



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# House of Commons Debates

Official Report  
(Hansard)

**Volume 151 No. 084**  
Wednesday, June 8, 2022

---

Speaker: The Honourable Anthony Rota



## **CONTENTS**

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 8, 2022

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayer*

---

• (1405)

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Yellowhead will now lead us in the singing of the national anthem.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

### RICHMOND CARES, RICHMOND GIVES

**Mr. Wilson Miao (Richmond Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of a local non-profit organization, Richmond Cares, Richmond Gives.

It has played a vital role in Richmond by providing philanthropic efforts and essential services in our community. Started in 1972 with humble beginnings, a group of passionate individuals launched an information centre. Eventually, the organization grew and began offering more services with the passion to serve the community as its core value.

Some of its programs include a child care resource centre, senior support services and the annual Richmond Christmas fund. Its contributions have demonstrated the community values of generosity, collaboration and compassion.

I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to the amazing work of all the volunteers, staff, board members and supporters of Richmond Cares, Richmond Gives. Their stories and ongoing work continue to inspire us all and remind us of what a healthy community looks like.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### LEUCAN SHAVED HEAD CHALLENGE

**Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to share the story of Clovis, a talented and imaginative little boy from Saint-Cyrille-de-Lessard.

The first summer of the COVID-19 pandemic, when he was two years old, Clovis started experiencing strange symptoms, which led to hospital visit after hospital visit, where he was poked and prodded. It was a very painful, emotional and worrisome time for both him and his family. Finally, he, his parents, Rémy and Véronique, and his brothers found out that he has cancer. He was diagnosed with leukemia.

His loved ones and community, along with Leucan, stepped up to help. Leucan brings moments of joy, peace and support.

On June 18, Jean-Philippe Dumas and I, the co-chairs of the 2022 Leucan campaign, will be shaving our heads in a show of solidarity at the Leucan Shaved Head Challenge in Montmagny. I am very happy to do it.

As we speak, every member of the House is receiving an email from me asking them to contribute to this cause and support Leucan. I want to thank them in advance on behalf of Clovis and all children with cancer. I thank them for their generosity.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### SENIORS

**Ms. Lisa Hepfner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, June is Seniors Month in Ontario, and last Friday I had the pleasure of visiting the Sackville Hill Seniors Recreation Centre, which serves about 3,000 members across my riding of Hamilton Mountain and beyond. I awkwardly participated in an energetic cardio dance class led by Pam, got schooled in billiards by Angelo and chatted and laughed with women enjoying the bright, sunny lounge.

The centre was packed and full of life, despite not yet returning to full capacity. We know the pandemic took a toll on many seniors, who are already vulnerable to social isolation. Places like Sackville are critical to healthy aging and supporting mental well-being and regular physical activity.

We thank recreation supervisor Laura Rolph for the tour, for showing me the impact that Sackville Hill Seniors Recreation Centre has on our community and for sharing postpandemic plans to further engage and expand.

*Statements by Members*

[Translation]

**ROGER BARRETTE**

**Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, today I have the pleasure and privilege of paying tribute to an exceptional man.

Roger Barrette, a community worker at the CISSS des Laurentides, is loved by all and known for his outstanding sense of dedication to his community. That dedication is not new. By the time he was 14, he knew he was destined for a career in community service.

He started getting involved at a young age. He opened the first youth centre in his home town of Lac-Saint-Jean. He became a community worker at the age of 21, and his first assignment was to support the community of Chapais in the wake of a deadly fire.

During his more than 40-year career, Mr. Barrette has taken on numerous professional challenges. Most importantly, he has played a vital role in developing a unique community approach that has made a huge difference in the lives of residents and strengthened the social fabric of our community.

I want to thank Mr. Barrette.

\* \* \*

● (1410)

**LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY LUNARS**

**Ms. Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Laurentian Lunars of Laurentian University in my riding of Sudbury recently won the Over the Dusty Moon competition hosted by the Colorado School of Mines.

Students from around the world went to Colorado to participate in the innovation competition. Each team had to create a system capable of transporting lunar regolith, or loose sediment.

I am so impressed by the team's hard work and innovative spirit. Its members are Ethan Murphy, Adam Farrow, Quade Howald, Alexander Mackenzie, Reid Ludgate, Goran Himic, Kevan Sullivan and Kyle Wulle.

The competition took place at the same time as convocation, so these students did not have the pleasure of walking across the stage with the other graduates.

Cheers to the team's impressive leadership, and congratulations to its members on winning the competition and earning their diplomas.

\* \* \*

[English]

**WOMEN'S INSTITUTES**

**Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on June 18, the Wellington-Halton District Women's Institute will be joining other women's institutes across Ontario to celebrate 125 years. Established in 1897 in Stoney Creek, Ontario, the Federated Women's Institutes of Ontario offers inclusive and supportive social networking for women, community action and the personal growth of women.

Women's institutes offer educational programs and advocate for social, environmental and economic change. Today, there are some 2,600 members across 220 branches in Ontario. In Wellington—Halton Hills, we have six branches in the local communities of Alma, Ashgrove, Coningsby, Dublin, Norval and Silver-Wood.

I would like to thank all of the volunteers of the women's institutes that have served our local communities. Congratulations on this important anniversary.

