



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# House of Commons Debates

Official Report  
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 094  
Wednesday, March 11, 2026

---

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



## **CONTENTS**

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, March 11, 2026

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayer*

---

• (1400)

[*Translation*]

**The Speaker:** It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem, led by the hon. member for London West.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

### HAMILTON CENTRE

**Aslam Rana (Hamilton Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on March 2, I had the pleasure of welcoming the Minister of Health to my riding of Hamilton Centre. We began the day at Carole Anne's Place at YWCA Hamilton, where we learned more about the essential low-barrier sports being provided to some of the most vulnerable members of our community. We then visited Womankind Addiction Service to see the important work being done to support women on their journey towards recovery and stability. We ended the day with doctors from Hamilton General Hospital and professors from McMaster University for a meaningful discussion about the future of health care and strengthening mental health supports in our community.

Hamilton continues to emerge as a leading health sciences hub. With the dedication of our frontline workers, researchers and community organizations, I am confident that the work happening in Hamilton today will help build a healthier and stronger Canada tomorrow.

\* \* \*

### AN EVENING IN GREECE

**Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last Saturday my wife, Larissa, and I, along with my fellow Conservatives, the hon. members for Regina—Wascana and Regina—Qu'Appelle, had the pleasure of attending the 32nd annual Evening in Greece, a signature cultural fundraiser supporting the Hospitals of Regina Foundation and the Autism Resource Centre. It is an amazing event filled with live music, outstanding Greek cuisine and, of course, the traditional breaking of plates.

Put on by the St. Paul's Greek Orthodox Community of Regina, over its 30-year history the gala has raised more than \$3 million to support health care and community programs in Regina and area. We keep this marked on our calendar every year because it is such an amazing event. I give a big thank you to the local Greek community, the sponsors and everyone who works so hard behind the scenes to make this event a success year after year.

\* \* \*

## WOMEN AND GENDER EQUALITY

**Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the story of women's rights is a story of courage and of persistence. From suffragettes who fought for our right to vote, to Olympians representing Canada and women leading in STEM, generations of women have pushed our country forward. Today, under our Prime Minister's leadership, Canada now has the largest women's caucus in our history, something we should all be proud of.

We also know that the work must continue. Women around the world still face barriers to leadership. They face wage gaps and gender-based violence. Indigenous and racialized women continue to face even greater challenges. Therefore, while we recognize the progress that we have made, we must keep working until every woman and girl can live safely, lead freely and stand equal in every part of society, because no woman should have to fight for the rights that she already deserves.

\* \* \*

• (1405)

## HUMAN TRAFFICKING

**William Stevenson (Yellowhead, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last weekend I attended Rocky Mountain House's Denim and Diamonds chamber event, where Alberta's own Paul Brandt shared the powerful story behind the #NotInMyCity organization and its mission to combat human trafficking in Canada.

*Statements by Members*

Founded in 2017, #NotInMyCity has grown into a national movement that raises awareness, connects law enforcement and community partners, and equips Canadians to recognize the signs of exploitation. Today, more than 20,000 people have completed its training, and its team works with over 40 airports across Canada to help identify trafficking, which is often described as modern-day slavery. It is one of the fastest-growing crimes in the world, targeting some of the most vulnerable members of our communities.

Awareness saves lives. I encourage Canadians to visit the website, take the training, learn to recognize the warning signs and join the efforts to protect people at risk. Together we can end human trafficking in Canada.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ROSE-EMMA LAVOIE**

**Steeve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Sunday was International Women's Day, and I would like to talk about a courageous and determined woman of faith, my aunt Rose-Emma Lavoie. She was a nun by profession and she ran a school for young girls in Haiti for over 20 years.

In often extremely difficult conditions, she taught them much more than the curriculum. She taught them to believe in themselves, to take their place in life and to hope for a better future. Despite overwhelming obstacles, poverty and challenges, her courage and hope never wavered.

Near the end of her life, she came back to Canada. She wanted to tell her story, bear witness to what she had seen and done, and share her hopes for these young women she loved so much. Rose-Emma remains one the greatest women my wife and I have ever known.

Today, our daughter Emma-Rose is named after her, and she is very proud of that.

\* \* \*

[English]

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

**Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, conflict in the Middle East is not new, but never have we seen it spill onto the streets of Canada in the way it has under the Liberal government. By politicizing foreign conflicts and pushing a soft-on-crime agenda, the Liberals have left Jewish and Iranian Canadians feeling unsafe in their own communities. Last week alone, three synagogues in the greater Toronto area were shot at. Canadians have heard enough of the condemnations and the endless empty words. Words are not enough.

The truth is that terrorists operate on our streets while the laws already on the books go unenforced. Now, an Iranian dissident in Vancouver, someone I knew personally, has gone missing, and police fear he was killed, yet successive Liberal immigration and public safety ministers have failed to stop hundreds of known, active IRGC agents from living here. Why will the government not deport them now?

[Translation]

**WORLD PLUMBING DAY**

**Caroline Desrochers (Trois-Rivières, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I take a moment today to highlight World Plumbing Day. Plumbers play a vital role in ensuring the safety and well-being of our communities every day. Their work helps to ensure that we have access to clean water every day in our schools, homes, workplaces and more.

[English]

Canada's plumbing professionals are also advancing modern conservation, energy efficiency and innovative building practices that support our environmental and economic goals.

The plumbing and heating industry is a major economic driver, contributing more than \$30 billion to Canada's GDP and supporting over 200,000 jobs nationwide.

As Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, I want to thank plumbers, contractors and industry leaders across Canada for the critical role they play in helping build the homes and infrastructure Canadians need. Their role is important, and we need them.

● (1410)

[Translation]

Happy World Plumbing Day, everyone.

\* \* \*

[English]

**NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Blake Richards (Airdrie—Cochrane, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, around the world, countries are searching for secure and reliable sources of energy. Many, including Japan, South Korea, India and Germany, have expressed a growing interest in Canadian energy.

Canada has the fourth-largest oil reserves in the world and the ability to help meet that demand responsibly, yet despite years of promises, the government has not approved a single new pipeline to tidewater. Its Major Projects Office was supposed to speed up development, yet it has not approved a single project. Instead, Liberal policies like Bill C-69, the west coast tanker ban and endless regulatory delays continue to block Canadian energy from reaching global markets.

Canada should be diversifying our energy exports so we are more resilient to instability abroad and we reduce our dependence on the United States as our only customer. By expanding access to global markets and allowing projects to move forward here at home, we can strengthen our economy, support Canadian workers and ensure that Canadian energy reaches the allies that are demanding it.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### FRANÇOISE HOGUE PLANTE

**Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, today I want to pay tribute to Françoise Hogue Plante, a woman who has had a profound impact on life in Louiseville. She was elected as a municipal councillor and served with exemplary consistency and generosity from 2009 to 2025, more than 16 years. Known for her close ties with citizens and her willingness to listen, she championed several key issues with conviction, including the l'Éveil skate park, the return of the Orléans Express bus service and the merger of municipal housing offices.

A true pillar of community life, Ms. Hogue Plante was also involved in numerous organizations, such as the Association des personnes handicapées du comté de Maskinongé, the Maison du commis voyageur and the Festival de la galette de sarrasin de Louiseville. Her career reflects a deep love for the people of Louiseville and they will long remember the lasting mark she made on their community.

I would like to thank Françoise Hogue Plante for everything.

\* \* \*

#### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

**Hon. Élisabeth Brière (Sherbrooke, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, we celebrated International Women's Day. In honour of the occasion, I celebrate women and all of our essential contributions to our country. Let us recognize the tremendous work of the women who came before us and ushered in the rights we enjoy today.

Women have demonstrated remarkable perseverance and determination in so many domains. For a long time, they were discriminated against or excluded from domains such as sport. With the Olympic and Paralympic Games top of mind, I want to take this opportunity to celebrate the courageous female athletes who wear our colours.

One of those women is Sherbrooke's Kim Boutin, a six-time Olympic medallist who is tied for most decorated Canadian female athlete in the history of the winter games. That is quite an accomplishment. Another is Lyne-Marie Bilodeau, also from Sherbrooke. She was the youngest Canadian athlete at the Beijing Olympics and won three gold medals at the Canada Winter Games. Her journey proves that nothing is impossible.

In celebrating these women, we celebrate all women. Their victories, their ambitions and their triumphs are, by extension, our own.

#### Statements by Members

[English]

#### AFFORDABILITY

**Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada cannot control what happens abroad, but the Liberals do control the policies here at home that are making life more expensive. Under the Liberals, Canada tops the G7 in food inflation and is the only shrinking economy. The most vulnerable Canadians are the ones who are left to pay the price.

One in five Canadians over 50 are now living in conditions comparable to the poverty line. After years of Liberal deficits and rising taxes, the seniors of Abbotsford—South Langley, the very people who helped build this country, are struggling to afford basic needs, yet the Prime Minister is pushing ahead with his rebranded carbon tax, the clean fuel standard, and his industrial carbon tax, passing higher prices on to those who produce our food and goods and ultimately to all Canadians. These costs are imposed here at home, not abroad.

When will the Prime Minister take responsibility for the policies he controls and scrap the taxes making life more unaffordable for all Canadians, especially our seniors?

\* \* \*

#### WORLD PLUMBING DAY

**Stéphane Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am a former welder and pipefitter.

• (1415)

[Translation]

Today is World Plumbing Day. It is celebrated every year on March 11 and it serves as a reminder of how important the plumbing sector is for the health, safety and well-being of all our communities across the country.

[English]

World Plumbing Day gives us the opportunity to recognize the outstanding work of Canada's plumbing professionals, whose expertise ensures that clean and safe water reaches our businesses and public institutions.

[Translation]

Plumbing professionals play a key role in the modernization of our systems, energy efficiency and water conservation. Their commitment and innovation have a direct impact on the safety and resilience of our communities.

[English]

The plumbing and heating sector is also a major economic driver. It contributes over \$30 billion to Canada's GDP and supports more than 200,000 jobs across the country.

[Translation]

I would like to sincerely thank plumbers. Their vital work keeps our water systems safe, efficient and sustainable.

*Oral Questions**[English]***RECOGNITION OF HEROES**

**Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there are heroes among us today, and if it were not for them, a life would have been lost. Two days ago, a member of my office suffered a sudden medical emergency, and in those critical moments, parliamentary assistant Ellena Yazdani, Constable Maxime Patry-Lavigne, Constable Matthew Sargeson and many other members of the Parliamentary Protective Service acted immediately. Because of their courage, quick thinking and medical training, a life was saved. I am happy to report he is doing very well. In the hospital, the doctor told me that if there had not been a defibrillator on site, a tragedy would have occurred.

I would like to also thank my colleague from Lanark—Frontenac for his endless work in advocating for access to defibrillators. We need more defibrillators in public spaces. Simply put, they save lives.

I ask all members of the House to join me in recognizing and thanking the PPS, police, emergency services and the heroes we have here today.

\* \* \*

**INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY**

**Gurbux Saini (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate International Women's Day this week, we take time to recognize the many contributions that women make in our communities, workplaces and families. Across Canada, women are leaders, caregivers, business owners, teachers and volunteers who help build a stronger and more compassionate country.

Let us be reminded to continue working toward equality and opportunity for all women and girls across Canada and around the world. When women have access to opportunity and stability, entire communities thrive. Let us continue working toward a more equal and prosperous future for all.

\* \* \*

**LOWELL GREEN**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last month residents across Ottawa learned of the loss of the legendary Lowell Green. Lowell was the voice of the common people in the Ottawa Valley on CFRA. Day after day, he would fill the airwaves with the truth that no one else had the courage to speak. He was the voice of the hard-working majority so often forgotten by those in power.

However, it was not just his radio show that kept people loving him for five decades. He also co-founded Big Brothers of Ottawa, which has become one of the longest-standing charities serving children in the capital. His work led to generations of mentors and mentees bringing up the next generation. Lowell's dedication also helped raise money for the Help Santa Toy Parade so everyone would have a gift at Christmastime. He helped save the Centennial Flame, and he raised money for countless other charities.

As we join with all of his former listeners, family members and friends, we say rest in peace to the legendary Lowell Green. May his wonderful legacy live on in the capital and across the country.

\* \* \*

**IRISH HERITAGE MONTH**

**James Maloney (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, five years ago yesterday, the House adopted a motion declaring March as Irish Heritage Month.

In 1847, Irish immigrants arrived on our shores. They were sick; they were hungry; they were dying. What did Canada do? We welcomed them. The Irish have helped build this country. Our first Governor General was from Ireland, our second Governor General was from Ireland, and our current Prime Minister is from Ireland.

When Lester Pearson commissioned our new flag, he tapped a man by the name of Patrick Reid, who had fought alongside Canadian soldiers in World War II. The red maple leaf ensign was on their shoulder, and that is what inspired the flag design that we fly so proudly today. When we walk out the doors of this building onto Wellington Street, it is a street named after a man who was born on Grafton Street in downtown Dublin.

Canada and Ireland are two great friends. They are two great allies, and they share values. There is so much more to do. I want to celebrate this month because Canadian Irish history is Canadian history.

*Sláinte.*

● (1420)

**The Speaker:** I let the hon. member go a little over time, but it is the Irish part of me that allowed that to happen.

**ORAL QUESTIONS***[English]***IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there are only two types of people: those who are Irish and those who wish they were.

*[Translation]*

The Prime Minister had four flip-flops on Iran, but the flip-flops at home have been even worse.

The Liberal government is claiming that the Global News report that indicated that there are 700 Iranian agents here in Canada is false. However, yesterday, the Liberals admitted that 239 agents have had their visas revoked, but only one of them has been deported. That means that there are at least 238 Iranian agents here in Canada at a time when we are seeing terrorist attacks on synagogues and other places.

Does the Prime Minister want to flip-flop again and tell us how many Iranian government agents are here threatening our population?

*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious situation. First, the government has already banned 10,000 IRGC officers from entering Canada.

Second, 170 investigations are under way, and like the Minister of Public Safety said, 28 are currently being subject to an extensive review process.

\* \* \*

[English]

**NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister had four flip-flops on Iran in just the same number of days. This is a pattern. He has also flip-flopped on oil and gas. He wrote a book called *Values*, in which he said he wanted to keep 50% of our energy in the ground. He said in that book that he wanted to raise carbon taxes, and then he claimed that he had flip-flopped on that, while he has since kept in place every antidevelopment law that Trudeau passed, he has renamed the carbon tax, and he has brought in an industrial carbon tax that has driven away an \$8-billion project.

Will he flip-flop again and reverse these Liberal policies so that we can actually supply the world with the energy it needs in this critical time?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate receiving this gift on this day honouring Ireland.

Canada has increased at record levels our oil exports. Canada has approved, under this government, Ksi Lisims. Canada has approved and started one of the biggest LNGs. Canada is working to the low-carbon LNG and the lowest-carbon oil exports in the world. We will maintain and increase our competitive position. We are driving straight forward.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is driving in circles. He said that he wanted to keep 50% of our oil in the ground. He supported blocking the pipeline to the Pacific. He has not approved a single oil pipeline, and his Major Projects Office has not approved a project of any kind. He has just tried to take credit for a project approved by Prime Minister Harper. Next he will be trying to claim credit for the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Will the Prime Minister flip-flop again, reverse his support of an industrial carbon tax and the Liberal antidevelopment laws, and get out of the way so that we can build pipelines to the Pacific to power paycheques for our people?

• (1425)

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I said in my book, as it is the policy of this government, we want the lowest-risk, the lowest-carbon and the lowest-cost oil and gas, and that is what makes ours competitive. That is the story of Canadian LNG. That is the story of the MOU with Alberta. That is the story of Bay du Nord. That is how we drive the country forward and not off a cliff like the member opposite.

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh!

**The Speaker:** Order, please. I am hearing a little too much of the member for Vernon—Lake Country—Monashee.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the world cannot put meaningless pieces of paper and meaningless MOUs in its gas tank. It needs real energy that comes out of our ground. The Prime Minister said he wants to keep it in the ground, and yet today we have the hilarious spectacle of the Liberal natural resources minister saying that Canada will do what it can to help with its stockpiles for the current energy shortage. Our stockpiles are zero.

Will the Prime Minister flip-flop again and adopt my policy that we should have a strategic oil and mineral reserve so that we can supply the world in the future?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there are many policies of the member opposite that I will not adopt. One of them is flip-flopping, jumping around and searching for ridings every election.

The second thing I will not adopt is the importance of having the most competitive oil and gas in the world. Our oil exports have never been higher. Under this government, exports are over five million barrels per day, and that will increase, because they will be low-carbon, low-cost and low-risk.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, sometimes the Prime Minister makes it too easy.

Today we have zero oil stockpiles. We have a strategic maple syrup stockpile, which he could use to put maple syrup on the pancakes that he flip-flops on, but we do not have any oil to supply to the world in the time of this crisis.

Will he reverse the antidevelopment policies that he has supported, which have come from the previous Liberal government, in order to unlock our production and power the world and the paycheques here at home?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is the way the G7 oil reserve works: If a nation is an importer, it has to have an oil reserve. If a nation is an exporter, which Canada is under this government, if it has record exports, which Canada does under this government, that is how it supplies the world.

I salute the work of the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Finance, who, working with G7 counterparts, confirmed with my G7 leader counterparts today the release of 400 million barrels from that strategic reserve.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, of the 400 million barrels of oil released from that strategic stockpile, how many are coming from Canada? There are exactly zero.

### Oral Questions

The Prime Minister's excuse, the reason we have no stockpiles, he says, is that we are a producer of oil. This is exactly the opposite of logic. The United States is a producer of oil. They have stockpiles. We have reserves, which the Prime Minister is successfully keeping in the ground.

Just last week, we saw an \$8-billion project cancelled under his watch. We are importing gas from Australia. Why will he not get out of the way so that we can produce our own energy?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite thinks he is on a rich vein, but he is tapping a dry well.

Under this government, production has never been so high. Exports have never been so high. We approved Bay du Nord. We are working with the Province of Alberta to produce the lowest-cost, lowest-carbon oil and gas. We are expanding our exports. We are expanding our future.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

**Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, 85,000 seniors have been having problems receiving their OAS payments since the new Cúram computer system was implemented. One federal public service union is even describing Cúram as the new Phoenix. Cost overruns for implementing Cúram are already approaching \$5 billion, 10 times more than SAAQelic, which caused a real scandal. When we raise these issues, the minister accuses us of fearmongering.

Is the Prime Minister taking the Cúram fiasco more seriously than his minister? Will he launch an inquiry?

• (1430)

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this is Service Canada's responsibility. Now there are 7.7 million people who are not having problems and for whom things are working well. Over the past week, the number of people experiencing delays related to these issues has been reduced by 10,000.

There are some issues, but it is Service Canada's responsibility to implement solutions.

**Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Cúram is a financial disaster, but for thousands of seniors, it is also a human tragedy. Some people are having to go into debt to pay their rent, buy groceries and pay their bills. The government keeps defending its decision to replace an outdated system with a malfunctioning system. Cúram has left thousands of seniors worried and anxious since it was first introduced.

Will the government, especially the Prime Minister, finally accept responsibility and take this situation seriously?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the government, we take this situation, like every other situation, seriously. That is because we are the government. Words are not facts, however. Cúram is not a financial disaster. There is a budget. Cúram is staying on budget.

**Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, he is quite the banker. We are talking about \$5 billion in cost overruns. Add to that the human cost for seniors struggling with Cúram. It was supposed to cost \$1.75 billion, and it is not over yet. We know this because it is the same old story every time. The costs keep climbing.

There are private firms and consultants laughing all the way to the bank as they listen to the Prime Minister today. This government acts like it has no obligation to manage public money properly. It is as though no one were responsible.

I would like to hear from the Prime Minister. When will there be a public and independent inquiry into the Cúram fiasco?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the funny thing is that the government offered a briefing to the Bloc Québécois and has yet to receive a response. There was no response to our offer for a briefing. There were discussions in committee.

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh.

**Right Hon. Mark Carney:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. It is a good idea to have a discussion before having an inquiry.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### PUBLIC SAFETY

**Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, for years the Liberals have known that there are hundreds of Iranian regime officials here in Canada. Two hundred and thirty-nine had their visas cancelled, yet we just learned that the government managed to remove exactly one of those. Its excuse is that they might claim asylum, there are no flights to Iran and we must protect their privacy. Meanwhile, an Iranian Canadian critic of the regime has gone missing, and police are now investigating that as a homicide.

Why are the Liberals protecting terrorists, and when will the minister finally have them removed?

**Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear. Those who are senior members of the IRGC will be removed. As we speak, right now, there are 28 individuals who are facing removal. We are going through due process and they will be removed. Let us also be very clear that if the party opposite wants more information, the Leader of the Opposition can go get a security check, and we will be more than glad to provide the requisite information for them to be accurate in their analysis.

*Oral Questions*

**Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the minister knows there are 700 IRGC agents in this country, and those are just the ones we know about. The minister knows that dissidents are being threatened. He knows that activist businesses are being shot out, and he knows that intimidation is happening under his watch, yet, after three and a half years, the Liberals have deported exactly one of those terrorists.

Will the minister commit to returning to the House within one week with a plan to expel more than just one regime activist?

**Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Canada Border Services Agency is working diligently to ensure the safety and security of Canadians, including 28 who are going through the process of being removed. Canada has identified the IRGC as a listed terrorist entity under Canadian law. We have listed Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism. We will continue to ensure the security of Canadians by removing those who are inadmissible.

• (1435)

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Mahdi Nasiri ran the Iranian regime's hardline propaganda newspaper and held other very senior positions within the Iranian regime, yet the Liberals let him enter Canada on a visitor visa, and then they let him stay here. Earlier today, the minister claimed that the Global News reporting was false and that there are not 700 Iranian agents in Canada.

I will ask the minister to be clear. How many senior Iranian officials like Mahdi Nasiri are in Canada?

**Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there are 28 current ongoing investigations that are going through our legal system, and they are deemed to be senior members of the IRGC. The Canada Border Services Agency is making a diligent effort to have them removed, but let us also be clear. We need to work with facts. Seven hundred IRGC members is not a fact. It is contrived by the Conservative Party. I am more than glad to offer a briefing to the Leader of the Opposition if he gets his security clearance.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the reality is that this number was reported by a credible Canadian news outlet. The minister will not answer how many are here. There is a loophole in the law that allows senior propagandists and senior officials of the Iranian regime, like Mahdi Nasiri, to stay in Canada. The Liberals are just letting this happen. They are letting the IRB say that yes, senior propagandists and Iranian officials who subjugate women stay in Canada. The law needs to change.

