cultural or religious significance.

Canada's current laws on theft are based primarily on economic notions of value. Stealing an item worth over \$5,000 can carry a heavier sentence than stealing an item worth less than \$5,000. However, economic value is not the only or the most important concept of value. Things can be valuable for reasons that have nothing to do with their weight in economic exchange. Our current laws on theft do not incorporate other, higher concepts of value than the purely economic.

This problem became evident to me when St. Thomas Syro-Malabar Catholic Forane Pilgrim Church in Scarborough was targeted in the theft of a sacred relic. It was not worth much in dollars and cents, perhaps, but was of immense value to the community.

Today I am introducing a bill that would create a separate offence for the theft of religious or culturally significant property. Essentially, it would apply the same level of seriousness and the same sentencing range for theft of religious and culturally significant property as are applied to the theft of items worth over \$5,000. This law would help protect religious communities but would also support local museums, indigenous nations and all ethnocultural communities that pass their traditions through culturally significant property.

While I am on my feet, I want to thank all those who advocated for giving us the opportunity to table private members' bills today so we can do our jobs as members of Parliament.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

[*Translation*]

ACT TO AMEND THE DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY ACT (SMALL BUSINESSES)

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP), seconded by the member for Courtenay—Alberni, moved for leave to introduce Bill C-291, An Act to amend the Department of Industry Act (small businesses).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am very honoured today to introduce a private member's bill that seeks to amend the Department of Industry Act with regard to the promotion of small businesses.

• (1625)

[*English*]

I want to thank my dear friend, the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni, for seconding this bill.

I think most members here agree that small businesses are the backbone of Canada's economy. They employ the most people. In

Routine Proceedings

every one of our communities and across Canada, they are responsible for more than half of the economic activity.

I presented this bill before, but it failed to get past second reading. Let me give some context. I first heard about what gets called the “think small first” bill from friends of mine who are in the Green parties in the European Union and the European Parliament. It was adopted in the European Parliament in 2008. The basic principle is that before any law passes a Parliament, there is screening to see whether there will be unintended consequences of a piece of legislation or regulation that are negative for small businesses. It is an advanced review that looks through a lens to see whether a law is going to create more unnecessary hurdles for small businesses to succeed.

It calls on the government and the Minister of Industry to protect and promote the role of small businesses within the Canadian economy. I certainly hope all of my colleagues here will see this bill passed unanimously, because small businesses matter.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL IMMIGRATION MONTH ACT

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill S-215, An Act respecting National Immigration Month.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured today to introduce Bill S-215, an act respecting national immigration month.

This bill that I am sponsoring seeks to designate the month of November as national immigration month. Its goal is simple: to recognize and celebrate the tremendous contribution that immigration has made to Canada. Our country was built by men and women who came from all over the world. Through their hard work, courage and talent, immigrants help to advance our economy, culture and society every day.

Bill S-215 gives us an opportunity to thank them and to remember that Canada is an open, inclusive and welcoming country.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

POLICE K-9S

Aaron Gunn (North Island—Powell River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition to provide our beloved police service dogs with the veterinary care in retirement that these valued police partners deserve.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners recognize that these dogs serve faithfully alongside police officers right across Canada, providing protection, detection and life-saving support to Canadians and members of law enforcement. It is support that often results in injuries or the development of service-related conditions. Disappointingly, in Canada, there is currently nothing to assist with the veterinary costs of looking after our K-9 friends after they have finished serving Canada with such distinction.

Therefore, the petitioners are calling for all police service dogs who have completed three years or more of active duty to have their veterinary care fully covered for all injuries directly linked to their policing service, and 50% covered for the remainder of their general veterinary care. After their service to this country and their fellow officers, it is the least that we can do.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present today.

It is with great pride and pleasure that I present a petition on behalf of representatives of the Elgin County Drowning Prevention Coalition, including Briar McCaw, Linda King and Nathan MacIntyre of the RIP Current Information Project.

The signatories of this petition point out that there are an average of 485 drowning fatalities in Canada every year, and non-fatal drowning incidents are nearly four times as common as fatal drowning. Drowning has one of the highest cost-per-case figures of all unintentional injury types, leading to estimates of over \$191 million spent on drowning-related care, as reported by Parachute Canada.

Drowning is a public health issue with a very significant impact, especially in communities like mine. Petitioners call for the development of a Canadian drowning prevention strategy.

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my second petition urges the transport minister to do the work of making CN reconnect the tracks between St. Thomas and London, which CTA order 1990-R-673 said it did not have the right to remove.

The London and Port Stanley Railway was one of the first railway lines built in Ontario. It has historical and cultural significance to Elgin County and, specifically, to the communities of Port Stanley and St. Thomas. The national transportation agency, as petitioners point out, ruled that CN Rail could not sever the connection to the southern Port Stanley line and ordered this restorative action.

Petitioners want to restore railway heritage in my community and have the transport minister reconnect this line.

• (1630)

CHINESE CANADIANS

Michael Ma (Markham—Unionville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of constituents to designate February as Canadian Chinese heritage month.

The petitioners note that there are over 1.8 million Chinese Canadians, representing one of the largest and most estab-

lished communities within the country. For generations, Chinese Canadians have played an essential role in shaping Canada's social fabric. Their contributions date back to the 1800s, with their vital role in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. However, the petitioners remind us that this history includes deep hardship. Chinese Canadians have endured systemic exclusion and discrimination, including the Chinese head tax and the Chinese Immigration Act of 1923. Despite these injustices, Chinese Canadians have persevered and shared a rich heritage that continues to strengthen Canada's multicultural mosaic.

The petitioners highlight that February is an important period for Chinese communities because of the cultural significance of the Lunar New Year, making it a meaningful and appropriate time for recognition.

Given that Chinese heritage month initiatives have taken place throughout numerous municipalities across Canada, Markham included, and have reached provincial legislatures, with Ontario among the first, it is time to take the most reasonable next step at the national level. Such a holiday would provide an opportunity for education, reflection and celebration while truly capturing the unique identity of the Chinese Canadian community.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present a petition signed by the residents of Prince George and hand delivered by members of city council, who are all deeply concerned about repeat offending, court delays and the growing impact of property crime in our community. The petitioners point out that downtown Prince George businesses continue to face theft, vandalism, broken windows, arson and ongoing public safety concerns, while a small number of prolific offenders are responsible for a disproportionate amount of crime.

The petitioners call on the government to strengthen bail provisions for repeat offenders, appoint more judges and prosecutors, increase resources for Crown counsel to reduce court delays and provide additional funding for correctional facilities, rehabilitation programs and release planning. I am pleased to table this petition on behalf of my constituents.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am so proud today to stand and table petition e-6783, which was signed by 10,182 Canadians. These Canadians are asking the government to apply the Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act consistently for all those Canadian citizens returning from conflict zones. They are asking the Canadian government to initiate investigations and lay charges if warranted, and to co-operate with the international justice system, among other calls for action.

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I also have petition e-6990. This is a petition that has been signed by over 6,000 Canadians. They are asking the government to amend the Canada Pension Plan act so that any province, including my province of Alberta, would require at least two-thirds of the other provinces to agree with that plan. They are asking for that to be applied because it is similar to other parts of the Canada Pension Plan act that require a two-thirds agreement.

AFRICAN REFUGEES

Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present petition e-7435, signed by 3,308 Canadians, concerning the lengthy processing delays for African refugees.

The petitioners note that reports from the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, the Auditor General and the Canadian Council for Refugees have documented inappropriately long processing times and significant backlogs affecting African refugee applicants. They express concern that these delays place vulnerable individuals at continued risk and undermine Canada's refugee protection commitments.

The petitioners call on the government to take action by addressing the existing African refugee backlog, including prioritizing those people displaced by the conflict in Sudan, and by establishing clear service standards, equitable resourcing and emergency measures for refugees facing immediate danger.

AGRICULTURE

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition, signed by over 215 residents in and around the Indian Head area who are protesting the closure of the Indian Head Research Farm. This research facility has over 100 years of data on soil, moisture and crop varieties. The current Liberal government is proving to be anti-science by shutting this site down.

The petitioners call upon the Liberal government to save the jobs at Indian Head, save the research that is done at the facility and keep the centre open.

• (1635)

[*Translation*]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Marianne Dandurand (Compton—Stanstead, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I rise today to present a petition signed by residents of the Eastern Townships, other parts of

Routine Proceedings

Quebec and even other parts of Canada regarding cellular connectivity in rural areas.

The petitioners point out that, despite the efforts of municipalities, regional elected officials and many citizens, cellular service is still poor in many rural areas, including village centres. They emphasize that reliable cellular service is essential for public safety, agricultural activities, economic activity, and also for access to education, health care and essential communications.

The petitioners are therefore calling on the Government of Canada to take measures to improve cellular coverage in rural areas and to bridge the digital divide that persists to this day.

[*English*]

Reliable cellular service should not depend on a postal code.

[*Translation*]

Whether they live in a major city or a rural community, every Canadian should be able to count on reliable cellular service when they need it.

[*English*]

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I present a petition today signed by 15,000 Canadians concerning the proposed World Health Organization pandemic treaty and the related amended international health regulations.

The petitioners express concern that the government may proceed with the signing and ratification of these agreements without sufficient parliamentary scrutiny, debate and votes. They highlight that Canada is the only G7 nation where international treaties may be ratified without mandatory parliamentary scrutiny and approval. Accordingly, the petitioners are calling on the government to table the agreement in the House of Commons before ratification, ensuring full parliamentary review and debate, and to establish the legal requirements for parliamentary oversight of major international treaties.

DIGITAL SECURITY

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have one other petition to present. It is signed by 5,000 concerned Canadians regarding the proposal for a national digital identification system in Canada.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners express concern that the digital ID system could enable the extensive collection of and linking of personal biometric information, raising significant privacy and cybersecurity concerns. They fear that such a system could lead to government or agency overreach and increased risk of data breaches and identity theft, and undermine the personal freedoms and individual autonomy of Canadians that Canadians cherish.

FIREARMS

Mel Arnold (Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present two more petitions. These two are on the Liberals' failing firearms confiscation program.

With nearly a \$1-billion price tag, barely a third of that program is going to actually compensate firearms owners, while the rest will go into bureaucracy. Therefore, the undersigned citizens and permanent residents of Canada call upon the Government of Canada to end its assault on law-abiding firearms owners by scrapping the massively expensive and ineffective firearms confiscation program, and focus its attention on resources toward criminals and illegal firearms smuggling.

OPIOIDS

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today to table e-petition 7402 in response to Manitobans who are calling for a public health emergency in light of the preventable passing of too many community members in the recent weeks due to toxic drug supply.

They are calling on the government to increase funding to substance use and addiction programs, the community action fund and the harm reduction fund and to expand current projects, ensuring reliable year-over-year supports. They also want to see the creation of an interjurisdictional secretariat on harm reduction to eliminate barriers between governments and expedite the creation of sustainability for frontline services.

• (1640)

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to table e-petition 7135, which calls on the government to modernize the disability tax credit by revising its eligibility criteria and administrative interpretation to recognize the fluctuating episodic nature of disabilities such as multiple sclerosis and to align the DTC with the disability definition used by the Accessible Canada Act and the Canada Disability Benefit Act.

ANIMAL WELFARE

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to rise today to table a petition to put in place a horse export ban. The citizens in my riding are calling on the residents of Canada to call on the government, through the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture, to ban the live export of horses for slaughter by amending the health of animals regulations to prohibit this practice.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, lastly, I would like to table a petition from the residents of Canada that calls on the government to issue a directive under section 19 of the Nu-

clear Safety and Control Act and order the CNSC to revoke the license of the NSDF at Chalk River.

CRYPTOCURRENCY

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith (Beaches—East York, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over 8,600 people have signed e-petition 6978, which was started by Kevin Zhang of Toronto and the 128,000 advocates with Stand with Crypto Canada.

Our budget 2025 committed to a stablecoin regulatory framework, and the petitioners are asking us to follow through quickly. They are asking for smart rules to protect consumers, preserve financial stability and give Canadian innovators a fair shot.

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to table a petition brought forward by a passionate group of residents in my community who remain deeply concerned that our laws continue to fail to safeguard the victims of intimate partner violence. Most situations of intimate partner violence begin with patterns of behaviour that involve severe mental, emotional and psychological abuse, yet our justice system and our police system too often fail to recognize this abuse and to intervene before the violence begins.

The petitioners are asking us to look at legislation criminalizing this behaviour in the U.K., Ireland and Australia. They would like the Government of Canada to amend the Criminal Code to criminalize targeted mental and emotional abuse. They are also asking for changes to be reflected in our bail and judicial system, as well as in law enforcement training, so we can recognize and investigate this abuse.

OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce petition 451-00919. More than 3.4 billion people live in countries that spend more on debt payments than they do on health or education. The petitioners are calling on the government to initiate a review of all bilateral debts held by Canada, to advocate in multilateral fora, such as the G7, the G20, the IMF and the World Bank, and to increase the grants portion of Canada's bilateral climate finance to at least 60%.

Warren Steinley: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to extend petitions by 10 minutes.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Is it agreed?

Routine Proceedings

Some hon. members: Agreed.

BRAIN INJURY

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all my colleagues for allowing that to happen.

Today is Brain Injury Awareness Day. It is an honour to table this petition on behalf of the families impacted by 165,000 new cases annually of brain injury in our country. They highlight that brain injury survivors face a 200% increased risk of struggling with addictions after sustaining a brain injury. Despite the federal government committing \$11 billion over 10 years to improve community support in mental health and addiction services, none have been specifically targeted to brain injury.

The petitioners call on the government to support Bill C-206, develop a national strategy to support and improve brain injury awareness prevention and treatment and the rehabilitation and recovery of persons living with a brain injury.

BC FERRIES

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to table this petition to modernize federal ferry funding policies and provide fair, stable, long-term federal operational support for BC Ferries as essential national transportation infrastructure.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to table a petition to reverse the planned cuts of the 665 AAFC staff and the closure of the organic and regenerative research program units.

VETERANS

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am tabling a petition signed by members of my community on Commissionaires, which remains the largest employer of veterans in Canada. Commissionaires had an agreement with the federal government that gives Commissionaires the first right of refusal for security at federal buildings for government departments. The government decided that policy will end in April 2027, with a clear lack of justification for doing so. The abolition of this agreement would cost Commissionaires up to \$330 million and put the employment of thousands of our veterans in jeopardy.

The undersigned citizens of Canada call upon the Government of Canada to revoke its decision to end Commissionaires' 80-year preferential contract entitlement on federal security guard contracts. This is important for veterans across the country. I so submit.

● (1645)

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to table a petition, initiated by Ms. Sharon McIvor, calling on the House of Commons to adopt Bill S-2 as amended by the Senate without further delay and to end sex- and race-based discrimination in the Indian Act, as well as the second-generation cut-off, now. A similar petition with the same language, e-petition 7200, was sponsored by the member for Nunavut and filed with the Clerk on May 7, though the member did not rise to present the petition in the House. That petition was signed by 14,298 people.

The petitioners note that the second-generation cut-off and the 1985 cut-off rules in the Indian Act, which determine eligibility for status, will result in the legal extinction of status Indians, according to Statistics Canada, and cause harm and divisions in families and communities. In the 40 years since, consultations resulted in repeated calls from first nations for its removal. They know the Senate amendments to Bill S-2 would effectively remove the second-generation and 1985 cut-offs and return to a one-parent rule for transmission of status, which were overwhelmingly supported by the majority of witnesses at the Senate committee, including first nations' leadership and organizations, women's organizations and affected individuals, many of whom took part in the government's collaborative process on the second-generation cut-off.

The petitioners know that Parliament has a responsibility to uphold the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms by eliminating sex and race discrimination, and the legal extinction scheme in the Indian Act. They, therefore, call for the adoption of Bill S-2 as amended by the Senate without delay.

CRIMINAL CODE

Gaétan Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition initiated by the Bolger family in honour of their late father, Jim, who was tragically struck by a reckless driver in Timmins back in September. The petition calls for a review of Criminal Code offences related to dangerous driving that cause death or bodily harm, stronger sentencing provisions and tougher penalties for repeat offenders.

Jim's legacy will live on, not only in the hearts of those who loved him, but also in the lives that may one day be protected because of this effort.

ELECTORAL REFORM

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank a local grassroots activist for proportional representation who has asked me to present a number of these petitions on the subject of our current first-past-the-post voting system. I want to thank Shelagh Levey for collecting so many signatures. Her petition calls for an immediate adoption of a fair voting system, such as what is in place in most democracies around the world, before the next election.

Speaker's Ruling

RODENTICIDES

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is an e-petition signed by nearly 2,000 Canadians calling on the government, particularly the Pest Management Regulatory Agency, to conduct a thorough review of the use of anticoagulant rodenticides, as well as neurotoxic rodenticides, the damage to the environment and the threats to pets and health.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present my first petition on behalf of the petitioners in Mission who are concerned about the proposed telecommunications tower at 32935 Cameron Avenue. The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to review the proposed location and work with the proponents and relevant authorities to identify alternative sites that better reflect community interests and appropriate land use.

HEALTH

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I would like to present today is on behalf of Canadians living with long COVID who are concerned that federal programs do not adequately meet their needs. The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to launch a national inquiry into Canada's pandemic response and the long-term impacts of long COVID.

VETERANS

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the third petition I would like to present today is on behalf of veterans in the Fraser Valley. They note that the absence of an office in Abbotsford limits access for a large and growing veteran population, which can lead to delays in processing disability benefits. They call upon the Government of Canada to open a veterans office in the Fraser Valley.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to present a petition on behalf of constituents. I rise, for the 14th 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 have read in the local newspapers, including a November report that the Dauphin RCMP is 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.

• (1650)

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the government's responses to Questions Nos. 1164, 1165, 1166, 1167, 1168, 1169, 1170, 1171, 1172, 1173, 1174, 1175, 1176, 1177, 1178, 1179, 1180, 1181, 1182, 1183, 1184, 1185, 1186, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1190 and 1191 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled in electronic format immediately.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ADMISSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS NO. 13—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: The Chair is now prepared to rule on the point of order raised by the member for York—Durham on June 16 regarding the admissibility of Government Business No. 13.

In his point of order, the member for York—Durham argued that this motion introduces an unprecedented measure by imposing a retroactive deadline for the submission of committee amendments during consideration of Bill C-22, an act respecting lawful access. In the member's view, imposing a retroactive deadline for the submission of amendments and making it impossible for members to submit further amendments at either committee or report stage is contrary to the fundamental principles of parliamentary law that protect the rights of the minority and ensure appropriate review of legislative measures. He called on the Chair to rule Government Business No. 13 out of order.

Speaker's Ruling

[Translation]

The member for Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon made similar arguments. She said that the motion grants an unfair advantage to government members, who were able to submit amendments before opposition members knew about the retroactive deadline. She further contended that the motion deprives members of their right to debate and amend the bill.

[English]

In response, the chief government whip submitted that the motion falls under the House's power to regulate its own proceedings and internal affairs. He argued that the House can adopt motions to govern the consideration of a bill and give direction to its committees. In his view, Government Business No. 13 is a legitimate exercise of this power and is entirely within the House's powers to organize its legislative agenda.

To decide this matter, the Chair must first review the provisions of the motion before the House. Government Business No. 13 is essentially designed to expedite consideration of Bill C-22. It imposes on the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security a time frame for completing its consideration of that bill, including by limiting the amendments the committee can consider to those that were submitted before 4:30 p.m. on June 15, 2026. As some members pointed out, this deadline had already passed when the motion was published in the Notice Paper. The motion provides that report stage is deemed to have been completed automatically. It also limits debate at the third reading stage and requires voting to immediately follow, with no possibility of deferral.

[Translation]

The Chair would like to begin by noting that it is not unusual for the House to adopt orders governing the various stages of consideration of bills, for purposes that include restricting how much time is allotted for debate and how committees dispose of amendments.

The legislative process, as set out by the Standing Orders, is not immutable. It can be adapted to the needs and choices of the House.

As Speaker Milliken stated in a ruling on a motion to manage proceedings on a bill that he delivered on February 23, 2007, which can be found on pages 7242 and 7243 of the Debates, and I quote:

The most fundamental privilege of the House as a whole is to establish rules of procedure for itself and to enforce them. A few rules are laid down in the British North America Act, but the vast majority are resolutions of the House which may be added to, amended or repealed at the discretion of the House. It follows, therefore, that the House may dispense with the application of any of these rules by unanimous consent on any occasion or, by motion, may suspend their operation for a specified length of time.

Section 14.26 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, fourth edition, describes the content of these motions when they deal with bills as follows:

These motions may also govern the time allotted to the various stages of the legislative process as well as the putting of questions and the holding of related recorded divisions. They may contain provisions concerning consideration in committee of a bill, including setting deadlines for the submission of amendments, when clause-by-clause consideration of the bill is to begin and end, how amendments are to be voted on and how the committee's report is to be presented to the House.

• (1655)

[English]

In recent years, the House has, on many occasions, adopted motions that set aside or temporarily changed the usual rules in order to dispose of a bill more quickly, sometimes in a more drastic manner than the current motion does. For instance, we have seen motions that provided for skipping committee consideration and report stage altogether.

The main issue this point of order raises is the retroactive imposition of a deadline for submitting amendments. The provisions of programming motions normally apply once they are adopted and are not intended to constrain past events. The Chair shares the concern that some members could have benefited from privileged information, enabling them to submit amendments while other members were unaware that they would not have that chance. In the absence of evidence, this remains a supposition. However, there is reason to question the potential inequities of this approach, but the fundamental question is whether including such a limitation makes the motion inadmissible. In other words, does this provision go beyond the limits of what the House can do in a motion of this kind?

It is true that Government Business No. 13 limits the time available to consider Bill C-22 and the opportunities to amend its contents, but these are decisions the House is empowered to make. If members find that these restrictions are too harsh or that the motion grants an inappropriate advantage to the government, they can propose amendments during debate to change its terms. It is through such decisions that the House specifies the balance to be struck between the government's right to advance its legislative agenda and the opposition parties' right to debate that agenda.

However, this balance is quite relative. As Speaker Fraser said on December 15, 1988, in a decision on the admissibility of a government motion to suspend the application of various standing orders governing the consideration of bills, which can be found at page 78 of the Debates, "Both the minority and the majority have rights; however, primacy cannot be given to both."

[Translation]

Additionally, the Chair notes that the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security has already begun its clause-by-clause consideration. Based on the wording of the motion, it appears that some amendments have already been submitted as part of this process. If the motion is adopted, the bill would be considered in accordance with the terms of the motion. The committee will have the opportunity to vote on a certain number of amendments, but perhaps not on all the amendments members would have liked to present. After that, there will be a debate and vote at third reading. It is up to members, not the Chair, to decide whether they wish to consider this bill under the process proposed by Government Business No. 13, to change that process or to defeat the motion and follow the usual process.

Government Orders

In conclusion, the Chair is of the view that Government Business No. 13 is in order and may be moved for debate.

[English]

That said, given the reservations I expressed a little earlier, I encourage the government to keep fairness in mind when it prepares these programming motions. While the government can legitimately propose to accelerate the consideration of bills, we are all legislators, and the legislative process functions best when there is debate and opportunities for amendments, and when everyone demonstrates openness and restraint. It is also vital to remember that, one day, the roles may be reversed, so it might not truly be a good idea to keep limiting the legislative options available to members through this type of motion.

I thank all members for their attention.

• (1700)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, The Environment.

I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded divisions, the time provided for Government Orders will be extended by 49 minutes.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS NO. 13—PROCEEDINGS ON BILL C-22

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent among the parties to agree to switch the first two speaking spots between the Conservatives and the Liberals, with the understanding that all regular rules, including allotted time allocations for those spots, be provided accordingly with that switch.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Wayne Long (for the Minister of Transport) moved:

That, notwithstanding any standing order or usual practice of the House, Bill C-22, An Act respecting lawful access, be disposed of as follows:

- (a) it be an instruction to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security that, during its consideration of the bill,
 - (i) the committee shall meet, within one hour after the adoption of this order, for the purpose of completing clause-by-clause consideration of the bill,
 - (ii) if the committee has not completed the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill within 30 minutes of the beginning of the meeting, all remaining amendments that were submitted to the committee by 4:30 p.m. on June 15, 2026, shall be deemed moved, the Chair shall put the question forthwith and successively without further debate on all remaining clauses and amendments submitted to the committee, as well as each and every question necessary to dispose of the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill, and the committee shall not adjourn the meeting until it has disposed of the bill,
 - (iii) the committee shall have first priority for the use of House resources for this meeting,
 - (iv) a member of the committee may report the bill to the House by depositing it with the Clerk of the House at any time after the completion of clause-by-clause consideration, and the Clerk shall notify the House leaders of the

recognized parties and independent members, and the report shall be deemed to have been duly presented to the House;

(b) the bill may be considered at report stage at any time following the completion of paragraph (a)(iv) of this order, and, when the order is read, it shall be deemed to have been concurred in, as amended, at the report stage;

(c) a motion for third reading may be made immediately after the bill has been concurred in, as amended, at report stage;

(d) motions to proceed to the orders of the day to consider the bill, and to adjourn the debate or the House may be moved by a minister of the Crown, including on a point of order, and any such motion when moved by a minister of the Crown, shall be deemed adopted;

(e) when the House begins debate at the third reading stage of the bill, one member of each recognized party, a member of the New Democratic Party, and the member of the Green Party, may each speak at the said stage for not more than 20 minutes, followed by 10 minutes for questions and comments, provided that members may be permitted to split their time with another member;

(f) at the conclusion of the time provided for the debate at the third reading stage or when no member wishes to speak, whichever is earlier, all questions necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill shall be put without further debate or amendment, provided that, if a recorded division is requested, it shall not be deferred; and

(g) when the bill is considered at report stage and at the third reading stage, after 12:00 p.m., no quorum calls, dilatory motions or requests for unanimous consent, except from a minister of the Crown, shall be received by the Chair. (Government Business No. 13)

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my last speech in this place. Having been here since 2015, I am retiring as of the end of the summer, and I appreciate this opportunity.