Will the minister agree to our common-sense Conservative proposal to table, within a week, a plan to review these loopholes and ensure that officials are—

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Public Safety.

**Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there are some important pieces of legislation that are now going through the House, which the opposition has been filibustering and obstructing. What we need right now is to be able to work together to ensure the safety and security of Canadians. The Canada Border Services Agency is working diligently on the removal of 28 individuals who are believed to be members of the

IRGC. They will continue to investigate credible information that goes to them, and we will continue to ensure the safety and security of Canadians.

**Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians have compassion over world events. Sometimes those world events spill onto Canadian streets. Such is the case with the situation in Iran. Three synagogues in Toronto were shot up within the last few days. One Iranian dissident was kidnapped, and it is now a homicide investigation. Only one Iranian regime official has been deported.

The question is this: Will the Liberals agree to table a plan within the next week to show Canadians how they will deal with this Iranian issue so that Canadians can walk their streets safely?

**Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague raised a number of issues in his question. One is the reality that many communities are facing when it comes to violence committed against their community of faith. We are all aghast at the horrors of the shootings that have taken place against synagogues in Canada over the last number of weeks, but it is important that we take action to actually provide solace to the communities who are facing such serious public safety threats. This includes funding to help protect the institutions where people practise their faith and pray, and it also includes legislative efforts that will more severely punish hate crimes in this country, including hate crimes committed against communities of faith.

Members of the House have an opportunity to support the combatting hate act to help provide such protection to communities. I hope we can count on their support.

[*Translation*]

**Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have known for years that senior members of the Iranian regime were living in Canada. This week, however, we learned that they expelled only one of them, even though 239 visas had been revoked. Liberal government officials also stated in committee that they could not expel members of the Iranian regime because they were eligible to claim asylum and their privacy had to be protected. Imagine that.

Where is the plan to expel these scoundrels from our country?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Safety has just clarified everything he is doing precisely to ensure that we deny suspected individuals the possibility of remaining in Canada. However, I encourage my colleague to support our Bill C-9, which is currently before the House. It was part of our election platform and, unless I am mistaken, it was part of theirs as well. We are committed to protecting faith communities, temples, synagogues and mosques in Canada. The legislation is before the House.

### Oral Questions

Will the member and his colleagues vote in favour of delivering on their election promise?

• (1440)

**Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Public Safety shared today is very little compared to what needs to be done. Today, we submitted specific points to the government. Allow me to repeat what we are asking the government to do. We are asking it to urgently enforce deportation orders for Iranian regime officials, to evaluate Canada's terrorism threat level, which has remained unchanged since 2014, and to stop approving any refugee claims without an in-person interview.

The government has one week to come up with a plan. The government has seven days to show its plan to the Conservatives.

Will it?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government has designated that segment of the Iranian community as a terrorist entity. The Minister of Public Safety is taking serious measures to respond to the current situation.

However, I want to repeat my question to my hon. colleague. He is committed—as I am, as we all are—to protecting faith communities in Canada, to protecting community centres, Jewish businesses, Muslim businesses, temples and synagogues.

Will the member and his colleagues say yes to these communities in Canada?

\* \* \*

### RAIL TRANSPORTATION

**Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the people of Terrebonne are worried about expropriation for the high-speed rail project, and they are right to worry, because in Bill C-15, the Liberals weakened the Expropriation Act specifically to limit the rights of property owners along the rail alignment. The mayor of Terrebonne is calling for real consultations. The Lanaudière chapter of the Union des producteurs agricoles is afraid that our best farmland will be cut in half and then abandoned. Everyone is worried.

Why are the Liberals making expropriation easier and treating the people of Terrebonne like second-class citizens instead of working to earn social licence?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the high-speed rail project is inspiring Canadians, inspiring the people of Terrebonne, inspiring entire communities across Quebec and Ontario. It will be a game-changer for the people in those places, who represent 40% of the Canadian population, including the people of Terrebonne.

We will complete this project in a respectful way, in compliance with standards and with social licence. We are going to build high-speed rail in Canada.

**Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, while the minister is working on being inspiring, Alto is doing nothing to reassure the people of Terrebonne. On the contrary, its CEO has con-

firmed to the media that there will be expropriations. That is not very inspiring to hear. Alto's CEO said he hopes that expropriation will not be the primary tool. In other words, people along the route in Terrebonne will get offers, and if they are not happy, well, Alto will use the tools granted by the Liberals to expropriate the land. That is not a negotiation.

Why will the Liberals not include the people of Terrebonne in the discussion rather than threatening them?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, people in Terrebonne, people across Quebec and Ontario, and even across Canada, are dreaming of this technology. We will make sure we do this right, consulting with landowners, communities, mayors, reeves and farmers. We will respect everyone, and we will end up with the most advanced technology that Canadians can only dream of for now, technology that is the envy of the world and that will be a game-changer for our communities. That is high-speed rail.

\* \* \*

[English]

### PUBLIC SAFETY

**Roman Baber (York Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, last week, three synagogues were shot at in Toronto. The war abroad is spilling onto our streets, while hundreds of Iranian agents are operating in Canada. The Conservatives are calling on the Liberals to table a plan within a week to enforce the deportation of Iranian officials, to disrupt Iranian efforts to launder money and to re-evaluate Canada's terrorism threat level.

Will the Liberals stop the Iranian regime here at home, or will Canada remain a playground for the revolutionary guard?

**Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague, like one of the previous questioners, raised the very real challenge of communities that are facing hate crimes, including synagogues that are being shot up in this country. There are efforts to intimidate and obstruct people from practising their faith, not just at synagogues but at temples, at mosques and at our churches. We need to do more to ensure that people can live freely. That means rights that are not just written on paper but actually enjoyed in communities.

This includes adopting new laws that would criminalize certain behaviours that target people on the basis of their faith. We have an opportunity to support the combatting hate act to deliver this outcome now for Canadians. I hope the Conservative members will join us.

*Oral Questions*

• (1445)

**Roman Baber (York Centre, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, shooting at synagogues is already illegal. Just like the Prime Minister, the justice minister is all talk and no action. Now an Iranian dissident is missing, and police fear that he has been murdered. Meanwhile, some Canadians actually recognized an Iranian official at the gym. The Conservatives are asking the Liberals to table a plan within a week to re-evaluate Canada's terrorism threat level, to identify gaps in our national security and to rid our country of the IRGC.

When will the Liberal government start protecting Canadians and finally deport those who are connected to the Iranian regime?

**Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our security threat levels are assessed by our law enforcement agencies, including the RCMP and CSIS. It is not politicians who assess those threats, and that is a very good thing.

Let me also say that the Canada Border Services Agency is making every effort to remove those who are inadmissible to Canada, who are members of the IRGC. There are 28 of them who are now going through the process. We will ensure the safety and security of Canadians, and we will ensure that those who are inadmissible to Canada are removed.

**Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, never have foreign conflicts spilled onto our streets the way they have under the Liberal government. Three separate synagogues were shot at in a week in the GTA. An Iranian dissident in B.C. has gone missing, and police are investigating it as a homicide. An Iranian dissident in Thornhill had his boxing gym shot up 17 times the day after organizing a rally in Richmond Hill. Canadians are watching violence and intimidation spread in their own communities, while the Liberals sit back and do nothing.

Will the Liberal government table a plan to take action against the Iranian regime operating here at home so that Canadians can feel safe on their own streets?

**Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to visit two of the synagogues that were attacked last week. It is deeply heartbreaking to see that their sense of security has been breached.

As a government, we are taking decisive action, including \$10 million that was just announced to ensure the coordination of security efforts in places of worship as well as other community centres within the Jewish community. However, that is not enough. We also have legislation in front of the House, Bill C-9, which the Jewish community has been asking for us to pass. I urge the party opposite to pass it forthwith.

\* \* \*

**IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP**

**Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians do not need more photo ops. They need results. This week, we learned the Liberals have only removed one IRGC official after nearly four years. At the House immigration committee, Liberal officials said they could not deport them because there were no flights to Iran and because they needed to protect their privacy. Conservatives are calling for the enforcement of deportation orders for Iranian regime officials, the closing of loopholes that allow hu-

man rights abusers to be admitted and a crackdown on regime money laundering in Canada.

I am going to ask again. When will the Liberal government implement the foreign influence registry, stop rubber-stamping refugee claims without in-person interviews and finally deport the regime agents who are terrorizing our communities?

**Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as has been litigated during the debate in this chamber already today. The IRGC has been listed, and that carries with it certain consequences about the inadmissibility of certain individuals. Their files are reviewed and the people who are not allowed to remain in Canada will in fact be removed.

The concern underlying the questions in the House of Commons today have to do with the safety of Canadians, including the safety of Jewish Canadians to practise their faith freely in a context where synagogues are being shot up. There is a piece of legislation, the combatting hate act, Bill C-9, that has been before the House. We have an opportunity to offer the protection communities are asking for. It is a shame that the party opposite will not listen to Jewish Canadians and do what they are asking.

**Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's sovereignty is not negotiable, but foreign conflicts are spilling onto our streets. Three synagogues have been shot up this past week. An Iranian dissident has disappeared, and the police think he may have been killed. However, the Liberals are patting themselves on the back because they removed one Iranian official linked to the IRGC. There are hundreds more on our streets. The number one job of any government is to protect its citizens. They are not doing that.

Will the Liberal government table a plan within one week to deal with the Iranian agents in our country and on our streets? It is about time it did that.

### Oral Questions

• (1450)

**Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we do have a plan. That is why we listed the IRGC as a terrorist entity. This provides our law enforcement and the CBSA with the tools to hold people inadmissible in our country and then remove them. The CBSA is working through the files and is removing those with links to the IRGC. This is the plan.

Along with that, we are protecting our institutions. We just made an announcement for an extra \$10 million today to make sure that our religious communities are safe.

\* \* \*

### NORTHERN AFFAIRS

**Lori Idlout (Nunavut, Lib.):** *Uqaqtittiji*, I am proud to join a team that will take the larger picture of meeting the current political environment and that is set on meeting the immediate needs of the north. Northerners know that food security is about more than getting food on the shelves. It is about addressing the cost of living, local capacity and true food sovereignty.

Can my colleague, the Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs, tell the House how our government is moving beyond food subsidies and creating a food economy for those who call the north home?

**Hon. Rebecca Chartrand (Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs and Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me start by welcoming the member for Nunavut to this side of the House. I also want to acknowledge her strong advocacy for the north.

We know that a subsidy alone will not solve the food insecurity issue in the north. That is why we are looking at moving from a food subsidy to a food economy in the north. This year alone, we have \$200 million supporting the evolution of nutrition north. We are concluding regional engagements at the end of the month with a food sovereignty summit. I look forward to working with my colleague to—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Newmarket—Aurora.

\* \* \*

### THE ECONOMY

**Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have had countless seniors in Newmarket—Aurora come up and tell me that they have had to leave retirement and find jobs because they are struggling to eat, heat and afford a roof over their heads. This reality is backed up by data. A new survey from the National Institute on Ageing revealed that one in five Canadians over the age of 50 are living near the poverty line and cannot even cover a \$500 emergency.

When will the Prime Minister stop punishing seniors and scrap the inflationary Liberal taxes that are making life so unaffordable?

**Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is what Canadians understand. There is a major international war raging. Canadians understand that our allies' supply of energy and their national security are being threatened. Canadians also understand that our actions are limiting

those shortages and reducing the impact on prices. Oil production is at an all-time high. Natural gas pipelines are full. Exports on the TMX pipeline are up 100% in the last year. Our LNG facility, the second-largest in the world, is now shipping at capacity. We are doing what we need to do.

**Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the member, during all my studies and over 15 years working in finance, there is one basic economic truth that always held. When costs go up, prices go up and when competition is fierce, prices come down, yet during this food affordability crisis, the Liberals are inhibiting competition all while piling taxes and regulations on those who grow, ship and sell our food.

When will the Prime Minister finally apply this basic economic fundamental and cut taxes and regulations so Canadians can get real relief in the grocery aisle?

**Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what Canadians understand is that when they have good-paying jobs, they can afford things. We are building LNG Canada. We are building Cedar LNG—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Speaker:** There should not be anyone standing on this side. Only the minister should be standing and responding.

The hon. minister, from the top, please.

• (1455)

**Hon. Tim Hodgson:** Mr. Speaker, through the Major Projects Office, we are building, and we are giving Canadians good-paying jobs. We are helping them afford the groceries they need.

**Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our farmers and fishermen are being punished with unreliable fertilizer supplies and a rising fuel tax to 17¢ that is driving up the cost of everything. Instead of supporting them, the Liberals have shuttered agricultural research stations and fuelled the G7's worst food inflation. It is outrageous that while he plays economist, one in five Canadians over 50 is now trapped in poverty, choosing between eating and heating.

When will the current Liberal Prime Minister accept responsibility for what he can control and scrap the Liberal taxes and policies that are making life unaffordable for Canadians?

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me say it once again. Studies show that the impact of the industrial carbon price on the price of food is zero.

However, if we want to talk about how we are supporting Canadians and Canadian food security, the member for Chatham-Kent—Leamington might be interested in what we are doing to support greenhouse production. It is a big thing that is helping farmers in his area. We are supporting greenhouse farmers with investments and tax incentives to increase capacity and production. That will help Canadian food security. If the member wants to talk about taxes, the first thing that this government did was cut them.

**Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, let me tell members what 15 national agriculture organizations wrote to the committee. They wrote that closing agricultural research centres will undermine research that they say is fundamental to keeping food affordable. At the same time, the Liberal government is pushing ahead with its fuel tax, which is rising from 7¢ to 17¢ per litre, while also raising the carbon taxes on steel, aluminum, plastic and farm equipment. All of these Liberal decisions have a direct impact on Canada's agriculture sector, causing production costs to rise, which get passed on to Canadians at the grocery store. These costs are imposed at home, not abroad.

When will these Liberals stop driving up food prices for Canadians?

**Hon. Heath MacDonald (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue down the path. We must change our direction in regard to research.

Let me quote some of the numbers over the past few years. The research and development system is becoming less diverse. Public investment in agriculture knowledge generation, which includes R and D, has declined by 15%. Private sector outsourced R and D to universities is down 77%. The number of enterprises conducting research and development has shrunk by 30%. If the members on the other side want to continue down this path, it will put us at an unfair advantage politically, economically and universally.

\* \* \*

#### SENIORS

**Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, a community member wrote to me about what they are seeing every day. They are seeing frail seniors standing outside grocery stores begging for help and Canadians lining up at food banks after a lifetime of work.

The National Institute on Ageing states that one in five Canadians over 50 is now living at the poverty line. Many cannot afford groceries, heating their homes, essential goods and services or even a \$500 emergency.

Rising costs are not driven by events abroad. They are the result of policies imposed here at home, which continue to make life more expensive. Are the Liberals really telling Canadian families and se-

niors that they should just lower their standards and accept that life is permanently unaffordable?

**Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians elected a government they know they can rely on to support the social fabric of this country, including the support of our seniors. That is why we introduced legislation to reduce taxes for nearly 22 million Canadians. We made the national school food program permanent. We launched the Canada disability benefit. We ensured that old age security would continue for those who are 65.

This is what seniors like Dava Houston are saying. They are seeing a lot of talk from the Conservatives about the grocery rebate helping no one, but as a senior, they disagree. This benefit is specifically targeted to help those on fixed incomes—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga.

**Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, one in five seniors cannot afford necessities, such as food and housing. Women, renters and seniors with health challenges are being hit the hardest, living in conditions comparable to the poverty line. The Liberal government often blames global pressures when the fact is that Canada has the worst food price inflation in the G7.

The Prime Minister's rebranded carbon tax, now increasing to 17¢ a litre, is a policy entirely within his control. Will the Prime Minister take responsibility, scrap the taxes and cut the regulations that are driving up food prices and start making life more affordable for the Canadians who are struggling?

• (1500)

**Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, just yesterday, I heard a Conservative member of Parliament say that helping people was ideological. Maybe they should get together and talk to each other, because if you think that helping people fix their teeth is ideological, feeding a hungry kid at school is ideological, cutting taxes is ideological or having child care that costs people \$16,000 less a year is ideological, then I actually think that you are out to lunch.

**The Speaker:** This is certainly not referring to me. The member did not mean me.

The hon. member for Richmond Centre—Marpole.

*Oral Questions*

**Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC):** Mr Speaker, what happens abroad may be beyond our control, but the Liberal policies making life more expensive are not.

Our seniors are paying the price. Seniors are being forced to work, with retirement slipping further out of reach. The National Institute on Aging reports that one in five Canadians over 50 is now living on the poverty line, yet the Liberals are making it worse by sneaking in carbon taxes that drive up the price of essentials.

When will the Prime Minister take responsibility for what he can control and scrap the Liberal policies that are making life unaffordable for Canadians, including seniors?

**Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member talks about seniors who are struggling in his community. They are struggling in my community, too. We have to acknowledge that. At the same time, what do we do to help those seniors?

We put forward a serious plan for the future, an opportunities agenda, which is focused on getting our resources to market and building up the infrastructure to do it. That is how we build an opportunities agenda that has purchasing power attached to it, because it leads to jobs. We talk about the programs and pensions, which the Conservatives want to cut, by the way, but all of that relies on a strong economy, which is exactly what the government is focused on delivering.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**TAXATION**

**Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, according to the National Institute on Ageing, one in five Canadians over the age of 50 is now facing a poverty-level standard of living. Meanwhile, the Prime Minister is stubbornly sticking to his fuel tax, which will increase from 7¢ to 17¢.

Can the Prime Minister finally take responsibility, stop denying reality and axe his taxes that are making Canadians and Quebeckers poorer?

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will say it again: Studies clearly show that the industrial carbon pricing does not affect food prices. There is zero impact. I want to make this very clear to everyone watching.

We are investing in our agricultural producers across the country to ensure that there is food, good food, for everyone here at home.

**Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the only thing that is zero is their score.

Canada has the worst food inflation in the G7. On top of that, this government continues to increase the industrial carbon tax on steel, aluminum, plastics and agricultural equipment, which is driving up costs throughout all supply chains.

When will this government eliminate its taxes on food so that Canadians can finally have an affordable life?

**Hon. Nathalie Provost (Secretary of State (Nature), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I disagree that our score is zero. All we have been doing

since we were elected is giving purchasing power to Canadians, especially seniors.

I will say it again. The Canada child benefit, although not for seniors, still represents a significant boost in purchasing power. The recent Canada groceries and essentials benefit is giving people back some purchasing power to cope with the current global situation. Everyone knows that.

\* \* \*

**HOUSING**

**Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government is working to help Canadians from all walks of life find a decent place to live. With the support of a number of partners, a seniors project recently opened in Drummondville.

Can the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure tell the House what this project has to offer seniors? How is Build Canada Homes going to help other projects get off the ground?

**Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Drummondville project is an important milestone in affordable housing for seniors, with 100 units now open. This new building reflects our efforts to make housing more accessible. It represents tangible progress in meeting the needs of the region's seniors.

I encourage my colleagues to support the Build Canada Homes legislation so that we have more tools.

\* \* \*

● (1505)

[English]

**MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTIONS**

**Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, a peer-reviewed study published yesterday in a world-leading scientific journal found that closing a supervised drug consumption site led to no increase in deaths and no increase in emergency room visits. In fact, after the drug site closed, users were more likely to access life-saving addiction treatment. Every single drug consumption site in Canada exists only because the health minister approved it under federal law.

The minister claims to follow science, so does she accept the science that proves consumption sites are not the solution to addiction?

[Translation]

**Hon. Marjorie Michel (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as my colleague knows, because I have said it several times, there is no single solution to this crisis. We know that. Various studies have shown a variety of results.

**The Speaker:** The interpretation was not working, but it is back now.

The minister can start again from the top.

**Hon. Marjorie Michel:** Mr. Speaker, as my colleague knows, because I have told him several times, a lot of different studies have shown a variety of results with respect to supervised consumption sites. As he knows, there is no single solution to this problem.

Supervised consumption sites are there to save lives. They do not get in the way of treatment. We can discuss this further.

[English]

**Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this is the first study in Canada to use individual-level, linkable health data. That means, for the first time, we can see exactly what happened to the people who have used these sites. Every drug consumption site in Canada operates under an exemption granted by the federal health minister.

If the research now says that closing a drug consumption site leads to more people getting life-saving treatment and no increase in deaths, why on earth is the minister still approving them?

[Translation]

**Hon. Marjorie Michel (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague should know that this minister grants exemptions every time the provinces that fund these supervised consumption sites fund projects following consultations with their own communities.

I have said it before, and I will say it again: Yes, these sites exist to save lives, but there is also work being done on treatment.

**Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, another Liberal drug experiment has failed. The Liberals promised that safe injection sites would reduce overdose deaths, but these deaths have increased by 400% in British Columbia and doubled in Quebec. Fifty thousand Canadians have died.

Now, a landmark study in Alberta has shown that the closure of a safe injection site did not lead to an increase in deaths. In fact, more people sought treatment.

How many Canadians will have to die before the Liberals admit that their policies have failed to address the real problem? When will they finally take a preventive approach?

**Hon. Marjorie Michel (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what my colleague should know is that we can walk and chew gum at the same time. What does that mean? It means that we can save lives through supervised consumption sites, provide treatment and work on prevention.

What you should know is that we are working in co-operation with all of the provinces to reduce the rate of drug use. What is more, even if your study does not show this, all of the figures on drug-related deaths are down in Canada—

### Oral Questions

**The Speaker:** I would just like to remind members to address their comments through the Chair.

The hon. member for Richmond East—Steveston.

\* \* \*

[English]

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Parm Bains (Richmond East—Steveston, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in 2025, the port of Vancouver had a record-breaking year for exports, moving more Canadian goods to global markets than ever before. This is a point of pride for the constituents in Richmond East—Steveston, who help power this success every day through their work in trade, transportation and port operations.

Could the Minister of International Trade update the House on what this record-setting year at the port of Vancouver means for Canadian workers and for Canada's growing trade opportunities?

● (1510)

**Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that member from Richmond, B.C., has been a tireless champion for the port of Vancouver and its workers. We are talking about 170 million tonnes of cargo, which is the highest in the port's history. That is more exports to China, South Korea, Japan, the Middle East and more.

Non-U.S. exports were up by 17% in 2025, and we are not stopping there. We are signing a record number of trade agreements to open new opportunities for the workers who are producing world-class products to get products out the door. This is how we build Canada strong.