I am going to begin with some comments about my husband, very briefly, though. He is my rock. At the age of 14, I wrote in the front of my Bible, “I want to marry someone who puts God first, me second and our children third.” Well, God outdid himself, and I had the opportunity to marry a man to whom, in my card for Father’s Day, I wrote, “You are everything I ever dreamed of”, and then on the inside, it said, “plus a whole lot of things that never even crossed my mind.” We were married, have had quite an amazing life thus far and expect that to continue.

Marty has a heart for ministry, so we went into ministry at a point later in our lives, and he was church planting, very entrepreneurial. There was a wonderful family from church we decided to take out for pizza one day, and they had a little girl named Katie. She jumped out of the car when we got to the restaurant, ran up to Marty, jumped and said, “Look, God, I got new shoes.” I had to explain to Katie that he was not God.

I say that because I want to extend it over now into my appreciation for the leader of the Conservative Party of Canada, the current leader of His Majesty's official opposition. He is not God, but he is amazing. He has gifts that this country needs. He has the ability to process like no one I know. We experience this in our caucus meetings all the time. I will stop there, but his heart is what drives him, as does his love for being a servant leader and caring about people. When my mom passed away, he phoned me. When this happens to anyone in our caucus, he makes that call, and no one ever feels rushed when he is talking with them.

With what happened at Tumbler Ridge, he was there not just for the service. I do not know if he would be appreciative that I am sharing this, but it is just who he is. He stayed until every one of those people had an opportunity to meet him and talk with him. He is gifted at understanding what needs to happen in this nation to give people their country back. I have been so honoured to be part of this caucus, and I wish nothing but the best for him as he moves forward with the most amazing group of people who serve in this caucus together. They all want to be named, but I am not going to go there.

We are a team. What I love is something I learned when I was the only female on a board at a college where I was the athletic director. I learned, when I went to those meetings, to do my thing, make sure I am heard, argue as much as necessary and then go for coffee. That is what this team does, and it will be the best thing to ever happen to Canada in well over a decade, if not longer. I apologize to Mr. Harper, but I think it is going to be even better. I am so appreciative of my leader and my colleagues.

Then there is my staff. I would love to name them all. I have been so blessed to have people in my office who love the things that I love, support the things that I support and go the extra mile over and over again to make sure I am prepared. I could not do my job without my staff who are in my riding and, certainly, those here on the Hill as well. I am so grateful for every one of them who has been a part of my team.

I want to thank the pages and all the folks who help us out in the lobby and put up with us on a daily basis. They are remarkable. I have a special place in my heart for our PPS, our protective services. When I was not allowed to do my job on the Hill because I would not share my status in regard to the COVID-19 vaccine, I was not allowed to be in the House, but I decided to come in finally. The Sergeant-at-Arms figured that out and escorted me. I was going to be apprehended, I believe my whip said. I did not know what that meant, but the Sergeant-at-Arms just escorted me down the Hill, and I said that I did not hold him responsible for what he had to do.

• (1705)

Nobody recognized me. They had phones outside the door here, over there and downstairs. They were trying to find me. They could not find me, because in every campaign, I look a little different. I said, "You have to do a better job of this. You have to protect us." The next day when I came to work somebody shared that there was an 8 1/2 by 11 laminated picture of me from Facebook on every desk in the precinct. To this day, they know who I am and that is great.

Government Orders

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to split my time, just so you know.

The things I want to share are the things that I loved having the responsibility for here.

I have been on the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs since I came to this role. I have such a deep appreciation for our veterans. I am just a civilian; I had to learn, and I still do not know everything I need to know. They are so gracious to me. It means the world to me that I have had the opportunity to be part of the study, "Invisible No More". Our women who joined the Armed Forces faced great duress because they were not really welcome there. Now Bill C-11 means that they do not get to make the choice of where they are going to take their cases, whether to the civilian court or to the Canadian Armed Forces court. However, I love them and I appreciate the opportunity I had to be part of that.

There is a group called the Mefloquine Rally warriors who were injured by that drug, when it was taken for malaria back in the days of Somalia. Something terrible happened on that deployment. They have suffered, and the government has not recognized that. They will continue to fight until that recognition is given. It was done improperly; there was no study of this unlicensed drug. It is a huge issue, and I want them to know that I am with them and will continue to be with them. I have been to every event that they have had over the course of the past 10 years. They will not give up on asking for an apology, a return to the Somalia inquiry and the care that they should have.

Service dogs is another area that is very special to me. Saskatchewan is a lovely province. Shame on all who have not been there yet. It is interesting, we only have 1.3 million people in that entire gorgeous province. Somehow even CBC forgets that we have weather when doing the weather report. We do have veterans. There are over 150 who are couch-surfing or living on the streets in places like Regina and Saskatoon. However, there is nothing there for them officially because our province is too small. We have begun something called the Yorkton Veteran Foundation that is going to change that, and I am very excited about that in our future.

The other thing that I will share today is that I have had the incredible opportunity in this place, to do not one, not two, but three different private members' bills. For those at home, a private member's bill is something that an individual member gets to speak on and bring forward to possibly be passed. It may or may not be part of the member's party stance or something that is needed according to other people, but it is something very important to that member, their riding and the people they serve. Many members get their name pulled out of that hat, but never get the opportunity because they are too far down the list. My predecessor was here for 22 years, and I do not believe ever had that opportunity.

Government Orders

My passion is caring about violence against women. The first bill was Bill C-225, protection of pregnant women and their preborn children act, Cassie and Molly's law, in 2016. I phoned this young man named Jeff Durham from Windsor and asked if I could be helpful to him. He did not understand how what happened to his wife, who was seven months pregnant, meant that the law did not recognize her baby. Now, we know there are issues around this topic in other ways, but this was a situation where she was confronted by an intruder in her home, someone she and her husband knew. He worked alongside them. He panicked. He did not want what he was doing to be found out, so he attacked her and killed her. She was more than seven months pregnant, seven weeks from having her baby. They had already named her Molly.

● (1710)

The individual was charged, went through the whole system and was facing his sentence. Jeff could not believe that, through this whole thing, there was no mention of Molly. It was like she did not exist, period.

This was a mom who was excited about having her baby. She was not with Jeff anymore but they lived in the same block so that they would be close. They were setting up their baby rooms. I did what I could to bring that forward as Cassie and Molly's law.

Of course, in the House, it did not pass but it brought huge attention to the fact that pregnant women are the most vulnerable when it comes to femicide, yet, in the House, they are never included in that conversation. I find that deplorable.

I then did one on sex-selective abortion. One has to ask why. The Morgentaler decision was made, that it was too onerous for women to seek an abortion. They struck down what was there, but the Supreme Court said that there must be new legislation and that it must come with a determination of when that fetus is considered viable. None of that has ever happened.

When I brought this forward, it was because I do a lot of trade shows and whatnot. I always have forms for people to sign, one on firearms and one on palliative care. We have a member over on that side of the floor. I wonder if she will get it done. I then had one on protecting pregnant women. A lot of women came and talked to me and said they wanted access to abortion. I said, "Fine."

The truth is that 84% of Canadians want access to abortion. I said that there was a DART & Maru/BLUE poll that was done. The National Post headline said that Canadians are not as divided on this issue as politicians and media would like you to think.

They went further and asked if respondents thought it was okay to have a sex-selective abortion. The answer was no, that there should be a law against that. This came from the same 84% of people, as 16% of people did not fit into that category. They are for the abortion-at-any-time-for-any-reason law. Did we know that Canada has nothing? We have no laws. We are the only democratic country in the world that has nothing. Our only friend in that field, other than democratic countries, is North Korea. This is appalling.

That decision enabled me to bring forward the sex-selective abortion act. Women and nurses, who are pro-choice, as the vast

majority of these people are pro-choice, want choice but they do not want baby girls to be killed simply because they are girls.

I was in a feminist class. I was going to talk about being a woman in politics. As we walked in, the teacher said they had changed their mind, that they wanted to talk about that but that they had heard I had just put forward a bill on sex-selective abortion and they would like to talk about that. I thought, I am in a feminist class. What is that going to feel like? They were absolutely appalled. Of course, it did not pass. That is fine.

I then had one more opportunity under our leader, and I brought forward the violence against pregnant women act, regarding, again, a situation where a third party attacks a woman, knowing that she is pregnant, causing physical or mental harm. The only thing it was calling for was that it would be considered an aggravating factor.

Joyce Arthur, who is the queen of the pro-abortion movement, said she could vote for it if it did these things, and it did them. It was two sentences. As soon as it was tabled, the previous prime minister and all of the women on the other side of the floor did a Twitter attack on me. When I had presented it in the House, in the first minute, when one just describes it, three colleagues from that side of the floor, women, clapped for it.

● (1715)

I have to split my time apparently. I am already at 15 minutes, but I am told I can keep going.

When they clapped for this particular bill, it told me that people on that side of the floor, whom I know, have friendships with and meet with on a regular basis, value protecting pregnant women and want to see recognition that when a woman is carrying a child, they should have protection.

In this case, Sherry and Chan Goberdhan lost their daughter, Arianna. Arianna had a very frightening marriage. Her estranged husband wanted her to come over. She was due to deliver, and her mom said, "Don't go." She said, "It's okay, he just wants to talk." He proceeded to stab her in the abdomen 21 times. When he was in prison and wanted to have a relationship with another woman, he took the picture of their wedding, removed her picture and put his picture up. There are terrible people in this world who attack women and are in relationships where they are brutal.

However, this case had absolutely nothing to do with anything that the pro-choice community does not want to see. It is for the protection of women when they are having their children. If we are truly concerned about feminism and women being attacked, on that side of the floor and on this side of the floor, it is something we could have all agreed on, but we do not, and that is fine. That is the reality of the makeup of the House.

I can tell members that, from that study, and with 84% of Canadians wanting choice, when people saw that Twitter war, they went berserk online. We will not find any of the comments any more. They have been scrubbed. They are not there. However, they said, “What is wrong with you that you don’t understand this is about women needing protection? Why do you always bring up abortion?” Well, I can tell members why. It is because it has become a tool on that side of the floor, actually the whole House, other than our party where we get to vote according to our conscience, that will not allow anyone to be part of their caucus if they have the same values here.

Although, when the three women clapped, I thought, “Okay, this is good.” They actually ended up being three of the members who stood up in the House and tried to accuse me of bringing forward an anti-abortion law. That tells us the kind of stress women on that side of the floor have, and people who value family and value women have, when women are being coerced within a terrible relationship or are facing a situation where they are being abducted, and the perpetrator is not accused of anything until they hurt that woman and possibly injure or kill the child as well.

It is tough to stand here today and say this on the day that I am leaving. I know it is divisive in some ways, but this place needs to represent Canadians and Canadians’ views. Never before—

● (1720)

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, I have a quick point of order.

I hate to interrupt the hon. member’s speech. Our ridings share a border, and so we are neighbouring members of Parliament. My riding goes all the way to Melville where her riding begins. I have enjoyed serving with her for the last decade or so, and it pains me greatly to have to bring up this point of order during her farewell speech. I will avail myself of the opportunity to hopefully ask a question or make a comment when she has finished her speech.

However, earlier today, the Speaker ruled on the admissibility of this motion, which does have several knock-on effects, including what might happen at committee. I want to give notice to the Chair that we may come back later on today to make a submission on some of the dynamics and some of those moving pieces.

Cathay Wagantall: Mr. Speaker, I will move on to this. I move:

That the motion be amended:

(a) by adding after the words “be disposed of as follows:” the following:

“(a) the bill shall be divided into two bills:

(i) Bill C-22A, An Act respecting timely access to data and information, which shall be composed of clauses 2 to 40 of Bill C-22,

(ii) Bill C-22B, An Act respecting the obligations of electronic service providers in relation to authorized access to information, which shall be composed of the remaining provisions of Bill C-22,

Government Orders

provided that Bills C-22A and C-22B shall each be reprinted and the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel shall be authorized to make any technical changes or corrections as may be necessary to give effect to this motion;”;

(b) in paragraph (a) by replacing,

(i) the words “the bill”, wherever they appear, with the words “Bill C-22A”,

(ii) the words “30 minutes”, in subparagraph (ii), with the words “three hours”,

(iii) the words “by 4:30 p.m. on June 15, 2026”, in subparagraph (ii), with the words “prior to the adoption of this order”;

(c) by deleting paragraphs (b) to (f) and substituting the following:

“(c) Bill C-22A may be taken up at the report stage at the next sitting of the House following the completion of the provisions of subparagraph (b)(iv) of this order;

(d) not more than five hours shall be allotted to the consideration of Bill C-22A at the report stage and not more than five hours shall be allotted to the consideration of Bill C-22A at the third reading stage, provided that at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration at the report stage and at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration at the third reading stage, or when no member wishes to speak, whichever is earlier, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of Bill C-22A then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment;

(e) if Bill C-22A is taken up at the report stage on Friday, June 19, 2026,

(i) report stage motions may be considered if filed with the Clerk of the House before 6 a.m. that day,

(ii) if a recorded division is requested in relation to the report stage, it shall not be deferred,

(iii) if Bill C-22A is concurred in at the report stage, a motion for third reading may be made immediately thereafter,

(iv) if a recorded division is requested in relation to the third reading stage, it shall not be deferred,

(v) the House shall continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment if required for the purposes of this order; and

(f) it be an instruction to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security that, during its consideration of Bill C-22B,

(i) the committee shall not commence consideration of Bill C-22B before Monday, September 21, 2026,

(ii) the committee shall receive at least six further hours of additional witness testimony, concerning the essential tools required by law enforcement to fight modern crimes within a framework respectful of Canadians’ personal privacy, before commencing clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-22B,

(iii) the Privacy Commissioner of Canada or his representatives shall be invited to appear as witnesses during the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-22B.”; and

(d) by deleting paragraph (g).

● (1725)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The amendment is in order. We are pushing up against the time for Private Members’ Business hour, and I want to quickly go through the motion.

The member for Saanich—Gulf Islands is rising on a point of order.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville gave her farewell address. I would just get on the record how much I am going to miss her. I want to thank her for her service to our prayer breakfast group when she was chair, and just say, best of luck in everything and all my love.

Government Orders

Lisa Hepfner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for her speech. I served with her on the veterans committee in the last Parliament. I know she was a great source of support for many veterans, including women veterans. I want to thank her for her service and wish her all the best in her retirement.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is some goodwill to maybe not see the clock for about five or six minutes, just to accommodate all the members who may want to wish my colleague the best.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Is there unanimous consent to extend Government Orders by 10 minutes?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, I offer my sincere thanks to my colleagues for that accommodation. I think that any time a member is retiring after great service to their constituents in this House, it is appropriate that we show that kind of grace.

I want to quickly extend all the very best to my colleague from Yorkton—Melville. We have worked together since 2015. We share a border and have many constituents who travel back and forth between her communities and mine.

One of the things I admire about my colleague is her conviction and dedication to her core principles. I was given advice when I first got to this place that we should always know what we are willing to resign over or lose our seat over, that we should always know the limits upon which we cannot compromise, because those are our core values and beliefs. I believe Canadians respect that. They want to see people elected to the House of Commons who do not just go with the flow or read the polls and make decisions afterwards, but have a clear sense of who they are and what they are all about. The fact that her constituents kept sending her back to fight for them and represent them is a great testament to her character, her integrity and everything she brought to representing her constituents and speaking on their behalf in the House of Commons.

Very quickly, I would like to wish her, her husband and everyone in her family the very best in her retirement and thank her for all she has brought to the Conservative Party of Canada, the official opposition in Parliament.

• (1730)

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my thanks to the hon. member, as my colleagues have done.

I was elected with my friend in 2015. As many know, we go through highs and lows in this job. She has always been resolute in her faith. She is a strong supporter of her colleagues. She was always someone who, if we were going through a hard time or if she found out that we or a loved one was struggling, was quick to tell us that she would pray for us. I do not know about you, Mr. Speaker, but when somebody reaches out to tell me that they are praying for me, it is deeply personal and means a whole lot.

Therefore, from me and my family to my colleague, I wish her success and thank her for the years she spent with us here in this House.

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to wish the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville all the best, a woman I got to know through the National Prayer Breakfast. We have sat together. We have talked together.

I wish the very best to her and her family for having served her constituents of Yorkton—Melville with great honour. Working in Parliament is a very unforgiving job, but she has acquitted herself well. I wish her the very best.

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Yorkton—Melville has been a great colleague. She really embodies the three things we talk about as Conservatives: faith, family and freedom. She always asks about people's families. I am a big family guy, and the fact that she is resigning to spend more time with her husband, their beautiful kids and grandkids really is a testament to her leaving on a high note and at the appropriate time.

I wish her and Marty the best in their retirement. I thank her for always being there, for talking about family and for making sure her colleagues' families were always top of mind. It is something I have always appreciated about her. I send her love and wish her a great retirement.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to join my colleagues in wishing the member a happy retirement. As women in politics, she and I help make up barely 30% of Parliament. I truly wish her a wonderful retirement.

Although we do not always share the same values, we live in a healthy democracy. Of all places, this is the very space where we should be able to debate. More importantly, we must not be afraid to debate.

[*English*]

Fraser Tolmie (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member has the heaviest suitcases and the best laugh. I just wanted to say that she may not have been a veteran, but she had the heart of a veteran. Truly, I respect her and love her, and I will miss her. I will miss our cappuccinos.

Private Members' Business

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I had two or three years as Saskatchewan caucus chair, and we moved our summer meetings around. I remember saying to this member that we were coming to Yorkton—Melville. What a delightful two days we had in Yorkton—Melville because of her. She brought the community together. We had a sensational meeting with the indigenous leaders. We had tours of Yorkton. I also remember one thing about her. As a caucus chair, when I said we were going to come, she was up to the task. It was fabulous. I also remember that community had the best Ukrainian food in this country. I just want to wish the hon. member a happy retirement for her and her husband, Marty. Our caucus is really indebted to her for the 10 and a half years she served.

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my colleague. I am one of the rare people in this chamber who had an opportunity to work with her as a staff member. Actually, I was a volunteer afterwards, when I left the Hill and being a staffer. She was chair of the National Prayer Breakfast for four years. I just want to thank her for her service on that as well. She really brought a lot of meaning to that role as chair, and I admire her faith, her conviction and how she is not afraid to share that with everybody else. I thank her for being such a great example to me and other staffers on the Hill as well. We will miss seeing her here. Congratulations.

• (1735)

Eric St-Pierre (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Yorkton—Melville for her nearly 11 years of service. Earlier today, I made a member statement where I acknowledged five departing members of Parliament. I learned shortly after about her departure. If I could, I would revise my member statement to include six departing members. I got to spend a brief moment of time with the member on the veterans affairs committee for a few months and really appreciated her insights. My understanding is that she has nine grandchildren—

An hon. member: She has 10.

Eric St-Pierre: Mr. Speaker, she has 10 grandchildren. I am hoping the member will spend a lot of time with her 10 grandchildren.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Before I give the floor to the member for Yorkton—Melville, I will just say, on behalf of all members, that we wish her and her family good health and happiness as she proceeds to the next journey in her life.

The hon. member for Yorkton—Melville.

Cathay Wagantall: Mr. Speaker, thank you so much, and I thank you for your patience through this unusual event, I think. I thank everyone who has spoken and all who are here. It blows me away. I cannot forget to just quickly thank my riding. The people there are just phenomenal. I thank my family as well. It has been an honour to serve here. I am not leaving because I do not love the job. It is great, and we have a great House here. Let us make Canada proud.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing the House that the Senate has passed the following bill to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-6, a fourth act to harmonize federal law with the civil law of Quebec and to amend certain acts in order to ensure that each language version takes into account the common law and the civil law.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

SPECTRUM POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR CANADA ACT

The House resumed from May 5 consideration of the motion that Bill C-268, An Act respecting the Spectrum Policy Framework for Canada, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-268, which is sponsored by the member for Compton—Stanstead. This is a bill that I am particularly interested in, given my professional background.

The bill concerns the spectrum policy framework for Canada. The French word for spectrum is “spectre”. If Quebecers and Canadians were asked what that makes them think of, 99.9% of them would probably mention ghosts or James Bond villains. Very few of them would talk about frequencies, airwaves or broadcasting in general. However, spectrum is absolutely essential to broadcasting and communications as we have known them today and for decades.

There is a reason why this topic is of interest to me. Before I got into politics, I dabbled in various fields, including radio. I worked at radio stations for three decades. That might be hard to believe. Some might say that this is impossible, because that would mean that I had to have started at the age of five or six, and they would not be far off. In any case, I spent many years in this fascinating industry. Issues related to spectrum, airwaves and broadcasting involve the technical side of the field that I was in and was genuinely passionate about.

Back in my day, although we are not talking about the 1920s or 1930s, we did not have this level of congestion. Regulations were in place, and the government was exercising some control over frequency usage, but it was not as important back then as it is today. It has been quite a while since this policy was last revised. It was revised in 1992 and again 15 years later, in 2007. Now, in 2026, almost 20 years later, we find ourselves needing to review these regulations and this framework.

Private Members' Business

In recent years, municipalities have begun implementing regulations to prevent owners from leaving vacant downtown lots unused. These lots must be developed because we need the space to alleviate congestion and we lack space to build housing. The same principle applies here. That is the analogy I would use to explain why spectrum allocation and frequency usage need to be managed in much the same way. There are telecommunications companies that have acquired frequencies but do not need to develop them or lack the resources to do so, because developing these services is quite expensive. As a result, they are holding these unused frequencies that could be put to other uses.

We have heard the industry call for more deregulation, rather than a stronger framework. I feel a little uneasy about that request, particularly in this case. We need to reach everyone. The argument we often hear from the industry is that 99% of the country is covered, that 99% of people have access to LTE or 5G technology, and that soon people will have access to the next technology. It might be 6G; who knows. Now, 99% does seem like a lot of people. Yes, that is true. It is good. It is much better than it was just a few years ago, but it still means that over 200,000 people do not have access to a cellular network.

In 2026, not having access to a cellular network is, of course, a problem for communication. It is certainly a problem when it comes to entertainment. Nowadays, entertainment is increasingly delivered through our electronic devices, our cellphones and tablets. In some cases, it is through our computers, but the fact remains that we need this system, these frequencies. We can say that those 200,000 people who do not have access to entertainment can always read a book or go play outside. Yes, there is always a way to make do, but these 200,000 people also do not have access to emergency safety services. We have seen cases where this mattered.

● (1740)

There have been situations where people needed to call the fire department or an ambulance urgently—after an accident or during a forest fire, since wildfires sometimes cut off regular communications where they are usually available—but were unable to access even the most basic emergency services. This is a cause for concern.

This is a cause for concern, and there is no reason why we should be prevented from providing this service simply because the companies do not want to develop it, even though they hold the required spectrum. People get the impression that everything is fine because almost everyone is connected. However, we are talking about an essential service. It becomes an essential service as soon as there is an incident like the ones I just mentioned.

Bill C-268 contains meaningful, positive measures that will improve the current situation. People in rural areas, such as Drummond, will no longer have to wave their phones around trying to get a signal. These measures are primarily aimed at ensuring that unused spectrum is put to use in one way or another. I think it is a waste to hold these resources and not take the necessary steps to use them, particularly in regions and situations where there is a pressing need that must be addressed.

I also like the idea of delivery timetables. According to Bill C-268, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications

Commission, or CRTC, would be required to act within a fairly short time frame of six months after the act's coming into force. It seems to me that the CRTC already has a rather large backlog of urgent matters to address, so entrusting it with managing this bill as a priority might be risky. There is a history of inaction at times due to the excessive workload that the CRTC faces. However, if everything goes well, we could already see results within six months of the bill's passage and implementation. I find that encouraging.

The other thing is that there would be a verification process to ensure the accuracy of data, such as mobile coverage data. When we check with companies that provide mobile phone services, we often get responses that do not accurately reflect the situation on the ground. We have seen this happen. I, for one, have been told that my region has 100% coverage and that there is no reason for there to be any problems. However, when we are passing through the rural parts of our ridings, it is rare not to come across areas where communications literally cut out and where there is no signal at all.

It is very frustrating, once again, to be told that 100% of the territory is covered when we run into situations like that. What are we waiting for? Are we waiting for something serious to happen before we realize that cell service has become something that we can no longer do without and for which we have an obligation to establish mechanisms to ensure reliable service? For now, obviously, that is not yet the case.

There would be a process to ensure the accuracy of mobile coverage data provided by telecommunications companies as well as data on network deployment. In short, there would be more transparency, more efficiency and a better overview of the situation. These are easy things to put in place. However, I will say it again, the argument that 99% and a bit of the population is covered is not enough. That is much better than 10 years ago, so congratulations may be in order. However, I find it extremely concerning that there are even a few people in this context who do not have access to basic security and emergency services. This requires us to act quickly.

On that note, I think it is pretty clear that the Bloc Québécois will support Bill C-268 from my colleague from Compton—Stanstead.

● (1745)

Louis Villeneuve (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, I began my career in radio. That was in 1974. I would imagine he was quite young then. At that time, more people were tuning into AM radio.

I rise today with great interest to support Bill C-268. This bill, introduced by my colleague, aims to improve cellular coverage in rural areas across Canada. The member who introduced this bill is my riding neighbour. We often go around together, and we call each other and chat from time to time. There are times when one of us misses something the other just said because the line cut out. We experience these problems, too.

I would like to begin by commending her leadership on this issue. I believe she is taking a serious, well-thought-out approach that is deeply rooted in the reality faced by citizens in all regions of the country.

Beyond the policies and regulatory frameworks, this debate is about something very simple, in my opinion: enabling Canadians to stay connected to loved ones, to services, to the economy and, most importantly, to their safety. Over the past several years, we have collectively made significant progress in terms of improving Internet access. This was discussed earlier. Substantial investments have been made to bridge the digital divide, which had become unacceptable. However, while progress has been made on that front, there is another equally fundamental and persistent issue, that of cellular connectivity.

Today, in Canada, nearly one-quarter of provincial highways have no reliable cellular coverage. Let us imagine what that means in practical terms. It means that a parent driving on a highway with their kids may have no way to reach someone in an emergency. It also means that a worker driving around a rural region may not have cell service for tens of kilometres. It also means that an accident could happen and there could be no immediate way to call for help.

This is not some hypothetical situation. This is an everyday reality. In my riding of Brome—Missisquoi, these situations are all too real. Dead zones are part of the landscape there. These include stretches of rural roads, forested areas, valleys, entire concessions and villages. I am thinking of Clarenceville, Saint-Ignace-de-Stanbridge and the area between Bromont and Cowansville. Even at home, I have to wave my phone around to get a signal.

I am not talking about a connection that is simply slow or unstable. I am talking about total silence: no calls, no messages, no access. The consequences are very real. For instance, farmers tell me that they have to deal with disruptions in their daily operations, even as modern agriculture increasingly relies on connected technologies. Entrepreneurs also tell me that this limits their ability to innovate, attract clients and grow their businesses. Self-employed workers tell me about contracts they have lost simply because they could not be reached. Above all, citizens confide in me that they feel vulnerable when they are on the road, when a loved one is travelling and when they realize that, in certain situations, they are completely cut off from the rest of the world.

The impact of these disruptions is not limited to full-time residents of our regions. In a riding like Brome—Missisquoi, we get tens of thousands of visitors a year. They include families, cyclists and outdoor enthusiasts who come to enjoy our scenery, our wineries and our local attractions. A lot of these visitors are city dwellers who are used to uninterrupted connectivity, and when they encounter our dead zones, the consequences for them and for local

Private Members' Business

residents are very real. People may get lost, be unable to use GPS, have trouble reaching emergency services if needed, or simply be unable to communicate with loved ones. Situations like these can quickly turn a positive tourism experience into a source of stress and anxiety.

In addition to the impact on individuals, this situation also has economic repercussions, because an area with unstable connectivity is less attractive. Visitors may be reluctant to come back. Tourism companies may lose business opportunities. All this is to say that the cellular coverage issue in the regions does not just affect the year-round residents. It affects everyone who visits, invests and contributes to the economic vitality of our communities.

• (1750)

In a riding like mine, cell service is not a luxury. It is a matter of public safety. It is a matter of economic development and a matter of regional equity. However, the official data make it seem like the issue has largely been resolved. The data shows coverage rates as high as 97%. Let me just say I know one thing about coverage: If the phone is showing just half a bar, there is no coverage.

It is important to remember that this data is largely based on information self-reported by telecommunications companies, without any systematic independent verification. This makes no sense. As a result, there is a disconnect between what the numbers suggest and what citizens actually experience. When the data is flawed, so are the decisions.

That is why the first good thing about Bill C-268 is that it tackles this problem at its root: the quality of the information. The bill requires the CRTC to establish a mechanism for independent verification of cellular coverage data. I believe this is a simple, reasonable and essential measure. Before we can fix a problem, we must first see it clearly, and right now, we cannot do that. Today, underserved areas are all too often underestimated or even invisible in decision-making tools.

The second pillar of this bill is just as important: modernizing our spectrum policy framework. This framework has not been updated since 2007. At that time, smart phones were barely a thing. In fact, they were only just coming onto the scene. Digital usage patterns were radically different. Data requirements were incomparable to what they are today. Since then, everything has changed, except the framework.

Continuing to rely on a framework designed for a different era means accepting that our policies are lagging behind reality. That is why the bill provides for a comprehensive review within 18 months. This review must address a fundamental question: Does our current approach truly enable us to serve the whole of Canada? In light of the experiences of regions like mine, the answer is quite clearly “no”.

Private Members' Business

Market forces alone have not been able to ensure equitable coverage. This is not a criticism; it is a statement of fact. In densely populated areas, investment happens naturally. However, in rural areas like ours, in remote regions where costs are higher and where, obviously, return on investment is less immediate, roll-out remains limited.

That is precisely why the third pillar of the bill is essential. It introduces a clear priority for underserved areas. It requires that future spectrum policy decisions consider, in a clear and deliberate manner, the needs of rural areas, remote communities, indigenous communities and roadside coverage. Roads are not trivial matters. They are the lifelines of our country. They connect our communities and support our economy.

I want to conclude by once again congratulating my colleague. She did tremendous work and I think the issue needed to be tackled head-on.

• (1755)

[English]

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to take a moment to thank a couple of people who have been part of my office this session and who will be moving on shortly.

First I want to recognize Oliver Batchilder, who has been with my office as an intern through the parliamentary internship program. Oliver is sharp, diligent and very hard-working. In fact, I have told him he works harder than most full-time paid staff I have known around this place. We are going to miss having him around, and Parliament is lucky to have young people such as Oliver coming through its doors, but I know he is going to do great things and his future is very bright.

I also want to recognize Brenda Birch, my constituency assistant in Neepawa, who will be retiring in the coming weeks. Brenda actually lived in Ottawa for a number of years, but she likes to joke that she had to move back home to find a job in politics. Since then, she has been the friendly face and the steady hand for so many people back home in my constituency who needed help to navigate the federal government. She has done that work with an incredible amount of care and patience, and I know how much constituents noticed and appreciated her work. On behalf of my constituents, I wish Brenda all the best in her retirement, and I thank her for her years of service.

With that, let me turn to the legislation before us today. On the night of April 14, 1912, a wireless operator aboard the *Titanic* tapped out a distress call into the dark Atlantic. Some ships caught it. One that might have reached the *Titanic* in time did not, because nobody was at the radio and because airwaves in those days were more like the Wild West. At the time, wireless communication was still new. The rules were incomplete, and channels were crowded. More than 1,500 people lost their life that night, and the inquiry that followed revealed that wireless communication was a matter of life and death. That is why, in the years after the disaster, countries agreed that the airwaves needed to be better managed in the public interest.

I start there purposely, because more than a century later, we are still arguing about the same basic resource. Today we call it “spectrum”, and the importance of it has, if anything, only grown. Today we manage spectrum mostly through auctions, where the government sells telecommunications companies the right to use these public airwaves. That is a reasonable way to assign spectrum, but selling a spectrum licence is not the same as solving a problem of coverage.

We cannot see spectrum and cannot touch it, but it is behind almost everything we do. It is the call that connects, or does not. It is the alert that reaches our phone, the card reader at a small-town shop and the radio a volunteer firefighter uses on a gravel road. In the city, Canadians barely notice any of this, but in rural Canada, it is the line between being part of the country's economy and being shut out of it. Right now, rural Canada is too often on the losing end of that line.

Let us look at a recent example. In the government's recent 3,800-megahertz spectrum auction, the licensing decision set a deployment requirement of just 5% population coverage within seven years for the Gander and Grand Falls-Windsor service area in Newfoundland, a region covering more than 144,000 people. Compare that 5% to the deployment requirement in a major city, where a provider has to reach 30% within five years and 70% over the long run.

That information is public. It is outlined in ISED's own licensing decision, for anyone who wants to check it out. That means a telecom provider can buy up the rights to serve rural Canada, let that spectrum sit there doing nothing for years, and clear a bar that is low, and the government calls that a mission accomplished. That is not good enough. Rural Canadians know it is not, because they are the ones living in the dead zone.

If the legislation makes it to committee, I strongly recommend that the committee review the large discrepancies between rural and urban tiers for spectrum deployment requirements. Long timelines for deployment of spectrum in rural areas result in the lack of priority given to deploying connectivity in rural regions. Telecommunications providers purchase this spectrum and slowly deploy it after they prioritize urban regions, where there is more revenue to be generated.

Private Members' Business

• (1800)

I have often asked myself why the deployment requirements are not equal between rural and urban regions, if we really want to close the digital divide. Any policy on this front must consider the spectrum that has already been licensed under weaker deployment requirements, because those terms and conditions were already agreed to and were reflected in the purchase price. Obviously, the telecommunications companies will oppose any accelerated deployment requirements. However, I will note that Telus, in recent government consultations, supported increased deployment requirements, so there is hope.

There is a revenue side to the story too, and it is worth being honest about it. Spectrum auctions have turned into a cash cow for the finance department, and all funds raised through an auction go into general revenues. A recent spectrum auction brought nearly \$9 billion into the federal coffers, with three large carriers accounting for the overwhelming majority of these funds. I have no objection to the government's raising money, but raising money and actually connecting people are two different things, and we keep treating them as if they were the same.

There is a real policy contradiction in this. If the government's main objective is to raise as much revenue as possible for spectrum auctions, that can come at the expense of connecting more Canadians. When the government sells a telecom company a spectrum license and allows the company to never deploy it, or to deploy it very slowly, the public loses. This is a principle I have raised in the House before.

During the 44th Parliament, I introduced Bill C-288, which was passed. It was aimed at making broadband service information more accurate. This was because Canadians were being sold one story about the Internet but were buying and living an entirely different one. That same idea belongs in this debate on spectrum policy. The coverage maps tell one story, but the people who live on those roads tell another. The map will colour an entire municipality green and call it served, while the people in that municipality can tell us, down to the bend in the road, exactly where the call drops every time.

There is also the matter of spectrum that goes unused. We have had stretches in this country's history where a frequency has sat idle in rural and remote regions for years, serving no one, and the demand for connectivity has kept growing. Therefore, it is worth Parliament's asking whether our current rules put any real pressure on licence-holders to actually deploy, or whether smaller licensing areas, tougher deployment conditions and more enforcement might finally get that spectrum working for the people it is supposed to serve.

Underneath all this debate sits the question of safety. A dropped call in downtown Ottawa is an inconvenience, but a dropped call on a rural highway in a Manitoba blizzard, with a vehicle off the road and the temperature dropping to -40°C, can be the difference between life and death. That is the same lesson the *Titanic* taught us over a century ago. We should not need to relearn this in 2026.

This brings me to the legislation that is in front of us. Bill C-268 asks two fairly reasonable things: that mobile coverage data actually be verified for accuracy, and that this framework be reviewed on

a regular schedule rather than being left to gather dust for another 20 years. I will not pretend that the bill would solve the whole problem, because it would not, but it would open the door and give the House a chance to ask questions that have been long overdue.

In the end, the question is a simple one: When we hand a company a piece of the public's airwaves, does it actually serve the public? It belongs to Canadians, and Canadians are entitled to know whether it is going to work for them. These are questions Parliament should take seriously, because Canadians, rural Canadians in particular, deserve action.

• (1805)

Paul Connors (Avalon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today on behalf of the people of Avalon to speak to Bill C-268, the spectrum policy framework for Canada act.

I would like to begin by thanking the member for Compton—Stanstead for bringing this legislation forward. Her work highlights an issue that affects Canadians in every region of the country, especially those living in rural and remote areas.

Cellular connectivity in Canada is no longer a luxury. It is essential. It connects us to our families and friends, it connects businesses to their customers, it connects students to their education and it connects Canadians to vital services, including emergency services. Quite simply, cellular connectivity connects Canadians to opportunity, yet many Canadians still do not have access to reliable cellular service. I do not mean just access on paper, but a real, dependable, working service in their everyday lives. This is especially true for rural and remote communities, like many of the communities I represent in Avalon.

I want to take a moment to make this real. Imagine that someone is at home and a wildfire suddenly breaks out nearby. They gather their loved ones and prepare to leave. They reach for their phone to call their neighbours, family, friends or emergency services, and there is no signal. They get in their car and drive away, but there is still no signal. They drive 10, 15 or 20 minutes, until, finally, they get a signal, but there is only one bar. This is not hypothetical. This was the reality for many residents across the Avalon Peninsula during the summer wildfires last year.

In moments of crisis, cellular connectivity is not about convenience. It is about safety. It can be the difference between getting help and being cut off. In remote and rural regions with long distances between towns or during harsh weather, reliable cellular service is not optional. It is essential to protecting lives.

Private Members' Business

This brings us to a critical point. We often hear that 97%, 98% or 99% of Canadians have access to cellular service, but we must ask what access really means. Does it mean just one bar? Does it mean a strong, reliable service? Does it mean being able to make a call without it dropping? Does it mean running a business, attending school or calling 911 without interruptions? In my hometown of Conception Bay South and throughout many communities in my riding, connectivity exists on paper. We are told we are fully covered and connected, but in reality, residents experience dropped calls, dead zones and unreliable service daily. In some homes, people have to walk from room to room to try to find a signal. This is not connectivity.

We need to rethink how we define and measure cellular connectivity in Canada. It is not enough to say a community is covered. We must ensure that the service is reliable, dependable and high-quality. This is exactly what Bill C-268 would play a key role in doing. This bill would help establish a framework to measure cellular connectivity across Canada. It would give us data to guide us in decision-making as we work to close the connectivity gap. That matters, because without accurate information, we cannot build effective solutions.

Improving connectivity is also about economic opportunities. In today's economy, nearly every business relies on reliable Internet and cellular service. Small businesses in rural communities are especially vulnerable. When connectivity fails, payment systems stop, debit and ATM machines do not work and online orders do not get processed. In many cases, customers no longer carry cash. If the system is down, the sales are lost. For seasonal businesses, like those in the tourism sector, any Internet or cellular downtime means a loss in revenue, and it does not take long for those losses to build up.

• (1810)

Without reliable service, businesses struggle to grow, attract customers and compete. This is one of the reasons why people are often pushed toward the urban centres. It is not because they want to leave their communities, but because the infrastructure they need is simply not there.

Connectivity also plays a critical role in education. In recent years, we have seen a major expansion of online and hybrid learning. Students can now attend classes, complete assignments and access resources from anywhere if they have reliable connectivity, but in rural communities, students face difficult challenges. Students may be forced to leave their hometown to pursue their education. Others may fall behind simply because they cannot access their coursework all the time. Schools may lack the infrastructure needed to fully integrate technology into the classroom. Beyond learning, there are also safety concerns. In rural areas, students often travel long distances by bus. Sometimes, they travel for more than an hour. If an emergency occurs, whether it is weather-related, medical or otherwise, reliable communication is essential. We cannot accept a situation where schools or families cannot connect when it matters most.

Part of the broader challenge we face relates to how we manage and allocate the communications spectrum in this country. The spectrum is the invisible infrastructure that powers wireless com-

munication. It is the foundation of cellular networks. Decisions about spectrum, how it is allocated, who can access it and under what conditions have a direct impact on connectivity outcomes.

Too often, the development of the spectrum is prioritized in densely populated urban areas, where returns on investment are highest. That is understandable from a market perspective, but it leaves rural communities behind. We need to ensure that the communications spectrum policy in Canada supports equitable access, not just profitable access. That means encouraging deployment in underserved areas, improving rural coverage obligations and making sure that carriers are accountable for delivering real service.

Satellite-based connectivity has made some considerable progress in recent years and helped bring services to some remote areas, but these solutions are still evolving and the costs can be high for individuals and families. Technology will be part of the solution, but it cannot replace the need for strong and reliable wireless infrastructure.

For too long, rural Canadians have felt like they are at the back of the line. They do not expect to be first, but they expect to be included. Right now, too many feel like they are still waiting to be part of it. Urban Canada has seen major improvements in connectivity. Now it is time to ensure that rural Canada is not left behind. That requires commitment and it requires a clear understanding of where the gaps truly are.

That is why Bill C-268 is so important. It is not the final solution, but it is a necessary step forward. It would help us better understand the reality on the ground and help us measure what truly matters. It would guide us toward more effective policies and investments. Most importantly, it would allow us to reaffirm a simple but powerful message. When we say we are connecting Canadians, we mean all Canadians, no matter where they live, no matter how remote their community is and no matter the challenges they face.

Canadians deserve reliable connectivity, not just in cities, but in every town, every community and every region in the country, because in today's world, connectivity is not optional. It is essential to safety, it is essential to opportunities and it is essential to ensuring that no community is left behind.

I am proud to support this bill.

Private Members' Business

• (1815)

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege, as always, to rise and speak on behalf of the people of Elgin—St. Thomas—London South. It is a particular privilege to speak to a bill such as this one, which speaks directly to one of the most persistent concerns I hear from people in the rural communities in my riding, scattered across Elgin County from Rodney to West Lorne, Straffordville, Vienna and Port Burwell. Oftentimes, they do not have dropped calls because they live in dead zones where they cannot even make a call. They cannot so much as send a text message or load a web page on their phone.

Obviously, we cannot have coverage everywhere we go in the country, but we look on the coverage maps that are published by many of the large telecoms companies and realize that much of what is on those maps is pure fiction. They will claim full coverage, as we see across southwestern Ontario in particular, when everyone who lives there knows that is just a joke.

I thank my colleague across the aisle from Compton—Stanstead for introducing this very important discussion. I have actually spent some time in her riding in the past, and I know it is very rural. Parts of it are very similar to my own riding. I know her constituents see many of the same challenges that mine do and that members across the aisle have seen in their own communities. It is something we encounter.

One of the things I love the most about my role is getting to criss-cross all of these different parts of these ridings and communities where people have to be on the go. Sometimes, it is a great privilege to be in areas where no one can call me. That is sometimes a convenience. Sometimes, it is an inconvenience. I am sure that we have all had periods when the whip could not get a hold of us because we were in an area without cell coverage. Still, for a lot of Canadians, that is incredibly important.

I want to explain what cellular service is, fundamentally. We can often trivialize the idea of being connected, and for good reason. In this world, we are overconnected sometimes, but we are not talking about the ability to download a game. We are not talking about the ability to idly scroll the Internet. For people in rural communities, the ability to connect to a cellular network is absolutely critical. As technology evolves, we see farmers incorporating more and more technology into their work that requires cellular connectivity, especially if they are out in the field, far from the Wi-Fi routers they may have in their homes or, increasingly, in their barns.

In our work on the justice committee, we heard from Liz Brown of Valora Place, which is an abused women's centre in St. Thomas, about how domestic and intimate partner violence in rural communities can be aggravated by not having the cell signal to make emergency calls. I do not wish to be overly dramatic or alarmist, but sometimes, a lack of cellular connectivity is literally a life-or-death issue if a person cannot get a signal to make a call. That is the case not just in an intimate partner violence situation, but in any emergency. If a person cannot call 911, they cannot get the help they may need in a crisis.

We also have, in general, the economic needs of travelling around rural communities. Stores increasingly want to use QR codes to load a menu at a restaurant, for example, or to redeem a

coupon someone may have found. These rely on cellular connectivity that, increasingly in rural communities, is not available.

One important point I will raise here is that rural communities have, for much of the last 10 years, felt very ignored by the Liberal government. We see announcement after announcement devoted to big cities. We have people in rural communities truly feeling left behind. While there has been leadership from provincial governments and, in some cases, from the federal government over the past years on rural broadband, this idea of rural cellular connectivity seems to have been almost entirely ignored.

I go back to two things that I believe need to change fundamentally. One is something that I hope and am optimistic this bill could address, which is the accuracy of coverage maps. The bill would require the CRTC to establish a process to ensure the accuracy of mobile network coverage data provided by Canadian carriers. This means that when people in Sparta, Iona, Iona Station or Dutton look at the coverage areas for a company that might want their business as a cellular customer, there has to be accuracy in those maps.

It is important to note that I am not talking about situations where, every once in a while, a call drops in an area. I am talking about perennial dead zones, where the telecoms companies are claiming they offer coverage, but the people attempting to use their phones there are not receiving it. That is a very important distinction.

• (1820)

We know that there are always going to be glitches and down points. We know that there are going to be slight variances and variations in coverage from day to day. We know that the weather can affect this. We know that there are going to be technical issues on the coverage maps. However, we are talking about establishing, as a baseline, an expectation that a lot of Canadians have that they are not going to pay for a service they are not receiving, and that they are not going to pay for a service that is not available to them at all points, especially when they may need it most.

It is interesting that the bill happened to come up today. Last week, I rose in the House and asked a question in question period about this very issue, which was about what the industry minister would do to ensure accuracy in telecom maps. I was very pleased that the parliamentary secretary to the industry minister rose to answer my question, but he did not actually address the substance of the issue. He talked about affordability, which again is a very important issue, but I would love to see concrete action from the government on the actual question of accuracy in the coverage maps.

Private Members' Business

Here is where I hope we can go if Bill C-268 is referred to committee. The bill requires a process for ensuring accuracy, but that is only the first step. We also have to be able to expand that coverage. In that sense, I hope this can be the beginning of a longer-term discussion about not just identifying where these dead zones are, but also fixing them.

I do not wish to be biased, but actually I do wish to be biased towards my part of the country, because it is a beautiful place. However, the regions I am talking about are not even insanely rural and remote areas. We are sometimes talking about communities that are 15 to 20 minutes outside of very large cities, like London or St. Thomas, which are still seeing these coverage dead zones. If we cannot have full coverage in an area as densely populated as southwestern Ontario, we are certainly not going to have it in areas of the country that are far more sparsely populated and far more rural.

We know that the telecom companies have tried to respond to some of these concerns by saying that we can move ahead with satellite technology. We have seen Rogers, in particular, Bell as well, advance satellite phones as an answer to some of these problems, but again, if people are near the Canada-U.S. border, as the vast majority of Canadians are, this satellite technology is not available to them. We still have the same problem, which is that we have people looking to a new technology, but that not solving the problem, which is applicable to not just the farmers in my riding, but all the people who live in these rural communities who want to work in these communities, want to study in these communities and, as my colleague for Avalon said a few moments ago, hopefully want to stay in these communities. We do not want people having to leave the place they call home because they feel they do not have the technical capabilities they need to live their lives there, to feel secure there and to feel like they can be on the go and run their businesses there.

I want to see from this Liberal government a real commitment to rural communities, like the ones I have the great privilege and honour of representing. I want to see us identify ways to ensure accuracy in telecom coverage maps in rural Canada, but I also want to see us fix and expand those areas where we know the coverage is not there. This is a crucial issue, and it is one that has wide-ranging implications for the economy and business, for connectivity and well-being, and yes, even for public safety and justice.

Conservatives will always stand in support of transparency and accountability. I believe that companies have a moral obligation to provide accurate information, and I believe that government, given the manner in which it regulates telecom companies, needs to do its job and ensure this.

My question I would like to leave everyone with is this: We have a framework proposed here. What do we do to turn this into real action? That is what I would like to see.

I appreciate my colleague raising this issue. It is about time we get some attention for rural Canada from the Liberal government.

• (1825)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Compton—Stanstead has five minutes for her right of reply.