\* \* \*

### FIREARMS

**Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Liberals tried to clarify the rules behind their ridiculous gun-grab scheme. Canadian soldiers who were deployed before the gun-grab program started will return after the amnesty period ends. This means that they would have no opportunity to declare their firearms under this gun-grab policy. Because of this, many armed forces members will return to Canada as criminals because the Liberals will not extend the amnesty period. This is very troubling.

If the Liberals trust our deployed soldiers with the biggest guns we have, why on earth would they not trust them with their Plinksters and turkey guns when they get home?

*Private Members' Business*

**Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the over 42,000 firearms enrolled in the compensation program. The corresponding individual law-abiding gun owners are going to abide by the law. The amnesty period expires on October 30, and I look forward to ensuring that those law-abiding gun owners get the compensation they deserve.

\* \* \*

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

**Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister told a story about living within a lie in Davos and said, "The power of the less power starts with honesty." Former Liberal cabinet ministers Allan Rock and Lloyd Axworthy, who have been honest about Canada's complicity in the killing of civilians, have come out publicly in support of Bill C-233. They said that Parliament now faces a clear choice to maintain an outdated exemption that undermines Canada's credibility or adopt a modern principled statement that reflects our commitments and responsibilities.

Will the Prime Minister be honest with reality and vote yes to Bill C-233?

**Hon. Anita Anand (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government opposes the bill. Canada has one of the strongest export regimes in the world, with human rights considerations applied to every single permit issued for military goods. The changes proposed in the bill would decimate Canada's defence industry, weaken Canada's role in NATO and jeopardize the capabilities of our Canadian Armed Forces. The bill would not close a loophole. It would create new vulnerabilities. It is irresponsible to propose a bill like this.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of Mr. Dara Calleary, Minister for Social Protection and for Rural and Community Development and the Gaeltacht of Ireland.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

[*English*]

**EXPORT AND IMPORT PERMITS ACT**

The House resumed from March 9 consideration of the motion that Bill C-233, An Act to amend the Export and Import Permits Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Speaker:** It being 3:14 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-233, under Private Members' Business.

Call in the members.

• (1525)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 85*)

**YEAS**

## Members

Al Soud	Boulerice
Casey	Coteau
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Gazan
Guilbeault	Idlout
Johns	Khalid
Kwan	May
McPherson	Nguyen
Rana	Saini
Tesser Derksen	Weiler
Zahid	Zuberi— 22

**NAYS**

## Members

Aboultarif	Aitchison
Albas	Ali
Allison	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Bains	Baker
Baldinelli	Bardeesy
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Bendayan	Berthold
Bexte	Bezan
Bittle	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Block
Blois	Bonin
Bonk	Borrelli
Bragdon	Brassard
Brière	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carney
Carr	Chambers
Champagne	Champoux
Chang	Chartrand
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Chong
Church	Clark
Cobena	Cody
Connors	Cooper
Cormier	Dabrusin
Dalton	Dancho
Dandurand	Danko
Davidson	Davies (Niagara South)
Dawson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	d'Entremont
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Diotte	Doherty
Dowdall	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan
Dzerowicz	Earle
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Epp	Eyolfson
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Fancy	Fanjoy
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Fry	Fuhr

Gaheer  
Gallant  
Gasparro  
Généreux  
Gerretsen  
Gill (Brampton West)  
Gill (Windsor West)  
  
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)  
Godin  
Gourde  
Guay  
Gull-Masty  
Hajdu  
Hanley  
Harrison  
Hirtle  
Hoback  
Hogan  
Housefather  
Jaczek  
Jeneroux  
Joly  
Kayabaga  
Kelly  
Kibble  
Klassen  
Konanz  
Kram  
Kronis  
Kusie  
Lalonde  
Lamoureux  
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)  
Larouche  
Lauzon  
Lavoie  
Lawton  
Lefebvre  
Lemire  
Lewis (Essex)  
Lighthound  
Lobb  
Ma  
MacDonald (Cardigan)  
Mahal  
Malette (Bay of Quinte)  
  
Maloney  
Mazier  
McGuinty  
McKenzie  
McKnight  
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)  
Ménard  
Michel  
Miller  
Moore  
Morrison  
Motz  
Myles  
Nater  
Normandin  
Oliphant  
O'Rourke  
Perron  
Plamondon  
Provost  
Redekopp  
Rempel Garner  
Richards  
Rocheport  
Rood

Gainey  
Garon  
Gaudreau  
Genius  
Gill (Calgary Skyview)  
Gill (Calgary McKnight)  
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)  
Gladu  
Goodridge  
Groleau  
Guglielmin  
Gunn  
Hallan  
Hardy  
Hepfner  
Ho  
Hodgson  
Holman  
Iacono  
Jansen  
Jivani  
Joseph  
Kelloway  
Khanna  
Kirkland  
Kmiec  
Koutrakis  
Kramp-Neuman  
Kuruc  
Lake  
Lambropoulos  
Lantsman  
Lapointe (Sudbury)  
Lattanzio  
Lavack  
Lawrence  
LeBlanc  
Leitão  
Leslie  
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)  
Lloyd  
Long  
MacDonald (Malpeque)  
MacKinnon (Gatineau)  
Majumdar  
Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)  
Mantle  
McCauley  
McKelvie  
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)  
McLean (Calgary Centre)  
Melillo  
Menegakis  
Miedema  
Mingarelli  
Morin  
Morrissette  
Muys  
Naqvi  
Nathan  
Ntumba  
Olszewski  
Osborne  
Petitpas Taylor  
Poilievre  
Ramsay  
Reid  
Reynolds  
Robertson  
Romanado  
Ross

Rowe  
Ruff  
Sarai  
Sawatzky  
Schiefke  
Seeback  
Sheehan  
Sidhu (Brampton East)  
Simard  
Solomon  
Steinley  
Stevenson  
Strahl  
Sudds  
Thomas  
Tochor  
Turnbull  
van Koeverden  
Vandenbeld  
Viersen  
Vis  
Warkentin  
Waugh  
Yip  
Zimmer— 295

### Routine Proceedings

Royer  
Sahota  
Savard-Tremblay  
Scheer  
Schmale  
Sgro  
Shipley  
Sidhu (Brampton South)  
Small  
Sousa  
Ste-Marie  
St-Pierre  
Stubbs  
Thériault  
Thompson  
Tolmie  
Uppal  
Van Popta  
Vien  
Villeneuve  
Wagantall  
Watchorn  
Wilkinson  
Zerucelli

### PAIRED

#### Members

DeRidder Grant  
Jackson Martel  
Mendès Valdez— 6

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

[*English*]

I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded division, the time provided for Government Orders will be extended by 12 minutes.

\* \* \*

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

**The Speaker:** 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-212, an act respecting a national strategy for children and youth in Canada.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### 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 12 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

*Routine Proceedings*

[Translation]

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), and in accordance with the policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaty entitled “Agreement between Canada and Australia on Cooperation and Mutual Administrative Assistance in Customs Matters”, done at Wellington on November 19, 2025.

\* \* \*

● (1530)

**INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS**

**Richard Bragdon (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, four reports of the Canadian section of the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group, or CEUS.

[English]

The first concerns the IPG's participation at the Council of State Governments, CSG, in South Carolina, at the South Southern Legislative Annual Conference, from July 8 to July 12, 2023.

The second concerns the IPG's participation at the Pacific Northwest Economic Region Annual Summit, known as PNWER, in Boise, Idaho, from July 16 to July 20, 2023.

The third concerns the IPG's participation at the annual meeting of the Council of State Governments Western Legislative Conference in Los Angeles, California, from November 12 to November 15, 2023.

The fourth concerns the IPG's annual congressional visit to Washington, D.C., from May 15 to May 16, 2024.

**Alexandra Mendès (Brossard—Saint-Lambert, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association respecting its participation in the Parliament of Jamaica Post-Election Seminar, held in Kingston, Jamaica, from January 28 to January 30, 2026.

\* \* \*

**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 second report of the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs, entitled “2025 Reports of the Auditor General of Canada: Follow-Up on Programs for First Nations.”

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

[Translation]

## TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

**Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities: the eighth report entitled “Strengthening the Regulation of Recreational Boating” and the ninth report entitled “Northern, Rural and Remote Air Travel: A Critical Lifeline”.

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

[English]

**Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Clarke, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise with respect to the recreational boating study previously cited.

Conservatives are entering a dissenting report because we believe that a rose by any other name smells just as sweet and that the carbon tax by any other name is just as painful. That is why we are tabling a dissenting report calling for the removal of the industrial carbon tax, to give boaters and boat manufacturers a break.

## HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

**Robert Morrissey (Egmont, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, entitled “Distribution of Federal Student Grants”.

The report has been submitted electronically to the table officers.

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 18th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, entitled “Certificate of Nomination of Anton Boegman to the Position of Foreign Influence Transparency Commissioner”.

The committee recommends the nominee to the position of foreign influence transparency commissioner.

[Translation]

## PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

**Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the third report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security in relation to Bill C-8, an act respecting cyber security, amending the Telecommunications Act and making consequential amendments to other acts.

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with amendments.

- (1535)  
[English]

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on International Trade, in relation to the motion adopted on Tuesday, February 24, regarding eliminating forced labour from Canadian supply chains.

I also have the honour to present, in both official language, the eighth report, in relation to the motion adopted on Thursday, February 12, regarding Canada-Taiwan trade-related co-operation.

\* \* \*

## OIL TANKER MORATORIUM ACT

**David McKenzie (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-264, An Act to repeal certain restrictions on shipping.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present a private member's bill that would repeal the Oil Tanker Moratorium Act. For almost a decade, the Liberal west coast oil tanker ban has stifled our energy industry and held back our country. In 2026, Canadian energy is more important here at home and around the world than it has ever been. Our allies and trading partners are anxious to purchase energy from a reliable and stable partner. Canada is that partner, and the world needs more Canadian energy.

Hundreds of tankers safely navigate the St. Lawrence River and Vancouver Harbour every year, yet the west coast oil tanker ban was put in place to suppress the Canadian petroleum industry. In fact, it killed projects like the indigenous-owned Eagle Spirit pipeline and has cost our country billions of dollars.

This private member's bill is about nation building. It is about leveraging our abundant resources to help our allies, our friends and our families. It is about taking action here at home so we can have success around the world. Conservatives want Canada to be an energy superpower.

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

\* \* \*

## FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

**Marcus Powlowski (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-265, An Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (List of Therapeutic Products Pre-approved for Special Access).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce my private member's bill, an act to amend the Food and Drugs Act with respect to the list of therapeutic products pre-approved for special access. My PMB would reform the special access program, which would allow doctors to access medications that are not approved yet by Health Canada.

I will give an idea of the problem the bill seeks to address. A pediatric ICU doctor recently told me about spending six hours trying to resuscitate a child, the first four hours of which were spent trying

## Routine Proceedings

to access a drug which is available only through this program, even though that drug is considered first-line therapy in the United States. This should not have happened. It should not happen in the future. The bill would reduce the red tape associated with this program and also leave the decision in life-threatening situations as to whether to use a drug not yet approved by Health Canada to the clinicians, not to bureaucrats in Ottawa.

I would like to thank SickKids, the sick children's hospital in Toronto, which co-wrote the first draft of the bill with me. I would also like to thank all the other children's hospitals that had a lot of input. I would like to thank the member for Kitchener South—Hespeler, an ICU doctor, for seconding the bill.

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

\* \* \*

- (1540)

## NATIONAL FRAMEWORK ON SKILLED TRADES AND LABOUR MOBILITY ACT

**Parm Bains (Richmond East—Steveston, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-266, An Act to establish a national framework respecting skilled trades and labour mobility.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present my first private member's bill.

Movement of skilled labour across Canada is essential to the country's economic development, productivity, infrastructure, delivery and competitiveness. However, regulatory barriers, as well as inconsistencies between certification processes across provinces and territories, hinder skilled trades and workers' mobility, and they delay national development priorities like housing, transportation, infrastructure and energy projects.

On this World Plumbing Day, and as a former aircraft maintenance engineer, I understand the challenges trades workers face when they try to take their skills on the road. My bill would help these workers take their skills from the Pacific Salish Sea to the Atlantic. While respecting provincial and territorial jurisdiction over training, certification and labour market regulation, my bill, an act to establish a national framework respecting skilled trades and labour mobility, calls on the government to work with provinces, territories, trade skills associations and unions to modernize, harmonize and streamline credential recognition.

I look forward to a spirited debate on this important issue for Canada's future.

*Routine Proceedings*

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

• (1545)

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

PACIFIC SALMON

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

**Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce C-267, An Act to establish a national framework to promote the durability of electronic products and essential home appliances.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I feel a great sense of responsibility as I rise today to introduce my very first bill as a member of Parliament. This bill seeks to establish a national framework on the durability and repairability of electronic products and essential home appliances.

Every year, millions of Canadians have to replace appliances that could be repaired. This is very expensive for families and contributes to the rapid growth of electronic waste. The purpose of this bill is to better inform consumers, encourage manufacturers to design more durable products, and promote a more transparent and responsible marketplace.

By working with the provinces, territories, manufacturers and consumer advocacy groups, we can promote products that are designed to last and easier to repair. This will help reduce household expenses, support the circular economy, and encourage more sustainable consumption.

I invite my colleagues to support this initiative.

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

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**PETITIONS**

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

**Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to table a petition today on behalf of the Mission Self Advocacy Group. Its members state that Canadians with disabilities face disproportionately high rates of poverty, and existing federal income supports, including the Canada disability benefit at \$200 per month, are insufficient to meet basic living costs. Individuals with permanent and lifelong disabilities such as cerebral palsy are required to repeatedly reapply for benefits, creating unnecessary administrative burdens, delays and stress with little or no public benefit. Reducing unnecessary administrative barriers would improve accessibility, efficiency and fairness, while ensuring federal programs serve their intended purpose.

Therefore, the signatories of this petition call upon the Government of Canada to increase the Canada disability benefit to \$500 per month, to implement a one-time application process for individuals with permanent disabilities and to significantly reduce administrative and paperwork requirements associated with the Canada disability benefit so that essential supports are accessible, dignified and effective for Canadian citizens and permanent residents.

**Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition I would like to present today is on behalf of the streamkeepers on the Miami River in Harrison Hot Springs. Streamkeepers throughout the province of British Columbia are committed volunteers who deserve certainty for funding and support from the salmon enhancement program beyond the current budget end of March 31, 2026. The salmon enhancement program collaborates with the Pacific Streamkeepers Federation on training that ensures that community volunteers are able to protect and improve aquatic health, habitat status, land use and stock assessment within their communities.

Therefore, the petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to not cut program funding for the salmon enhancement programs across British Columbia, which educate thousands of young people on salmon habitat and life cycles.

PUBLIC SAFETY

**Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise for the eighth time on behalf of the people of Dauphin, Manitoba, to present a petition on the rising rate of crime. The residents of Dauphin and the Parkland region are demanding that the Liberal government repeal its soft-on-crime policies that have fuelled a surge in crime throughout their communities. Since 2015, there has been a 54% increase in violent crime and a 75% increase in sexual assaults across Canada. Petitioners are deeply concerned by what they read in their local newspapers, including a November report that Dauphin RCMP members are searching for a wanted man with three separate arrest warrants. Our once-safe communities have now turned into places where people fear for their lives because the government's catch-and-release policies have allowed violent repeat offenders to be out on bail instead of in jail.

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

DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION

**Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Richmond Hill South to present a petition where petitioners are concerned that over the past decade, diversity, equity and inclusion, DEI, mandates have become embedded across federal departments, agencies, granting councils and federally funded institutions.

Figures released by the current government indicate that more than a billion dollars has been spent on DEI-related initiatives and programming within the federal sphere. These DEI requirements risk undermining trust in public institutions, discouraging excellence and diverting public funds away from frontline services, innovation and high-quality research. Petitioners are also concerned that Canadians' trust in public institutions depends on the assurance that public service employment and research funding are awarded on the basis of merit and value to taxpayers, rather than adherence to ideological tests or identity-based criteria.

Therefore, the petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to prohibit DEI quotas and targets in federal hiring and promotion; eliminate DEI requirements in federal research funding; ban DEI compliance offices and mandatory DEI training in the federal public service; prioritize federal support for post-secondary institutions that uphold merit-based hiring and promotion and do not maintain DEI compliance offices; and strengthen transparency through annual reporting and Treasury Board audits to ensure merit-based standards.

#### PEACEKEEPING

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise to present a petition from Canadians committed to advancing peace and human rights, especially given the conflict right now in the Middle East. The petitioners note that Canada pledged itself to these principles with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. They highlight that justice, equality and freedom are essential to preventing conflict while a lack of respect for these rights fuels violence worldwide.

The petitioners further stress that Canada has lost vital civilian-led capacity for research, education and training in peace operations with the closure of the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre. They cite also that the current spending obligations and commitments by the federal government on NATO and military spending should prioritize peacekeeping. Therefore, they call upon the Government of Canada to establish and fund a new centre of excellence for peace and justice to support conflict resolution, diplomacy and peacebuilding for Canadians and the international community.

#### RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

**Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am rising once again to submit petitions on behalf of Oxford residents, with a thousand more signatures, raising concerns with the Liberals' attack on faith in Bill C-9. The petitioners are very concerned about the Liberal-Bloc amendments to Bill C-9, which could be used to criminalize passages from the Bible, the Torah and the Quran. Faith plays a huge part in our communities. It is the backbone of a strong, vibrant country.

The petitioners are calling on all members of the House to stop this attack on faith, to stand with faith communities, religious freedom and freedom of expression, and to stop Liberal censorship. Once again, I call on the House to stand with these faith communities.

• (1550)

#### NATURAL HEALTH PRODUCTS

**William Stevenson (Yellowhead, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of Yellowhead residents. Natural

#### Routine Proceedings

health products are used by millions of Canadians. They include vitamins, probiotics, herbal remedies, protein powders, body care products and many other items. People rely on these products to prevent or address illness and maintain well-being. Regulatory changes by Health Canada have increased their cost and restricted accessibility.

Canadians want the freedom to make choices about their own health and the products they use. They also expect natural health practitioners and retailers to be able to provide guidance without facing excessive penalties. Therefore, the residents of Yellowhead and people across the country are calling on the government to guarantee the right of every Canadian to access and use natural health products, ensure costs are not increased, safeguard the ability to share information and support Bill C-224.

#### RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

**Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to present a petition on behalf of the folks of Elgin, St. Thomas and London, as well as people across the country, who are calling on the Liberal government to withdraw the divisive and toxic Bill C-9, which takes aim at religious freedom and freedom of expression. The petitioners continue to be concerned with comments made by the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture that quoting certain scriptures should attract criminal prosecution, which is why they do not trust the Liberal government at this current juncture to stand up for these fundamental freedoms.

The petitioners call on the government to stand firmly behind religious freedom and freedom of expression, withdraw Bill C-9 and unequivocally avow to uphold the right to share, read and pray as people of faith in this country see fit.

**Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present a petition on behalf of Canadians who are opposed to Bill C-9. They are concerned that this broad and over-reaching piece of legislation would restrict freedom of expression and freedom of religion. They call upon the government to not restrict debate on it and to withdraw the bill.

*Government Orders***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. 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775 and 776 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled in an electronic format immediately.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Speaker, I would 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.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

**CANADA-INDONESIA COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-18, An Act to implement the Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement between Canada and Indonesia, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** There being no motions at report stage, the House will now proceed, without debate, to the putting of the question on the motion to concur in the bill at report stage.

[English]

**Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.)** moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** 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.

**An hon. member:** I request that it be passed on division.  
(Motion agreed to)

[Translation]

**Hon. Maninder Sidhu** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

**Steve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I request the unanimous consent of the House to split my time with my colleague from Ottawa Centre.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** The hon. member for Beauport—Limoilou.

**Steve Lavoie:** Mr. Speaker, today I would like to talk about Bill C-18 and diversifying Canada's trade. I would like to take a few minutes to talk about the economy of my riding, Beauport—Limoilou. I will start with some examples of businesses in my riding that do business internationally.

Maple 3 is located on 5th Street in Limoilou. I had an opportunity to visit the company last year and meet its amazing team. What I saw really helped me understand our riding's economic reality. Maple 3 transforms a homegrown product, maple sap, into a natural beverage that is now sold internationally. The company sells its products in places like Singapore and Hong Kong and is expanding its presence in other Asian markets. Driving those exports is a small team of entrepreneurs and employees busy innovating, developing products and building an international presence from a neighbourhood in Limoilou.

On Jérémie Fortin Street in Limoilou, the Primattech lab designs and manufactures specialized tools for hardwood floor installation. The company's trademark Québécois manufacturing know-how is now in foreign markets thanks to its export development activity. Products designed right in my riding are being used by professionals elsewhere in the world.

There is also a company in Beauport that is involved in opening up markets. The smokehouse La Fée des grèves processes seafood products and is part of an agri-food chain that gets Quebec products into the hands of consumers outside our domestic market. This translates into local jobs in processing, quality control, packaging and logistics.

I would like to give one last example. In Beauport, Groupe Sio helps businesses structure their import-export activities, identify foreign partners and navigate international markets. When we look at all these examples together, it is clear that Beauport—Limoilou's economy is made up of innovative SMEs, specialized manufacturers and processing companies that are succeeding in carving out a place for themselves in international markets. That is the economic reality of Beauport—Limoilou. These companies are rooted in their communities, creating value here while also creating opportunities abroad.

I want to continue with a simple but telling image to illustrate my point today. It is an image that I like. International economic relations are often like a big chess game. Each country is a player. Each trade decision is an agreement, a strategic move. Each agreement sets the stage for future positions. In games like this, it is never just about the next move. Players always think in the short, medium and long terms. They protect what they have achieved. They develop alliances. Above all, they prepare for the future. All countries in the world have this framework in mind when they develop a national strategy.

In all great strategies, there are decisive moments, moments when a player must decide whether to simply defend what they have achieved or to advance their pieces. That is exactly the position Canada is in today. The global economy is changing. Supply chains are being redrawn. Geopolitical balances are shifting. In this great global economic chess game, Canada is not a spectator. Canada is a player, a player that must think in the short, medium and long terms.

That is exactly what Bill C-18 does. The bill is more than a trade agreement; it is a strategic move. It is a piece that is being moved with intention, a position set up with the future in mind. It forms part of an ambitious trade diversification plan. The plan is clear: to open new markets, to reduce dependence, and to create opportunities for Canadian businesses, including those in the greater Quebec City area.

In any game of chess, the short term is about openings, those first moves that set up a position. In the short term, the agreement with Indonesia immediately enhances access to a market of nearly 300 million people, the largest economy in ASEAN, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, and an Indo-Pacific global powerhouse.

● (1555)

The elimination of tariffs on more than 95% of Canadian exports will make our products more competitive in one of the world's most dynamic markets. This is a tangible gain. It is an immediate gain. It is a strategic gain. For Quebec and the Quebec City region, this means more exports for our manufacturers, new technology partnerships, and more investments that create quality jobs.

A national strategy cannot be limited to the opening moves. In the medium term, a game of chess involves controlling the centre of the board, creating solid positions, and connecting the pieces. That is exactly what this agreement will do. It establishes predictable and stable trade rules. It strengthens the supply chain. It paves the way for lasting partnerships between Canadian and Indonesian companies. For Quebec's key sectors, namely aerospace, clean technology, artificial intelligence, and sustainable energy, this means a real strategic advantage in a growing market.

What we are doing today is consolidating a position that will enable our companies to grow tomorrow. Great nations, like great chess players, always think long term. By 2050, Indonesia is expected to become one of the world's five largest economies. For Canada, establishing strong trade relations with this rapidly growing partner now is a strategic move.

For too long now, our economy has relied heavily on a major trading partner. Diversifying our trade is about reducing risk, build-

### *Government Orders*

ing resilience and positioning Canada for future prosperity. It is about giving our businesses predictability. That is the word business people used the most at the Standing Committee on International Trade. They want predictability. That is why our government is working to double non-U.S. exports over the next decade. This is not some slogan; this is a national strategy, and the agreement with Indonesia is a key component of that strategy. Canada's first bilateral agreement with an ASEAN nation, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, clearly signals our engagement in the Indo-Pacific region.

In the global game currently unfolding, some countries are choosing retreat; Canada is choosing to engage. Some are choosing protectionism; Canada is choosing partnership. Some are reacting; Canada is making strategic advances. This bill projects leadership in a world grappling with economic and geopolitical uncertainty. It asserts that Canada will remain a major player in international trade. It affirms that Quebec will continue to export innovation. It signals that our businesses will have access to growing markets.

A good chess strategy is based on three principles: anticipate, diversify, build. Anticipate risks, diversify options and build a winning position. That is exactly what Bill C-18 does. It prepares our economy for the realities of the 21st century. It connects Canadian ingenuity with global demand. It creates opportunities for Quebec businesses. It strengthens the prosperity of communities across the country. Canada is playing this game with confidence, clarity and determination.

I therefore invite all members of the House to support Bill C-18 for a more diversified, resilient and prosperous economy. In the big global economic game that is being played, Canada is not just defending its position, it is playing to win.

● (1600)

**Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say good afternoon to my esteemed colleague from Beauport—Limoilou. It is a very beautiful region. My mother-in-law lives in that magnificent region.

We are all in favour of developing new markets. However, I will pick up on my colleague's chess analogy. Right now, the government is going after the pawn instead of the king. Strategically, in chess, the goal is to take down the king. Right now, the number one issue is U.S. tariffs and the agreement with the U.S. government. The Liberal government seems to be hiding from that and backing down. It is being vague. With the agreement in Bill C-18, yes, we want to grow, but it is not going to pay off right away. It will take many years. Also, this represents less than 0.1% of trade.

My question is very simple. Why are the Liberals not dealing with the real issues?

**Steve Lavoie:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague. I really appreciate his participation at the Standing Committee on International Trade. He is a proud representative of Beauce.

*Government Orders*

We were talking about chess matches and the short, medium and long terms. We do need to look at the short term. As of tomorrow morning, we will have access to a market of almost 300 million people, and 95% of tariffs will be removed. As my colleague just said, U.S. tariffs are hurting our businesses. They are hurting businesses in Beauce. We are talking about almost 97% of goods being tariff-free.

We are also looking at the long term because we want to double exports in the next decade. That part of the world is the fourth-largest economy in the world, and it is growing fast. Canada must position itself now. We cannot wait until that part of the world is at its peak. We are doing it now, and that is good for the future.

• (1605)

**Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague told us that this agreement would be good for his riding and for the Quebec City area. I applaud that. I would like to know if he is aware of any businesses in his riding or in the Quebec City area that currently export goods to Indonesia. I would like him to give us some concrete examples.

I would also like to know whether he has any reservations concerning respect for workers' rights. We know that a little over one million children work in Indonesia. There are health and safety issues related to chemicals used in the textile industry or in leather tanning, for example.

What parameters have been included in this agreement to ensure that we do not import products that involve worker exploitation?

**Steeve Lavoie:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. I really appreciate it. I will start at the end. To be very clear, Canada has always considered any amount of worker exploitation unacceptable. Canada has always asked that such clauses be included in its agreements.

As for businesses in my riding that already do business abroad, I named some earlier, including one that helps businesses import and export abroad. Yes, I talked a lot about Beauport—Limoilou because I am proud of it. However, we can look at the reactions of stakeholders. Cereals Canada, the Canadian Agri-Food Trade Alliance, the Wheat Growers Association, the Canadian Meat Council and the Canadian Pork Council have all responded positively to this agreement and the forthcoming agreement.

[*English*]

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is substantial legislation. Let us look at Indonesia's role, in particular as a player in the whole Pacific area. There are billions of dollars in bilateral trade between Canada and Indonesia today, and this is good news in terms of the potential that is there. Never before have we had a prime minister so aggressively go out to meet world leaders and to bring opportunities for exporters here in Canada to increase investment coming into Canada. I wonder if my colleague could just provide his thoughts on the bigger picture of how important it is that we go out and make these types of deals.

[*Translation*]

**Steeve Lavoie:** Mr. Speaker, we exported \$2.3-billion worth of goods in 2024. We are talking about a country with the fourth

largest population in the world. As I said earlier, this country is ascendant. Now is the time to position ourselves, because we can exponentially increase that \$2.3 billion. We are working on positioning ourselves. We have seen the investments that are going to be made in our infrastructure.

Wheat is exported to Europe from my riding of Beauport—Limoilou. We need to invest in infrastructure today if we want to double exports within 10 years, so this is excellent news for the Canadian economy.

[*English*]

**Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to Bill C-18.

Bill C-18 is a very important piece of legislation. It is critical at this moment in our history for Canada's economic growth and prosperity, and for making sure that we are able to create the important jobs necessary for Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

Before I get into some of the substantive parts of this legislation, I want to take this opportunity to thank some people for their important work in getting us to this point. Of course, the Minister of International Trade has been very active in making sure that this agreement was concluded. He was part of the signing ceremony, along with the Prime Minister, with our Indonesian administration counterparts.

There are a number of officials from Global Affairs Canada who were on the negotiating team, and who worked for multiple years to negotiate and finalize this really important agreement in the best interest of Canada. I want to take a moment to thank all those officials for their hard work and for their service to our country.

I want to acknowledge all the members of the Standing Committee on International Trade. It is a real pleasure to work with them, and I mean from all three parties, including the government side of the committee. It was a very co-operative committee with a co-operative process whereby we could work together. We were able to share ideas with each other. There were some changes: As members can see from the report stage, some minor changes were added to the bill, and it all happened in a thoughtful, consultative way. It was Parliament working at its best in committee, and it demonstrated how working together for the well-being of Canadians, for our own constituents, is extremely important.

I also want to extend my gratitude to the Indonesian ambassador here in Canada, His Excellency Muhsin Syihab, who recently arrived in Canada. He has a lot of knowledge about Indonesia, of course, and is keen to learn about Canada. He is a very enthusiastic champion of this legislation. I thank him and look forward to working with him in terms of implementing this agreement, once it has passed in the House and in the other place and becomes law, so that we can create those opportunities for Canadian companies in the Indonesian market.

*Government Orders*

It has been said during second reading, and we heard this during committee, but it is worth repeating how important this Canada-Indonesia comprehensive economic partnership agreement is, which is affectionately referred to as the “Canada-Indonesia CEPA”. It represents an important milestone in Canada's trade engagement in the Indo-Pacific region. It was concluded in December 2024 and signed, as I mentioned earlier, in September 2025.

This agreement seeks to deepen economic ties with Indonesia, which is a nation of nearly 280 million people. It is a big country in the Indo-Pacific region and had a thriving economy of \$1.9 trillion in 2024, so imagine how beneficial a bilateral comprehensive economic agreement with a country that size could be for Canada. That is what we have been able to accomplish through this very important agreement.

The agreement is quite focused. It is also quite expansive in terms of the breadth and scope for Canadians. As I mentioned, it is a fairly comprehensive trade agreement that addresses market access for goods, services and investments, and includes provisions on small and medium-sized enterprises, labour, environment and women's economic empowerment. It is truly a model agreement, when it comes to free trade agreements, in terms of how modern trade agreements can be developed. Canada, working along with our friends from Indonesia, is able to set the stage for it.

• (1610)

The committee process was a really positive one. We got to hear from many stakeholders who represented various diverse backgrounds, and they spoke to us in support of this agreement. The two who really came to the fore for me were from our agriculture and agri-food sector. Their enthusiastic support for this was quite remarkable. Whether we were talking about the cattle or pork industries or speaking of the pulse and soy industries, they were all really keen for this agreement, because for them, this agreement would give preferable market access to a large economy. They would see Canadian exports rising significantly in an already robust market because of the preferential treatment that they would receive under the agreement. They were really keen, and they really stressed to all of us that we should try to conclude and pass the ratification of the agreement through Parliament as quickly as possible.

As such, I want to take this opportunity to thank them and all of those important associations. I particularly thank all our farmers, who work so hard day in and day out to make sure that we are producing world-class food, not only for Canadians but to sell around the world. I think they realized that Indonesia is a growing market, economy and population, and that Canada can be selling that sustainable, good-quality food to Indonesians.

The other sector that was really highlighted during the committee process was the nuclear sector. A representative from a nuclear company, AtkinsRéalis, spoke about the opportunities the agreement would create around energy security and the ability to export Canadian technology when it comes to safe, reliable, stable nuclear technology. As members know, CANDU is a Canadian innovation. It is remarkable in terms of creating energy around the world, not only in Canada, and companies like AtkinsRéalis are quite keen to be engaging with countries like Indonesia. The agreement would allow them to do that on a preferential basis and to find ways to sell

that technology. This would mean not only helping Indonesia to have more energy security and to meet its net-zero targets by 2050, but also, and most importantly, creating really well-paying jobs for Canadians.

In my province of Ontario alone, we have one of the world's best supply chains for nuclear energy, and if we are able to open more export markets for that technology, it will only mean more jobs for Canadians. This agreement would create that opportunity and allow for Canadian companies like AtkinsRéalis to sell in places like Indonesia.

The last point I want to talk about is why this agreement is important for the work that we are doing as a country in trade diversification. I think this House spends a lot of time talking about the challenges we are going through, like the protectionism that we are seeing right now, especially as it relates to our American partners. Our effort is to diversify our trade. Our effort is to double our non-U.S. exports in the next 10 years. That is the goal that the Prime Minister has set. This agreement is a really important example of how we can do this, and not only that, but it is an opening for us to finalize our agreement with the ASEAN countries, which Indonesia is part of. Other major countries, like the Philippines, Thailand, Singapore and Vietnam are also ASEAN countries, and this agreement would set the template in terms of the work that we need to do.

I want to thank the deputy minister of trade from Indonesia, who was instrumental in this. When I met with her in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, at the ASEAN ministerial summit, she committed that she would make sure that ASEAN also finalizes an agreement this year, in 2026, so that we can keep building stronger economic ties with other countries and create well-paying jobs for Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

• (1615)

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, of course, most Canadians know AtkinsRéalis by its original name of SNC-Lavalin. It is the now disgraced company that is so corrupt it cannot do business anywhere in the world after bribing Gadhafi's family to get a contract. We also know that AtkinsRéalis got the deal of deals when Harper sold it all of AECL for \$17 million. Now, using the name of Canadian Nuclear Laboratories, it masquerades as having real technology for small modular reactors that do not exist anywhere.

Can the parliamentary secretary possibly justify why we are throwing billions of dollars into this without a single day of debate in this place about nuclear technology?

**Yasir Naqvi:** Mr. Speaker, I think we all share the goal of making sure there is energy security, and not only energy security. In order for us to really fight climate change, we need to make sure there is more enhanced electrification, not only in Canada but around the world. I think that is going to be an imperative. For us to do that the best way, we need to make sure we have net-zero electricity. Some may disagree, but I fundamentally believe that nuclear energy is a very important source of that net-zero technology.

*Government Orders*

Canada has been a leader in safe nuclear technology. We have demonstrated that in places like Ontario, the province I come from. I think there is an opportunity to help meet those climate change goals around the world. Canada can take a leadership role in that.

• (1620)

[*Translation*]

**Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the process.

The Bloc Québécois is proud to have gotten an amendment adopted that will require the minister to ensure that a review is carried out every three years and a report submitted to the House. That is a good thing.

However, we would rather have debated the agreement itself. Instead, we are being forced to debate its application. On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton introduced Bill C-228 to strengthen Parliament's role in the treaty ratification process. What are my colleague's thoughts on that?

Would it not be democratic if we could discuss it more ahead of time and talk about the process as well?

**Yasir Naqvi:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her important question. I was very pleased to work with my colleagues from the Bloc Québécois on the amendment to the bill.

[*English*]

It was a good amendment. We agree with the member that having a report-back mechanism in the agreement is a good procedural step to ensure that we as parliamentarians will be able to take full stock of the promise of this legislation.

I thank the member opposite for his constructive approach to this and look forward to continuing to work with him.

**Marcus Powlowski (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would note that some of the organizations that support this agreement are Cereals Canada, the Canadian Agri-Food Trade Alliance, the Wheat Growers Association, the Canadian Cattle Association and Soy Canada. That is a lot of agricultural associations. This seems to be a good deal for Canadian farmers.

I do not know what trade barriers existed before with Indonesia, so could the member help explain how this is going to benefit Canadian farmers?

**Yasir Naqvi:** Mr. Speaker, that was a very good question, and the member is absolutely right. The agriculture sector was extremely enthusiastic, because it opens up a very big market. Some of the big barriers that exist are around sanitary and phytosanitary conditions. The agreement allows for better regulatory harmonization, for better process and understanding, and for high-quality products that are grown in Canada to be sold in places like Indonesia.

I think it is good news for our farmers. Our farmers were present at the committee process, and they agreed that the agreement will allow for them to export more Canadian-produced goods to places like Indonesia.

**Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, my question for the member is this: What distinguishes this agreement

from other free trade agreements we have? Is there any specific element of this agreement that makes it so special?

**Yasir Naqvi:** Mr. Speaker, that was a very good question. As I mentioned, this is a more modern free trade agreement than we have done in the past. That is why we do not call it a free trade agreement. Rather, we call it a comprehensive economic agreement. I think this is the kind of template that we will be able to use in other places, like ASEAN and Mercosur. We are negotiating with the Philippines and Thailand as well.

There is a great desire for engagement with Canada. People want to buy Canadian-produced goods, especially when it comes to our agriculture and energy resources. That is the work we are doing through agreements like the one we are debating here today.

**David McKenzie (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to split my time today, with the agreement of the House, with the hon. member for Beauce.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**David McKenzie:** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise in the House today on behalf of the residents of Calgary Signal Hill to speak to Bill C-18, an act implementing the Canada-Indonesia comprehensive economic partnership agreement.

Let me begin by stating clearly that Conservatives believe in trade. Canada has always been a trading nation. From the earliest days of Confederation, our prosperity has depended on our ability to reach beyond our borders and sell Canadian goods and expertise to the world. For that reason, we approach trade agreements with a constructive mindset. When agreements expand market access, reduce tariffs and create opportunities for Canadian producers, we welcome them. At a time when natural resources are more critical than ever, we are a truly fortunate nation. Canada holds some of the world's most abundant natural resources, including oil reserves that have the potential to make Canada one of the most influential and prosperous nations on earth.

For too long, we have let outdated ideology and self-sabotage stand in the way of our potential. In 2026, the world is shifting under our feet, and we have no excuse not to be an export powerhouse. Indonesia is an opportunity for Canadian trade and Canadian influence. It is the fourth most populous country in the world, home to more than 270 million people. It has one of the fastest-growing economies in the Indo-Pacific region. It has a rapidly expanding middle class and increasing demand for food, technology, natural resources and energy. Energy is so central to our standard of living here at home and to that of all people around the world yet is something that the Liberal government has neglected.

*Government Orders*

When the Minister of International Trade appeared at the international trade committee hearing last month to answer questions about Bill C-18, I noted that the Asia Pacific Foundation has produced a report highlighting the growing relationship between the United States and Indonesia in the energy sector, particularly with respect to oil and liquefied natural gas.

Indonesia imported roughly 322,000 barrels of crude oil per day in 2024, and it is dependent on energy imports for 40% of its national energy demand, which will only grow as the Indonesian economy expands and more Indonesians are lifted out of poverty. It seems we are missing the boat on this opportunity. Not only is the United States stepping up to meet Indonesia's demand for oil, but the minister informed the international trade committee that the conversation with the Indonesians was focused on sustainable energy. What he said was that "in Indonesia they also want to go to more sustainable energy. When they talk about sustainable, they talk about nuclear and about LNG, which is a bit lower in terms of carbon emissions when you compare it to crude."

That was on February 5 of this year. It would seem from the minister's evidence to the committee that Indonesia is not interested in oil, would it not? As it worked out, 15 days after the minister spoke to the committee, Indonesia signed an agreement with the United States that covers, among other things, \$15 billion per year in American energy exports to Indonesia, including \$3.5 billion of liquefied petroleum gas and \$4.5 billion of crude oil. As if that was not enough, just a few days ago it was reported that Indonesia will be increasing its crude oil imports from the United States due to the war in the Persian Gulf. I hope the irony is not lost on anyone listening today.

As I said to the minister at the hearing, "It strikes me that we may have missed the boat in terms of our ability to export those products into this marketplace." On that day, I used the word "may". I am now certain, as I think we all are now, that Canada's energy industry missed what could have been a magnificent opportunity for growth. We allowed this opportunity to go to the United States.

The Liberal government makes blunders like these because it fundamentally sees energy as a source of embarrassment rather than a source of power. Liberals can talk all they want about making Canada an energy superpower, but actions, as always, speak louder than words. Becoming an energy superpower requires more than rhetoric, more than speeches and more than press conferences. It requires action, infrastructure and legislative, regulatory and policy certainty. Above all, it requires a clear commitment to ensuring that Canadian energy can reach global markets.

• (1625)

Maybe the reason Indonesia was not interested in discussing Canadian oil, as per the minister, is that it knew we cannot be relied upon to supply it. Yes, it is true that LNG Canada is finally up and running, but let us be honest. One project delayed by years of red tape and regulatory hurdles is not a strategy. It is a lucky break. We have managed just that one LNG facility, in Kitimat. Our competitors on the gulf coast of the United States, however, are building export terminals at a record pace, and they are not just engaging with Indonesia. They are signing contracts. They are eating our

lunch because their government views energy as an asset, not a liability and not something to be phased out.

During that same international trade committee hearing, I reminded the minister of the Liberal government's decision to cancel the northern gateway pipeline roughly a decade ago. I pointed out that had that project gone ahead, Canada would today be in a far stronger position to export crude oil to Asian markets. Canada should be well positioned to supply that demand. We have vast energy resources, world-class producers, workers who are second to none anywhere in the world and some of the highest environmental standards in the world. We have just chosen to put obstacle after obstacle in our own way for no good reason.

The obstacles include Bill C-69 and the tanker ban affecting the northern coast of British Columbia. With these laws in place, no new pipelines will be built to carry Canadian crude oil to market, even though the ports of Prince Rupert and Kitimat can safely host oil tankers, and projects like the Eagle Spirit pipeline can reduce our reliance on the port of Vancouver for west coast energy exports.

The foregoing is why today in the House I introduced a private member's bill that would repeal the tanker ban on the west coast of B.C. I introduced that bill because I believe Canada must confront a certain truth. If we want to become an energy superpower, we cannot simultaneously block the infrastructure necessary to export our energy.

Right now, roughly 240 tankers move crude oil every year between a storage facility in Montreal, via the St. Lawrence River, and a refining facility beside Quebec City. In Newfoundland and Labrador, approximately 90 international tankers visit the Whiffen Head facility to export oil brought in by offshore shuttle tankers. There is no logical reason tanker traffic is unacceptable in Kitimat or Prince Rupert but just fine in Quebec City and Vancouver. Anyone working in the energy sector will tell us that the tanker ban represents one of the the most significant barriers to expanding Canadian crude oil exports to global markets.

The CBC published an article yesterday asking this question: "With a crucial oil artery blocked near Iran," and that would be the Strait of Hormuz, "can Canada fill the gap in global supply?" It shows just how much Canada has to contribute in today's turbulent world and just how much of an opportunity is being missed. It is not just an opportunity to boost our energy sector but also an opportunity to support our allies as they look to diversify away from dictator oil.

*Government Orders*

The CBC article ended on a disturbing note. It quoted Heather Exner-Pirot, director of energy, natural resources and environment at the Macdonald-Laurier Institute, who stated, “in a situation where you have this Iran conflict and you're seeing 20 per cent of global supply impacted, when push comes to shove, you'll start to see countries...importing some Russian supply”. This is not something we want to see happen.

Canada's energy sector has long been one of the pillars of our national economy. It generates billions of dollars in revenue that fund public services, supports hundreds of thousands of jobs across the country and drives investment and innovation in communities from coast to coast to coast. Trade agreements like this one with Indonesia must be part of a broader strategy to strengthen Canada's economic position in the world, and that strategy must include all sectors of the Canadian economy, including energy. Trade with Indonesia is a good thing, but a trade agreement is not worth the paper it is written on if the Liberals see it as principally a tool for making themselves look good at home.

Canada must be a leading supplier of oil and natural gas to the world. Our allies need it. We can make that happen.

• (1630)

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member is wrong in so many ways and put a lot of information that is questionable, at best, on the record. We would have to go back generations before we would see a prime minister who has been more proactive, whether it is signing an MOU or going to countries like India to talk about energy, have discussions and secure export opportunities second to no other.

I realize the member is relatively new to the House, but does he not realize that when his party's leader was part of the Conservative government, in 10 years, not one inch of pipeline to tidewater—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** The hon. member for Calgary Signal Hill has the floor.

**David McKenzie:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have the advantage here of being somebody who is not tied to the past. Quite frankly, I am looking forward. I am looking forward to what the opportunities are for our country, what things we can build and what we can achieve. I have no interest in the Liberal failures of the past. I am interested only in what we can do going forward. Trade agreements are a good thing, but we have to have our act together domestically in order to be a valuable trading partner to the world.