Marianne Dandurand (Compton—Stanstead, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today after my colleagues, and after speaking last month in the House, to conclude debate at second reading on Bill C-268.

I thank all my colleagues who spoke. I am pleased to see that this is not a partisan issue. I want to thank the members for Tobique—Mactaquac, Joliette—Manawan, Egmont, Portage—Lisgar, London—Fanshawe, Brome—Missisquoi, Drummond, Avalon, Riding Mountain and Elgin—St. Thomas—London South for supporting the bill.

My colleague from Elgin—St. Thomas—London South was talking about people who live just outside urban centres and have no Internet connection. I live in a city with a population of nearly 200,000, and I do not get more than one bar of Internet signal inside my home. Members of Parliament from every region of the country and every party have described exactly the same reality: roads with no signal, underserved communities, and citizens who cannot rely on their phones when they need them. That is also my personal experience, as I just mentioned. I am one of those people who has to move closer to a window to get better reception. On the roads in my region, I know exactly where I have to tell the person on the other end of the line that the connection is going to drop and that I will have to call them back in a minute. Sometimes it is even worse: I have to call back in 10 minutes.

As the member for Portage—Lisgar pointed out, people have come to accept a level of service that would be considered unacceptable in any other sector. He gave the following example: No one would agree to buy a car that stops working as soon as they turn onto a certain road. In too many rural regions, people are paying full price for cell service that disappears once they reach a certain road or a certain village. My colleagues from Drummond and Brome—Missisquoi demonstrated what this is like by holding up their phones and pretending to search for a signal. We all do that in the regions. We laughed about it because it is something that we do all the time. However, behind such anecdotes lie much more serious concerns.

My colleagues talked about emergency services, first responders, accidents, serious health problems and women experiencing violence who cannot always rely on the network when they need it. The mayor of Martinville, Michel-Henri Goyette, was the one who reminded me that this issue goes beyond cellphone call quality. He also reminded me that we should not settle for mediocrity. That is why, as my colleague said, I have tackled this issue head-on. That is why I am bringing it before the House. It is a matter of economic development, public safety and fairness for people in rural areas.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

The member for Egmont reminded us that poor connectivity limits access to telehealth, remote learning and new learning opportunities. The digital divide is becoming a social, economic and regional divide. We know where the dead zones are. Constituents know them; mayors know them; paramedics know them; firefighters know them. The problem is not whether they exist. It is having the tools needed to map these areas and guide future decisions.

[*English*]

Bill C-268 proposes two practical measures. First, it would require a process to verify the accuracy of wireless coverage data. If we want to fix connectivity gaps, we need an accurate picture of where those gaps actually exist. Second, it would modernize Canada's spectrum policy framework, which has not been updated since 2007. Technology has changed immensely since then, and our policy framework must evolve as well.

We do not agree on everything, but there is something we seem to agree on: Doing nothing is not an option. The bill would not be the finish line, but a starting point. The bill would get the ball rolling. It would create a better understanding of the problem, and ensure that rural connectivity is considered as a priority in future spectrum policy decisions.

• (1830)

[*Translation*]

I urge all members to support Bill C-268 at second reading and to refer it to committee for further consideration.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion.

[*English*]

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

[*Translation*]

Marianne Dandurand: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill C-268 be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill is referred to the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I suspect if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent to call it 6:37 p.m.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

**GOVERNMENT BUSINESS NO. 13—PROCEEDINGS ON
BILL C-22**

The House resumed consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and speak to Bill C-22 and to just how important lawful access is to our country.

Bill C-22 is important legislation. I say that to members across the way, in particular, and those who have been following the whole debate and discussions that have been taking place in the House of Commons not only since the last election but also during the last election, when people at the doors raised the issue of safe communities. I believe all members of the House would have heard that at the doors. I genuinely believe that. The Prime Minister took a position during the election that we wanted to say to Canadians, in the form of an election platform, that we would be bringing in laws to make our communities safer.

That was an important aspect of the last election campaign. When the Prime Minister or any Liberal member of Parliament talks about building Canada strong, it is not only the economy that we are talking about. We are talking about the health and well-being of the communities we represent. When they think of it with that lens on it, members should understand and appreciate why it is so very important that we deal with the issue of crime.

I have a fairly long history of dealing with the issue of justice and crime. In fact, back in the day when I was in the Manitoba legislature, I was the justice critic for the Province of Manitoba. During that time, understanding the issue of community safety was of the utmost importance. For example, I believe in community policing. It was something the City of Winnipeg moved toward at one time but then backed away from. I honestly believe that community policing makes a difference. It is the City of Winnipeg that plays that role, in terms of policing our communities.

We can look at it from a provincial perspective, and there is a very strong role that provinces play, including the appointments of Crown attorneys and judges. There are provincial laws, and there are municipal bylaws. Then we can look at Ottawa and our criminal justice system. Obviously, Ottawa also plays an important role, from the Criminal Code to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I say all that because we need to push the issue of collaboration, of working with the different levels of government, in order to deliver safer communities.

Government Orders

We understand the role that Ottawa has to play in that. I would argue that no prime minister in generations has recognized it to the degree that this Prime Minister and this government has. Since the last election, just over a year ago, when Canadians made the decision to elect a new Prime Minister, we have had a commitment to bring forward a series of legislative initiatives. That is exactly what Bill C-22 is. As a government, we recognize that the national government has to play that important role in demonstrating goodwill, work collaboratively with other jurisdictions and deliver safer communities to Canadians. Before I get into some of the details of the legislative agenda, I believe it is important for us to recognize that fact.

• (1835)

A Free Press editorial, and I will not quote the entire article, from September 9, 2025, reads, “But those measures mean little if there are not enough prosecutors to move cases through the courts in a timely manner.”

Further down, it reads, “The cost of inaction is far greater than the cost of investment. Failing to fund the Crown’s office means risking collapsed trials, emboldened criminals and disillusioned victims. It means communities losing confidence in the courts’ ability to protect them. Ultimately, it means eroding the very rule of law.”

I only quote from this to highlight the fact that if we are going to build and have stronger and healthier communities that incorporate safety, and our constituents want consequences for crimes and want safer communities, it cannot be delivered just by the federal government. However, the Prime Minister and every Liberal member of Parliament recognize that Ottawa has to play a strong leadership role. That is why, when we look at Bill C-22, we need to look at the legislative package the Prime Minister and this government have put before the House of Commons in hopes that the legislative initiatives would be passed. Unfortunately, we have seen a great deal of resistance and outright opposition to that.

The government House leader made reference to this today in question period when he talked about the old Conservative Party, the Progressive Conservative Party. When law enforcement agencies across Canada came to the House of Commons, the Conservatives would respond positively, but that it is not the case today. The Conservative Party today is far different from what it used to be.

It is a good thing that the national Liberal Party, under the leadership of this Prime Minister, has picked up the slack. Not only that, but we have taken actions to show that Ottawa is prepared to lead, even if it means bringing in things such as time allocation to get our legislation through. Not only do Conservatives oppose many of the measures we are bringing forward to make our communities safer, but they have intentionally made the decision to prevent the legislation from passing. We have seen that in the last week.

Bill C-22 is on lawful access, and we have been talking about this since the summertime of last year. The House will remember Bill C-2, which had lawful access in it. Part of the problem is, as I understand it, that the Conservative Party is split all over the place on the issue of lawful access, and it should not be. There is a united Liberal Party that recognizes what law enforcement agencies across Canada are saying. Every region of our nation is talking about how

important it is for Canada to have lawful access, and the Conservative Party has been turning a blind eye to law enforcement agencies in Canada.

It is not just law enforcement officers—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: No, I am not kidding. It is true.

Mr. Speaker, we see that, and I will give a good example. Last week, the Conservatives finally, after years, agreed that they would sit late. A few hours later, they moved a motion to adjourn the House, and it was not the first time. It is not about wanting more time to debate. It is more about preventing the legislation from passing.

• (1840)

I can say to the members opposite that, whether it is this Prime Minister specifically, the government as a whole or every Liberal member of Parliament, we are prepared to use the tools available to the government in order to pass the legislation. This is what Canadians expect and want, and this government will deliver. It was part of our election platform. It is what communities want to see happen.

If we look at lawful access, yes, the Conservatives were destructive. They are in opposition to it.

Let us look at what we had to do for Bill C-9. That was really a grassroots movement that we witnessed in the last federal election, and we made it a part of our platform to deal with the issue of hate. We brought in legislation and set up new aspects to the criminal law that would deal with hatred directly. Not only has the Conservative Party voted against it, but it continues to spread misinformation in regard to it. It is so unfortunate, because racism hurts to the core. The Conservatives had the opportunity to stand up and do something on the hatred file to fight racism.

If we look at Bill C-14, the bail reform legislation, once again, much like Bill C-22, we have law enforcement officers across our nation saying they want it. We have prosecutors who have been demanding bail reform. I have been holding this piece of paper in my hand, which is a press release from 10 municipal cities in Manitoba saying that they want bail reform legislation, as did the mayor of Winnipeg. I only highlight these cities because they are in my home province.

I can assure members that of the law enforcement agencies in every region, province, municipality and rural community, and the many different people we all represent, I cannot point to one who has told me we do not need bail reform. Our constituents want a government that is going to deal with the issues before us. When we talk about building Canada strong, that includes bringing in legislation that is going to make our communities stronger, healthier and safer, yet we see resistance.

Government Orders

Yes, we are trying to push Bill C-22 through. The Conservatives cannot try to tell me they have not had enough time to debate the issue. It has been there since September 2025 in one form or another. That is the reality, but the Conservatives have made the decision that they do not want this legislation passed because they have a divided caucus, and the extreme right within the Conservative Party, the ones who wear the tin hats, are saying they do not want it. We say to them that it is time they look at what past Conservatives would say about it. There is no reason whatsoever that today's Conservative Party should be in opposition. We are the only Five Eyes country that does not have lawful access.

An hon. member: What would Joe Clark say?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues asked what Joe Clark would do. Do members remember what Joe Clark, the former Progressive Conservative prime minister of Canada, said? He said that he never left the party; the party left him. Since he said that, the party has gone even further. That is fine. The Conservatives are the ones who will determine their future. However, for me, when the actions of the Conservative Party, Canada's official opposition, play a detrimental role in good, sound public policy, I think we should all be standing up and holding its members to account for the types of things they are doing.

• (1845)

When I look at what the Conservatives say on the crime file, I see that they like to talk a lot about crime, but when it comes down to it, they use the issue more as a fundraising mechanism. They see that, by talking about it, they can actually mine data and raise money. However, when it comes time to actually pass legislation and support budgetary measures, they are found wanting.

There is a list of emails I have acquired over the last year from the Conservative Party. There are many of them. Here are some quotes of what these emails state: “More criminals loose on the streets to terrorize our people”, “Donate now”, “The cause of this VIOLENT uptick in crime? The Liberals' radical catch-and-release policies”, and “Criminals are WREAKING HAVOC across the country.” Another says, “DEFEND YOUR HOME.” I have some that ask for money. One states, “Crime is out of control—and it's only going to get worse.” They are calling us radical, I guess. There is something that says, “Sign here”. That is a petition.

I have some other things here that are truly amazing in terms of the press releases that come from the Conservative Party. I like this one: “The Liberals and Bloc want to prosecute people for quoting scripture.” Imagine that. That is truly amazing. It says, “They are trying to push laws that could criminalize passages from the Bible, the Quran, the Torah, and other sacred texts.” In that one, they are mining data. There is one that goes directly toward raising funds.

Kurt Holman: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I would just like clarification. Is the member for Winnipeg North utilizing a prop?

The Deputy Speaker: No, he is not. I have been paying attention to the parliamentary secretary. He has been picking up documents and putting them down as he goes. If he were to use a prop, as I am sure he knows, I would be the first to notice and to call him back to order.

I will let the parliamentary secretary finish.

• (1850)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, these are actually quotes from emails that come from the Conservative Party of Canada. Here is another one, and members will like this one: “the Liberals are waging a war on religious freedom.” Wow, that is truly amazing. It states, “Their goal is to expose people of faith to criminal prosecution for the simple act of quoting their own sacred texts.” It goes on.

This one has, “Donate now” on the email. Here is the point: I raise these emails because that is the motivating factor when it comes to the issue of crime and making our communities safer for the Conservative Party of Canada today. The emails kind of demonstrate it. When the Prime Minister, the government and 170-plus Liberal MPs are bringing forward legislation and trying to push legislation through the House that would actually make our communities safer, the Conservative Party is filibustering and trying to prevent the legislation from passing.

Even with legislation that has a wide spectrum of support from provinces, municipalities, law enforcement agencies and the constituents we represent, the Conservatives say no. They are trying to prevent legislation from passing that would make our communities safer. I say shame on the Conservatives for not realizing the damage they are causing. I do not blame each and every member of the party, obviously. I believe it is the leadership from within the Conservative Party that is actually driving the Conservative Party's agenda today. I am telling my friends across the way to look at the legislation. They do not have to believe everything their back room or the leader's office tells them. The bill is good, sound public policy.

I wish I had enough time to talk about Bill C-16. I cannot believe the Conservative Party is going to vote against Bill C-16, which would reinstate mandatory minimums and would bring the issue of femicide onto the table. That is something that other countries around the world have not done. It would also deal with coercive behaviour.

There is so much substance that the government is bringing on crime, in order to make our communities safer. The Conservative Party of Canada has been an absolute disaster on the issue. In fact, it has been spreading misinformation to try to mislead Canadians. I say to the Conservatives that it is time at least some of them started rethinking what the leadership of the Conservative Party is saying and—

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments, the hon. member for Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan.

Fraser Tolmie (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague across the aisle mentioned the former leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, Mr. Joe Clark. I actually have interactions with a former Liberal minister, Mr. Dan McTeague, who said that he did not leave the Liberal Party but that the Liberal Party left him. I think there is some give and take here.

Government Orders

I would like to know what my colleague from Winnipeg North's opinions are on Mr. McTeague. I feel as if the Liberal Party has lost its compass. It is way off and seems to be getting into everybody else's business instead of looking after the business of looking after Canadians.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I will let the name of Joe Clark, one of Canada's prime ministers, a Progressive Conservative, stand pretty high.

I can tell the member opposite that never before, at the doors, have as many people told me that they voted Conservative in the past but were voting Liberal this time around. I truly believe it was because there is a great deal of contrast between the leader of the Conservative Party and today's Prime Minister, the leader of the Liberal Party. I can say one thing, which is that never before has the Liberal Party of Canada received as many votes as it did in the last election, under the current leadership. I believe it has a lot to do with today's Prime Minister.

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to the police chief of Durham Regional Police Service, as well as to members of the association that represents the frontline officers, and they have all supported our government's legislative agenda on public safety, including lawful access, bail reform, combatting hate, the protecting victims act and more. The member has pointed to all those bills.

What I find really challenging is that members of the Conservative Party on the finance committee wasted 25 hours of committee resources to block key economic measures that Canadians are relying on us to deliver. By their own admission, they did it to block lawful access. They admitted that on camera, on the record.

Can the member speak to the obstruction that we have seen in the House by the Conservative Party?

• (1855)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the question allows me to highlight what we have seen taking place on the floor of the House of Commons over the last week or so. Not only is an excessive amount of filibustering or wasting time taking place in standing committees, as has often been witnessed, but it has also happened here in the House.

Last week, a motion was agreed upon by the Conservatives that allows us to sit Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday until midnight, and Friday until 8 p.m. They all voted in favour of it, but an hour and a half later, they moved a motion to adjourn the House. One would think maybe it was just a stupid thing they did, but they did it again and again. Then they had the bells ring at report stage of Bill C-25, a bill they support. All they are doing is taking away debate time, yet they cry that they do not have enough debate time. There really is no logic to what they are doing on the floor of the House of Commons. I suspect that, again, it is probably rooted in the House leadership team.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I always listen care-

fully to my colleague from Winnipeg North, and I do not know why he feels the need to shout like that. When I have my earpiece in, I find it hard to hear the interpretation. I know he is a passionate person, but still, I struggle to sit through his entire speech.

I disagree with him on some things. He can attack the Conservatives all he wants, but he forgot to mention that the Barreau du Québec, the Canadian Bar Association and civil society groups had many questions and concerns about part 2 of the bill. It is not just the Conservatives, but also many groups in society that were questioning Bill C-22. Also, filibustering is a parliamentary tool that can be used when it becomes clear that the party in power is unwilling to negotiate or co-operate.

What does my colleague have to say to the Barreau du Québec and the Canadian Bar Association, which have called on the government to split Bill C-22 in two?

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's comments. Back home, I am often told that when I am addressing groups, I speak loudly. I tend to speak loudly. That is my normal. I do not mean to cause issues by it.

I believe that there has been a great deal of collaboration between the minister's office and different ministers. We have seen collaboration working with the many different stakeholders in many different communities. The parliamentary secretary posed the question about support from the local police organizations in his own riding. People will find that this sort of consultation and reporting back takes place a great deal. Our Secretary of State for Combatting Crime came to Winnipeg and met with the police association. A lot of consultation and collaboration went into the making of the legislation.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened very intently to the member for Winnipeg North's speech. He talked about collaboration and said that the Liberals want to collaborate. Unfortunately, that is simply not the case. Any time we tried to collaborate, the answer was always no. Unfortunately that left us little availability to do other things.

The Liberals also said that they want to use the tools. I would suggest they abuse the tools. The member also called the legislation "sound public policy", so I will say this: If Bill C-22 is good, sound public policy, then it should be able to withstand scrutiny, it should be able to withstand amendments, and it should be able to withstand debate. Frankly, the motion, in my view, is an admission by the Liberal government that it has failed. The bill is so flawed that it cannot possibly withstand debate, and the member should agree with that, because it is definitely not able to withstand scrutiny.

Government Orders

• (1900)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, let us imagine this. The Government of Canada, through its ministries, worked collaboratively with provincial jurisdictions, municipal jurisdictions and law enforcement agencies, and it built a consensus, which is very easy to do, on lawful access. The bill came to the floor of the House of Commons in September year. It was brought to the Conservatives, and they said, “No way. We are not going to support this. We do not like lawful access. We are going to debate this thing endlessly. We are not going to allow it to pass.”

Well, it is kind of hard to collaborate, with that kind of an attitude, on the issue of lawful access. It has been made very clear: The Conservative Party of Canada does not support lawful access. We want lawful access, but the Conservatives do not. It is as simple as that.

Michael Coteau (Scarborough—Woburn, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member did mention just fighting hate, and he mentioned anti-hate legislation. A proposed change came through the Senate to include the noose as a hate symbol, which the Conservatives have voted against. Can you tell the House why it is important for us to put in place hate legislation and, more specifically, to fight against these hate symbols here in Canada?

The Deputy Speaker: Before I let the parliamentary secretary respond, in case there is more of this, I will point out that the member used “you”. I cannot respond. Members should speak through the Speaker to the parliamentary secretary.

I will let the parliamentary secretary respond.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I really do appreciate the question. I think it is best answered by recounting what one of our senators said in addressing the bill. She talked about having a wonderful dinner at home and then going for a walk, during which she was harassed by some people in a truck who were saying some fairly harsh things. They actually had a noose in the truck.

In order to really appreciate the hatred that, unfortunately, is still out there, we have to understand the impact of something of that nature. I do not deny the fact that the noose sends all sorts of strong, negative messages. It hurts people to the core. It is time that we actually do something about it, and Bill C-9 addresses that particular issue and a whole lot more.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as we know, Bill C-25 includes changes to the names of electoral districts. The new name of my electoral district will be “Vallée-du-Haut-Saint-Laurent”. It will be easier to pronounce, but it will be less melodious for those who take pleasure in saying my riding's name.

I am pleased to rise to speak to Government Business No. 13. I have a lot to say, but please allow me to digress briefly. We are soon going to adjourn for the summer, and I would say a certain fatigue has set in in the House. We are wrapping up our work this week, and one thing we do not say often enough is that, while we work hard, we could not do it without the support of our staff.

Tonight, I would like to thank my assistant, Racim, who was brand new to Parliament Hill. He came here with me this fall and

learned on the job. We had never analyzed a bill together or done clause-by-clause consideration together, so we learned together. Tonight, I want to say how happy I am with his work, his loyalty, his effort and his perseverance. It must be said that we put in long hours, especially heading into a break, to wrap up all the bills.

I am part of a very hard-working and thorough caucus. We work hard and diligently, always with the common good in mind, to do everything we can to improve bills, to assess whether they are in Quebec's best interests and to develop proposals. It is all the better if they are in Canadians' best interests too.

Racim and I work with a great team, and we are also building relationships with the other political parties. We have worked with the Conservatives and the Liberals, and we have also worked with an NDP colleague and our colleague from the Green Party. We joined forces to improve Bill C-22. I will say this straight away: This bill is probably one of the most significant pieces of legislation I will have had the privilege of working on in my time as a member of Parliament, because it brings about fundamental change.

Incidentally, I would like to apologize for stumbling over my words and making a few minor slips. I am a bit tired. Yesterday, we sat until midnight, and as everyone knows, I am no spring chicken. I am 62 years old, so I am tired this evening. I hope everyone will forgive my little slips—

• (1905)

Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The first thing I want to say is that it is a bit distracting, when there are not that many people in the House, to hear a conversation between members on the other side. Is it possible to ask that conversations be taken outside?

The second thing is that my colleague just said she is 62 years old. I do not know if it is allowed under the Standing Orders to lie about one's age. I appeal to your judgment on that.

The Deputy Speaker: Let us deal with the first item first.

[*English*]

If members are having conversations, it would be good to take them outside of the chamber. Some voices do carry more than others, and they can be heard. Also, some people's hearing is much better than others, and they can hear conversations being had much more clearly.

[*Translation*]

Now, with respect to the other item, I do not think that the member misled the House. I am certain that she is well aware of her age. If she wishes to disclose it in the House, she is free to do so, or not. Of course, members cannot do indirectly what they cannot do directly.

Government Orders

I just want to remind the hon. member for Drummond, who referred to lying, that members cannot use that word when speaking about another member. Even if he wants to make a joke to a member of his own political party, I urge the member to make sure that he does not use that word, in case it leads to disorder in the House.

That said, I invite the hon. member for Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon to continue her speech.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you for your rigour and thank you for rising to call for a little more order.

I was saying that it is a great privilege for me, and I will likely never experience this again in my career, to work on a bill that will profoundly change the way we approach public safety and privacy. Basically, Bill C-22 will change investigative practices and give police better tools, but it also involves invasions of privacy. Our challenge in committee was to determine how to support law enforcement agencies so they could lay criminal charges more easily, especially in the modern Internet era, while ensuring privacy protections under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Honestly, this was a difficult bill to study.

It quickly became apparent that the government had already made up its mind, and since it had a majority, it was hard for the opposition parties to feel that their input was valued and sought. I must say that at some meetings, other than one or two colleagues on the government side, a number of colleagues across the aisle took off their earpieces and talked among themselves, showing little interest in what we had to say.

We have often heard the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons say that the Conservatives engage in a lot of filibustering. Personally, I am not in favour of filibustering. However, it is still a parliamentary tool that can be used as a last resort when one feels that, no matter what people say, the government's primary goal is to run out the clock, hold a few hours of debate, and then, after about 20 hours, bring in closure and claim that the opposition parties are wasting their time.

We could have wrapped up Bill C-22 in a single sitting if, from the outset, we had known that the government had little interest in listening to both civil society and opposition members, even when they were proposing good ideas. As a member of the Bloc Québécois, I was nevertheless quite fortunate. The seven amendments that were proposed, discussed, and debated were those put forward by the Bloc Québécois. Of the seven proposed amendments, only one was adopted, after being amended by the government. All the amendments I proposed came either from the Privacy Commissioner of Canada, the Quebec Bar Association, or the chair of the National Security and Intelligence Review Agency. I did not propose far-fetched amendments. They were based on expert testimony that sought to help us strike a balance.

Representatives from the Barreau du Québec said, among other things, that they could live with part 1 of Bill C-22, but that part 2 was more problematic and would have required further study. My Liberal colleagues said there was no point in devoting more time to study it because the Conservatives were filibustering. However, when we have the impression that speaking is pointless because we know in advance that the government just wants to run down the

clock so it can then justify invoking closure, filibustering makes sense.

That is what really bothered me, because I truly wanted to study Bill C-22 thoroughly and make a valuable contribution. The minister had assured us in the House that the government was open to amendments. When the debate on Bill C-22 is finally over, in the end, very few of the opposition's amendments will have been adopted, actually not really any. I find that very disappointing. Perhaps I am too much of a dreamer, too positive and too eager to collaborate. Since securing a majority, this government comes across as far more arrogant. Perhaps it was so aggrieved from having a minority that now it is making up for that. That is broadly how I see things.

● (1910)

There are Liberal Party members I enjoyed working with because I found them to be very sincere in their work as well. Sometimes, as members of Parliament, we have an idea and we defend it. Our whip, our leader or party authorities give us instructions. In the case of the Liberals, the Prime Minister may be the one giving instructions. Sometimes, government members have to remain silent and toe the party line. The government wanted us to pass Bill C-22 from the get-go.

What irritates me about today's motion is that it is a super closure motion. Closure motions do exist. The Speaker confirmed that it is a procedural tool. I was here in 2006 when the Conservative government was in power. The Harper government also frequently invoked closure to pass legislation. It is a strategy. However, there is something that irritated me and that I found insincere. It struck me that the government had included in its motion the requirement that amendments be submitted by Monday at 4:30 p.m., yet it moved the motion at midnight on Monday night. When I read the motion on Tuesday morning, I nearly fell out of my chair, and I was given a bit of a scolding by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety.

I do not think that is fair. That part of the motion is not right. In my opinion, it is unprecedented and akin to what is known in finance as insider trading. It is odd, but on Tuesday morning, I received amendments from the government. I wondered how government members knew that they could table amendments before 4:30 p.m. The reason is that they were told so. That, to me, is unacceptable. That is what irritated me the most in the Speaker's ruling on the point of order that I raised with my Conservative colleague.

I was expecting a closure motion. I thought that the government would eventually want to pass the bill and would run out of patience. It never occurred to me, however, that it would do so before the parliamentary session ended. I expected it would do that in the fall, because I thought we deserved some measure of respect, and because the bill that we were preparing to pass was by no means small.

Government Orders

I want to come back to this motion, which imposed a retroactive deadline for submitting committee amendments. I would have had to present my amendments the day before I received the motion. That is really unacceptable. I know Liberal members who serve on the same committee as I do, and I am sure that, if we had them take a polygraph, we would find out that they disagreed with this move just as much as I did. I reacted by raising a point of order because this goes against my values. It is the government's right to impose closure if it so chooses. It can do that. However, I think it was wrong of the government to include this retroactive deadline.

We wanted to improve the bill, but that proved difficult. I asked questions. I am not a lawyer or a computer scientist. Quite a bit of expertise was required just to be able to ask relevant questions about this bill. I wanted to delve deeper into the subject, but that was not easy. I would have liked to hear from software architects, for example. I would have liked to hear from IT experts who could explain to me encryption and the consequences of weakening encryption.

I would have liked for someone to explain this to me. If we store data for a year, are we creating back doors? Back doors are created to make the work of police officers easier, but do they also give cybercriminals access to that data?

There were civil servants at committee to answer our questions, but they are not IT specialists or IT experts. They drafted a bill in line with the government's expectations.

• (1915)

I wondered why it was so urgent. I have asked this question many times. My colleagues here in the House who have worked on this with me know that. Police have been waiting for this bill for 30 years, so here is what I asked them: Would it be an issue if we dealt with part of it now and finalized the bill a little later, given that it is such a big undertaking?

I could sense some pressure. I am going to put forward a hypothesis about that pressure. I do not have any inside information, so this just is a hypothesis. I think much of the pressure is coming from the United States, which would like to share intelligence with Canada. Currently, we cannot exchange information because Canada is the only country of the Five Eyes that cannot do so. With the lawful access bill, we will be able to share intelligence with other Five Eyes nations.

However, I have issues with what the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons said. He is telling us that Canada is lagging behind. What exactly are we comparing ourselves to? The United Kingdom does not have a charter protecting people's rights, and neither does the United States. They have street cameras in the U.K. that film people. It is a country that intrudes heavily on people's privacy, so, to me, it is not a model. It is even worse in the United States. It is the Wild West over there.

They say that the other Five Eyes nations are scolding us because we are lagging behind and cannot share intelligence. We are comparing ourselves to countries that are not necessarily models when it comes to protecting privacy. We are also hearing about Australia, where things are happening as we speak.

In fact, as part of the study, we received 100 written briefs and 70 or 75 letters from members of the public. I think there were about four submissions in favour of the bill. The rest of the submissions were against the bill, either in part or in full, but often only partially. I learned a lot from reading those briefs, because we did not have a chance to ask any questions of the representatives from the Five Eyes or Australia. Australia is actually reviewing its legislation on lawful access because it has been abused. There have been incidents that should never happen again. People in the United Kingdom are also reconsidering things, and civil society is taking action. My question, then, is why are we rushing this?

The prime example always given is that, if lawful access had been in place, a criminal who abused children could have been arrested. We are also told that it would have been easier to stop an organized network of pedophiles operating on the Internet. I asked if that means that such criminals cannot be arrested today, because we do not have a law on lawful access on the books. The answer is no. That said, it is true that such arrests are difficult, and I do not want anyone to think that I am against lawful access.

We think that police tools need to be modernized and that they should be up to the task of countering cyber-attacks. Most serious crimes often take place online. Criminals have more advanced tools than the police do. The police need more advanced, more suitable and more modern tools to stop the crimes being committed today. However, that is no reason to rush things to the point of not taking the time to hear certain witnesses.

I will give an example. The Privacy Commissioner came to testify before the committee. He spoke as though we already had his brief in hand. His brief contained amendments. There is a major problem with the translation service. It took two weeks to translate some of the briefs and provide them to the committee in both official languages. We did not receive them in a timely manner because the work wrapped up so quickly. We did not have the opportunity to review them or even invite certain witnesses.

In my opinion, the commissioner is a leading authority on privacy protection, because that is his mandate. We did not have the opportunity to ask him about his amendments because we did not have them in front of us.

• (1920)

However, he had submitted his brief a week in advance, and when he testified, no one had received it. We then asked the government if the commissioner could come back. What was happening was that department officials were completely dismantling all of the amendments proposed by the Privacy Commissioner. It is easy to understand why I was a little skeptical. I wondered if the commissioner and his team had really been that wrong.

Government Orders

We asked for unanimous consent for him to return, just to defend his amendments, which we had not had a chance to review, but the Liberals refused. There were plenty of small gestures the government members could have made to signal their openness. It would then have been justified for them to get all worked up over the Conservative filibuster, but honestly, I saw plenty of outstretched hands. There were proposals from the Bloc Québécois, the NDP and the Conservatives. They were all rejected out of hand.

I want to conclude by saying that I really enjoyed working with my colleagues. I learned a lot.

I also want to take the time I have left to thank the interpreters. I am a unilingual francophone. When I am in a committee meeting that starts at 3:30 p.m. and ends at midnight, it is hard for me. It is much easier with support from the interpreters. I want to thank all the interpreters who worked on the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security during its study of Bill C-22. We worked very hard, and they worked very hard too. Without them, my participation would not have been as meaningful.

[*English*]

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I truly appreciate the work ethic of my friend and colleague who sits with me on the public safety committee and the amount that she has studied this bill. We studied it in depth, and I appreciate her being thankful for all the staff who have done this work with us as well.

As we went through this very rushed process of pre-clause-by-clause, I think there were somewhere upward of 48 witnesses over just nine hours whom we sped through to try to study the bill. We had a hard time getting the briefs, as well, because it was rushed, and that created some problems. I asked for consent of the committee to bring the Privacy Commissioner in during clause-by-clause to help us. As we looked through the amendments, a lot of them he had suggested, we could not ask him questions very much during pre-clause-by-clause.

Could the member comment on what she thought the Liberals were doing when they blocked the Privacy Commissioner from coming?

• (1925)

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague. I appreciate her thoroughness a great deal. I spoke about that earlier. I ended my speech by saying that I would really have liked him to come back. I think that would have been a good thing for everyone, including members of the government.

From the start, however, I sensed that the dice were loaded and that we were basically marking time, because there was not a lot of interest. I am not blaming committee members; as I said, there are party lines and members sometimes do things that they would not have necessarily chosen to do.

However, I want to highlight that the Canadian Association of Journalists is concerned about this bill. It wonders whether journalistic sources, whistle-blowers and investigative journalists themselves could face threats. I find that disappointing, because I would have liked to have heard from the association's representatives and

to have explored these questions, which came to me after reading their brief. Unfortunately, we were unable to invite them because the study period was so short that it prevented us from hearing what they had to say.

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my young colleague on her speech, which I greatly appreciated. I know that she has worked extremely hard on this bill, as she does in everything that she undertakes. She did such a thorough and professional job, and I commend her for that.

In her speech, she spoke of the difficulties that Canada may face in sharing information with other countries, particularly the United Kingdom, England. Certain countries have a history of experiencing attacks, acts of terrorism and various threats that have led to the introduction of different types of measures.

I would like to ask my colleague whether she thinks that more flexibility is needed in terms of privacy protection in order to ensure public safety. Should we adopt security measures similar to those in some of these countries, such as having surveillance cameras on every street corner and greater tolerance for intrusions into personal data?

Should we uphold our principle of protecting personal information, or should we instead align ourselves more closely with countries that may have less regard for such matters when it comes to their citizens?

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his very wise question.

Like every country, we are facing cyber-attacks from foreign entities, particularly India and China. We need to ensure that we have robust tools, and Internet providers must do the same. The bill provides some protections and imposes cybersecurity protection requirements on telecommunications service providers. That is what we did with Bill C-8. It also requires important collaboration to support the work of law enforcement. We agree with that. It is one of the good things about the bill.

I have to admit that I agree with the government members, and I think that there is a consensus on that. There is nobody here who does not want to support law enforcement in their work and who does not want to give the police modern tools with which to carry out their duties, but it is hard to draw a line between ensuring public safety and ensuring some degree of privacy protection under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I thank my esteemed Bloc Québécois colleague for the hard work that she did at the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. I also had the opportunity to attend the meetings of that committee, but as an observer. I watched her work, and I completely agree with what she said this evening.

Government Orders

It is really strange to be rushing through such an important bill. Why does my colleague think that the government is forcing us to put such a rush on this bill that we could not even hear from witnesses?

• (1930)

Claude DeBellefeuille: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her kind words. I think she is brave, because she came during the clause-by-clause study, like my NDP colleague did. They did not have the right to speak, but they were there, hard-working and rigorous, and they proposed amendments. I have a lot of respect for these two members.

I think that the reason for the haste is pressure from the United States. That is speculation, I do not have the truth, but I think that there is this push coming from the United States so that we can share intelligence also. It is all well and good to share intelligence with Canada, but the other countries would like Canada to share some in return. We are under pressure from a country that has no concerns about privacy protection.

Obviously, I wish I had had more time to call witnesses I was unable to question. There are people who were not consulted by the government. Let me give an example. The chair of the National Security and Intelligence Review Agency was not consulted by the government when it drafted this bill. The chair was forced to submit proposed amendments herself because the government did not see any significant role for her to play. I was disappointed. During her testimony, the chair, Ms. Deschamps, recommended amendments to us, and we will likely deal with them during our clause-by-clause consideration.

[*English*]

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, I just want to acknowledge and thank my colleague as well.

I am not a regular attendee of the SECU committee. However, on Bill C-22 I listened to all the exchanges and debates. I have to say my colleague from the Bloc was superb in many of her interventions.

With respect to the amendments that were made, the NDP also moved an amendment related to the issue of “reasonable grounds to suspect” versus “reasonable grounds to believe”. However, the NDP amendment was defeated. The Bloc similarly moved an amendment in that regard, in accordance with the Quebec bar association. This was also an important issue that did not get support.

Could the member elaborate on the rationale behind the Liberals' objection to that important amendment?

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Madam Speaker, I would like to return the compliment to my colleague from Vancouver East. It has truly been a pleasure.

Yes, that is true. Together, often alongside the Conservatives, we tabled the same amendments, particularly regarding the threshold for obtaining information. We both believe that “reasonable grounds to suspect” is not a high enough threshold. Our political parties, along with the Conservative Party, are calling for a much higher threshold, namely “reasonable grounds to believe”.

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, I was at the committee meeting the day the Privacy Commissioner was there, along with other witnesses representing social media platforms. Before the meeting, all the witnesses indicated that they had submitted their briefs to the committee. However, members were not able to see them because they had not received them.

Did the member not find it frustrating that we did not receive the briefs before the meeting, not only from the Privacy Commissioner but also from the other witnesses?

• (1935)

Claude DeBellefeuille: It certainly did, Madam Speaker. I think even the Privacy Commissioner was disappointed that we did not have his brief or his amendment recommendations before us when he testified before the committee. Having that information would have allowed us to make better use of his presence right then and there by asking him more specific questions so that he could defend his amendments.

Madam Speaker, I think it was a mistake on the part of government members not to agree to invite him back so that we could give him another opportunity to defend his amendments, which, in my view and that of the New Democrats and the Conservatives, were very important.

[*English*]

Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been discussions amongst the parties, and if you seek it, I think you will find unanimous consent to adopt the following motion:

That, notwithstanding any Standing or Special Order or usual practice of the House, with respect to the consideration of Government Business No. 13:

(a) when no member rises to speak, all questions necessary to dispose of Government Business No. 13 be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment;

(b) if a recorded division is requested, it shall not be deferred and the bells to call in the members shall be sounded for not more than 30 minutes.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay.

There being no dissenting voice, it is agreed.

[*English*]

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

(Motion agreed to)

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, I rise to speak to this important moment regarding Bill C-22. Of course, the government has brought down the sledgehammer, the guillotine, to shut down debate.

Government Orders

Bill C-22 is a version of its predecessor, Bill C-2, the so-called strong borders act, which was an offensive, omnibus bill that was dead on arrival. It immediately generated widespread opposition from the public, with tens of thousands of people advocating against it. More than 300 civil society organizations, communities and legal experts soundly rejected the bill, and the government was forced to shelve it. Now, the government has decided to recklessly ram Bill C-22 through. Rather than take the time to listen carefully and hear concerns thoughtfully, the government is plowing ahead because it thinks it knows best. Its reputation for centralization, frankly, is well deserved.

Did the government take the time to listen to the Privacy Commissioner's perspective, or those of legal experts, civil liberty advocates or privacy rights experts on this legislation? I should note that the government did not even consult the Privacy Commissioner prior to tabling this legislation, so the short answer is that no, it did not.

This is a deeply flawed piece of legislation that is being rushed through in a haphazard and, frankly, unsettling fashion. Members of Parliament across all party lines have put forward amendments to Bill C-22, and there were a significant number of amendments tabled at committee.

The NDP put forward a large volume of amendments at committee to address legitimate concerns raised by experts and businesses alike. I will provide some examples. The NDP amendments aimed to ensure that Bill C-22 could withstand scrutiny under section 8 of the charter; to strengthen and clearly define "systemic vulnerability" to explicitly rule out any requirement that would weaken or break encryption, mandate client-side scanning, or otherwise introduce any security weaknesses; to anchor the definition of "electronic service provider" to a primary function test, ensuring obligations would apply only to entities whose core business is the conveyance of communications between persons; to address the concerns of threshold from the legal experts who have pointed out that Bill C-22's "reasonable grounds to suspect" threshold is unreasonably low, particularly given the Supreme Court of Canada's findings regarding high potential sensitivity of subscriber information. They wanted to see that language amended to "reasonable grounds to believe". The idea behind the amendment is to require a probability of crime rather than a mere suspicion before a citizen's movement can be mapped out or identifying logs can be demanded.

The NDP amendments also sought to replace ministerial secret orders with judicial warrants; to ensure warrants would remain targeted and would avoid broad or general searches to remote data, and mitigate charter and cross-border legal risks; to remove the requirement for broad long-term metadata retention mandates and to, instead, use targeted time-limited preservation orders for specific metadata when needed to reduce costs, security risks and section 8 charter violations. For context, the EU Court of Justice has repeatedly found general and indiscriminate retention of metadata to be incompatible with fundamental rights. I should note that the United States imposes no general mandatory data retention requirement.

Sadly, today, the NDP amendment that was debated and moved before the committee failed. The sheer volume of the amendments tabled by all parties at committee, I think, tells us something about the bill and how flawed the bill is.

• (1940)

Instead of giving us a chance to fully debate the amendments, the government rejected many that were put forward by opposition parties, and it is now choosing to use the closure guillotine with its new-found majority, from floor crossers, to ram the bill through without proper debate or scrutiny. Canadians will be appalled at the government's approach to pushing through the legislation.

If the government wants to have public policy that is durable, and that will meet the test of time, then it should take the time to do it properly in the first place. Instead, the government has moved full-throttle over its critics. This is a completely unsustainable way to run a government. Will the Liberal caucus just support this approach like a bunch of sheep, or will they call it out for what it is?

Bill C-22 would add sweeping new powers that would allow for any digital service provider to retain data on every single person in Canada, without cost. It would compel the redesign of digital systems in ways that would make Canadians more exposed, not more secure.

As the Canadian Civil Liberties Association rightfully pointed out in an open letter to the government, Bill C-22:

...could force the creation and installation of privacy-compromising surveillance tools and backdoors in an enormous and ill-defined set of "electronic service providers", including telecom providers, social media and cloud service providers, AI tools, and any "smart" device. The law could even be used to force Canadian companies to build backdoors into their products before they export them abroad. The result creates an untenable threat to privacy and cybersecurity....

According to the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, Bill C-22 represents one of the most significant expansion of state surveillance authority in Canada in years.

In the words of Tim McSorley from the International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group:

This legislation presents one of the greatest threats to privacy in Canada of the past two decades. Its provisions will weaken the rules governing police access to personal information, all while facilitating a vast expansion of government surveillance. This is another clear case of the decades-long trend of governments using national security as an excuse to erode civil liberties and human rights.... We are encouraging all members of parliament to oppose these new powers....

Matt Hatfield from Open Media states, "Bill C-22 is even more dangerous than the bill it replaces."

The Centre for Free Expression says that it is "an unprecedented and extraordinarily dangerous surveillance architecture".

Government Orders

The Citizen Lab said that the legislation could “weaken the rules governing police access to personal information, all while facilitating a vast expansion of government surveillance”. It goes on to say that the legislation is “enormous and poorly defined”.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce, representing nearly 200,000 businesses across the country, a network of over 400 chambers of commerce and boards of trade, said that it fundamentally opposes breaking encryption and other essential zero-knowledge security tools to provide the government and law enforcement with unfettered access to digital systems.

At a time when trust in digital governance, data security and state surveillance is already fragile, the government is bringing in legislation that would significantly change the relationship between individuals, private companies and the state. Basic due diligence when considering such sweeping changes to the privacy rights of Canadians is required, yet the government is in such a hurry to violate the civil liberties of Canadians that it did not even take the time to consult with the Privacy Commissioner. Why? Is it because the government is afraid that the Privacy Commissioner's analysis of the bill would have given the House the necessary non-partisan perspective on the implications on privacy?

Bill C-22 would expand police and intelligence access to personal information, reduce judicial oversight and introduce mechanisms that could require private companies to retain and expose sensitive user data on a systematic basis. This is not speculation. It is built into the structure of the bill.

● (1945)

The legislation contains two main components: timely access to data information and the supporting authorized access to information regime. Together, they would establish a framework that would allow government authorities to compel access to data from a wide range of electronic service providers far beyond traditional telecom companies.

Under Bill C-22, the Minister of Public Safety would be granted authority to issue secret orders requiring these providers to modify their systems to facilitate access to user information. These orders would not require judicial authorization. They would not be subject to public scrutiny and, in many cases, they might never be disclosed. Instead, they would be approved through an administrative process involving the intelligence commissioner. While that office plays an important role in oversight, it is not equivalent to independent judicial authorization in open court. It would not provide the same constitutional safeguard against unreasonable search and seizure. It would move us away from a warrant-based system rooted in charter protections and toward a model of executive-initiated access to private data.

That is not all. Bill C-22 would also introduce a second deeply concerning feature: compelled data retention. The bill would allow the government to require companies to retain metadata for up to one year on every single person in Canada or abroad. Metadata may not include the content of communications, but it reviews patterns of behaviour, who we talk to, when we talk to them, where we talk to them, how often we interact and for how long.

Why is the government looking over the shoulders of Canadians? In this digital era, metadata is often more revealing than content. It is a skeleton of a person's private life, damaging the privacy of millions, not because they are suspected of committing any crime or posing any security threat but because it might become useful in the future. This is a profound invasion of privacy. This is precisely what overreach is. The legislation would create democratic deficits by design and has features that are far more characteristic of a neo-authoritarian regime.

This is not an exaggeration. The government is continuing a backward slide into centralization. A government run by a former central banker is moving toward centralization, and it is the wrong direction.

We also need to address the risks created when governments require systemic access points or infrastructure modifications. When companies are forced to build mechanisms that enable easier state access to encrypted or private communications, those mechanisms do not remain confined to lawful use. They become vulnerabilities. We have seen this repeatedly. Systems designed for access become systems exploited by hackers, foreign intelligence services and malicious actors. As pointed out by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce:

[Encrypted zero-knowledge digital systems] would require technical measures that alter the security architecture of these systems, including changes to how encryption is implemented and managed. As a result, any requirement to facilitate this form of access would introduce systemic vulnerabilities by design, exposing both private and public sector systems to unacceptable cybersecurity risks and potential liability in the event of a breach. We need look no further back than the FINTRAC breach of 2024 or the Salt Typhoon attacks that same year which led the Canadian government to join a dozen governments in advising greater adoption of encryption, to truly appreciate the risk that our secured systems face on a daily basis.

Compounding these concerns is the increased potential for cross-border data exposure. Bill C-22 would open pathways for information sharing with foreign governments, including jurisdictions where civil liberty protections are weakening and surveillance powers are expanding, some with a history of abusing cross-border police authorities to persecute diaspora communities.

Concerns do not stop there. Canada may also be implicated in transnational repression. At a time when digital rights and due process protections are under strain internationally, expanding these channels raises serious concerns about accountability and misuse of Canadian-held data.

Government Orders

We must also be honest about the historical context of surveillance in the country. It is not theoretical to say that expanded surveillance powers have, in the past, been used disproportionately against activists, organizers, journalists and communities advocating for social and political change.

• (1950)

Oversight bodies have repeatedly documented concerns about intelligence gathering that extends beyond legitimate criminal investigation. We need to look no further than the RCMP surveilling and actively undermining indigenous activists and movements, as the recent news from a few months ago revealed with the release of documents. When surveillance powers expand, they rarely remain confined to their original intent. They expand in scope, in use and in impact.

This brings us to an important point about precedent. What we are seeing is an expansion of surveillance powers that were previously rejected due to legitimate concerns about privacy, proportionality and charter compliance. At a time when global political conditions are unstable and civil liberty protections in some jurisdictions are eroding, Canada should be strengthening privacy protections, not weakening them. The government may argue that these powers are necessary for public safety and effective law enforcement, but necessity must be demonstrated, not assumed, and proportionality must be proven, not implied. We do not need to choose between security and privacy. This is a false choice. Effective policing and intelligence work can and should operate within robust legal frameworks that preserve judicial oversight and limit data collection to what is strictly necessary.

Bill C-22 fails that task. It lowers thresholds for access to personal information. It expands executive authority over digital infrastructure. It mandates or enables large-scale data retention and increases systemic exposure of private communications to risk. Businesses are considering withdrawing services from Canada should Bill C-22 be implemented. For these reasons, this legislation should not proceed in its current form. If not withdrawn and sent back to the drawing board, at minimum, it requires substantial amendments, such as restoration of judicial authorization for access orders, strict limitation of data retention powers, removal of secret system modification orders and clear prohibition of infrastructure changes that compromise encryption or system integrity. A clear understanding of the implications of system vulnerabilities needs to be incorporated with amendments to the bill to ensure those vulnerabilities do not put Canadians at further risk. Absent those kinds of changes and more, Bill C-22 represents a significant step backward for privacy rights and constitutional protections in Canada.

This is not what Canadians want, I do not believe, from a Liberal government. The question before us is whether we are willing to accept a shift towards generalized surveillance infrastructure as the default condition of digital life in Canada. I am not, nor are my constituents in Vancouver East, so I urge the House to reject this path. We still have a chance. I want to be surprised. I want to be shocked. I want to see the government members not just roll over and do what they are told. We heard from other members in the House earlier who say there were not even robust, meaningful and fulsome discussions at committee with witnesses. Witnesses were

not able to attend committee. Briefs were not transcribed or provided.

This cannot be a path forward, because the structural changes are so significant and impactful for Canadians that we cannot afford to get it wrong. Let us take the time to do it right. I urge all members of the House to do what is important and what is right for Canadians. I urge them to not just follow the orders of what the government whip tells them to do but to do what civil society organizations, advocates and experts tell them must be done. They must examine these issues with their own mind and make that determination. I urge members to do that.

• (1955)

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for that very passionate speech. As opposition members, we propose to improve these types of bills with amendments. The Liberals characterize these amendments at committee stage as obstructions, yet all we are trying to do is make the bills better.

Could the member tell us if there are amendments that can be implemented to achieve the objectives while still protecting privacy and civil rights?