• (1635)

[*Translation*]

**Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the departing member, but I am not sure whether he will understand it. I would like to ask him about palm oil. Indonesia is one of the major producers of palm oil. Palm oil imports are skyrocketing in Canada. This is causing problems with deforestation of tropical forests and is affecting local populations, who are often forced to work on these plantations, as well as indigenous peoples.

Does my colleague think that Canada should follow the European Union's example and create a special group to monitor developments in this area?

[*English*]

**David McKenzie:** Mr. Speaker, a trade agreement gives us opportunities to work with other countries around the world. We are not going to immediately be in any position to impose standards or our standards of living upon a trading partner, but it is the beginning of a relationship, and in that, we can grow over time to appreciate different practices. Canada has many of the world's leading environmental, agricultural, industrial and energy practices. When we trade with other nations, we have the opportunity to exchange that expertise and improve circumstances in both countries.

**Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight on what has happened over the last couple of decades in this place. When Stephen Harper became the prime minister, he did not inherit a single tidewater pipeline project from the previous Chrétien-Martin governments. When he left office in 2015, there were four of these projects, not to mention the number of projects that were actually done in expanding our trade to the United States.

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh!

**Blaine Calkins:** Mr. Speaker, because my colleague is from Calgary, he talks about oil and gas. He actually knows what he is talking about, unlike the guy who is chirping me across the way right now.

Based on the announcement by the government on the expected value of this trade relationship with Indonesia, I wanted to ask my colleague if he can tell me what the value of one LNG tanker leaving Canada might be worth to our economy in context.

**David McKenzie:** Mr. Speaker, quite interestingly, there were some discussions on that very subject earlier today that I was part of. When we look at an export relationship of about \$400 million, two LNG tankers would be equivalent to that in terms of value. It is obvious that our greatest opportunity to increase trade, to provide for Indonesia and to provide opportunities for export for Canadian companies is in energy. The value is tremendous, beneficial for both sides and something that we are well behind on because of our domestic situation. We must get to work on that so we can be an effective international trading partner.

[*Translation*]

**Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is a pleasure and an honour for me to represent the magnificent region of Beauce in the House.

Today, I rise to speak to Bill C-18 on the Canada-Indonesia economic agreement.

*Government Orders*

Beauce is considered the entrepreneurial capital of Canada. We have a large number of businesses and entrepreneurs. We also have many farmers. Beauce is home to some of the best farmers in the world. We work hard. We are proud to grow our economy. Beauce, and the people from there, create wealth. That is why, as parliamentarians, we must do everything we can to help them develop new markets, but we must develop them with discipline, care and rigour.

Conservatives have always defended and will always defend free trade, but also trade that is fair and reciprocal. I call these win-win agreements. This approach must remain our priority as Canada seeks to diversify its markets.

Under Stephen Harper's leadership, the Conservatives actively championed free trade with free nations, signing numerous free trade agreements to diversify our trade, but in a cautious and very responsible manner. Unfortunately, under the Liberals, Canada has fallen behind, and our dependence on the Americans and the United States has only grown over the past 10 years. Today, the Liberals are trying to make up for lost time by signing agreements quickly and at any cost, but they are forgetting to do their due diligence.

This brings me to Bill C-18. The Prime Minister called this agreement between Canada and Indonesia revolutionary. There is nothing revolutionary about it. It is pretty marginal.

Canadians need meaningful results. The Liberals are hiding the reality, and the reality is that we are still facing unjustified U.S. tariffs. Beauce borders the United States. Its geographic location allows our businesses, farmers, manufacturers, exporters and retailers to do business with the world's largest economy.

However, the Liberals have failed the people of Beauce. They have basically given up on the relationship with the United States. After promising a speedy trade deal with Washington, they are now at an endless impasse. The people who come up to me day after day are not talking to me about Indonesia. They are talking about the American tariffs. Every day, people in Beauce ask me whether we are going to have a new agreement or a deal with the Americans. I have never heard anyone mention Indonesia. It is simply not the priority.

Meanwhile, the Prime Minister and the Minister of International Trade travel all over the globe and come back to Parliament with minor free trade agreements. These agreements are minor, but they contain hidden tariff barriers.

A recurring issue raised by Canadian beef producers is that Canadian beef continues to face a technical problem that we call non-tariff barriers. For example, Indonesia requires that beef exports come from cattle born and raised in Canada or that have resided in Canada for at least four months immediately prior to slaughter. These are called non-tariff barriers. Producers have complained. We do not hear much about this from the Liberal government.

According to the Canadian Cattle Association, "The integration of the North American cattle market makes it near impossible to achieve this residency requirement", so they will not be entering into an agreement or doing business with them, plain and simple. This impossible requirement may prevent our Canadian producers from taking advantage of duty-free access to the Indonesian market.

• (1640)

This apparent non-tariff barrier represents a significant challenge for Canadian beef producers. Although Global Affairs Canada mentions a memorandum of understanding establishing a dialogue on sanitary and phytosanitary issues, we are concerned about this. We are seeing a trend where non-tariff barriers are simply not being addressed by the Liberal government.

Just look at the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement between Canada and the European Union. The Liberals promised to resolve the issue of regulatory differences between Canada and Europe. Today, 10 years later, nothing has changed. European producers have full access to our market to compete with Beauce's farmers, while we are unable to export our pork and beef. The devil is in the details.

Over the past few weeks, the Standing Committee on International Trade has been hearing testimony about the non-tariff barriers that the United Kingdom continues to impose on Canadian beef and pork. The United Kingdom's accession to the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership eliminates tariffs on Canadian beef and pork on paper. However, in practice, the United Kingdom continues to impose non-tariff barriers to prevent us from accessing their market. The consequences for our beef and pork producers are devastating.

Allow me to share some figures from the Library of Parliament. In 2024, the United Kingdom exported 42 million dollars' worth of beef products to Canada. In the first half of 2025, 28 million dollars' worth of beef products entered Canada. In 2024, Canada exported only 85,000 dollars' worth of beef products to the United Kingdom. In 2025, brace for this: zero. That is right, zero dollars. It is all well and good to sign agreements, as my colleagues say, just to save face. However, an agreement that serves no purpose is a waste of time and money.

As with the agreement with Indonesia, the Liberal government is prepared to sign the free trade agreement without obtaining any guarantee that our Canadian producers will receive barrier-free access. Meanwhile, our farmers are struggling to remain competitive. Our beef producers raise cattle of the highest quality, some of the best beef in the world. They are proud, and they deserve a government that is willing to fight for them. We need a government that will fight to ensure that Canada's free trade agreements are 100% barrier free. Too often, this Liberal government seems reluctant to fight to eliminate the most significant barriers affecting farmers in Beauce and across the country.

*Government Orders*

In the meantime, regions like Beauce are facing enormous challenges, including U.S. tariffs, non-tariff barriers in Europe, and major increases in input costs. The Canadian government needs to prioritize producers, defend our industry, and achieve meaningful gains for our farmers. That is the way to protect Canadian producers and put Canada first.

Canada cannot control what the President and other countries' negotiators do, but one thing it can do is control its own destiny. The government must ensure that all non-tariff barriers are removed and secure a firm guarantee that trade will be not only free, but fair. Again, it has to be a win-win situation. We must diversify our trade without leaving our farmers behind. We can strengthen our sovereignty and grow our economy. That is how Canada can take control and put itself first.

In conclusion, farmers in Beauce, as everywhere else in rural Canada, feed the country and the world. However, they are struggling and only benefit from free trade when they have genuine reciprocal access to new markets. Once again, Bill C-18 does not remove all non-tariff barriers, so our farmers will have to continue to fight for fair and reciprocal access.

• (1645)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni, Marine Transportation; the hon. member for Cloverdale—Langley City, The Economy; the hon. member for Calgary Nose Hill, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship.

[*English*]

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member was talking about the pork industry. It is an \$8-billion industry here in Canada. Less than a year ago, I was with the Minister of Agriculture in the Philippines, where we highlighted industry representatives from the province of Quebec. I have met, as recently as yesterday, with members of the Manitoba pork industry. We understand the true value of that industry. The government sees huge numbers from our pork exports and sees the opportunities being created in that industry. When the Prime Minister talks about getting a trade agreement with the Philippines or when the Prime Minister goes to Japan, these are critical markets in terms of pork.

Would the member not agree that having a prime minister who is going out and about to create export opportunities is the best thing that we can do to protect our pork industry?

[*Translation*]

**Jason Groleau:** Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question. Yes, we need to diversify our markets everywhere, we need to improve our businesses, and we need to enter into agreements. However, allow me to repeat myself, the way I do as a member of the Standing Committee on International Trade: When it comes to non-tariff barriers, the details of agreements are important. Simply signing agreements is not enough. Signing an agreement is easy; anyone can do it. What matters is getting something in return.

I can give my esteemed colleague an example: the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, or CETA. Under CETA, we were supposed to export 300 million dollars' worth of pork. How much was sent? The answer: zero. Because of non-tariff barriers, access is not guaranteed.

• (1650)

**Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to start with a comment and then move on to my question.

Just because no one in Shefford is talking to me about the agreement with Indonesia does not mean that we should not diversify our markets and seek to reduce our dependence on the United States.

As I said earlier, my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton succeeded in getting various amendments adopted in committee, including the one I mentioned earlier, which provides for a review of the agreement's operation and effect every three years, with a report to be tabled in the House. I would like to congratulate him on that achievement.

The other amendment stipulates that the government must ensure that companies exploiting natural resources in Indonesia, particularly palm oil plantations, comply with environmental standards and respect workers' rights.

My question for my colleague is this: Why did the Conservatives vote against several of the amendments proposed by my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton?

**Jason Groleau:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Shefford for the question. It is much appreciated.

I would like to acknowledge my committee colleague, who is looking at me and wants to hear my response. I will respond to my colleague's first comment about the importance of diversifying our sector and diversifying the countries we trade with. Yes, I agree that we need to expand our circle of friends in business. I agree on that point.

However, I want to come back to something. She says that we do not hear much about Indonesia. We hear about the United States. However, no one here is talking about that. It seems that we are the only ones talking about it on this side of the House. We share a border with the United States. We do business with the Americans. We are talking about 0.12%. We are spending time on this. To me, it is a waste of time and money. Canada is not lacking in talented entrepreneurs or strong industries. Canada needs a government that takes action, not a government that is asleep at the wheel.

[*English*]

**Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his really informative speech. I think we all agree we need to diversify our markets.

Why does my colleague think Canadians are having trouble believing what the government says it is going to do and are questioning whether any of this is actually going to happen?

*Government Orders*

[*Translation*]

**Jason Groleau:** Mr. Speaker, the answer is simple. Canadians do not believe it because all they hear are words. They are not seeing any results. Announcements are made, but there is no progress. Since I started here, the government has done nothing but make announcements. It makes sense that people do not believe the government, because no real action is being taken on the ground.

The example I can give once again is the negotiations with the Americans, which were supposed to take place at the beginning of the Prime Minister's mandate but never did. Now, it is business as usual and nothing is happening.

**Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak about the proposed trade agreement with Indonesia. Indeed, everyone is talking about diversifying markets and partners these days. There is a lot of talk about this. It is an idea that has become quite popular just in the past year. I wonder why that is.

We are in favour of free trade, but not at any cost. I will come back to that shortly as I dissect the agreement. It is like how people are always talking about returning to a rules-based international order. Rules are all well and good. We need rules. We cannot live in total chaos. However, it always depends on what rule we are talking about. Not every rule is legitimate in its own right either.

The same goes for free trade. It is an economic principle that, when properly defined, applied and regulated, can have very positive outcomes, particularly for a small economy like Quebec's. It allows Quebec to become part of a large market and to have access to many partners.

However, it is important to be mindful of certain types of free trade agreements, like the ones signed in the 1990s, which grew at lightning speed during the glory years of globalization, if we may call it that, during most of the aggressive years of neo-liberalism. During that time, free trade was incorrectly taken to mean regulatory agreements that imposed the sovereignty of multinationals on specific communities and states. I will come back to that shortly.

I want to start with some positive remarks about this agreement. As the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, I am delighted by what is in this agreement. The city of Saint-Hyacinthe is the agri-food processing capital of Canada. Of course, the rest of the riding, like the Maskoutains and Acton regions, are highly agricultural as well. I am pleased to see that this agreement will be good for our farmers. The agreement talks a lot about grain. It will be excellent for that.

I am also pleased that I managed to get two amendments adopted. In fact, the only two amendments to the agreement implementation bill were mine. I used exactly the same formula that I got adopted a few years ago in the agreement with Ukraine. The minister responsible for the agreement must submit an annual report on the human rights situation in the partner country and the conduct of Canadian companies there, so that we can get a yearly update. That is one of the two amendments.

I also had the other amendment adopted in relation to the agreement with the United Kingdom. We will discuss this again tomorrow. This amendment provides for a three-year review to ensure

that, if we commit to something like this, we can re-examine it. I think it is quite reasonable to put the agreement on the table after three years, carefully review it and look at the results. That seems quite reasonable to me.

That is known as sweetening the pill. Now let us talk about the less attractive aspects of this agreement. Unfortunately, it is an agreement from another era. Honestly, I do not understand why Canada, which always claims to be a progressive country, continues to sign and negotiate such agreements.

Let us start with the process. We are accustomed to this, because this is a monarchy and, once again, there is no transparency with regard to parliamentarians and the provinces. This agreement is completely opaque, as are all such negotiations. We often hear from senior officials and negotiators who say that they have spoken with their Quebec counterparts. Forgive me for doubting that there was any real consultation. Forgive me for thinking that it is more of a fait accompli. There is nothing, absolutely nothing, in the Canadian Constitution that says that, if a province is against the implementation of an agreement, then it can withdraw from that agreement. There is nothing comparable to Belgian federalism, for example, where if one region of Belgium opposes something in an agreement, then the entire country does not sign it. That is true federalism that respects its member regions. We have nothing like that here.

There is also nothing that allows a province to say that it will send its own negotiators and representatives to negotiating tables abroad, because it wants to have a distinct voice and make its voice heard in such discussions. There is nothing in the Canadian Constitution that guarantees that, either.

● (1655)

Of course, transparency is just as elusive for parliamentarians. We are parliamentarians. We are elected by the people through a democratic process. We have constituents, people who give us a mandate to stand up for certain positions, values and interests. Why, then, are we kept out of the loop and given so little say in something as important as agreements with other countries?

On the surface, these agreements seem highly complex. In reality, their effects are anything but abstract; their impact on daily life is highly palpable. Why are we kept so far out of the loop?

In many other approaches used around the world, the opposite happens: Parliamentarians are involved, they take part in debates early in the process during which their thoughts on the issues are sought out even before the negotiators are called in. These parliamentarians are asked whether they want certain things to be pushed for and whether they are flexible on certain matters. Nothing like that happens in Canada.

### *Government Orders*

What happens here is so different that it reaches absurd levels. I have been a member of the committee since 2019, and we have even been asked to study an agreement without having the text in front of us. That shows just how much of a joke Canada is when it comes to trade negotiations. The shocking lack of transparency is nothing but a big monarchical joke.

Furthermore, there is no law requiring a minimum waiting period. Agreements can be thousands of pages long and written in complex legal language, and there is no law or obligation requiring a fixed waiting period between the time the agreement is announced and the time it is presented to Parliament. Theoretically, this could happen the very next day, when absolutely no one would have had time to read the agreement, analyze it and understand its ins and outs. We know that the devil is often in the details. The devil is often in the misplaced commas in a bill.

The problem is that the agreement has already been signed. We have no say in the matter. Then we debate a bill to implement the agreement. We debate a bill to implement the agreement, not the agreement itself, so we cannot change or amend anything. When I propose amendments to such bills, one of the first things the committee chair tells me is that the amendments are inadmissible because they would alter the intent of the bill or because they would incur additional costs that were not initially provided for in the bill. I find it extremely unfortunate and detrimental that there is not more consideration for the democratic power of parliaments when it comes to debating something as important as this.

Now, let us talk about the substance of the agreement. This agreement is problematic on several levels. First, there is the issue of investor-state dispute settlement. Again, I do not understand. Canada loses a lot of lawsuits and a lot of money. There is a case currently under way because Quebec abandoned the GNL Québec project in Saguenay. As a result, we are being sued by the American company. How is it that Canada is still signing agreements that allow this to happen?

These clauses began to gain popularity with the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, but they are no longer part of North American free trade. Even the agreement that brought this into being on a global scale no longer includes it.

However, Canada's official position is still that it supports the right of multinationals to take governments to court if laws, measures or policies adopted by said government could harm a foreign investor's profits. It is that right to profit that elevates multinationals to the status of sovereign powers.

This can happen if, for example, a country decides to adopt health measures related to the environment and public property. Mexico was sued for taxing soft drinks. Australia was sued for placing restrictions on smoking. One country in the Middle East, I think it was Egypt, raised the minimum wage and was sued by a multinational corporation. Why is Ottawa still signing agreements that allow this?

The UN has published reports on this. One came from the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, or UNCTAD. It is a bit dated. I think it was published in 2013.

• (1700)

It shows that, in 60% of cases, multinationals managed to thwart the democratic will of governments either entirely, by winning lawsuits against the state, or partially, by settling out of court.

Canada supports a complete surrender of political sovereignty every time it negotiates and pushes for investor-state dispute settlement, which is an unfair, outrageous and undemocratic mechanism. I gladly voted against that clause in the bill implementing the Canada-Indonesia Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement when we studied it at the Standing Committee on International Trade. In the end, I did not vote against the agreement. We passed it. I was the one who asked for it to be passed on division, but I still voted against that clause of the bill.

The other issue is human rights. Indonesia is not a model country in this regard, particularly when it comes to workers' rights. We know that there are certain regions where there is violence, where there are warlords, where there is a lot of unrest. I introduced Bill C-251, which is modelled on the American system, which works. The Canadian model does not work when it comes to screening out goods produced by forced labour. All in all, Canada has seized and kept about five shipments, if I am not mistaken. There were others that were seized but later released in most cases. Some were returned to the importer.

In some cases, shipments rejected at the U.S. border because the Americans suspect they contain products made with forced labour are simply sent to Canada afterwards. Canada stupidly takes them in. It is that easy. That is Canada's reputation. That is a serious problem, is it not? My esteemed colleagues are so right to be proud when they sing the national anthem on Wednesdays. There is a reason I do not enter the House at that time. That is Canada's reputation. It is tough.

Canada is unable to come up with a proper model, but all we have to do is copy the model of our neighbour to the south, which works. That would also help the Americans trust us more on this matter. Of course, a free trade agreement and lower tariffs on foreign products mean that more products will be coming in. In the case of the United Kingdom, which we will be talking about tomorrow, I am not too worried about forced labour. In the case of Indonesia, however, I am more worried. However, the agreement remains silent on this issue.

*Government Orders*

It is also silent on the environment. We heard from the Minister of International Trade, who said there was a chapter on the environment. Yes, there is a chapter, but it contains no principles, no mechanisms or rules, nothing binding, nothing meaty. The minister told us that it would open up a conversation on the environment as it relates to trade. I ran out of time, but I would have liked to ask him what happened with previous agreements that included chapters on the environment. What conversation followed? Were there additional results? If we take the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement from six years ago, or the agreement with Ukraine from two years ago, was there any follow-up on them? It is all fine and good to say that there is a chapter on the environment, but what purpose does it serve?

In the case of Indonesia and Canada, we know that Canada is going to send its problematic products, its toxic products, to parts of the world like Indonesia allegedly for “recycling”. Some people may say that having some parts of the world generate wealth this way is normal, that these countries increase their GDP by taking care of toxic waste, for example. However, although these countries might see an immediate rise in their GDP, the hidden costs are troubling, quite apart from the environmental aspect. We need only consider water tables. Workers who handle this waste will end up with health problems. These countries pay an economic cost, especially in relation to their health care systems. These workers are going to need care. Something will have to be done with them. Water tables will have to be decontaminated. Sending them potentially toxic waste and products for recycling does nothing for these countries. I am also talking about plastic waste, since Canada's plastic waste is sent to Indonesia.

I will now address the specific case of Canadian mining companies, particularly Baru Gold, a so-called Canadian mining company. I say “so-called” because Canada and its mining companies have a lackluster reputation.

• (1705)

I went to Colombia and Chile and heard stories of private security firms shooting people at point-blank range and stories of people being evicted. Projects are being promised to the people there. Companies get support at first because they promise jobs, but in the end, they bring in their own workers and do not even hire locals. I have heard of cases of air pollution and water poisoning.

For example, Baru Gold mines for gold on Sangihe Island in Indonesia. I mentioned Canadian mining companies earlier, but whether it is accurate to call them that is open to debate, because Canada is a flag of convenience. More than half of the world's mining companies are Canadian. That alone should set off alarm bells. All a company needs is a post office box in Canada to claim to be Canadian. This allows these companies to benefit from the Toronto Stock Exchange. It allows them to enjoy tax benefits, speculative advantages and more. There are no consequences whatsoever.

If the Indonesian government tells a company that it is not interested in this Canadian mining project, the investor-state dispute settlement mechanism, or ISDS, that I was talking about earlier would suddenly allow the company to sue Indonesia. That is what Canada is supporting. This so-called human rights leader is supporting that through the ISDS mechanism.

My colleagues might argue that there is an ombudsperson. The ombudsperson can receive complaints if a mining company or any Canadian company behaves badly abroad. It is a joke, and the ombudsperson position has been vacant for a year anyway. Nobody has occupied this position for a year. The ombudsperson does not even have the power to call witnesses as part of the investigations. The ombudsperson does not have the power to compel the production of documents as part of the investigations. That does not look good. It is simply an empty shell that the Trudeau government decided to create to partially appease the civil society groups that were advocating for some form of accountability for companies abroad. It is useless because it is an empty shell.

In any case, since the position has been vacant for a year, I would not be surprised to see this government abolish it in the near future. I do not want that, because even though it does not amount to much, it is better to have something than nothing.

This is also the same government that shirked its obligation to introduce a bill on forced labour by the end of the year. This was a promise it made in the March 2023 and March 2024 budgets. Those two years have come and gone, and we have not seen this bill, nor was it mentioned at all in the 2025 budget. After breaking the promise for two years in a row, the government simply stopped making it. I have to say, the Chinese are going to love that, so there is that, too. That must have been the reason. That explains it. I would not be surprised if it were dropped entirely.