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, the NDP submitted dozens of amendments. I believe that those amendments, along with some from other parties, would achieve that goal to develop proportionality and bring some balance to this legislation. The amendments would not fix everything, but they would be a good start for the government to adopt opposition member amendments, and not just go forward with government or Liberal member amendments. That is the track record so far with what has happened at committee, and I think it is the wrong track.

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague mentioned that we have not consulted with the Privacy Commissioner. I want to mention that this is the wrong information, and I believe that my colleague was misinformed before her speech. The Privacy Commissioner said at the committee, "I would not say that we were not consulted in this instance. We made a number of recommendations. A number of them were taken and I've highlighted those improvements". He said that during his witness testimony. I would also like to highlight that the government did its due diligence by getting the Privacy Commissioner's input for that bill.

Government Orders

I also want to mention that, as a Liberal member on the committee, we would like to work with the opposition party members to improve the bill and work on the amendments. However, we heard 10 hours of witness testimonies, plus three hours with the officials. We had over 40 briefs and lots of witnesses on that study. Filibustering, unfortunately, is not allowing us to move on the amendments. The amendments are on the table. We would like to continue with the amendments and working on them, but the Conservatives are not allowing us to.

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, the Privacy Commissioner actually appeared as a witness at the committee and offered suggestions. I also contacted the Privacy Commissioner after Bill C-22 was tabled and asked whether they had any comments about the bill. They provided comments on C-2, which the government took into consideration. However, I think that there is much work to be done. I wonder why the government rejected the motion that was tabled by committee members to bring the Privacy Commissioner back to committee to ensure questions were answered by the Privacy Commissioner as the committee went through clause-by-clause. That was rejected by the Liberals.

To the member's point about the filibustering, I went to committee and watched what was going on. What happened was members were asking legitimate questions and then there was a motion to split the bill, by the Conservatives, into part one and part two. The Liberals rejected it. I then observed that the filibustering started to happen. It is a tool. When members get frustrated with the government's approach, they use that as a tool to send a message to the government that it cannot run roughshod when trying to make laws. That was the message, I believe, the members were trying to send.

• (2000)

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): Madam Speaker, earlier in debate tonight, we heard from the Liberal side of the House suggesting that anybody who was opposed to Bill C-22 was fearmongering and spreading misinformation. However, the very rational debate coming from the member for Vancouver East would suggest otherwise.

Also, I am reading a Global News story that says that social media platforms, satellite companies and telecommunication companies will consider leaving Canada if and when Bill C-22 passes because they are afraid they are not going to be able to maintain their customers' privacy, something that they are committed to doing. The secondary concern of these companies seems to be the additional cost of having to maintain digital information for a long period of time.

Can the member for Vancouver East comment on those very rational concerns?

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, it is very unusual for me, as a New Democrat, to agree with the Conservatives. On this bill, the Conservatives, the NDP, the Greens and the Bloc are all offering the same voice. What message does that send to the government? I think the message is that the government got it wrong.

To the member's question about businesses being worried, yes, some of them have indicated to me that they would actually leave Canada should Bill C-22 proceed because it would put their companies in jeopardy on the privacy protections for their customers.

Equally to the point, it would put them in a liability situation should there be a breach. The backdoor mechanism would create a breach that could actually violate people's privacy and put those companies in a liability situation. Once the cat is out of the bag, we cannot put it back in. That is why we cannot ram through this bill.

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for what I thought was a very thoughtful speech on a very concerning bill. It is not just the NDP or Conservatives who are concerned, but civil liberty organizations and other stakeholders. The Privacy Commissioner himself has significant concerns about the privacy aspects of this legislation.

Earlier today, Conservatives moved an amendment to separate the bill into Bill C-22A and Bill C-22B. By doing that, we could work with and allow the police the tools they need for investigations of serious crimes and other matters, but it would also put on pause the ultimate concern of this bill, which is part 2, and allow the Privacy Commissioner and others to come back in further reflection on this bill.

Does the hon. member agree with the amendment that we put forward?

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, I appreciate what the Conservatives are trying to do, which is to bring more debate on part 2 of the bill. However, the premise of the amendment is still framed in terms of bringing in closure on debate. That is what I am challenged with. I do not think we should be bringing in closure to any parts of this bill. The two parts go hand in hand and are important, so we should take the time to do the work.

This is what I am urging all members to do, take the time to do it right, because it is significant in terms of the changes for Canadians and for us as a country, as a whole.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I am in the same position as the member for Vancouver East in having a deep concern about this bill. This has not come up in the debate, but just to clarify, even though we have the fiction that committees are the masters of their own process, every PMO since Stephen Harper's has insisted that members of Parliament from parties that do not have 12 members are given 24 hours' notice to come up with amendments and then their amendments are deemed to have been moved, but we are not allowed to speak to the bill much, question witnesses ever or even vote on our own amendments. We are in the same boat, but we have both observed what has been going on at the public safety committee. Rather than repeat everything the member just said, I will say that I observed the same things.

Government Orders

As a member who has been here for the last 10 years, has she ever seen anything like starting with Bill C-2, going to Bill C-12 and then going to Bill C-22 and, at every stage, ignoring the concerns about the overreach?

● (2005)

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, I have been a parliamentarian in this House for 10 years, and prior to that provincially for 19 years. I have never seen a government embark on this kind of process in such an aggressive way, setting aside the basic rights, civil liberties and privacy rights of Canadians, setting aside valid legal experts' concerns, civil liberty advocates' concerns, privacy experts' concerns and a whole host of community concerns. This is from a Liberal government that pretends to listen to people, but what I have witnessed in the last two weeks with the volume of programming motions the government is bringing forward to ram things through on significant bills, such as Bill C-22, is unprecedented. I have never seen anything like it.

It is not a democratic government. It is an authoritarian government wielding its majority, not through legitimacy and democracy but through floor-crossers.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Richmond Centre—Marpole.

I have been a member for just over a year, 12 or 14 months, and I think I am more disappointed this week than I have been in my entire time in the House. I am not only disappointed on behalf of my neighbours in Oshawa, but disappointed on behalf of all Canadians, who believe they sent us here for democracy and for freedom and to be able to represent them in the House.

What we are witnessing today from the Liberal government is quite alarming, as members from the Bloc, members from the NDP and the Green Party member have also said. It is shocking, quite frankly, that all four opposition parties are in line on this. The other shocking piece is that we even had some identical amendments that came forward, which was quite amazing. I find the Liberal government's response, both in committee and in the House, to be very arrogant and dismissive of the process that we have in the House for a reason.

The Liberal programming motion is not only about Bill C-22, which is of course the Liberal government's lawful access bill, but it is also about whether Parliament is still allowed to do its job. Over the last several weeks, I have spent countless hours studying this bill, both on my own and in the public safety committee. I had to add time on my own because of the rushed nature of the witness testimony and because the stage of study for this bill was like nothing I have ever seen before.

I think we saw a minimum of 48 witnesses in just eight hours. We could not possibly get all our questions in. Several times, witnesses from multiple organizations were there in one hour. We had to pick and choose whom to ask questions when we needed to ask questions of all of them. Often, we would get only two rounds of questions in that hour because of all sorts of different reasons. I did not get to ask any questions of the Privacy Commissioner because of that in the short time he was there. In fact, it was the hour the Privacy Commissioner was there when we had only two rounds of questions.

Every question we asked at clause-by-clause was relevant to the importance of this bill and the understanding of it. There has been a lot of hard work put into dozens and dozens of amendments. I think the public safety minister mentioned in a press conference that there were about 100 amendments. That says something. Work has been done.

I appreciated the Bloc member from the committee mentioning the staff who worked on studying this bill. The staff in our offices put countless hours into helping us. They have been studying this bill and doing lots and lots of research. We are doing it from a place of really wanting to understand this and do it right, not just do it fast.

It has been so rushed. It has been mentioned that briefs did not get to us until well after the witnesses were there. They spoke about the briefs, and we said, "What briefs?" We had not seen these briefs. Earlier in some heckling, I heard the Liberals blaming the clerk because we did not get the briefs in time, but, quite frankly, the real reason we did not get them in time was the rushed nature of this and the way the Liberal government has been pushing it through.

Conservatives have been clear from the beginning: We support giving police the tools they need to pursue terrorists, child predators, organized crime networks and cybercriminals. With proper judicial authorization, law enforcement should be able to obtain lawful access to necessary and relevant evidence when investigating serious crimes.

What we cannot support is the idea that Parliament should simply rubber-stamp legislation without proper scrutiny. That is exactly what this motion seeks to do. Right now, there are over 100 proposed amendments to Bill C-22, which I just mentioned. We have been able to debate only a small number so far. However, because of this motion proposed by the government, the Liberals are effectively saying they do not want Parliament to finish the work and take the time it needs to get this legislation right.

● (2010)

If committee members cannot complete clause-by-clause consideration within the government's imposed timeline, the remaining amendments would simply be deemed moved and we would be voting on them, so the truth is that not only would we not get to move and debate each amendment and possibly make subamendments, but Canadians would not be able to see what those amendments are until they have already been voted on. The secrecy of that alone should alarm Canadians. That should concern every member of the House.

What troubles me most is that the Liberal government continues to talk about trust. At the committee, the public safety minister agreed with me when I told him that public trust is important and essential, especially on matters such as these, but trust is not built by cutting off debate. Trust is not built by limiting scrutiny, and it is not built by using a manufactured majority to silence opposition voices. Trust is earned through transparency. It is earned through accountability, and it is earned by allowing Parliament to do its job.

I think the member for Winnipeg North said Bill C-22 is “sound” legislation. If it is so sound, it should be able to withstand scrutiny. It should be able to withstand amendments, and perhaps subamendments. We should be able to debate those in good faith, and the bill should be able to withstand said debate. In my view, the motion that the Liberals have brought today with Government Business No. 13, to cut off debate and ram the bill through committee and through Parliament, moved by the Liberal public safety minister and the Liberal government, is an admission that the bill is so flawed that it cannot possibly withstand debate and scrutiny. I think the Liberals are afraid to answer the questions.

As members of His Majesty's loyal opposition, our job is not to rubber-stamp government legislation. Our job is to ask the tough questions, even if we might agree with aspects of the legislation before us. Our job is to identify problems, as well as anticipate future consequences, and our job is to ensure that Canadians understand what is being done in their name. That responsibility does not disappear simply because the government wants a bill passed before summer. That would be irresponsible.

That is why we are trying. Our amendment to the motion even is reasonable: to split the bill, pass what we can agree on and do this right. Canadians expect us to do our homework, to read the fine print and to identify problems before legislation becomes law, not after. Most of all, Canadians expect Parliament to function as more than a government approval machine. Governments come and go, and majorities come and go, but the precedents and intentions we set in the House matter. When governments normalize cutting off scrutiny whenever it becomes inconvenient, Parliament becomes weak. When committees are prevented from completing their work, accountability becomes weaker. When opposition voices are treated as obstacles and obstruction, rather than participants in democracy, Canadians lose confidence in their institutions. That should concern us all.

The motion asks Parliament to move faster, but when legislation affects Canadians' privacy, freedoms and rights, speed should never come at the expense of scrutiny. Getting legislation passed quickly is easy; getting legislation passed right is the hard part. That is the job Canadians sent us here to do, and Conservatives will stand in the House every day, fight for the job that we are here to do and protect Canadians' rights.

● (2015)

Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon South, CPC): Madam Speaker, one year in, the member for Oshawa has done a lot of work on the public safety committee. I just want to state again, on our amendment, that we agree with the government on part 1, which would be Bill C-22A. We have also heard from police all over this country that they need the tools. However, the privacy issue is what we are debating here tonight. Bill C-22B would be on the privacy issue. I sit

Government Orders

on the heritage committee, and we had the same thing with the government this week when it threw up Bill C-34. That is also a privacy issue we are going to have to deal with when it comes back in the fall.

To the hon. member for Oshawa, let us talk about part 2, because that is the hill we are going to die on. We need this amendment tonight for Bill C-22B.

Rhonda Kirkland: Madam Speaker, I appreciate that very much, because that is exactly the kind of collaboration that is the correct collaboration in the House.

The Liberals' version of collaboration, with all due respect, is that we should say, “Yes, yes” to everything they say, without any debate and without any scrutiny, and say, “Please, just do whatever you want.” That is unacceptable.

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.): Madam Speaker, I know the member. She and I share a border, being from Oshawa and Durham region, respectively.

I know that our chief of police and the Durham Regional Police Service have been asking for lawful access. This is a tool that our government was elected to give police officers, police forces and law enforcement agencies across Canada to be able to do the investigative work they need to do.

If the member opposite is truly tough on crime and listens to our police force and law enforcement, then what I want to say is that obstruction is not the same as scrutiny. What we have seen from the Conservative Party is obstruction. I witnessed it on the finance committee just last week, with 25 hours of time wasted, only to be told that it was really about another bill in another committee. The Conservatives held us hostage for ransom.

If the member opposite was so concerned about time for debate, then what does she have to say about the waste of time that her colleagues have perpetrated in other committees?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Order.

The hon. member for Oshawa has the floor.

Rhonda Kirkland: Madam Speaker, it is true: I do share a border with the member. I would argue that common sense ends at that border.

Government Orders

Quite frankly, Durham Regional Police Service and Durham Regional Police Association know that I stand with them. I have spoken to them about the bill, and I have been very clear about my stand on it. I want them to have the tools they need, but I do not want them to have this at the expense of the privacy rights or the charter rights of Canadians. Every officer I spoke to agreed with me. They want it, but not at the expense of privacy.

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member for Whitby heckled that democracy is a waste of time. This is the prevailing attitude of the Liberal government. It is interesting to hear this—

● (2020)

Ryan Turnbull: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, that is not what I said. With all due respect to the member, whom I greatly respect—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): That is debate, and we are not going to enter into debate.

John Brassard: Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Oshawa does not even know this yet, but there is breaking news that the Liberal government is actually standing down on some of the contentious parts of the bill, namely the retention of records. They are talking about reducing it from one year to six months now. There are other things they are talking about with respect to adjusting this piece of legislation.

Again, like everything else they do, is this not an admission of failure that the bill is completely flawed?

Rhonda Kirkland: Madam Speaker, yes, it is an admission of failure. If the government cannot allow its legislation to go through the process of study and clause-by-clause without cancelling it, that is the strongest admission of failure. In fact, it is such an admission of failure that it cannot allow more scrutiny.

The court of public opinion is speaking up as well, and quite frankly, they are against what is going on, because they are being attacked.

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise today to express serious concerns with part 2 of Bill C-22 and to oppose the motion in Government Business No. 13. Let me be clear from the outset: Conservatives believe that law enforcement must have modern tools to combat organized crime, fentanyl trafficking, child exploitation, terrorism and foreign interference in a digital age. These types of rampant criminality cannot go unattended.

That is why Conservatives have taken a constructive approach to Bill C-22 and have indicated that we are prepared to support part 1 of the bill, subject to several changes, clarifications and amendments, even though we recognize that part 1 is not perfect. In fact, Conservatives have repeatedly proposed at committee that the bill should be split, allowing part 1 to proceed, while part 2 undergoes more thorough study and scrutiny.

Part 2 would create an entirely new framework governing electronic service providers and compelled assistance. It is this portion of the legislation that has attracted substantial criticism from privacy experts, constitutional experts, technology companies and civil

liberties organizations. If the government believes those concerns are unfounded, then it should welcome scrutiny, not shut it down.

When legislation grants new surveillance powers, expands access to personal information and creates new obligations for communication providers, Parliament has a duty to scrutinize those powers carefully, deliberately and transparently. That duty becomes even more important when respected legal, privacy, constitutional and technology experts continue to warn that significant concerns remain unresolved. However, instead of allowing Parliament to complete that scrutiny, the Liberal government has brought forward the motion to force this legislation through before Parliament has properly completed its work. That is precisely backwards.

When respected experts continue to identify unresolved concerns, Parliament's responsibility is to examine those concerns, not to declare that the discussion is over. Throughout committee consideration of Bill C-22, witness after witness identified concerns regarding privacy protections, judicial oversight, transparency and the impact on personal and business communications.

The Office of the Privacy Commissioner has stated that amendments remain necessary to strengthen privacy protections within the legislation. That alone should give Parliament pause before debate is cut short. The Privacy Commissioner was denied the opportunity to appear during clause-by-clause consideration, by Liberal members at the public safety and national security committee, despite being Canada's foremost independent authority on privacy rights.

The Canadian Bar Association has also raised concerns regarding the legislation. In its submission on Bill C-22, it warned that certain provisions expand state powers while reducing traditional safeguards and questioned whether the government had adequately demonstrated the necessity and proportionality of some of the measures being proposed. Those concerns deserve answers before debate is terminated.

The Canadian Civil Liberties Association has seemingly warned that aspects of Bill C-22 raise significant constitutional and civil liberties concerns. It has argued that broad surveillance powers require proportionally strong safeguards, oversight and accountability measures. That principle should not be controversial. Throughout Canadian history, Parliament has recognized that extraordinary powers must be accompanied by extraordinary safeguards. Canadians expect no less.

Government Orders

Researchers from The Citizen Lab at the University of Toronto have also raised concerns regarding the scope and operation of certain powers contained in Bill C-22. The Citizen Lab is internationally recognized as one of the world's leading research institutes on digital surveillance, cybersecurity and human rights. Its work has been cited by governments, courts, journalists and academics around the world. When researchers of that calibre identify concerns with surveillance legislation, Parliament should carefully examine those concerns rather than rush the bill through the legislative process.

• (2025)

Even major technology companies and communications providers have expressed important concerns about the legislation. Their concerns are not about avoiding the law; they relate to whether legislation intended to improve public safety could inadvertently weaken cybersecurity, undermine encryption or create new vulnerabilities for law-abiding Canadians. Canadians deserve confidence that legislation intended to improve public safety would not inadvertently compromise digital security. This is where Government Business No. 13 becomes especially troubling.

The government is effectively asking Parliament to conclude that the debate is finished, but the debate is not finished. In fact, it has barely begun. The Minister of Public Safety has changed his position on part 2. He began by resisting amendments, but after hearing the extensive evidence provided by the opposition and expert witnesses on why part 2 required amendments, he agreed that changes were necessary. However, by shutting down further clause-by-clause debate before we have even begun considering part 2, the government would be using the motion to effectively prevent the very amendments that the minister himself has acknowledged are necessary.

With the proposed shutting down of further clause-by-clause debate, experts, industry and parliamentarians continue to raise concerns. The Liberal government is free to disagree with those concerns, but disagreement is not justification for shutting down parliamentary scrutiny. The purpose of Parliament is not to rubber-stamp legislation but to democratically challenge assumptions, test arguments, identify flaws and improve laws before they affect millions of Canadians. Government Business No. 13 would disregard democratic process and parliamentary responsibility.

The Liberal government argues that the legislation is urgently needed because Canada has fallen behind in modernizing lawful-access authorities. The Liberal government has a long history of asking for extraordinary powers in the name of urgency. Parliament's responsibility is to determine whether those powers are truly necessary, proportionate and accountable, before they are granted, not after they have already been exercised. This is where scrutiny matters the most.

Conservatives believe that Canadians deserve both security and freedom. Canadians can have effective law enforcement while safeguarding the constitutional rights that define our democracy. Public trust is essential, and it is strengthened when security measures are carefully designed, properly supervised and transparently justified. Public trust is weakened when governments appear eager to curtail

debate before legitimate and constitutional concerns have been addressed.

• (2030)

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I enjoy working with my colleague at committee, as well as with my colleague from Oshawa, who also expressed concern about not having enough time to ask questions at committee.

With respect, every member of the committee has the same time allocated. I have difficulty understanding why, while most of the other members of the committee could ask questions, the member was not able to. It is all about using our time wisely, I think. It is like someone's complaining about the distance they cannot go, when they have waited at the station too long. That was my concern. I am trying to understand how they could not use the time wisely and why they filibustered their own witnesses.

Chak Au: Madam Speaker, with a bill that is so complex and complicated, we need time to understand it thoroughly and assess each portion of the bill so that we can address the concerns being raised and the questions being asked by the public and by professionals. I want to ask whether the member on the other side agrees that it is not democratic that we had not even had the chance to start debating clause-by-clause on part 2, and the government chose to shut down the discussion.

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.): Madam Speaker, my understanding is that the components of Bill C-22 were in a previous bill that was debated in committee and studied, just as Bill C-22 was, which was also studied for at least eight or nine hours in committee.

As I have mentioned in the House today, I have not gotten one clear answer from any Conservative on why they chose to filibuster a spring economic update implementation act, Bill C-30, which includes key economic measures, at a time when Canadians need the tax deductions and the support.

Why would the Conservatives hold up progress on the economy to block a bill that would give police officers and law enforcement agencies the tools they have been asking for to crack down on organized crime? It does not make any sense to me. Maybe the member can enlighten me.

Chak Au: Madam Chair, I have to point out that we cannot replace necessity with convenience. It may be convenient for the government to shut down debate in the name of urgency or in the name of saving time. As I mentioned, with a bill that is so complex and sometimes difficult to understand thoroughly, we need the time to do thorough work. It is necessary. It is not just for the sake of convenience that we shut it down.

Government Orders

I also want to point out that someone made a very interesting observation, which was that the Conservatives, the Bloc, the NDP and the Green Party, all parties that are very different on the political spectrum, are united in opposing Bill C-22. That is rare. With that kind of a situation, it is obvious that something is wrong. In this case, the Liberal government is wrong.

Scott Anderson (Vernon—Lake Country—Monashee, CPC): Madam Speaker, this is one of the deepest debates in Canadian politics, between the rights and freedoms of citizens on one hand and the powers of government on the other hand. I wonder if my colleague could speculate on why the Liberals want to shut down debate like this, so pre-emptively.

• (2035)

Chak Au: Madam Speaker, the government is known for its intention, its seeking of power and its expansion of its power. Therefore, I suppose that through shutting down this debate, the government wants to have more power, and it wants to do what it wants to do without really caring about the different views being expressed by the public and by professionals.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I am rising at this hour to speak to the programming motion on Bill C-22.

I have heard the speeches of a number of colleagues in this place with whom I agree, particularly my colleagues from the Bloc Québécois and the New Democratic Party.

As I explained earlier, in an answer to an earlier discussion with the hon. member for Vancouver East, the position we were in was not as members of the committee but as members of Parliament with the right to participate in the development of amendments. As we were not full members of the committee, our participation in the public safety committee, and when I speak of “we”, I mean the member for Vancouver East and me, was more limited than that of members who are full members of the committee.

I have been very concerned, from the very beginning, which was June 2025's tabling of Bill C-2, the so-called strong borders act, there was an astonishing, broad, deep coalition of groups, over 300, that came together to oppose the bill on many grounds relating to human rights, as well as to privacy and overreach. Again, I just want to preface my discussion of Bill C-22 by placing it, for citizens watching this, in the context of how we moved away from Bill C-2, the strong borders act, which was strongly opposed, in June 2025. I do not think I have ever seen quite a diverse coalition. Certainly there are some bills that invite a lot of organizations to get involved and individual citizens to get involved. There was a breadth and a depth here that was certainly unusual.

The government realized it was in trouble. There was so much opposition to Bill C-2. When we came back in the fall, I thought to myself that the bill, over the course of the summer, had been dumped and replaced as we now had Bill C-12. It is not a completely different bill. It is largely the same chunks of language that were in the strong borders act, Bill C-2, taking out the parts that were an overreach into privacy, for instance, the sections originally in Bill C-2 that said that postal workers could open the mail and such things. There were a number of examples that got dropped.

The thing that is unusual about this, and I know it is complicated and I know the hour is late, but why would a government introduce a bill, which is widely panned, and then bring in a different bill, as opposed to amending the bill it already had on the Order Paper? I have not seen this before. It then brought in Bill C-12, which had most of what was in the strong borders act, and left Bill C-2 on the Order Paper while continuing to force through Bill C-12.

Time will tell when Bill C-12 will be challenged in the courts globally because it violates our charter commitments to the protection of refugee rights. I speak of that in terms of the global convention on refugees. It may also offend the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, but I am speaking globally. It pulled that protection out from under people who had expectations. They had expectations of being in Canada but did not know their access to claiming refugee rights would be taken away so abruptly.

In any case, this has been bizarre. We had Bill C-2 staying on the Order Paper, and we had Bill C-12, which was largely language from Bill C-2, being pushed through.

The whole time we were thinking that at least we had avoided the surveillance concerns, the privacy concerns and the overreach concerns that were evident in the original Bill C-2, the strong borders act, but come March 12, 2026, we had the bill that is before us tonight, Bill C-22. Again, it is the government's, at this point, third run at crafting a bill that deals with lawful access.

I will give them this: Bill C-12 actually avoided the lawful access sections and just focused on the portions that affected refugee rights. That one still grieves me, the fact that we had Bill C-12 pushed through to final stages on a unanimous consent motion in this place last June. I really still regret it very much that it was pushed through. This is a phrase we will hear from the opposition members tonight, and we have it heard it often: pushed through, rushed through.

• (2040)

This is not hyperbole from opposition members. I am an experienced member of Parliament. I have been here 15 years, and I am honoured to have been so, but to my hon. colleagues in the government party on the other benches, it has been a shock to see how often we see these things. When mistakes are identified, previous governments have been more willing to say, “Ah, we have a mistake and we are going to have to rethink this. This is a mistake, and we are going to amend the bill. We are going to say where we made the mistake and how we are going to change it.” The government is quite unusual in not admitting mistakes, but it will bring in a different bill that does some of the same things. In this case, it is taking its third run at it.

Government Orders

This lawful access regime has many improvements over the lawful access regime of Bill C-2. There is no question and no doubt. There have been significant changes, and I think every group that was in the original coalition opposing Bill C-2 has said that Bill C-22 is much better. We have fewer problems with it, but there are still very serious problems, which is why it is lamentable that we were not able to have the kind of conversation one would have with a government that was more comfortable in its skin to say that it made a mistake with Bill C-2. Such a government would say, "We pushed too hard, too far, too fast. Now we are going to listen to people. As we craft a lawful access regime, we are going to really listen and we are not going to assume we have it right because we are right, or because we have the majority, so we are right." This has been very difficult to observe.

Certainly, in committee, I have to say that I was surprised. I was taken aback when a reasonable request to have before the public safety committee the Privacy Commissioner, who had raised concerns, was rejected. We had a lot of witnesses there who represented government agencies and law enforcement to provide technical background. I try to be as non-partisan as possible, but I could not see any problem with getting the expertise of the Privacy Commissioner in the room as members were discussing and debating the impact of Bill C-22 and whether some amendments should work and how they should work, but the idea that the Privacy Commissioner should be in the room was rejected. I could not see, in any world, where that would not have been seen as helpful, but it was rejected.

I had some amendments before the committee. We will get to them later this evening. I do not think it is anything but a foregone conclusion that the motion before us is going to pass, but I lament that we have seen the government, and it is a pattern, moving very fast and passing legislation despite significant concerns from significant quarters.

A significant number of respected law professors and experts in privacy law and constitutional law wrote, as recently as last month, to most of the cabinet to express their deep concerns about Bill C-22. I think it is important to say that people are not just partisan here. Certainly law professors are not, and they acknowledge that they see the improvement over Bill C-2 in a number of areas. I will read from the letter, which was signed by 20 or 30 law professors from across Canada, and it is dated May 4, so anyone who is looking for it can find it. It reads:

We write as lawyers and law professors who teach and practice in the areas of privacy law and constitutional rights...

I will skip ahead to their conclusion, which reads:

...provisions of the bill as currently drafted raise serious constitutional concerns and fail to strike a reasonable balance between the legitimate needs of law enforcement and the privacy rights of Canadians.

Again, these are not the voices of people who have been misinformed through social media. These are people of depth, knowledge and experience, and they are very concerned.

One of Canada's premier policy wonk magazines is *Policy Options*, and I do not speak of it pejoratively here. *Policy Options* is not something one would pick up in the supermarket, such as "inquiring minds want to know". *Policy Options* is serious.

• (2045)

There was an article just yesterday by Professor Cynthia Khoo, who is a professor at University of Toronto and a senior fellow at The Citizen Lab at the University of Toronto. She is an expert in both technology and privacy areas. Her conclusion was that "Ottawa should reject any data-sharing arrangement that allows U.S. law enforcement to access Canadians' personal information". This is based on recent research within The Citizen Lab that the regime for surveillance being established by Bill C-22 could provide easy access for, for instance, U.S. homeland security to the private information of Canadians.

I know the government benches have heard, and do not want to hear anything more, from Professor Michael Geist, who is, again, a prominent critic of Bill C-22, starting with his opposition to Bill C-2. He pointed out that what he sees being spread by the government benches could be described as misinformation, mischaracterization, overly broad definitions and a failure to be precise in areas where one really has to be precise.

I am just going to quote from a blog he posted recently: "The political pressure against Bill C-22 has been steadily mounting, with the opposition parties," as we can see, all the opposition parties in this place, "tech companies, and privacy experts, all increasingly" concerned about the need to amend this bill, increasingly concerned that all the government seems to have in response to the criticisms are, in his words, "misleading or inaccurate claims with little in the way of an actual defence" based on the facts. His conclusion is that "the government's disregard for facts and privacy is fast becoming Bill C-22's legacy."

Now, the criticisms come, again, from a broad sweep of legal, privacy and tech experts. They are not all the same. I practised law, and technology is not my area. I would not put myself out there as an expert in technology, though I read deeply. I am concerned about constitutional rights and privacy as a former practising lawyer, but it would seem to me that anyone with a background in the various areas that are touched by Bill C-22 would want to take the time to get it right.

Government Orders

There have been things claimed, like that all our Five Eyes partners have legislation just like Bill C-22. That has been debunked by numerous experts. We have been told that it was wrong to take a long time in committee. Obviously, as my hon. colleague on the other side the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance knows well, we had a very lengthy filibuster on Bill C-30 in the finance committee. I sat through those evenings waiting for the chance to speak to my amendments.

As I mentioned earlier, motions are passed by committees as if they are normal, and they are not normal at all, but the longer they are used, I guess, the more that future committees will just assume, as every committee did after this last election, that it is just normal to take away the rights of the smaller parties so that the larger parties do not have to fuss with them at report stage. That is the case. If it were not for the motions that were passed by committees, without thinking about them, taking away the rights of smaller parties, I would have the right to put forward amendments at report stage. I do not have that right at report stage only because I have been given this so-called opportunity to work really, really hard to bring forward amendments that give me the ability to sit in a room and not speak for days at a time, hoping for the chance to speak to the one or two amendments that I had brought forward.

I want to thank my hon. colleague from Vancouver East, from the New Democratic Party, because she is in the same boat and she brought forward many more amendments to Bill C-22 than I brought forward on Bill C-22. I think I was too busy trying to write amendments on Bill C-30.

In any case, what we have here is not just an imperfect bill but a potentially dangerous bill. We are now down to the final moments. The clock is ticking, and the words of experts from across Canada are being shut out because the government has determined it will move forward with Bill C-22. That is why we have a programming motion, to make sure that we do not have any further debate on the amendments that have been put forward by members of the Conservative Party, the Bloc Québécois, the Greens and the New Democrats. We are in a hurry.

● (2050)

Again, I have to push back and ask why. What is the hurry? What is the rush? As a reminder, the first attempt the government made to bring forward lawful access was in the very outrageously overreaching Bill C-2 a year ago. A year has passed. One would have hoped that year would have been used well by allowing a real discussion and continually striving to have the best possible surveillance architecture to protect privacy, to give law enforcement what it needs, without tests of access that are so low, the reasonable grounds to suspect, which we do not think the courts will find to have been an adequate ground to seize personal information.

We are hearing concerns, again, from tech companies, constitutional and privacy law experts, those who work in the field and others, like OpenMedia. I am honoured to claim that the executive director of OpenMedia happens to be one of my constituents, so I also speak on behalf of my constituents when I stand here at this hour. We are hearing concerns, yet those voices seem to have just gotten annoying to the members of the government. They do not

seem to be concerned, despite all the work and the full year that has gone by, that we could get this right.

Again, we hear that we have run out of time. Well, we have not. I do not think any of us are going to expire in any particular moment. We could meet next week. We could get together again and have more time for witnesses to actually discuss without a clock ticking, for witnesses and experts to share with the members of the committee in a respectful way how we can improve this.

I saw that the hon. member for Barrie South—Innisfil mentioned it earlier, but we are seeing news across the news wires that the Minister of Public Safety is about to make a step. Who knows, but certainly it was not the National Enquirer saying this. It was at least the CBC, saying that the Government of Canada is prepared to fundamentally change one aspect of this, which is not having to hold Canadians' private data for a year but maybe bringing that down to six months. Is that going to be presented? I do not know.

We will be going into committee after the programming motion is passed. There will be an opportunity for new amendments to be tabled, but not, of course, from me or the member for Vancouver East, because we had a deadline some time ago, and we either had to bring it in by that deadline or could not bring in something new.

There may still be that opportunity to improve the bill. I certainly hope so, because what we have in front of us may violate our own Charter of Rights and Freedoms, open up personal data, surveillance data, and do serious damage. If, good heavens, the Citizen Lab research is right and Canadians' private data would be available to the U.S. homeland security folks in large tranches, none of us are going to feel particularly happy about that.

Our government should be making sure that our privacy is protected. It is an inherent right that we have. I would like to say it is a right in the same way first nations have the right to clean drinking water, although we have now been informed that they do not have the right to that but only the hope of a gradual or eventual "realization" of a right. That term is just so extraordinary. Well, we have a right to privacy, and I do not want to hear that it is dialed back to a gradual realization of a right. We have a right to privacy. We can reasonably expect it of our government to ensure that our private data is not left in an architecture of surveillance that allows it to be accessed by foreign governments, any foreign government.

The Citizen Lab research that was just published in Policy Options yesterday talks about U.S. homeland security as an example, but I do not want my government asking tech companies to save, store and access private data about Canadians that is then available to foreign governments. We have certainly learned a lot about foreign interference, and we are waiting for the foreign interference registry to actually be established since we passed that law some time ago.

Government Orders

At this late hour, and I know I'm out of time—

• (2055)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member is out of time.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance has the floor.

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.): Madam Speaker, let me start by saying how much I respect the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, for her patience but also for her attempt, always, to operate in good faith. I recognize that with bills like this, it is about striking the right balance, and I think the member mentioned that in her speech. I feel like we are getting the balance right. Maybe she does not feel that way.

What was not part of her speech and her story was how much obstruction has become normalized. The hon. member saw it in finance committee. She admitted there was a filibuster going on for 25 hours by the Conservatives, which she sat through and witnessed, just as I was there witnessing it, because they wanted to hold a bill hostage to extract out of the government some compromises on Bill C-22 to limit lawful access.

My dad was a police officer for 30 years, and I know they investigate crimes. It is important that we give police the tools to be able to access information in a digital age that can help solve some of these tough crimes. We all want to get criminals off the streets and crack down on organized crime.

Can the member opposite at least speak to the obstruction we have seen? That is why the government has to use programming motions, closure and these types of tools in order to get things done for—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, I understand the member's frustration, but I do not accept that that is an excuse for the programming motions. Again, in 15 years in this place, I have never seen anything like putting a bulldozer on steroids in the way that programming motions are being used, and it is offensive. Again, I know there is frustration. Inevitably, between a majority government and an opposition, tools like filibusters will be used, but the point is that we do not have to be in a rush to get out tomorrow or the day after or next week. We could take our time and make sure we get this bill right rather than have it thrown out by the court later.

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member gave a knowledgeable speech in terms of democracy and the way this place is supposed to work. In fact, when I came here, the Liberal government had a minority government, and things were working. It was getting comments from all the MPs in this place, and there was compromise and amendments in committee. Now that the Liberals have a majority, they stacked their majority and now they do not allow debate on any amendments from any party. By my numbers, there are 174 Liberal members who

want to force this bill through, but there are 169 MPs from every party who want to fix part 2.

Does the member see the fault in this? Can she see how this is wrong and how it is working against the democratic system?

Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, from my point of view, as leader of the Green Party, I did not think it was working terribly well in the minority Parliament because the Conservatives supported every egregious Liberal bill like Bill C-5. I still feel the pain of the bulldozer across my back when I think of Monday, June 16, 2025. I do not forget, because June 18 was a Wednesday, and I went to Marc Garneau's funeral in Montreal. I then went back online to try to fight off the changes in Bill C-5, and by Friday, Bill C-5 was done. That was offensive to democracy. This is offensive to democracy. We can make Parliament work better, yes we can, but that is not an excuse for bulldozing through bills that need work.

• (2100)

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands on her speech. She has been in this House for many years. My colleague was very, very young when she was first elected, as we all know. She has seen various permutations of government.

I was first elected in 2019. The Liberal government held a minority. We had to debate important bills and sensitive issues. The government had no choice at that time but to negotiate with one of the opposition parties. Even though feathers got ruffled on a few occasions, particularly among the Conservatives and the Liberals—some committees got pretty rowdy—bills were always passed in the end, thanks to the co-operation of the opposition parties.

Now we have a government that has secured a majority through various manoeuvres, as everyone is well aware. The fact remains, however, that the views, ideas and contributions that opposition parties can bring to bills as important as Bill C-22 are essential. I think it is quite shameful that the government has decided to shut the door on these discussions.

I would like to know whether my colleague for Saanich—Gulf Islands thinks that the Liberals got burned so badly over the past few years that now they are saying enough is enough, they can do what they like without giving the opposition a second thought, they can manage their affairs as they see fit, that is just the way it is now that they have their majority, and democracy be damned. I would like to know what my colleague thinks about that.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague for Drummond said, I have been a member of this place for 15 years. What an honour it is to represent the communities of Saanich—Gulf Islands and Sencoten- and Lekwungen-speaking indigenous peoples.

Government Orders

The fact that I represent a very small party always causes problems, but right now things are worse for me than ever before. Mr. Harper's majority government from 2011 to 2015 was an awful time for me. Now, however, too much is being done too fast. Right now, I do not get a sense that the current government respects Parliament or Canada's institutions.

In my opinion, it may be because of our Prime Minister's experience. He is a brilliant man who is respected around the world for his experience in the banking sector, but not for his experience in Parliament at our level, because he does not have one day of experience in Parliament. That is what frightens me. He has things to learn. As brilliant as he is, however, he does not understand that he has things to learn.

[English]

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the Green Party member's speech. I have a lot of respect for the time she has spent in this place and for her opinions.

I would like to hear her opinion on this. I believe she was probably watching some of the clause-by-clause in our public safety committee. During that time, we received amendment suggestions from the Privacy Commissioner. They were brought forward by all parties. When we had some confusion on why he brought certain amendments forward and had questions, I asked for the consent of members of the committee to have the Privacy Commissioner come back to clause-by-clause as we were going through these suggested amendments, so that we could do this right and understand some things.

I do not know if the member noticed, but every Liberal member voted against that and blocked the Privacy Commissioner from coming to sit in at clause-by-clause. Would the member like to comment on why she thinks they would do something like that?

Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, I can offer my opinion. I think it is just a fact that they were told to.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I completely disagree with the leader of the Green Party, because I do not think she is reflecting on the reality of change that we have seen over the last 15 years.

If we follow the logic of the leader of the Green Party, it would be the Conservative Party of Canada that would determine what legislation passed, because she does not believe that time allocation should be used. The moment that the Conservative Party says they do not like legislation, the government would not be able to pass the legislation.

There was a time when there was co-operation, many years ago, but we need programming, in the same way we program opposition days and private members' bills, in order for the government of the day and future governments to be able to get their legislation across the goal line.

I am wondering if the member could provide her thoughts on that change.

• (2105)

Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, as the hon. parliamentary secretary knows, I believe that if we followed the rules of this place, we could far more easily come to consensus around how long each bill should have at second reading before going to committee and so on.

The rules of this place say we cannot read a written speech. Knowing that a member cannot deliver a speech unless they have the knowledge in their head to stand up and speak would winnow down the number of members that a House leader uses to negotiate with the other parties. "We have 100 people ready to speak." Really? Without written notes? I do not think so.

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join this very important debate today.

I am a member of the public safety committee, and I have been there throughout this process. We have seen in this Parliament the failure of the government, when it brought forward Bill C-2, and the ongoing failure of the government to get legislation moved forward, with Bill C-22.

I want to say at the outset that I will be splitting my time with the member for Thornhill.

I want to make it clear that we see there is a need for changes to be made to assist law enforcement in this digital age. I saw, a number of years ago, in the wake of a 5-4 decision of the Supreme Court on Bykovets revolving around the idea of the reasonable expectation of privacy in the case of a credit card fraud case, that the methods being used by law enforcement to investigate these crimes, and many other crimes that take place digitally, had been severely curtailed. I worked with my local RCMP integrated childhood exploitation unit and other stakeholders. I think a good solution is contained in what is considered part 1 of Bill C-22.

That is not to say that Conservatives and I do not have issues with part 1. There are issues. There are questions about the thresholds, be it a reason to suspect or a reason to believe. One of the thresholds, the one that was chosen by the government, is far lower, but essentially, I believe, as Conservatives, we can support part 1, because we know that, if law enforcement has to reach out to a telecommunications company or an electronic service provider, they do not know whether that provider actually provides a service to an IP address, a name or a phone number, and they have to write a warrant for that process. That is a very time-consuming process for law enforcement. It is like searching for a needle in a haystack. It is very difficult.

As such, part 1 of the legislation seeks to create a subscriber confirmation, and I think that this could be an effective way to have something that does not require a warrant and to ask electronic service providers and telecommunications companies a simple yes-or-no question: Do they provide services to an IP address, or do they provide services to a number? I think that this could really cut down on the bureaucratic red tape that law enforcement faces. It could help speed up investigations. That is why, as Conservatives, despite some of the concerns that experts have raised, like civil liberty groups and Canadian Bar Association, we can work with that

However, where we really get into the weeds is with the concerns we set out on part 2 of the legislation. Before I get into the concerns on part 2, as they are very technical in nature, but very important, I want to provide a bit of an overview of what happened at committee.

This is very far-reaching legislation. It proposes to radically remake the entire paradigm of investigations in Canada. While I recognize that there need to be reforms, when we are dealing with something of this magnitude, that is not something that can be rushed. This is not necessarily because members just want to be oppositional for the sake of opposition. However, it is actually in the government's, and all of Canada's, best interests that parliamentarians really scrutinize the legislation, because we know that the legislation is going to be contested in the courts in the future, and we want to make sure that we have the best legislation so that it is actually effective at doing the job.

What Canadians fear is that the government could potentially misuse it, and maybe not even the government but malicious actors and criminal actors could misuse the vulnerabilities that the government would be creating through the legislation.

● (2110)

At committee we heard from many witnesses, but the amount of time that we had to hear from witnesses was extremely truncated. It was over a short matter of weeks in two-hour meetings, where we had panels of very intelligent experts who had a lot to say about the legislation. Every day I was getting emails from the public safety committee clerk with new submissions and briefs. We simply did not have the appropriate time to really dissect the legislation and go deep down into the far-reaching, potentially negative impacts of it so the process became very rushed.

It was a real sea change because, prior to the government's manufactured majority, it actually had to work with other parties in order to get legislation passed. The cybersecurity legislation came forward, and there were some really strong amendments put forward by opposition parties in this House that were adopted. I think it really made the legislation stronger. However, ever since the government received its manufactured majority, it has not been interested in working with other parties. Now we see that it is using this programming motion to try to ram through the legislation so that we cannot scrutinize it further.

I respect the members of our non-partisan public service. At the committee clause-by-clause stage they came as technical witnesses to speak about aspects of the bill. However, during the back-and-forth, it became very clear, and they said as much, that this was im-

Government Orders

portant legislation to them as members of the public service, and that they were invested in getting this legislation passed.

Many of the amendments that we as Conservatives and other parties put forward were based on the recommendations of the Privacy Commissioner, who is a constitutional lawyer. He is a very intelligent man who I think put forward some very reasonable amendments. We as Conservatives and the Bloc Québécois wanted to have him sit in on the meeting so he could provide his insight on the more technical nature of some of the amendments and the issues we were talking about. The government would not allow that to happen. I think that is where this process really broke down and where it was shown that the government was not acting in good faith and not willing to work with opposition parties. The Privacy Commissioner is not partisan. He is an expert in his field. He is appointed by Parliament. Bringing him forward to committee to help us explore the very real privacy implications of this legislation I think would have done a great deal in easing its passage. It is a gargantuan bill with a number of amendments. It would have taken the committee a great deal of time to get through it, but I think the fact the government was not willing to hear from the Privacy Commissioner showed that it was not really interested in having a serious discussion on it.

I want to get into some other aspects of part 2 now. I am very concerned about these metadata provisions. Metadata, for those listening, is the stuff in our phones. It is not necessarily the content of the text messages or the browsing history, but it is very important information about our location, what phone numbers we are contacting and other such things. The government is putting forward a proposal that would require telecommunications and other companies to maintain this metadata for up to a year. It has been ruled unconstitutional in the European Union to mass-keep the data of people in the European Union, yet this is what the government is putting forward. Some people would say that it is not going to misuse the data and that it would have to get a warrant in this case. However, my issue is not necessarily what the government is going to do with it, but what malicious actors would do with it.

Government Orders

Imagine this allegory. The Government of Canada tells every home builder in Canada that they need to make a master key to open all the houses they produce and now it has the master key to open everyone's house in Canada. That is what it is asking the telecommunications companies, the Apples, the Googles and the Metas, for, a master key. Do I think the government or law enforcement are going to misuse it? That is not a serious fear, but who is to say that key is always going to be protected, that vulnerability is not going to be exploited or it would not be stolen by third party actors, foreign governments or malicious criminal networks? The government is creating vulnerabilities in encryption that would impact not just Canadians but people across the world, because the encryption is not just in Canada but across the world. This has now become a trade issue. That is why I am very concerned about this legislation.

• (2115)

[*Translation*]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the Conservative Party used to call itself the party of law and order. Unfortunately, today, the Conservatives no longer have any credibility on this issue. When the time comes to better protect victims, what do the Conservatives do? They vote against it. When the time comes to combat hate crimes in our communities, they vote against it. That is not to mention all the disinformation they have been spreading on the matter. When the time comes to debate Bill C-22 to give the authorities the tools they need to fight crime, what do they do? They filibuster.

I would like to hear the thoughts of my colleague opposite. What does he think about the fact that his party no longer has any credibility when it comes to keeping our communities safe and getting tough on crime?

[*English*]

Dane Lloyd: Madam Speaker, that is a loaded question, but coming from that member and that party, it is quite ironic. The Conservatives are not the party that gutted mandatory minimums and brought forward legislation that made bail mandatory for violent repeat offenders. We are not the party that has overseen a rise in violent crime and extortion of over 55%. It is a direct result of the current Liberal government's policy. The Liberals call themselves a new government. They have been in power for 11 years, and that is their record. Conservatives will not take any lessons from them.

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, the way the Liberals are acting tonight, it is almost like the arsonist who sets a house on fire and then we expect him to put the fire out. It is almost the same thing.

I want to go back to the issue of the Privacy Commissioner. One of the things that I saw, and the member was there when I was there, was that the briefs that were submitted to the committee did not arrive and were not sent to committee members until the day they were sitting around the table to question the Privacy Commissioner and other witnesses who had submitted briefs, eight days later. I know the hon. member brought this up. He was quite concerned, as were other members sitting around that table, including the Bloc members.

How much of an impact did not having those briefs have on the member's ability, as a member of this committee, to scrutinize this piece of legislation?

Dane Lloyd: Madam Speaker, the hon. member was indeed there. It was very concerning because we had the Privacy Commissioner come to committee, and I had received nothing from the Privacy Commissioner prior to the start of that meeting. The Privacy Commissioner was referencing recommendations that he had provided to the committee weeks before, and I had no idea what these recommendations were.

There were issues with interpretation and technical issues, but I could not even get transcripts from the meeting that had taken place three weeks before, where we had former justice Deschamps from NSIRA come and provide recommendations to the committee. I could not even reference past committee meetings. Because the government is rushing through this legislation so quickly, we could not even do proper due diligence. It really did impact my ability and all members' ability to be effective in scrutinizing this legislation.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member cannot change what was decided in the last federal election, when Canada elected a new Prime Minister and a new government. Under the administration of the new Prime Minister, we brought forward a legislative suite of crime legislation, and the biggest barrier to passing that legislation, which would make our communities safer, is the Conservative Party of Canada. That is the reality. That is what is happening today. That is what Canadians are concerned about.

Why is the Conservative Party today, the extreme right, making the decision to deny Canadians safer communities?

• (2120)

Dane Lloyd: Madam Speaker, the member talks about being a member of a new government. It is the same member, and people can check the Hansard, who has been speaking in this place for nearly 11 years. It is the same talking points. It is the same failed Liberal policies. It is the same Liberal government. In fact, the Liberal Prime Minister was advising former prime minister Justin Trudeau on many of these failed economic policies that we are seeing today, and now we have this legislation coming forward.

Canadians, in the last election, did not vote for these policies. They voted to get tough on criminals, but they did not vote for law-abiding Canadians to be subjected to this level of government surveillance.

Government Orders

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Madam Speaker, before we can even talk about this bill in Parliament, we have to talk about whether members of Parliament are even allowed to talk at all anymore. That is what the motion is about. A government that claims to defend Canadian rights is using every tool at its disposal to make sure those things cannot even be debated on the floor of the House of Commons. That is what people are seeing tonight. The Liberals are pushing the House to ram through legislation in its current form that nobody asked for, nobody wants and nobody thinks is a good idea, according to the testimony at the committee that they have just shut down.