To wrap up my speech, I would say yes to free trade, yes to trade in general. However, I still find it extremely sad to see Canada continue to negotiate agreements that are outdated, that do not include any human rights or environmental obligations and that continue to elevate multinational corporations to the status of sovereign powers. This is unworthy of a country that claims to be progressive and a champion of human rights.

Diversification, however necessary it may be, does not excuse everything. I hope the situation will soon be rectified.

• (1710)

**Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, over the past few years, I have had little opportunity to observe my colleague's work at the committee. However, listening to him, it is clear that he has worked very hard and very effectively for the people in his riding. I am very pleased to hear him talk about the solid benefits of this agreement for farmers, including those in his riding. I would like to ask him the following question.

We know very well that there is no such thing as an ideal world; there is only the world as it is. There is no such thing as an ideal agreement; there are only agreements that could be signed. Given all the criticism that has been levelled at the agreement, does he still believe, ultimately, that it is a good agreement and a good deal?

**Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Mr. Speaker, the beauty of 20-minute speeches is the opportunity to say that there are good things and not-so-good things. I think that is the beauty of this type of speech.

*Government Orders*

There are certainly some good things for our producers and exporters, but there are some very bad things in terms of the environment, the rights of multinational corporations, and human rights. I think that sums it up.

[*English*]

**Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister claims that this Indonesia trade deal is a major breakthrough, yet his own government says the economic impact will be just 0.012% of the GDP by 2040. That is about the value of one tanker's worth of LNG. At the same time, the United States has negotiated billions in the Indonesian purchases of American goods, including energy, agriculture and aircraft.

Why does my colleague think that the Prime Minister keeps signing deals that look good in a press release, but leave Canada trailing behind our competitors?

[*Translation*]

**Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question. As I said, diversification is always a good idea. Could the government have done better, even in this regard? To circle back to my previous answer, there are some good and some not-so-good elements in the agreement. There are many good economic elements. There are not so many in other areas. Even though the government could have gone further, diversification in and of itself is not a bad thing.

What worries me, however, is seeing agreements that would be directly beneficial to Quebec, such as the one with Taiwan, gathering dust on the Prime Minister's desk simply because the government would rather pander to the Chinese giant and accept cars that will eavesdrop on our conversations.

• (1715)

**Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking my colleague and friend for his speech. He certainly knows what he is talking about, as Olivier Guimond used to say in his famous slogan.

In his speech, my colleague often referred to the fact that this agreement contains clauses from another era that are no longer really found in modern agreements. I would like him to discuss that a bit more, focusing on the issue of ensuring that we do not import goods that are produced with child labour. There is also the issue of the environment. He talked about palm oil, deforestation, and so on. Then there is the whole issue of protecting the investments of Canadian mining companies. As he said, foreign investment often comes here to get incorporated in Canada, resulting in less accountability.

Can he tell us how the agreement could have been better drafted?

**Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Mr. Speaker, can you give me another 20 minutes? That question cannot be answered properly in such a short period of time. Also, I think it would likely involve repeating things that I mentioned and elaborated on in my speech.

In committee, I tried to make what I thought were moderate amendments. It is unfortunate that my Liberal and Conservative colleagues did not accept them. For example, I voted against the investor-state dispute settlement, or ISDS. I knew it would pass any-

way, but I moved an amendment requesting a report on the costs of ISDS, including the costs of litigation. It was really quite straightforward; I just wanted a report. If everyone is so sure that everything is fine with ISDS, then they should not object to an annual report. Both parties voted against it. Unfortunately, the two parties that are friendly with multinational corporations voted against the amendment. That is what happened. If we could at least have a simple report, a bit of information, a bit more transparency, so that things could be documented and proven, that would already be a great start.

However, the next step is to offer recourse. We cannot amend the bill to include it, but we could have modified the agreement. I am talking about recourse for victims, binding recourse, and not just for multinationals that feel their profits have been harmed. I am talking about victims who are being abused by companies abroad or by governments. We need to be able to offer something to address that. There are other things as well that could be included in the legislative framework, such as legislation on the importation of goods produced by forced labour or legislation requiring greater transparency with parliamentarians.

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton. As he knows, I am very concerned about trade agreements that include investor-state dispute settlement mechanisms.

That gives rights to foreign companies, like the Indonesian company Paper Excellence for example, which bought the vast majority of pulp and paper companies across Canada, particularly in Quebec with Resolute.

Under this agreement, Paper Excellence would have the right to sue the government if the government implements environmental protection measures or measures to protect unions and workers. Does my colleague agree?

**Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Mr. Speaker, this gives me an opportunity to explore this issue in greater depth, because too few people are talking about it. Civil society is fairly well informed on this topic; there were protests in the 1990s against the worst cases of misuse of this clause in agreements. However, it sounds very abstract and legal when people talk about “investor-state dispute settlements”. People think they need to be a lawyer or a negotiator to understand what it is, yet it has real consequences.

Earlier, I mentioned the real consequences of lawsuits and the fact that they have caused governments to back down, but now I would like to talk about another effect, one that cannot be quantified: the upstream impact of ISDS. It certainly creates a climate of self-censorship among public decision-makers. Public decision-makers often decide not to implement a particular policy because they fear ending up in court. They fear losing the case. This is the kind of slippery slope that is not quantifiable, that is difficult to assess, but that nevertheless comes with the territory.

• (1720)

[English]

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was a little disappointed in the Conservative member's question. I appreciate that they are voting in favour of the bill. Having said that, she tried to downplay the amount of trade by saying it is a fraction of a percentage point of the GDP. We are talking about billions and billions in merchandise trade with Indonesia. That is a whole lot of opportunities for—

**An hon. member:** No, you are not.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, yes, we are. They do not understand that. We are. Look at the numbers.

Having said that, the member opposite talks about the issue of consultation. I think, at times, the Bloc could maybe be found to not be recognizing the amount of consultations and the amount of working with stakeholders, whether it is in the different levels of government or private industry. I wonder if he could provide us—

[Translation]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton.

**Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Mr. Speaker, I understand that the question is about consulting businesses, entrepreneurs and so on. That probably happened to some extent.

As far as the premiers are concerned, I think I did a pretty good job of explaining how the provinces had no input and no say in the matter. Just because somebody gets a call and is asked what they think about a particular topic does not mean that they have veto power and that they can do anything they want.

I gave the example of Wallonia, which has a statutory right in the Belgian constitution. Even if the Belgian parliament were in favour of a particular agreement, if the Walloon parliament does not agree, Belgium cannot move forward with it. That has happened. Actually, I should talk about member regions. I referred to Wallonia in particular because there is an example of this in 2016, if I am not mistaken, in the context of the Canada-European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, where Wallonia nearly stopped the entire agreement. That is true federalism, where the provinces are involved. Canada is not like that.

[English]

**Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today in support of Bill C-18 and the Canada-Indonesia trade agreement, an agreement that reflects who we are as a country and where we are headed as an economy.

One in five jobs in Canada depends on exports and trade. We are talking agri-food, forestry, aerospace, energy and manufacturing, and we have a lofty goal. We want to double our exports beyond the U.S. market, double those exports around the world, and that is what we are doing.

We are a government focused on building: building infrastructure, building opportunity and building Canada strong. Across this country, from coast to coast to coast, Canadians can see and feel

### *Government Orders*

that momentum. Through our Major Projects Office, we are working to ensure that nation-building projects move forward efficiently, responsibly and in partnership with communities and indigenous peoples.

We are aligning approvals, cutting duplication and ensuring that major investments turn into real jobs for real people. We are modernizing and expanding our ports so Canadian goods can reach global markets faster and more competitively. We are advancing responsible resource development so that Canada remains a world leader in critical minerals and sustainable mining.

We are moving forward with projects like the refurbishment and expansion of the Darlington nuclear generating station in Ontario, which is an investment that will provide clean, reliable energy for decades to come, powering our growing economy and supporting thousands of skilled workers. As a member from Mississauga, Ontario, I can say that nuclear energy produces 60% of our energy here in this province. This is a great project.

These projects mean hard hats on heads. They mean shovels in the ground. They mean apprentices getting their first paycheques and experienced tradespeople passing on their knowledge to the next generation. Behind every one of these projects stands incredible, world-class Canadian companies, engineering firms, construction leaders and technology innovators ready to deliver excellence here at home and around the world.

However, building Canada strong does not stop at our borders. When Canadian companies grow, they do not just build here; they build everywhere. When they succeed internationally, that success flows home in the form of jobs, investment, research and prosperity, which brings me to Indonesia.

Indonesia is one of the fastest-growing economies in the Indo-Pacific. With a population approaching 300 million people and projected to surpass that in the coming years, Indonesia is urbanizing rapidly, expanding its middle class and undertaking ambitious infrastructure transformation. This is a country investing heavily in ports, transit systems, power generation, water systems, mining development and sustainable infrastructure. It is building new industrial hubs. It is even advancing the development of a new capital city to support long-term national growth.

### *Government Orders*

The new capital, known as Nusantara, is one of the most ambitious urban development projects in the world today. Planned for East Kalimantan on the island of Borneo, it is designed to ease pressure on Jakarta, which faces congestion, pollution and land subsidence challenges. Nusantara is envisioned as a smart, sustainable forest city, powered by renewable energy, with modern transit systems, resilient water infrastructure, digital connectivity and green building standards at its core, which are all opportunities for Canada and our trade. The scale of this undertaking, including government complexes, housing, transportation corridors, utilities and social infrastructure, represents hundreds of billions of dollars in long-term investment and extraordinary opportunities for global infrastructure partners.

• (1725)

Taken together, this kind of growth requires world-class expertise. It requires engineering excellence. It requires project management to the highest global standards, and Canada has exactly that. Canadian firms are recognized worldwide for their expertise in mining, energy systems, nuclear technology, clean infrastructure, environmental services and large-scale project delivery. Our companies know how to operate responsibly, transparently and sustainably. They know how to partner with local communities. They know how to deliver complex projects on time and on budget.

Trade agreements are not abstract documents; they are practical tools. They reduce barriers. They create certainty. They protect investment. They improve transparency. They make it easier for Canadian firms to compete fairly and win contracts abroad. When we lower barriers to trade in services, when we protect intellectual property and when we ensure clear procurement rules, we are not just signing paperwork. We are opening doors for Canadian workers and businesses. We are creating the conditions for Canadian companies to contribute to infrastructure delivery both here at home and in dynamic markets like Indonesia.

To bring this all together, I want to highlight a local example. Hatch is a global engineering and professional services firm headquartered in Mississauga, in Peel Region. Hatch employs more than 10,000 people globally, including a significant concentration of highly skilled engineers, project managers, technologists and support staff here in the GTA. Founded in 1955, this company began as a small Canadian engineering firm and has steadily grown over seven decades into a truly global enterprise with offices on six continents and projects in more than 150 countries. This is a Canadian success story. It is what we want to see duplicated over and over here in our country.

With decades of expertise in mining, energy, infrastructure and metals, Hatch has built a reputation as one of the most respected engineering firms in the world. Hatch already has a presence in Jakarta, supporting projects across Indonesia and southeast Asia. It is there because Indonesia is growing, and growing big time. An agreement like this would reduce barriers even further. It would provide clearer rules. It would improve market access. It would strengthen investment protections. It would help ensure that when Canadian companies bid on major infrastructure projects in Indonesia, they do so on a level playing field.

Here is why that matters to families in my community: When Hatch grows in Jakarta, Mississauga feels it, Peel Region feels it and Canada feels it. It means more engineers hired here at home in Mississauga, more co-op students trained, more research partners with Canadian universities, more procurement from Canadian suppliers and more tax revenue to support our schools, hospitals and public services. International growth builds our economy and strengthens it for future generations. If we want Canadian workers to benefit from global growth, we must be present, competitive and have the right agreements in place.

Bill C-18 would do exactly that. It would support services trade. It would enhance investment certainty. It would reduce red tape. It would create opportunity. It would say to Canadian companies to go out there, compete, win, succeed, come home to the true north, strong and free, and deliver. It would say to our workers that their skills are world class, their expertise is in demand and their new Liberal government is backing them.

For all these reasons and so many more, I urge all of my hon. colleagues in the House to join me in supporting Bill C-18. Let us keep building. Let us keep trading. Let us keep competing. Let us keep growing. Let us keep building Canada strong.

• (1730)

**Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully and my Liberal colleague was speaking, at the end of his speech, about the benefits to an organization like Hatch. Who does Hatch work for? Actually, I want to ask a few more questions. When the Prime Minister travels to China, who gets a billion-dollar loan? When the Prime Minister travels to Washington, who gets an \$80-billion nuclear contract? When the Prime Minister travels to Europe, who gets a multi-year lease extension? When the Prime Minister travels to India, who gets a \$2.6-billion uranium deal? The answer is the same to each one of those questions: Brookfield does.

Part of this agreement is preferential access for Brookfield in Indonesia's renewable energy, clean-tech and critical minerals sectors through reduced barriers. Who is the Prime Minister working for, Canada or Brookfield?

*Government Orders*

**Peter Fonseca:** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is focused on Canadians and on building Canada strong. It is about diversifying our economy and making us more resilient. Right around the world, he is well respected to do that, and that is why people in Europe, Asia and around the world are reaching out to Canada. It is because the Prime Minister is out there working as hard as he can to deliver for Canadians. I could not be prouder of the Prime Minister and the work that he is doing in diversifying our economy. We have some big goals and we are going to achieve them.

[*Translation*]

**Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to ask my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton that question, but I will ask this colleague instead.

I am a member of the All Party Parliamentary Group to End Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking, and we are very interested in finding ways to strengthen laws to ensure that the products we buy are not tainted with blood. Working groups have pointed out the existence of forced labour and human rights violations in Indonesian supply chains. We really want to encourage the government to include strong protections for workers, indigenous communities and the environment.

Unfortunately, there is nothing in the agreement that offers these groups binding protections. On the contrary, the agreement represents a step backwards on the progress that has been made to protect workers in Canadian trade agreements.

My question is this: Why did the government fail to include this crucial issue?

• (1735)

[*English*]

**Peter Fonseca:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for the opportunity to talk about this agreement. As members can see, it is a comprehensive economic partnership agreement. Within that partnership, there are labour provisions. There are environmental provisions that are part of this agreement. It is an agreement that is looking to raise standards and provide the stability and the predictability that we are all looking for. We believe in a rules-based order, and that is what an agreement like this agreement between Canada and Indonesia brings to the table.

This is the type of agreement that I would hope the member would support. I would think that she is going to be voting in favour because she understands that this agreement would actually raise the standard and bring us to a better level.

**Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for being such a strong advocate for jobs in his riding and for the city of Mississauga. Could the member share with the House which sectors he believes hold the greatest opportunities for trade diversification and for expanding Canada's trade in the years ahead?

**Peter Fonseca:** Mr. Speaker, there are many sectors, but I will speak to one in particular for the member and his many constituents, which is the aerospace sector. Indonesia is spending about \$1 billion in aerospace as it grows, buying planes for commercial use, for defence, etc., and Canada has only a bit of that investment. We get about \$3 million or \$4 million of \$1 billion. We

could double, triple or quadruple and more the amount of trade that we are doing in the aerospace sector.

However, every sector is touched. Be it forestry, agri-food, manufacturing or energy, it is every sector right across our country. This is a very complementary agreement that would work between Canada and Indonesia in terms of what our needs are. I foresee great growth in terms of our trade with Indonesia through this agreement.

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, the question I asked earlier to the Bloc Québécois, to my friend from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, was specifically about an Indonesian company that has bought up most of Canada's pulp and paper mills. It is called Paper Excellence. This agreement, and its investor-state agreements, will limit our ability to regulate to protect our forests and those jobs. Does the hon. member not agree?

**Peter Fonseca:** Mr. Speaker, I have so much respect for the member. These are the types of agreements, as I said in my previous answer to a question, that raise our standards to be able to make everybody better. Within the forestry sector, or any other sector, this is what we can do within the agreement. What countries, companies and investors are looking for is stability and predictability in a modern agreement.

I have so much faith in our negotiators. We have the best negotiators in the world. We have tremendous trade negotiators. When they go to the table, they are always looking to make things better, so that is what this agreement does. It is looking at always improving, and that is why I am so bullish on this agreement for what it will do, not only for Canada but also for Indonesia, as we continue in our goals for diversification.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties, and if you seek it, I believe you will find that there is unanimous consent to put the question on Bill C-18 at third reading.

• (1740)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The question is on the motion.

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

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I request that it be carried on division.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)

*Private Members' Business***PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS***[Translation]***CRIMINAL CODE**

The House resumed from December 4, 2025, consideration of the motion that Bill C-246, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (consecutive sentences for sexual offences), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I already had an opportunity to speak about this bill for four minutes. It was at the end of the last hour. I was given four minutes to begin the debate on Bill C-246, which deals with consecutive sentences for sexual offences.

The bill aims to acknowledge the seriousness of sexual violence. Some sexual offences are among the most serious crimes in our society. They leave deep and lasting scars on victims. Victims experience psychological trauma, relationship challenges, loss of trust and sometimes an inability to get back to a normal life. Yes, indeed, sexual offences are among the most serious crimes in our society.

According to Statistics Canada, level 1 sexual assaults in Canada increased from 57 to 87 per 100,000 population between 2015 and 2022, which is an increase of 52%. I also mentioned a number of figures in the first part of my speech, but I want to start with a few statistics. In Quebec, these offences increased from 45 to 98 per 100,000 population, which is an increase of 119%. In absolute terms, 20,466 sexual assaults were reported in Canada in 2015 compared to 35,956 in 2022.

However, these figures should be interpreted with some caution. The important nuance is acknowledging the effect of the #MeToo movement. A large part of the increase in reports can be explained by the #MeToo movement. This movement, which emerged in 2017, has really raised collective awareness, made victims more willing to report their attackers and improved police practices in classifying complaints. In short, this does not necessarily signify an increase in the number of assaults committed, but rather an increase in the reporting and visibility of these crimes, which is a good thing.

The objective of Bill C-246 is to amend the Criminal Code to require that sentences for certain sexual offences be served consecutively rather than concurrently. In other words, when a person commits multiple sexual assaults, the sentences would be served one after the other, rather than at the same time. The offences covered include sexual interference, invitation to sexual touching, sexual exploitation, incest, sexual assault, sexual assault with a weapon and aggravated sexual assault.

Obviously, the Bloc Québécois is in favour of the bill in principle and wants it to be studied in committee, because sexual offences are serious crimes that require serious penalties. Consecutive sentences can be an acknowledgement of the seriousness of each offence and of each victim. This acknowledgement is important because victims of sexual assault often show tremendous courage in coming forward to report their attacker. We are well aware of this, but we do have some reservations.

There are several factors that raise concerns. Consecutive sentences already exist. The Criminal Code already provides for the possibility of consecutive sentences. Section 718.3 provides that sentences may be served consecutively when the offences do not out of the same event or series of events. Some judges already have the discretion to impose such sentences when the situation warrants it.

There is also the principle of proportionality. The Criminal Code establishes proportionality as a fundamental principle of sentencing. According to this principle, the sentence must reflect the gravity of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the offender. The bill could potentially limit judges' ability to tailor the sentence to the specific circumstances of each case.

Another thing in the Criminal Code is the totality principle. This principle provides that judges must ensure that combined sentences are not excessive. The totality principle requires that the overall sentence remain proportionate to the overall culpability of the accused. It is clear, then, that mandatory consecutive sentences could, in some cases, lead to sentences that would be considered disproportionate. Another consideration is interaction with minimum sentences. Many sexual offences already carry mandatory minimum sentences. Combining mandatory minimum sentences with mandatory consecutive sentences could result in extremely long sentences that no longer take special circumstances into account.

How would this be viewed by the system? As for case law, there is the Bissonnette case. The Supreme Court ruled on the issue of consecutive sentences in the Bissonnette decision. In that case, a man had murdered six people at the Quebec City mosque in 2017. In the end, the Supreme Court ruled that imposing consecutive sentences violated the principle of rehabilitation, so that case law already exists.

Harsher penalties are not the only solution, either. We often hear this at the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. It is important to remember that increasing penalties is not in itself a solution to reducing crime, because crime is influenced by multiple factors, such as social conditions, inequality, support for vulnerable people and resources allocated to prevention.

● (1745)

In closing, I want to talk about Quebec's example of using specialized courts. Quebec chose an interesting approach after the #MeToo movement. An expert panel drafted 190 recommendations to improve support for victims in the report entitled "Rebâtir la confiance".

In 2021, the Quebec National Assembly even unanimously passed a motion to create courts specializing in sexual and domestic violence. Since 2022, these courts have been rolled out in 24 cities across Quebec. They include specialized training for judges and judicial stakeholders, a specialized division of prosecutors and judges, support for victims to help them better understand their rights, and changing the layout of courthouses to ensure victims are welcomed safely and appropriately.

In conclusion, sexual assault is a serious crime that must be denounced and strictly punished. Victims need to feel that their words are heard and that their suffering is recognized. Bill C-246 therefore raises important issues. That is why the Bloc Québécois will support this bill so that it can be studied in committee, where its principle will, as always, be carefully reviewed to ensure that the core principles are upheld and, most importantly, that they actually strengthen victim protection.

[English]

**Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of Bill C-246, the ending sentence reductions for sexual predators act, which is legislation rooted in dignity, accountability and respect for people who have survived sexual violence.

Sexual crimes are among the most serious violations a person can experience. The harm reaches far beyond the moment of the offence. The effect goes beyond the physical. It can affect a person's sense of safety, trust and self-worth. For survivors, the impact does not end when the assault ends. It can follow them for years and often for a lifetime. It shapes how they move through the world, how they relate to others and whether they feel safe in their day-to-day life.

In our justice system, sentencing is meant to reflect the gravity of an offence. This principle exists not only to hold offenders accountable but also to ensure that the harm done is fully acknowledged. No sentence can undo what happened, and no verdict can erase trauma, but sentencing sends a signal to survivors and to society that these crimes are unacceptable and will not be tolerated, and that perpetrators will be punished accordingly. Tragically, this is often not the reality. We have seen cases where individuals are convicted of multiple sexual offences, sometimes against multiple victims, yet are given sentences that do not reflect the scope of what they have done.

In Toronto, a physician was convicted of nine counts of sexual assault and four counts of sexual exploitation, taking place over nearly a decade. His patients came to his practice with the expectation of professionalism and care. Doctors swear an oath to do no harm. Instead, his patients were betrayed and victimized by someone who held a position of authority and trust. What was the penalty for this doctor? Despite the number and seriousness of the offences, this total sentence was just three and a half years.