Let me be clear about what this debate is actually about, because it is not about the bill. It is about whether lawful access matters. It does. Lawful access is a tool that every police officer in this country needs, and we are ready to give them that bill, but Bill C-22 would not stop there, and that is exactly where the government has lost the plot on all this.

Tonight, instead of a serious debate on a serious bill, we are listening to the Liberals mount an obnoxiously loud defence of the indefensible. They want to debate whether we should ignore the rights of the House, the will of our constituents and the basic principles of good governance that everybody came here to carry out. The government abandoned those a long time ago, but I know a lot of members of the House come here every day to scrutinize the very legislation that the Liberals are trying to ram through tonight.

Let me say this to anybody watching at home at this late hour: The Liberals' argument in this debate is completely disingenuous, and they know it. I appreciate the police chief of York Regional Police. We have an enormously good relationship, a great one. I have also met with the commissioner of the OPP and with the Toronto police chief. They have all asked us to help pass lawful access, and we told them we would. Everything they asked for was in part 1 of the bill. We support that and are ready to pass that today. We were ready to pass that long ago. It is the Liberals who said no.

However, not one of these police chiefs asked for the unprecedented expansion of government surveillance powers, secret ministerial orders, no oversight and a massive erosion of Canadians' privacy protections. That is all in part 2, and that is exactly what the problem is. The Liberals' trying to ram it through is a disgrace to the House.

The Liberals say the police are demanding it, and I think that is as much of an insult to the police as the last 10 years of their leadership on this file has been, full stop. I do not think they can find anybody who says they need every provision in this bill, because it is just not true. We came to the government with a straightforward proposal: Pass part 1 now, give the police chiefs what they are asking for, and we will support it through the House, every part of it; then take time to properly fix part 2 instead of programming a motion that would ram it through the House without any debate.

We want to fix it by hearing from the civil liberties advocates who raised concerns in committee, from the private companies and from ordinary Canadians who have every right to be heard by every member of Parliament, every member of the House, because the legislation would affect them directly. They all sounded the alarm

bells at committee. Making this go away would not protect Canadians. It would protect the Liberals.

The government said no to us, because the minister presenting the bill cannot even defend it. If we put him in front of a microphone, we will see. He would be blundering all over the place, not answering questions, and giving entirely wrong answers, because he does not know the contents of the bill. If he did know the contents of the bill, he would admit that it is part 1 that police officers were asking for to protect people. When the Liberals stand up and say that Conservatives are blocking lawful access, that is simply false. Every member of the House should know that. The culprit is the government's own stubbornness, its refusal to listen to anyone outside of its caucus, and, of course, it is the minister who is incapable of defending his own bill.

What is the Liberals' response to that refusal? It is a motion to cut off debate, to limit how long the bill is discussed, to limit committee study and, in an unprecedented move, to retroactively pass the bill through committee without ever hearing the remaining amendments that were in committee. That has never been done in this place except with Bill C-9, the last bill the government passed through the House. My colleague mentioned that she had never seen that happen in her 15 years in this place, which is longer than I have been here.

● (2125)

This is not procedural housekeeping, but that is what the Liberals are going to make it sound like. It is a very real, very clear threat to the rights and freedoms of all Canadians from coast to coast to coast. The government has heard this loud and clear. That is exactly why it is ramming this bill through, because its members cannot go off on a summer break and have Canadians raise the alarm bells on it. They want to get it through the House.

One of the members opposite supporting this motion, and we need to talk about this, is the member for Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong. In a previous life, she sat on this side of the House as the Conservative shadow minister for civil liberties. She participated in nearly every civil liberties debate in this chamber. Every single time, she told Canadians the truth, which was that the government could not be trusted with privacy. I agreed with her then, and I agree with her now.

Government Orders

This is what we are talking about. This is a bill that would lower the constitutional bar. This is where it gets serious. It would create secret ministerial orders with no sunlight. It would open back doors for bad actors who would mandate metadata retention as a direct precursor to AI-driven mass surveillance, and it would weaken the encryption that protects Canadians' private communications, even with their financial institutions. That is the problem. I think this bill deserves to be debated and the House should give it that. Instead, the Liberals have rammed it through with what is called the programming motion to sweep this away right before they take their summer break.

Let us go back to the member for Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong. She also told the House, and I remember it, that members of the Liberal caucus wanted to see her jailed over the views that she held on these exact kinds of topics. Now she is voting with those same people. She is handing them unprecedented power to conscript private business as instruments of state surveillance and potentially break the encryption that millions of Canadians rely on every single day.

This is not hyperbole. Signal, NordVPN and DuckDuckGo have all publicly said that this kind of bill would force them to leave the country entirely. With that kind of testimony at committee, does anybody in this place not think that this deserves more scrutiny and more study? That is not a talking point. They actually said that. That is a business decision that they are planning to make because of this legislation, and that tells us everything we need to know about how deeply flawed part 2 is and how it strikes at Canadian privacy rights.

Normally, I might wonder out loud what the people of Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong think of all of this, but in this case, I already know because I went there. Just like Canadians across the country did not vote for the construction of a surveillance state, the people of Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong did not vote for her to erode their rights in this place. Police unions and police chiefs did not ask for their members to be handed these broad, sweeping powers; they asked for lawful access. We are ready to give it to them in part 1 of this bill. We asked for that and the Liberals said no. That is the conversation today.

We are not prepared to write a blank cheque to the government. I do not think that anybody is. We, the members of the opposition, certainly are not prepared to do that as we watch the government of the day erode not only the rights of Canadians but also the ability to debate those rights in the House and the ability to scrutinize a bill that is deeply problematic. This is a bill that civil liberties associations, social media platforms and all kinds of private companies have raised the alarm bells on. We are certainly not going to do that with no debate, no witnesses at committee, no ability to propose amendments, no oversight mechanisms and no answers from the people who will actually be responsible for implementing the legislation.

The reason that we are talking about this motion in the House is because of the public safety minister's inability to defend his own legislation in here, out there, at committee and everywhere else across the country. The government is programming this motion to save that minister, and Canadians deserve better than that. They deserve a debate, and they deserve scrutiny on this legislation.

• (2130)

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this goes back to April 2025, when Canadians elected a minority government to provide oversight, accountability and transparency so that the opposition parties could hold them to account and provide that oversight. What we have seen since this manufactured, transactional majority is that this heavy-handed hammer has come down on this place, which has limited all other parties' ability, as an opposition, to do that.

I am wondering if the hon. member would speak to the impact this is having, not only on our parliamentary democracy, but on the decline of democracy in general.

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, I think it is yet another erosion of the rights of Canadians. The same that we see in bills like this, in Bill C-11, Bill C-18, Bill C-9, Bill C-8 and Bill C-34 to some extent, although we are still studying it. This is an erosion of democracy, and it limits the participation of many in democracy. We hear every single day from our constituents, asking why we cannot do something about it. It is because they shut down debate, they shut off the cameras and they shut down committees.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is unfair for the member to make the kinds of comments that she has. She knows full well that lawful access has been debated and talked about. We brought in legislation back in September of last year. The Conservative Party opposed it; they did not want anything to do with it. That is the reality. If it were up to the opposition, it would never pass. Without time allocation, it would not pass.

We are going to respond to law enforcement officers because the Conservatives have abandoned their support of law enforcement officers. Why have they done that?

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary knows full well that law enforcement did not ask for anything in part 2 of this legislation. We offered to pass part 1. We offered to pass it weeks ago and we offered to pass it today. We will still make that offer if he wants to put that on the table, but that is not really what this is about.

[*Translation*]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I do not understand part of my colleague's argument, and I would like her to explain it.

She criticized the government for shutting down debate and shutting off the cameras. However, in June of last year, the Liberals did the same thing during the study of Bill C-5 on projects of national interest. Who supported that closure motion? It was supported by her party, the Conservative Party.

I would simply like her to explain why it was okay to turn off the cameras and support the closure motion last year, but it is no longer acceptable this year.

Government Orders

[*English*]

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if my colleague is arguing for this motion or against it. This is about scrutiny on this and any piece of legislation in the House. We are never going to be for turning off cameras and shutting down debate the way that this programming motion has, being brought to the floor of the House of Commons. It has not happened in 15 years, except for the last piece of legislation that they did it with, Bill C-9.

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is basically democracy that translates from the House to committee. The Conservatives, the Bloc and the NDP all agree with part 1 of this bill. There is no question about that. It is 9:30 at night, and after this, the committee will sit again. It will be one more attempt for MPs in the House to protect civil liberties and privacy.

Does the member think the Liberal government will listen to the debate and actually consider the amendments put together by all the members of the House outside of the Liberal majority government?

• (2135)

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, I have one comment to that: “Democracy Dies in Darkness”. That is what the Liberals should listen to very carefully.

[*Translation*]

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am curious about something.

If the Conservatives are so constructive, I would like the member to tell me, of the hundreds of hours the Conservatives spent speaking on this bill in committee, how many minutes, because, yes, we are talking in terms of minutes, were spent discussing the actual subject at hand.

[*English*]

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, we have heard from various members on that side of the House that it is 25 hours. There is no number of hours that will replace democracy in this place. That is what we are arguing tonight. We are going to stay as long as we can and as long as Canadians have sent us here to pass legislation.

We offered them part 1. They said no, and that is on them.

The Speaker: There being no further members wishing to speak, pursuant to an order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.

The question is on the amendment.

If a member participating in person wishes that the amendment 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.

The hon. member for Saskatoon South.

Kevin Waugh: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recorded vote on this. Ring those bells.

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (2220)

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 171*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Berthold	Bexte
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Bloch	Bonin
Bonk	Borrelli
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Caputo
Champoux	Chong
Cobena	Cody
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Davies (Niagara South)	Dawson
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
DeRidder	Deschênes
Diotte	Doherty
Dowdall	Duncan
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Falk (Provencher)	Fortin
Garon	Gaudreau
Genius	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Goodridge
Gourde	Groleau
Guglielmin	Gunn
Hallan	Hardy
Ho	Hoback
Holman	Jackson
Jansen	Jivani
Khanna	Kibble
Kirkland	Kmiec
Konanz	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kronis
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche
Lawrence	Lawton
Lefebvre	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd
Lobb	Mahal
Majumdar	Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Mantle	Martel
May	Mazier
McCauley	McLean (Calgary Centre)
Melillo	Menegakis
Moore	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perron	Plamondon
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Reynolds	Richards

Government Orders

Roberts
Ross
Ruff
Scheer
Seeback
Steinley
Stevenson
Strauss
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer— 151

Rood
Rowe
Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Simard
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Williamson

MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
Martin
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Ntumba
Olszewski
Osborne
Powlowski
Ramsay
Robertson
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sodhi
Sousa
Sudds
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 171

MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McKelvie
McKnight
McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Oliphant
O'Rourke
Petitpas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Rochefort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Schiefke
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Solomon
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

NAYS

Members

Acan
Ali
Anand
Bains
Bardeesy
Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill Riv-
er)
Bittle
Carney
Casey
Champagne
Chartrand
Chen
Chi
Clark
Cormier
Dabrusin
Danko
d'Entremont
Desrochers
Dhillon
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fancy
Fergus
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fry
Gainey
Gazan
Gladu
Grant
Guay
Gull-Masty
Hanley
Hepfner
Hodgson
Housefather
Iacono
Jaczek
Johns
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lambropoulos
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Lattanzio
Lavack
Leitão
Long
Ma

Al Soud
Alty
Auguste
Baker
Battiste
Begum
Bendayan
Brière
Carr
Chagger
Chang
Chatel
Chenette
Church
Connors
Coteau
Dandurand
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Deschênes-Thériault
Dhaliwal
Diab
Duguid
Earle
El-Khoury
Eyolfson
Fanjoy
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Gaheer
Gasparro
Gerretsen
Gould
Greaves
Guilbeault
Hajdu
Harrison
Hirtle
Hogan
Hussen
Idlout
Jeneroux
Joseph
Kelloway
Klassen
Kwan
Lamoureux
Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lauzon
Lavoie
Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)

PAIRED

Members

Anandasangaree
Fuhr
Godin
Kelly
Lalonde
McGuinty
Shipley

Blois
Gallant
Joly
Kuruc
LeBlanc
McKenzie
Thériault— 14

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on the main motion.

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

[*English*]

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results from the last vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting against.

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote and will vote no.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote and will vote no.

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

(Division No. 172)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Auguste
Bains	Baker
Bardeesy	Battiste
Beech	Begum
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill Riv- er)	Bendayan
Bittle	Brière
Carney	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Champagne	Chang
Chartrand	Chatel
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Church
Clark	Connors
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dandurand
Danko	d'Entremont
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Earle	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson	Fancy
Fanjoy	Fergus
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Gasparro	Gerretsen
Gladu	Gould
Grant	Greaves
Guay	Guilbeault
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Hanley	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Idlout
Jaczek	Jeneroux
Joseph	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Klassen	Koutrakis
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lattanzio	Lauzon
Lavack	Lavoie
Leitão	Lightbound
Long	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Ma	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Maloney
Martin	McKelvie
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McKnight
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	Ménard
Mendès	Michel
Miedema	Miller
Mingarelli	Morrissey
Myles	Naqvi
Nathan	Nguyen

Noormohamed
Oliphant
O'Rourke
Petipas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Rochefort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Schieffe
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Solomon
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

Aboultaif
Albas
Anderson
Arnold
Baber
Baldinelli
Barrett
Beaulieu

Berthold
Blanchet
Block
Bonk
Bragdon
Brock
Calkins
Champoux
Cobena
Cooper
Dancho
Davies (Niagara South)
DeBellefeuille
DeRidder
Diotte
Dowdall
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Garon
Genuis
Gill (Brampton West)
Gill (Windsor West)

Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Gourde
Guglielmin
Hallan
Ho
Holman
Jansen
Khanna
Kirkland
Konanz
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lawrence
Lefebvre
Leslie

Government Orders

Ntumba
Olaszewski
Osborne
Powlowski
Ramsay
Robertson
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sodhi
Sousa
Sudds
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 166

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Au
Bailey
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel
Belt)
Bexte
Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin
Borrelli
Brassard
Brunelle-Duceppe
Caputo
Chong
Cody
Dalton
Davidson
Dawson
Deltell
Deschênes
Doherty
Duncan
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Fortin
Gaudreau
Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Goodridge
Groleau
Gunn
Hardy
Hoback
Jackson
Jivani
Kibble
Kmiec
Kram
Kronis
Lake
Larouche
Lawton
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)

Adjournment Proceedings

Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd
Lobb	Mahal
Majumdar	Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Mantle	Martel
May	Mazier
McCauley	McLean (Calgary Centre)
Melillo	Menegakis
Moore	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perron	Plamondon
Poillievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Reynolds	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ross	Rowe
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Simard	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Stevenson
Strahl	Strauss
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Williamson	Zimmer— 150

PAIRED

Members

Anandasangaree	Blois
Fuhr	Gallant
Godin	Joly
Kelly	Kuruc
Lalonde	LeBlanc
McGuinty	McKenzie
Shipley	Thériault— 14

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I suspect if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent to call at 12:49 at this time so we can get to the late show.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed nice that we have seen the clock at midnight. I cannot break the legal fiction, while we are all here together, but it is time for Adjournment Proceedings.

I am raising a question I initially raised April 20, two days before Earth Day. I had, on a previous occasion, witnessed an exchange between the hon. member for Edmonton Strathcona and the Minis-

ter of Energy, in which he was dismissive of the concerns of the most recent oil spill from Imperial Oil on the Cold Lake First Nations territory.

I asked on that occasion if there might be an interest on the part of the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources in amending his answer to reflect deep concern for the fact that it is not just one oil spill or one leaking tailings ponds in northern Alberta in the area of the oil sands, it is multiple.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I am having trouble hearing myself.

• (2225)

The Speaker: The member for Saanich—Gulf Islands is correct. There is too much noise in the chamber. We will wait for things to quiet down and then I will ask the hon. member to continue.

I think it is more or less quiet enough at the moment, so I would ask the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands to continue.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the difficulty we have and the reason I raised this issue again is that I did ask in the House, on April 20, for a better answer.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment attempted to answer at that point, saying that the government was concerned and was “working closely with the Crown-indigenous working group along with the affected communities”, and that it would find “a long-term, science-based solution”.

The difficulty I have with that answer is that it has been more than a decade since one of the most prominent scientists in Canada, the late Dr. David Schindler appeared before the fisheries committee in this place and testified that his research had found the component parts, chemical contaminants that could have come only from the tailings ponds, not from any natural source in the environment, of contamination that violated the Fisheries Act, yet the government had taken no action. Dr. Schindler made it very clear to the fisheries committee that there had already been extensive contamination of the Athabasca River from what are called tailings ponds.

The difficulty is not so much that Imperial Oil is experiencing leaks. It is that the containment system is a failure. It is basically a sieve. What Imperial Oil did in the past, when it initially did not tell the community that it had what it could see was a breach of containment, was pump the water out of the areas where there was extensive recent contamination, and then pump it back into the same container, which was a sieve and was leaking.

Years before, I had participated in environmental assessment hearings where this particular oil sands mine was approved to go ahead, with conditions to make sure that the river, the treaty rights, the rights holders in the area, and the indigenous people were actually protected. Their health, the environment where they live and the fish they eat needed to be protected. Dr. David Schindler warned the environment committee of this in public testimony more than a decade before these recent, continuing leaks and breaches.

Adjournment Proceedings

It would be easier for me to accept that the government, either the current government or previous governments, is concerned about the multiple breaches of the treaty rights of the rights holders throughout the area of the oil sands development, if it ever had been in the past. It would be easier to believe that something was going to happen, if it had ever happened in the past.

I put it again to the government: When will it show concern for the environment in this area and the continual breaches and leaks?

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the continuing work of the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, the leader of the Green Party, on issues related to contaminants and leakage. I also want to thank her for the interventions regarding the work of the late Dr. David Schindler, who raised some of these issues, as she mentioned, in the decades and years past. These were issues I covered for some time in my previous life as a journalist.

In terms of the issues that the hon. member has raised, we take these concerns regarding oil sands, tailings and related infrastructure seriously. The impacts of tailings pollution on water, ecosystems and community well-being continue to inform federal action. It is something we take very seriously, as we do the protection of the health of communities and the integrity of Canada's water and ecosystems. It is a core responsibility of the current government, and, I would say, of government, both now and for future generations.

We need to address risks associated with tailings management in a way that gives sustained attention and brings solutions grounded in sound science. Environment and Climate Change Canada is advancing work on oil sands mining effluent through structured, ongoing engagement with indigenous communities, the Government of Alberta and the Government of Northwest Territories, industry, environmental NGOs and other governmental departments.

The hon. member referred to the Crown-indigenous working group. That work continues, with Environment and Climate Change Canada and indigenous groups working together through that working group to develop long-term, science-based solutions that will form recommendations to the minister.

I think the hon. member knows that Environment and Climate Change Canada also co-leads the oil sands monitoring program with the Government of Alberta, together with indigenous communities and industry. The program, for the interest and knowledge of people watching at home, seeks to enhance the understanding of the effects of oil sands development activities through ambient environmental monitoring in the oil sands region. Monitoring data and reports are publicly available on the oil sands monitoring program portal.

I would add that, with some of the investments we have been making in science and research and some of the advances in technology, we hope this work can continue to accelerate and to inform policy-makers, government and hon. members in an even more timely fashion.

In conclusion, the Government of Canada will continue to work with all partners, stakeholders, indigenous communities, and provinces and territories to support ongoing reconciliation efforts, ensure sustained environmental protections and uphold public trust.

• (2230)

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the difficulty I have with this, again, is that we have had working groups and consultation groups, and if we ask the first nation peoples of Cold Lake, as well as those around the Cold Lake operations and the Kearl mine, there have been repeated breaches of their rights and contamination of their waterways, yet Imperial Oil last year, in 2025, had a profit of \$3.5 billion. It seems that perhaps we have a disconnect between where the wealth of the area is going, which is not to sustain people's livelihood or assist in protecting the environment, and the treaty rights of the peoples of the region.

I would ask again that when the government considers reconciliation, it would consider honouring the promises made in the treaties we have.

Karim Bardeesy: Mr. Speaker, treaty rights are sacrosanct to this government, as are the regimes that we have in place, including the regimes for non-compliance and the environmental damages penalties that we have under the legislation. Incidents such as the recent spill at Cold Lake are taken very seriously. Federal officials are in contact with their provincial counterparts and indigenous leadership to ensure that appropriate response and oversight measures are in place. If there is non-compliance with federal legislation, there is enforcement action that is available and will be pursued.

This shows why the work to strengthen oversight of tailings and mine water is so critical. How do we do that work? We do that work through indigenous partnership, through transparency and through rigorous scientific work.

Canadians expect strong environmental protection, informed, in part, through the advocacy of the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands. That is precisely what we will do to guide our actions.

The Speaker: The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 10:34 p.m.)

Fragiskatos	9490	(Amendments read the second time and concurred in)....	9497
Rood	9491		
Fraser	9491		
Steinley	9491		
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)	9491	An Act to Authorize Certain Payments to be Made out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the Purpose of Improving Housing Supply	
Steinley	9491	Bill C-26. Second reading	9497
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)	9491	Motion agreed to	9499
		(Bill read the second time, considered in committee of the whole, reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed)	9499
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship			
Rowe	9491		
Diab	9491		
Natural Resources			
Rowe	9491		
Hodgson	9492		
Health			
Mazier	9492		
Michel	9492		
Strauss	9492		
Michel	9492		
Konanz	9492		
MacKinnon	9492		
Employment			
Al Soud	9492		
Hajdu	9492		
Public Safety			
Caputo	9493		
Sahota	9493		
Kirkland	9493		
Sahota	9493		
Lloyd	9493		
Fraser	9493		
Indigenous Affairs			
Idlout	9493		
Chartrand	9493		
Public Safety			
Baber	9494		
MacKinnon	9494		
Indigenous Affairs			
Gazan	9494		
Gull-Masty	9494		
Presence in Gallery			
The Speaker	9494		
		ROYAL ASSENT	
The Speaker	9494		
		GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
Combatting Hate Act			
Bill C-9. Second reading and concurrence in Senate amendments	9494		
Amendment negatived	9496		
Motion agreed to	9497		
		PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS	
		National Framework on the Durability of Electronic Products and Essential Home Appliances Act	
		Bill C-267. Second reading	9499
		Motion agreed to	9500
		(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	9500
		ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
		Public Sector Integrity Commissioner	
		The Speaker	9500
		Export Development Canada	
		Naqvi	9501
		Government Response to Petitions	
		Lamoureux	9501
		Interparliamentary Delegations	
		Bragdon	9501
		Committees of the House	
		Indigenous and Northern Affairs	
		Sheehan	9501
		Environment and Sustainable Development	
		Miedema	9501
		Bexte	9501
		Medical Assistance in Dying	
		Powlowski	9501
		Jansen	9501
		Housing Cost Transparency Act	
		Redekopp	9502
		Bill C-287. Introduction and first reading	9502
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	9502
		Protection Against Online Fraud Act	
		Lantsman	9502
		Bill C-288. Introduction and first reading	9502
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	9502
		Stopping Supply to Save Lives Act	
		Au	9502
		Bill C-289. Introduction and first reading	9502
		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	9502

Fergus	9514
Steinley	9514
Larouche	9514
Tolmie	9514
Waugh	9515
Rood	9515
St-Pierre	9515
Message from the Senate	
The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater)	9515

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Spectrum Policy Framework for Canada Act	
Bill C-268. Second reading	9515
Champoux	9515
Villeneuve	9516
Mazier	9518
Connors	9519
Lawton	9521
Dandurand	9522
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)	9523

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Government Business No. 13—Proceedings on Bill C-22	
Motion	9523
Lamoureux	9523
Tolmie	9525
Turnbull	9526
DeBellefeuille	9526
Kirkland	9526
Coteau	9527
DeBellefeuille	9527
Kirkland	9530
Champoux	9530
May	9531
Kwan	9531
Brassard	9531
Carr	9531

Motion	9531
(Motion agreed to)	9531
Kwan	9531
Ross	9534
Acan	9534
Van Popta	9535
Brassard	9535
May	9535
Kirkland	9536
Waugh	9537
Turnbull	9537
Brassard	9538
Au	9538
Acan	9539
Turnbull	9539
Anderson	9540
May	9540
Turnbull	9543
Ross	9543
Champoux	9543
Kirkland	9544
Lamoureux	9544
Lloyd	9544
Deschênes-Thériault	9546
Brassard	9546
Lamoureux	9546
Lantsman	9547
Brassard	9548
Lamoureux	9548
Blanchette-Joncas	9548
Ross	9549
Desrochers	9549
Amendment negatived	9550
Motion agreed to	9552

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

The Environment	
May	9552
Bardeesy	9553

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>