In British Columbia, young women were deceived by a man posing as a talent agent and were assaulted after being lured to so-called auditions. Even with multiple survivors, the sentence amounted to just 18 months.

Unfortunately, these are not isolated examples. Sexual offences are increasing across the country. Since 2015, reported sexual assaults have risen significantly, and women account for the vast majority of people harmed. Offences against children have also increased sharply over the same period. So many lives have been permanently changed.

In my own community, I have spoken with families, advocates and frontline workers who support women and girls as they rebuild after sexual violence. These are not distant stories. They involve real people who were harmed by someone they knew, someone in a

### *Private Members' Business*

position of trust or someone they were supposed to feel safe with. What I hear repeatedly is not a call for vengeance; it is a call to be fully seen and understood by the justice system.

When survivors see that offenders convicted of multiple sexual offences serve sentences nearly identical to those imposed for a single offence, despite multiple convictions involving multiple acts of harm, it can feel as though their individual experience disappears into the process. The perception of being reduced or overlooked can deepen the harm long after the courtroom doors close.

For survivors and their families, the journey through the justice system already requires extraordinary courage: reporting the assault; reliving it in court, often multiple times; and facing scrutiny and disbelief. What is sometimes less visible is how long that process can last and how much it demands. Court proceedings stretch over months or years. Survivors are asked to recount the most painful moments of their lives over and over again in unfamiliar, intimidating settings. They are cross-examined and wait for decisions that will shape their sense of justice and closure.

When that process ends with a sentence that appears disconnected from the number or seriousness of the offences, it can undermine faith not only in the outcome but also in the system itself. Sentencing should reflect what the court has found to be true. When convictions establish multiple sexual offences, the sentence should reflect that multiplicity.

● (1750)

Bill C-246 would align sentencing outcomes with judicial findings, ensuring that repeated criminal conduct would be treated as such. Bill C-246 would address a loophole in the Criminal Code that allows concurrent sentencing, meaning that sentences for multiple sexual offences can be served at the same time. In practice, concurrent sentencing can result in offenders' serving nearly the same amount of time whether they commit one sexual offence or several, even when the number of offences and victims is greater.

*Private Members' Business*

The law recognizes the convictions as separate, but the sentence often does not meaningfully distinguish between them. It can create a perverse kind of discount, where additional crimes do not meaningfully increase accountability for each offence or each person harmed. For people carrying the impact of sexual violence, this can feel as though the law is counting time rather than harm. It leaves the impression that additional violations are absorbed into the process rather than recognized as separate acts of violence. When the law treats multiple sexual offences as one, survivors are left feeling that only part of what happened to them truly counted.

Consecutive sentencing corrects that imbalance by ensuring that each offence is treated separately, because each act caused its own harm. This approach also speaks to public confidence in the justice system. Canadians expect that when serious crimes occur repeatedly, the law responds in a way that reflects that reality. When sentences appear compressed or reduced, it can erode trust and raise questions about whether the system is equipped to deal with repeat sexual offending. Clear, proportionate sentencing helps reinforce the idea that the justice system recognizes patterns of harm and responds accordingly. It supports deterrence, not through harshness but through certainty and accountability.

Bill C-246 would require consecutive sentencing for sexual offences, ensuring that each offence carries its own penalty and that each survivor's experience is treated individually. This approach already applies when sexual offences are committed against children. The bill would extend that same principle to adult survivors, recognizing something fundamental, which is that sexual violence causes profound harm regardless of age. Age should not be the discerning factor, as everyone deserves the same clarity and protection from the law, whether the abuse occurs in childhood or adulthood, whether it happens once or repeatedly and whether it takes place in a home, a workplace or a community setting.

Parliament has a responsibility to ensure that our laws reflect the lived realities survivors face, not just the technical structure of the Criminal Code. The bill would not change definitions or create new offences. It would simply ensure that when harm occurs more than once, the response of the law reflects that reality.

Consecutive sentencing affirms that each act of sexual violence stands on its own and that each survivor's experience is acknowledged fully, not absorbed into a legal calculation. This is not about retribution. It is about responsibility. It is about affirming that every survivor is a whole person, not a fraction of a case filed, and that sentencing should reflect the full scope of the harm inflicted. This is about the standards we set for our justice system.

This should not be a partisan issue. It speaks to dignity, respect and restoring confidence in a justice system that too many Canadians feel has fallen short when it comes to sexual violence. To survivors, the bill would send a clear message that they are seen, that their experience will not be minimized and that the law will recognize the full reality of what they endured. To the people who commit these crimes, it would send another message: Each act of sexual violence carries consequences, and each offence will be answered in full.

I want to thank my colleague, the member for Lethbridge, for bringing forward this important legislation. I encourage members

on all sides of the House to consider what the bill seeks to correct, and to work together to ensure that our sentencing laws reflect both the seriousness of these crimes and the dignity of the people who survive them. Justice should never be reduced, bundled or discounted.

• (1755)

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to maybe provide a bit of a different perspective and, at the same time, to recognize that sexual violence in all forms is, in fact, a horrific crime. The victims of this particular crime all deserve justice. That is one of the motivating factors in regard to why, over the last number of months, the government has brought forward a series of legislative initiatives that are, in part, dealing with the types of issues that are being raised with Bill C-246.

The primary difference is that the legislation we are proposing is constitutional. There is a strong, valid argument that if we take a look at Bill C-246, we will find that it is in fact unconstitutional.

I can appreciate that all members of the House would recognize the desire and the need to act on the issue of sexual violence. There are opportunities for us to be able to do that. In some legislation, what we have seen is movement in the same sort of direction that is being suggested in Bill C-246. I would cite, for example, Bill C-14. I will go over all aspects of the legislative agenda, but if we take a look at Bill C-14, as an example, that is the bail reform legislation. It took a little longer than I would have liked to ultimately pass through the House, but we did get it passed through the House, and it is in the Senate.

It actually takes a look at sexual violence and says that we are going to be eliminating conditional sentences for sexual offences. It is a positive measure in terms of bail reform. It also ensures that a judge will have constitutional authority, for repeat sexual offenders, to impose consecutive sentences. This is something I would encourage members opposite to recognize.

I say that in a very encouraging way, in the sense that we were finally able to deal with Bill C-14. It is currently in the other place. We are hoping they will pass it as it is, so that we can ultimately give it royal assent, but at the end of the day, there is reason for members to say that on the issue of sexual assault, there is something very tangible there.

It is more than that. We take more of a holistic approach in terms of what the Prime Minister and the government have actually brought forward to the chamber for debate. We are hopeful, as we have a substantive crime agenda, of being able to pass it all.

*Private Members' Business*

We can talk about Bill C-2 and how Bill C-2 has the potential to empower our prosecutors to potentially even prevent some sexual assaults from happening. That is one of the reasons we see a great deal of commentary that comes from the government benches, asking for the official opposition to recognize the value of Bill C-2, much in the same fashion as we saw value in the bail reform legislation.

For me, I think we should take a look at Bill C-16. Bill C-16 is legislation that I would argue is just as important as bail reform. Bail reform is very important. Let us just say I would not want to have to decide which one is more important than the other. Bill C-16 is before the House in second reading. When we talk about a private member's bill, Bill C-246, we know there is a cap. The debate will end today. It is programmed.

• (1800)

I would love to see Bill C-16 advance because, when we look at it, there are some new initiatives dealing with coercive control. The idea of femicide has been around for a long time. I would suggest that Bill C-16 really raises the bar, and not just here in Canada. I suspect other nations would take note of that because there are significant things within it. I can say that it ultimately brings back mandatory minimum sentences for sexual interference, in particular and as an example, with respect to the sexual touching of a child. That is something for which these mandatory minimums could receive support from all sides of the House. The bill would reinstate mandatory jail time for the sexual exploitation of a child, including abuse by people in positions of trust. That is a very positive aspect of the legislation.

We are making sure, to the nth degree, that when we bring forward the legislation, it is charter compliant so that our courts can look at the laws being proposed and understand the severity of them. Bill C-16 does just that, as does Bill C-14. If we think of intimate partner violence and the issue of coercive control, it is something that I would say does not get enough attention when we talk about sexual violence in our communities today. However, it is very real and being dealt with.

The bill deals with issues such as stalking. What about the emotional and psychological abuse that takes place, not to mention the economic abuse? These are substantial and very real. There is also physical abuse and a lot of cyber violence. These are the impacts of sexual violence. If we add in the issue of femicide, we have elevated that to first-degree murder in certain situations. That is where I think the legislation really puts justice for victims of violence upfront and makes our communities safer. It sends a very strong and powerful message.

I look across the way and ask members to put some of the partisan politics to the side. I would suggest that the legislative crime agenda the government has brought forward since the last federal election is substantive. There are many aspects of several bills that deal directly with the issues of sexual violence and justice for victims. The biggest barrier for legislation ultimately passing is the political will of the chamber.

On the bill before us, the opposition bill, we have two hours of debate and then it would go to committee. I would love to see some of the other issues dealing with sexual violence also advance to

committee sooner as opposed to later. The reason I say that is that the bail reform legislation could be law today had we done it back in December. Therefore, I encourage members to look at the government agenda to see that the legislation being proposed would arguably be unconstitutional.

• (1805)

**Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am proud and grateful to support and second Bill C-246, the ending sentence reductions for sexual predators act, brought forth by my very strong, principled Conservative colleague, mom of a sweet baby girl and a fellow Albertan, the MP for Lethbridge. I want to thank her for her advocacy on so many issues and for her leadership on this serious one.

Sexual violence shatters lives. These cruel, pervasive crimes strip victims of dignity, security and trust with physical, psychological and spiritual harm, devastating consequences that for many survivors last a lifetime. Predatorial violence like rape, sexual exploitation and sexual assault leaves deep scars. Frankly, these crimes often impose life sentences of trauma on victims, yet today, the system that is supposed to prosecute criminals and protect victims hinges on a glaring, dangerous flaw. It is yet another reason so many people in Lakeland say it is not a justice system in Canada.

Right now, sexual predators who commit multiple sexual offences can serve all of the sentences at the same time. That is concurrent sentencing. What that means in practice is simple. Sexual predators who commit multiple sexual offences can get discounts on their punishments. No matter how many lives they destroy or how many victims they traumatize, the time those criminals serve can remain almost the same. It seems to me this is a basic principle of justice. Multiple crimes with multiple victims should mean multiple punishments.

Let me share a case that shows systemic injustice clearly. In Ontario, someone posed as a talent agent to lure young people into modelling. Two young women accepted the offer, but instead of offering opportunity, he inflicted repeated sexual assaults. He pleaded guilty and got one sentence of 18 months and another of 24 months, a total of 42 months, but due to concurrent sentencing, those two separate punishments were merged into one sentence of 24 months. That is two crimes, two victims, one sentence. That is wrong. Sexual predators who destroy lives must be held accountable to the full extent of the law. Their sentences should reflect the seriousness of every crime they commit and the sanctity and value of every victim they harm, yet today, too many offenders walk free far too soon.

*Private Members' Business*

This is why people in Lakeland call it a catch-and-release or revolving-door criminal system, not a justice one. Too many victims struggle in a system that does not protect them. Too many families watch predators return to the streets or into their own homes while the trauma of the crime lasts a lifetime. The worst part is that it has not just happened this way. People elected to stand and pass laws in this very place, the Liberals, made it that way. Over the past decade, they have weakened penalties for serious crimes; let criminals, gangsters and terrorists run free; put law-abiding, innocent Canadians at risk; and retraumatized victims.

The same Liberals passed Bill C-75, which introduced the concept of the principle of restraint, which outright directed judges to make it easier for repeat offenders to walk free on bail "at the earliest reasonable opportunity and on the least onerous conditions". Let us be straight here. This so-called principle says Canadians should trust criminals to follow the rules, like the law, and their bail conditions. Yeah, that works well. The Liberals also passed Bill C-5, which allowed house arrest for serious crimes, like illegal drug trafficking and illegal drug importing, and major gun crimes, like drive-by shootings and illegal gun trafficking, while they target law-abiding firearms owners.

Parliament deliberately put mandatory minimum sentences in place to deter such severe crimes, but the truth is that time and again, the Liberals directly legislated favour for criminals and punishment for victims and innocent Canadians. That has to change, so that is exactly what our Conservative Lethbridge MP's Bill C-246 aims to do. If passed, her bill would require courts to impose consecutive sentences for individuals convicted of multiple sexual offences, so each crime would carry its own penalty, each victim would be honoured and each predator would serve the full weight and time for their crimes.

This law is needed now more than ever because while the Liberals like to talk about standing with victims, the reality is different. Since 2015, sexual assaults reported in Canada are up nearly 75%. Sexual offences against children, and this is almost unimaginable, are up by nearly 120%. Between 2015 and 2019, there were more than 27,000 sexual assault charges and over 33,000 sexual offence charges.

● (1810)

These numbers are shocking alone, but all MPs must recognize the truth and never forget that each of those numbers is a victim, a person, a human being, violated. Each number is a young adult who no longer feels or is safe in their own home, a woman who checks her locks at night and still cannot sleep, a man who suffers in silence because stigma still stops many male victims from speaking out, and a survivor who carries invisible and, at times, literal physical trauma into every part of their life.

The numbers do not lie, but they are not just statistics. They are Canadians whose dignity, security and sense of self-worth were stolen on top of horrific physical violation and the damage and harm of long-lasting fear. That is why they are called survivors, and that is why we here owe them our greatest duty.

Criminals can serve sentences that do not reflect the severity of their crimes. When that happens, victims are erased, unseen, unheard and devalued, which is reprehensible. If we are all to stand

here with straight faces and say that there is a justice system in Canada, then it should punish those who prey on the vulnerable and ensure effective corrections to prevent recidivism. However, today, the max penalty for sexual assault against an adult is 10 years. If we compare that to property crimes like robbery or breaking and entering, which are also out of control under the Liberals, the max penalty can be life in prison. If this was sexual violence, it would be like robbing three banks but only being jailed for one, or breaking into six homes and only being punished for two. How does that make any sense at all?

No Canadian should accept that. The people of Lakeland certainly do not, but it is exactly what happens today with sexual offences. It sends a clear message to sexual violence victims that their sanctity and suffering does not count. It tells predators that their crimes may carry fewer consequences. How the heck are the ones who committed the crimes getting the better end of the deal around here?

It also sends a clear message to the many indigenous people in Lakeland and across Canada, who are disproportionately harmed by sexual violence and other violent crimes. Culturally sensitive approaches are important, but Canadian law should show without a shadow of a doubt that every single victim's life matters and every single criminal will be held to account.

In 2021, the ethics committee investigated the exploitation of victims of non-consensual or child sexual assault material of rape, sexual assault and human trafficking on platforms run by MindGeek. The survivors' words seared me, as did the clarity that the laws already exist to combat this but were not enforced. Just as it was then, it is true today that the laws exist for all of those crimes and predators can be held accountable, but that does not happen. A senior counsel at the justice department said, "I am not sure it's the problem of the law. The problem...is the application of the law". Therefore, the tools exist, but the problem is that they are not being used. That is a fact, and this is the loophole for convicted sexual predators that can be closed, which is what the MP for Lethbridge wants to do.

I say to all MPs to ask themselves and really reflect on this: What message does not enforcing laws and discounting sentences really send to women and girls and to men and boys across Canada who have been victims of sexual violence? What message does it send to those who are recently recovering, afraid to speak out, because they fear their abusers will be out of jail?

*Private Members' Business*

MPs can get up here and make speeches on days like Red Dress Day, International Women's Day and the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women, but without action, it is just words on paper and hot air out of our mouths. Liberals have a chance to act by voting for this bill.

Some victims will spend their lives trying to rebuild safety. Some will move. Some will never rebuild it. Some will struggle to trust again. Anxiety for some will be so great that they leave their jobs. Families and friends will watch loved ones change because of their trauma. Some will end their own lives. The truth is that just one person can change entire lives in horrible ways, but it does not have to be this way. Each person here has the power of just one vote, and we can change entire lives for the better.

I urge MPs to protect survivors and support this bill. It is not partisan. It does not matter if a member wears blue, red, green or orange, every MP holds the same duty to defend survivors and real justice. Parliament together can send a message to both survivors and to predators that sexual violence is never okay and that those who perpetrate it will be punished, because every survivor matters and every crime must count.

• (1815)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I recognize the member for Lethbridge for her right of reply.

**Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have said it here before, but I will just say it again: There is a type of discount that is reasonably exciting for us, like a sale, a two-for-one or 15% off. These are reasonable discounts, but these types of discounts in our court system do not belong, and it should alarm us when they do. That is exactly what concurrent sentencing allows, and in particular with regard to sexual assault, it should be disheartening and even alarming for all of us in this place.

Since introducing Bill C-246, I have heard from dozens and dozens of Canadians who have taken the time to write to me, give me a call or meet with me in person. I believe that their voices are urgent, I believe that their pain is real, and I believe that their calls for justice are unmistakable.

Rudy contends that predators, especially those who repeatedly prey on the innocent, should never, ever get easy passage.

Marilyn wrote to the justice minister and copied me on the correspondence. She asked where the minister's morality was. Where was his humanity? Where was his justice? She said the most vulnerable members of our society were counting on him, and he should stand with the victims, not with the criminals.

Leah urged that we act now to resolve reduced sentencing for perpetrators.

Bill summed it up very plainly, saying that sex offenders should not receive reduced sentences, full stop.

We have many examples throughout years of history and throughout different provinces, different cities and different communities, of teachers who are committing abuses, of doctors who are committing abuses, and of uncles, aunts, friends, neighbours, boyfriends and spouses. All of these individuals are given a place of trust, a place of prominence and a place of respect in the lives of

those they then go on to violate, and this violation is not something small. It is something big, and it goes to the heart of a person and is carried with them for their entire life.

These crimes are shattering, yet the so-called justice system gives predators a discount, while victims will carry the trauma for the remainder of their lives. My private member's bill would change that. It would mandate that consecutive sentences would be given for sexual offences, ensuring that each crime carries its own penalty, that each victim is recognized and that voices matter.

As Cait Alexander, the founder of End Violence Everywhere, has said, "Concurrent sentencing tells survivors that what happened to them counts less." She goes on, "Every victim is a whole human being, and every crime deserves its own consequence."

Kelly Favro from Beyond the Verdict contends that "Consecutive sentencing admits that each offence caused real harm. That gives survivors confidence to come forward because it tells them the system will not automatically minimize what they went through".

This is so important. Victims must have confidence in the system if they are to come forward.

The Liberals have signalled that they will oppose this legislation. They claim that it fails to comply with the charter, but I would offer that the hypocrisy in that statement is quite palpable. The Liberals have imposed consecutive sentences, under Bill C-14, for certain crimes. The inconsistency is stark, because consecutive sentencing is perfectly acceptable when it serves the Liberals' policy agenda, but suddenly it is problematic when it confronts an issue that they would rather ignore or turn a blind eye to, like sexual assault. The charter is being invoked selectively rather than consistently in order to defend political choice rather than the principle of justice and standing with victims. It is disheartening to watch as the Liberals turn this into an opportunity for gamesmanship rather than working collectively with other parties to benefit Canadians.

I will end with this: Every sexual assault that is committed is a distinct harm, and it is against a distinct individual, and every crime must carry weight. We cannot afford to be a society that sends the message that somehow one victim matters more than another, and we cannot be a society that sends a message that somehow says that criminals get off the hook easily. This type of messaging must stop, and that is what this legislation seeks to do.

I urge the House to stand with victims and vote yes.

• (1820)

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The question is on the motion.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

[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.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, March 25, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

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

• (1825)

[English]

## MARINE TRANSPORTATION

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am here again tonight to once again remind the House and, of course, the Liberal government about a massive gap in our emergency preparedness framework: the lack of a standing federal plan to prevent, prepare for and actively respond to marine debris spills.

To begin, I want to recognize some of the environmental champions who have been calling attention to the urgency of this issue: Lilly Woodbury from Surfrider Pacific Rim; Karla Robison, who helped deal with the tsunami fallout from the Japanese earthquake at Fukushima; Josh Charleson and Josh Temple, both from Coastal Restoration Society; and organizations like Ocean Legacy and Living Oceans. These people and groups have been doing the work on the ground in coastal communities. They have been raising the alarm for years, but the government still has not addressed the gaps. It is time the Liberal government listened and actually took action.

In 2016, the *Hanjin Seattle* lost 35 shipping containers just off the coast of Tofino, spreading millions of pieces of damaging styrofoam and plastic across the beaches. In 2021, even worse, the *ZIM Kingston* lost 109 shipping containers in a spill just south of Ucluelet, in the Strait of Juan de Fuca off Victoria, dumping toxic chemicals, toys, household appliances and other plastic items off our coast. Those are going to appear and resurface for the next 100 years and beyond. Last November, near Bella Bella, a freighter carrying a full load took on water. If not for the quick response of the Heiltsuk nation, it might have caused a devastating marine spill with reverberating effects on the environment and nearby communities.

Each time, it was not the federal government taking the first response and leading the cleanup. It was municipalities, volunteers and, again, often first nations and indigenous communities. While the work they do is incredible, they can only respond rather than act to prevent the worst effects of marine debris spills, straining limited resources in this process.

That is why, in 2022, the fisheries and oceans committee called for the government to step up with regulations against expanded

polystyrene foam in packaging, a stronger polluter pays liability model and a coordinated cleanup plan involving all stakeholders, especially first nations. That is also why the Transportation Safety Board reported in 2024 that Canada is not properly prepared for marine emergencies, including marine debris spills, and advised that a well-resourced response plan will protect marine ecosystems and save lives.

That is exactly why I am here. It has been over a year since that report came out and four years since the committee report, and there has been nothing from the government. Transport Canada committed to act on these recommendations, yet in all that time, there has been no concrete action, no improved liability framework and no standing response plan. It has been pure inaction, plain and simple.

However, there is a clear path forward here. Canada has standing oil spill response teams at the dock, ready to move. I want to thank them for their deeply valuable work. With new equipment, training and capacity, these crews could actually step in and also respond to marine cargo spills as well, giving much-needed support to existing cleanup efforts. A small ecosystem service fee could be applied to each container coming to port, which could help fund critical response capacity while keeping the financial onus on transnational shipping corporations that are doing business, not on everyday Canadians. A polluter pays model, as with oil spills, could apply here.

Again I will remind the government that the time to act is now. We learned on Monday that cargo volumes at the Port of Vancouver rose to a record high of 170 million tonnes in 2025. More traffic, alongside increasingly dangerous navigating conditions due to climate change, mean that spills will only become more common and more devastating without a real plan.

Let us not ask coastal communities to wait for the next disaster. I ask the House to please pass my bill to establish a national strategy on shipping container spills, build out rapid response capacity with an ecosystem service fee, and take proactive steps to protect our coasts.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

**Mike Kelloway (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government has been clear that we must protect our oceans, including our coastal environment. That is why we have taken steps, including working with key federal stakeholders and the private sector, to prevent spills of oil and of hazardous and noxious substances in Canadian waters. Through the Canada Shipping Act, 2001, and its regulations, the government strictly regulates air emissions and vessel discharges, as well as ship design and construction, based on international standards, and we often exceed those standards.

Pollution prevention is at the heart of Canada's marine regimen. We know that spills, chemical discharges and marine debris represent real threats to the health of marine ecosystems. This regulatory and legislative framework is reinforced by a robust regimen for spills when they happen. The Canadian Coast Guard leads when spills occur and coordinates the deployment of rapid response teams and specialized equipment.

The work with industry, provinces and territories, and most importantly indigenous communities because of their local and traditional knowledge, is essential in minimizing the impact of spills. They are not left to address the situation alone. This is a cross-government approach where we have sought to incorporate, utilize and learn from indigenous knowledge in our national response system and subsequent responses.

Our framework is based on a simple and central principle that the polluter pays. It is enshrined in the Canada Shipping Act, which contains substantial penalties for polluters, and other relevant legislation that places the financial responsibility for cleanup and restoration on those responsible for incidents and accidents.

The Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act is another example of empowering authorities to address vessels that pose a risk to navigation or the environment and to make owners responsible for the cost of removal and remediation. The framework helps to ensure that owners remain responsible for their vessels throughout the lifetime and reinforces the principle that the polluter pays.

Concrete steps have been taken to strengthen marine safety and environmental protection in collaboration with indigenous people and stakeholders. The Canada Shipping Act of 2001 has been amended to strengthen marine emergency responses by enhancing Transport Canada's authorities to ensure early action by the responsible party to prevent and contain marine emergencies, expand the preparedness, respond to a regimen including spills of hazardous and noxious substances, and strengthen the compliance and enforcement regime.

Transport Canada has also updated the regulations to strengthen preparedness in the event of oil spills from a vessel. Our government is taking further steps to strengthen marine environmental protection by requiring more rapid access to marine emergency services, such as firefighting resources and emergency salvage capacity, as the recent incident in Bella Bella required, and improving preparedness and response for incidents involving hazardous and noxious substances.

These actions and our regimen recognize that a strong safety system is crucial for protecting our marine ecosystem and our coastal

communities. It is the foundation for a growing trade and economy in a sustainable fashion.

● (1830)

**Gord Johns:** Mr. Speaker, we can ask coastal communities how the Liberals' regimes are playing out. If a spill were to happen today, nothing has changed. It would be municipalities, conservation groups and first nations caught holding the bag. Promises and statements like that do not protect coastal communities. The Transportation Safety Board said that Canada is not properly prepared for marine emergencies, including marine debris spills.

The owners of the ZIM Kingston are only on the hook for six years under the current regime the member talked about. A hundred shipping containers landing on the bottom of the ocean are going to take a lot longer than six years to surface.

We are calling for the government to actually act, follow up on its own transportation board recommendations, listen to the recommendations and introduce a coordinated response plan that includes coastal communities, with an ecosystem service fee so industry actually pays for it and cleans up our coast when there is a spill.

**Mike Kelloway:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this important debate. I will say that Canada does have a strong marine safety system in place. The system works to prevent marine incidents from happening in the first place. When an accident does happen, the Canadian authorities are prepared to respond in an effective manner that mitigates impacts on mariners, marine ecosystems, coastal communities and, indeed, our supply chains.

The Canadian Coast Guard, the agency tasked with an incident response, is absolutely spot on in terms of working with first nations and indigenous communities to mitigate the impact of spills when an accident occurs. Our marine safety regimen ensures that responsible parties can be identified through the life cycle of a vessel and can be held to account for pollution incidents.

I do appreciate what the member is saying, and I particularly appreciate the importance of including indigenous knowledge and first nation communities in all that we do in transport.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

● (1835)

## THE ECONOMY

**Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to begin with something that happened in my riding, because sometimes the most honest way to understand an economic problem is simply to listen to the people living with it.

A woman named Amy from Cloverdale wrote to me recently. She works hard, pays her bills and tries to live responsibly, but she told me that grocery shopping has become something that she now dreads, not because she is buying luxuries, but because basic food is becoming harder to put in the cart. Meat, once a normal part of meal, has become something she buys only occasionally. When she heard that prices are expected to rise again this year, she wondered whether Canadians will eventually be on their hands and knees, begging the government for relief.

I heard a similar concern when I visited seniors in my riding this week. These are men and women who spent decades working, paying taxes, raising families and contributing to this country, yet many told me that they are now studying grocery flyers and cutting back on foods they never imagined giving up at this stage in their lives. The question they asked is the same as Amy's, and it is very simple: How did it become this hard to buy food in Canada?

The Prime Minister once told Canadians to judge him by the price of groceries, and Canadians are doing exactly that. The numbers are troubling. Canada now has the highest food inflation in the G7, with grocery prices rising more than 7% over the past year, which is far faster than overall inflation. Coffee and beef are up dramatically. Everyday staples are rising faster than the rest of the economy.

Roughly 70% of the food Canadians eat is produced right here in Canada. When Canadians see food prices rising faster here than anywhere else in the G7, they begin asking whether the explanation lies closer to home than the government would like to admit.

There is a very simple rule in economics: When governments make something more expensive to produce, the price of that thing eventually rises. When we look at the policies affecting food production in Canada today, we see farmers facing higher costs from the industrial carbon tax on fuel, fertilizer and farm equipment; truckers facing the fuel standard tax, which raises the cost of transporting food across this country; and food producers and processors facing a packaging tax projected to cost Canadians more than \$1 billion.

None of these policies appear on a grocery receipt, but their costs travel through the system, from the farm to the processor to the truck, and finally to the grocery shelf and when they arrive at the checkout counter, which is where Canadians experience them.

When I think about where those rising costs eventually lead, I cannot help but think of my own family. I have 22 grandchildren, and like every grandparent, I want them to grow up in a Canada where hard work still allows a family to afford the basics of life.

The seniors I spoke to were not only worried about prices but asking something deeper, about fairness. These are Canadians who spent decades paying taxes into this country, yet they now find

themselves watching every dollar they spend on groceries while government spending seems to grow in every direction. Some of them asked how it is possible that people who paid into this country their entire lives are struggling to keep up with the basics, while individuals whose refugee claims have already been rejected can still remain in Canada for years and continue receiving benefits, including coverage for dental care, prescriptions and other health services that many seniors still have to pay for themselves.

Canadians are patient people, but they expect one thing from their government, which is not to make the essentials of life harder to afford. Canadians like Amy and the seniors I spoke with this week are asking a very simple question: When will the government stop the policies that are driving up the cost of food, so that Canadians can afford to feed themselves again?

**Mike Kelloway (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, indeed we live in rapidly changing times, uncertain times. Around the globe, trade relationships that help to ensure good jobs and affordable products are being disrupted. Here at home, the rise in tariffs is posing significant challenges to Canadians, and particularly to those working in trade-exposed sectors such as manufacturing. The Canadian government is also aware that the cost of living is putting financial pressures on Canadian families and small businesses.

The Prime Minister recently announced new measures to make groceries and other essentials more affordable. For example, in order to bring down costs for Canadians, Canada's new government is introducing the new Canada groceries and essentials benefit. It was formerly known as the goods and services tax credit. Also, we are increasing that amount by 25% for five years beginning in July. On top of that, we are providing a one-time payment this spring equivalent to a 50% increase in the 2025-26 value of the GST credit. Combined, this means that a family of four will receive up to \$1,890 this year and about \$1,400 a year for the next four years. A single person will receive up to \$950 this year and about \$700 a year for the next four years. I am proud to say that the new Canada groceries and essentials benefit will provide additional and significant support for more than 12 million Canadians.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

Also, this government is setting aside \$500 million for the strategic response fund, to help business owners address the cost of supply chain disruptions without passing the cost on to Canadians at the checkout line. For the same reason, we will create a \$150-million food security fund under the existing regional tariff response initiative for small and medium-sized businesses and the organizations that support them.

We cannot control what other nations do, but we can control how we respond. As the member opposite may remember, on our very first day in office, we cancelled the divisive consumer carbon price, bringing gasoline prices down by approximately 18¢ per litre in most provinces and territories. Now we are delivering on a tax cut that will impact 22 million Canadians, one that will save a two-income family up to \$840 this year. We are also eliminating the GST for first-time homebuyers on new homes up to \$1 million. There are other things we are doing in relation to building Canada strong and building homes where they are needed.

This is an important time. It is an important time to invest in Canadians. I think of the national school food program, which impacts hundreds of thousands of children, in particular when I think of my riding of Sydney—Glance Bay. I have talked to teachers and families who have talked of the essential impact of that measure and how it creates healthier kids, provides dignity and, indeed, provides hope, not just for families but for the children it is designed to help.

I will conclude by saying that these are tough times. We have a government here that is compassionate and also fiscally minded when it comes to ensuring that we have the firepower to help people, and that is what Canadians do, in my opinion. Just like Cape Bretoners do back home, we help those in need, we help our brothers and sisters, and we help people we do not know.

These programs are designed to help people, giving them a leg up, and boy, across this world, these are trying times, as I started off with in my speech. However, I will say that I believe in Canada. I believe, and I have seen it many times in this chamber, that when we come together, we have good debate, but at the end of the day we need to put slogans aside and focus on solutions.

• (1840)

**Tamara Jansen:** Mr. Speaker, the families and seniors in my riding who are carefully studying grocery flyers deserve a straight answer about why food keeps getting more expensive. We often hear the government members say it is a global problem, but if that were true, every country would be feeling it equally, and they are not. Canada now has the highest food inflation in the G7.

When we look at where Canadians are being hit hardest, we see that it is not on imported luxuries. Ground beef is up 22%; whole chicken, nearly 13%; pork, more than 13%; and even romaine lettuce has jumped 17%. These are not imported luxuries. These are foods raised and grown by Canadian farmers, yet families and seniors in my community are paying more for them every single week.

Food prices are 27% higher than five years ago, and food bank use has doubled since 2019. People in my riding do not want to have to rely on food stamps. What they want to know is why deci-

sions are being made in Ottawa that keep driving up the price of Canadian food.

**Mike Kelloway:** Mr. Speaker, I think this is an immensely important discussion and debate we are having here tonight. When we look at the government and the measures that I spoke about in my opening speech, we see that these are measures that matter to Canadians. We are also focused on building the economy with major projects from coast to coast to coast that will put people to work and back to work and will enhance the skill sets they have.

I will say this. I am entering my seventh year in the House, and particularly in the last couple of years, when we put forward ideas and solutions to help Canadians, oftentimes the opposition will bring up the problems. When it is time to vote on solutions, the opposition is not to be found. I think that lacks some credibility. I do not question the sincerity, but I do question the credibility, of being a part of the solution. What we are focused on is the solution.

• (1845)

## IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that some agreement can break out in this place tonight. I would just like to note that colleagues in the House of all political stripes spent a lot of time debating Bill C-12, which includes some measures that I think need to pass quickly in order to begin to restore some order to the immigration system.

However, I have been closely following some of the proceedings in the other place, and I am becoming concerned that colleagues in the other place may be unduly holding up proceedings on the bill, which has been substantively amended by the House. We came to agreement. We sent it over there in December, I believe. It has been several months at this point.

I would like to see some movement from colleagues in the other place. I am just wondering if my colleague on the other side would agree and perhaps would also offer some encouragement to colleagues in the other place to respect the will of the House and to get on with it.

**Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with respect to Bill C-12, the government is always interested in ensuring that legislation passed in the House moves quickly through here and the other place. I am going to take a moment to address the question that I think prompted this evening's late show.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

I want to take a moment to address Canada's actions with respect to the officials of the Iranian regime and the integrity of our immigration system. The government is unwavering in its commitment to hold this regime to account while protecting the safety and security of Canadians. Canada has taken some of the strongest measures in the world against the regime. On November 14, 2022, under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, Canada designated the Islamic Republic of Iran as a regime that has engaged in terrorism and systemic breaches of human rights.

Canada has also listed the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist entity. This designation rendered tens of thousands of senior Iranian officials permanently inadmissible to Canada, including heads of state, intelligence operatives, diplomats, judges and senior members of the guard. In September 2024, Canada strengthened this measure by extending the start date of the designation back to June 23, 2003. That is the date Iranian Canadian photojournalist Zahra Kazemi was arbitrarily detained, tortured and died in custody. Her case shocked Canadians and highlighted the regime's systemic human rights abuses. As a result, anyone who has served as a senior official of the Iranian regime since that date is inadmissible to Canada.

Canada's immigration system includes rigorous screening both before and after arrival. Everyone who needs a visa to travel to Canada must apply in advance. Applicants provide personal information and biometrics, including fingerprints, which are checked against Canadian and international databases to verify identity and assess potential security risks. Immigration screening is a joint effort involving Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, the CBSA and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. Cases that raise concerns may be referred for in-depth security screening before a visa is ever issued.

Individuals determined to be inadmissible may have their visa refused, lose their temporary or permanent resident status in Canada, and be subject to enforcement action, including removal. These cases can be complex and must be handled in accordance with Canadian law and due process. Since November 2022, IRCC has cancelled 234 visas for individuals who are inadmissible because of the Iranian regime designation. This number does not include applicants whose visa applications were refused from the outset on the same grounds. Removals by CBSA officers have increased over the last two years, and similar results are expected in 2026. The government has also committed to hiring 1,000 additional CBSA officers to strengthen the agency's capacity and help protect the safety of Canadians.

I also want to address the question raised about the Immigration and Refugee Board. The IRB is an independent tribunal. It adjudicates admissibility allegations brought forward by the CBSA, which has the burden of demonstrating the individual is inadmissible on security or other grounds. Removal hearings are generally

public. However, by operation of law, certain proceedings before the immigration division must be held in private. This includes hearings where the person concerned has made a refugee claim.

In order to protect the safety and security of individuals in all other matters, the hearings are held in public. Even in private matters, it is always open to the media to make a request that the hearing be public. These requests are decided on a case-by-case basis, balancing the public interest in openness against other important considerations, such as the safety and security—

• (1850)

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Calgary Nose Hill.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Mr. Speaker, I would say this. What the IRB has done is interpret the provision under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act around senior officials in a way that would exclude, and did exclude, a man named Mahdi Nasiri, who was the supreme leader of Iran, the Iranian regime's key representative at its propaganda newspaper, the political deputy of the policy council of Friday imams and the deputy at the supreme leader's representative outlet at the U.A.E.

Would my colleague agree that it would be incumbent upon the government at this point to at least review the law and come back to Parliament with suggestions on how to strengthen the provision that is within the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act to ensure that men like this do not continue to be admissible to Canada?

**Leslie Church:** Mr. Speaker, Canada screens those entering the country for potential criminal activity and links to terrorist groups. We have designated the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as terrorist entities. That has made senior Iranian officials inadmissible to Canada.

Since November 2022, the IRCC has cancelled 234 visas for individuals who are inadmissible because of the Iranian regime designation. This number does not include applicants whose visa applications were refused from the outset.

The CBSA is going to continue to increase removals and has committed to hiring 1,000 additional CBSA officers to strengthen the agency's capacity and help protect the safety of Canadians.

The government is going to continue to use every tool available to protect Canadians and to ensure that those linked to human rights abuses and terrorism are held accountable.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6:52 p.m.)





# CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 11, 2026

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Hamilton Centre

Rana ..... 6353

### An Evening in Greece

Steinley ..... 6353

### Women and Gender Equality

Khalid ..... 6353

### Human Trafficking

Stevenson ..... 6353

### Rose-Emma Lavoie

Lavoie ..... 6354

### Public Safety

Dalton ..... 6354

### World Plumbing Day

Desrochers ..... 6354

### Natural Resources

Richards ..... 6354

### Françoise Hogue Plante

Perron ..... 6355

### International Women's Day

Brière ..... 6355

### Affordability

Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley) ..... 6355

### World Plumbing Day

Lauzon ..... 6355

### Recognition of Heroes

Kuruc ..... 6356

### International Women's Day

Saini ..... 6356

### Lowell Green

Poilievre ..... 6356

### Irish Heritage Month

Maloney ..... 6356

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Poilievre ..... 6356

Carney ..... 6357

### Natural Resources

Poilievre ..... 6357

Carney ..... 6357

Poilievre ..... 6357

Carney ..... 6358

### Public Services and Procurement

Normandin ..... 6358

Carney ..... 6358

Normandin ..... 6358

Carney ..... 6358

Lemire ..... 6358

Carney ..... 6358

### Public Safety

Lantsman ..... 6358

Anandasangaree ..... 6358

Lantsman ..... 6359

Anandasangaree ..... 6359

Rempel Garner ..... 6359

Anandasangaree ..... 6359

Rempel Garner ..... 6359

Anandasangaree ..... 6359

Caputo ..... 6359

Fraser ..... 6359

Paul-Hus ..... 6359

MacKinnon ..... 6359

Paul-Hus ..... 6360

MacKinnon ..... 6360

### Rail Transportation

Garon ..... 6360

MacKinnon ..... 6360

Garon ..... 6360

MacKinnon ..... 6360

### Public Safety

Baber ..... 6360

Fraser ..... 6360

Baber ..... 6361

Anandasangaree ..... 6361

Ho ..... 6361

Anandasangaree ..... 6361

### Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Ho ..... 6361

Fraser ..... 6361

Gill (Windsor West) ..... 6361

Sahota ..... 6362

### Northern Affairs

Idlout ..... 6362

Chartrand ..... 6362

<b>The Economy</b>	
Cobena.....	6362
Hodgson.....	6362
Cobena.....	6362
Hodgson.....	6362
Epp.....	6362
Dabrusin.....	6363
Epp.....	6363
MacDonald (Malpeque).....	6363
<b>Seniors</b>	
Cody.....	6363
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke).....	6363
Kramp-Neuman.....	6363
Hajdu.....	6363
Au.....	6364
Fragiskatos.....	6364
<b>Taxation</b>	
Vien.....	6364
Dabrusin.....	6364
Vien.....	6364
Provost.....	6364
<b>Housing</b>	
Ntumba.....	6364
Robertson.....	6364
<b>Mental Health and Addictions</b>	
Mazier.....	6364
Michel.....	6365
Mazier.....	6365
Michel.....	6365
Hardy.....	6365
Michel.....	6365
<b>International Trade</b>	
Bains.....	6365
Sidhu (Brampton East).....	6365
<b>Firearms</b>	
Calkins.....	6365
Anandasangaree.....	6366
<b>International Trade</b>	
Kwan.....	6366
Anand.....	6366
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker.....	6366

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Export and Import Permits Act</b>	
Motion negatived.....	6367
<b>Message from the Senate</b>	
The Speaker.....	6367

#### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Lamoureux.....	6367
<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Ramsay.....	6368
<b>Interparliamentary Delegations</b>	
Bragdon.....	6368
Mendès.....	6368
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Indigenous and Northern Affairs</b>	
Sheehan.....	6368
<b>Transport, Infrastructure and Communities</b>	
Schiefke.....	6368
Lawrence.....	6368
<b>Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities</b>	
Morrissey.....	6368
<b>Procedure and House Affairs</b>	
Bittle.....	6368
<b>Public Safety and National Security</b>	
Duclos.....	6368
<b>International Trade</b>	
Sgro.....	6369
<b>Oil Tanker Moratorium Act</b>	
McKenzie.....	6369
Bill C-264. Introduction and first reading.....	6369
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed).....	6369
<b>Food and Drugs Act</b>	
Powlowski.....	6369
Bill C-265. Introduction and first reading.....	6369
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed).....	6369
<b>National Framework on Skilled Trades and Labour Mobility Act</b>	
Bains.....	6369
Bill C-266. Introduction and first reading.....	6369
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed).....	6370
<b>National Framework on the Durability of Electronic Products and Essential Home Appliances Act</b>	
Sari.....	6370
Bill C-267. Introduction and first reading.....	6370
Adoption des motions; première lecture et impression du projet de loi.....	6370
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Persons with Disabilities</b>	
Vis.....	6370
<b>Pacific Salmon</b>	
Vis.....	6370

<b>Public Safety</b>	
Mazier .....	6370
<b>Diversity, Equity and Inclusion</b>	
Ho .....	6370
<b>Peacekeeping</b>	
Johns .....	6371
<b>Religious Freedom</b>	
Khanna .....	6371
<b>Natural Health Products</b>	
Stevenson .....	6371
<b>Religious Freedom</b>	
Lawton .....	6371
Kronis .....	6371
<b>Questions Passed as Orders for Return</b>	
Lamoureux .....	6372
<b>Motions for Papers</b>	
Lamoureux .....	6372

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Canada-Indonesia Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement Implementation Act</b>	
Bill C-18. Report stage .....	6372
Sidhu (Brampton East) .....	6372
Motion for concurrence .....	6372
(Motion agreed to) .....	6372
Third reading .....	6372
Lavoie .....	6372
Groleau .....	6373
Ste-Marie .....	6374
Lamoureux .....	6374
Naqvi .....	6374
May .....	6375
Larouche .....	6376
Powlowski .....	6376
Aboultaif .....	6376
McKenzie .....	6376
Lamoureux .....	6378
Ste-Marie .....	6378

Calkins .....	6378
Groleau .....	6378
Lamoureux .....	6380
Larouche .....	6380
Konanz .....	6380
Savard-Tremblay .....	6381
Duclos .....	6383
Jansen .....	6384
Ste-Marie .....	6384
May .....	6384
Lamoureux .....	6385
Fonseca .....	6385
Falk (Provencher) .....	6386
Larouche .....	6387
Iacono .....	6387
May .....	6387
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed) ...	6387

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Bill C-246. Second reading .....	6388
Larouche .....	6388
Cody .....	6389
Lamoureux .....	6390
Stubbs .....	6391
Thomas .....	6393
Division on motion deferred .....	6394

### ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

<b>Marine Transportation</b>	
Johns .....	6394
Kelloway .....	6395
<b>The Economy</b>	
Jansen .....	6396
Kelloway .....	6396
<b>Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship</b>	
Rempel Garner .....	6397
Church .....	6397

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>