\* \* \*

**BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS**

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable person from my riding of Ottawa Centre who will be celebrating her 100th birthday on June 25. Rita Margaret MacKenzie Markey moved to Ottawa when she was 18 years old to help support her mother. She worked hard and was employed in this very House as a transcriber of Hansard. She is a proud Canadian who takes pride in the fact that she has voted in every election.

In 1940, Rita met a young man named Edward John Markey. They have been married for an amazing 62 years. They found joy in their six children: Stephen, Shaun, Scott, Stuart, Sloan and Sharon. Her 22 grandchildren and great grandchildren adore their *nonna*. Rita loves nature and always spends her time painting, gardening and swimming at her cottage on Danford Lake.

On behalf of the entire community of Ottawa Centre and the entire House, I wish to recognize Rita Markey, a wonderful Canadian. I wish Rita a happy 100th birthday.

\* \* \*

**CANADA-IRELAND RELATIONS**

**Mr. James Maloney (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have risen many times in the chamber to celebrate the important relationship between Canada and Ireland. This week is the first-ever Canada regional conference. It is hosted by the Irish embassy in Ottawa and brings together Irish honorary consuls and the trade promotion agencies from across Canada. Representatives from Vancouver, Calgary, Toronto, Halifax and Ireland are meeting to look at ways to continue strengthening the bonds between our two nations.

I want to thank them, and in particular I want to thank our friend, the Irish ambassador to Canada, His Excellency Eamonn McKee. His tireless efforts to highlight our cultural ties and close historical links are truly inspiring. I also want to say a special thanks to our friend Eithne Heffernan, a true champion in the Irish community.

However, it is with great sadness that I also pay respects to a former ambassador, His Excellency Jim Kelly, who passed suddenly on March 17. He was a man of great integrity and kindness and a diplomat with enormous vision.

As we look to the future, the House looks forward to working with Ambassador McKee and his team. Lastly, I want to wish my Irish seatmate a happy birthday.

\* \* \*

• (1415)

#### CANADIAN WALK FOR VETERANS

**Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay (South Surrey—White Rock, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today, I have the honour to talk to the House about the annual Canadian Walk for Veterans. The first walk was hosted as a fundraiser for the Equitas Society, organized by South Surrey—White Rock resident Marc Burchell, a great friend of mine, and the co-founder, retired Master Corporal Chance Bules.

This year the walk will take place both in person and virtually across Canada over the weekend of September 24 in over 152 cities. This event, hosted by One Veteran Society, invites Canadians from coast to coast to coast to walk shoulder to shoulder in recognition of our military, veterans and first responders, with the goal of providing opportunities for Canadians to learn about the challenges of coping with life after service. The walk will raise awareness of the plight of translators, interpreters, cultural advisers and other locally employed people who have been essential to the success of multiple Canadian missions.

I call on each and every member of the House to participate in any way they can and help bring awareness to this very important issue and outstanding organization.

\* \* \*

#### PORTUGUESE HERITAGE MONTH

**Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in June, we celebrate Portuguese Heritage Month. It is a great time to recognize and celebrate the contributions of Canadians of Portuguese descent.

Also, Friday, June 10, is Portugal Day. It is commemorated both in Portugal and around the world. It is a very special day of pride for me as a Portuguese Canadian. Canada is now home to one of the largest Portuguese diasporas in the world, with nearly half a million people of Portuguese origin calling Canada home.

This year, we have the special honour of having with us His Excellency Augusto Santos Silva, President of the Assembly of the Republic of Portugal. I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to the ambassador of Portugal, António Leão Rocha, and Mrs. Luisa Leão Rocha for their great service to our Portuguese Canadian community.

To our LUSO community and in tribute for 70 years of Canada-Portugal relations, I say this.

*[Member spoke in Portuguese]*

*[English]*

\* \* \*

#### NORTH NOVA SCOTIA HIGHLANDERS

**Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1944, 156,000 Canadian, British and American

#### *Statements by Members*

soldiers stormed some 50 miles of beaches along the heavily fortified Normandy coast of France. The sage advice given to troops by Dwight Eisenhower was simple: “You are about to embark upon the Great Crusade, toward which we have striven these many months. The eyes of the world are upon you.”

Fortunately for us, one of the regiments to land on D-Day was the North Nova Scotia Highlanders. This storied regiment, based in Amherst in my riding of Cumberland—Colchester, pushed through the extreme fighting and made the greatest inland gains of any allied forces. The now Nova Scotia Highlanders still exists today in Cumberland—Colchester and in Pictou County. Those who continue to serve stand on the shoulders of giants. The cenotaph in Amherst has recently been beautifully revamped. It is adorned with a lifelike North Novie and it is spectacular.

As we often debate freedom in this House, let us always remember the great sacrifice by those who have gone before, the seriousness of our decisions and the plight of those we represent. Lest we forget.

\* \* \*

#### JUSTICE

**Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this House with sadness, frustration and worry. These emotions are directly related to the Liberal government's agreement with British Columbia that will decriminalize fentanyl. Never before has the government made such a bad decision that will directly impact the safety and well-being of British Columbians. This exemption will now allow British Columbians to carry up to 2.5 grams of this deadly drug. This amount is serious enough to kill someone many times over, including many members of this House.

How can the Liberal government be so complacent and look to normalize the use of this deadly drug, which is 50 to 100 times stronger than morphine? Street drugs are a serious issue in B.C. In so many cases, parents cannot take their children to the park without first checking for used needles. Just this week, at my son's school, teachers were picking up drug paraphernalia right at the entrance of his classroom. This is devastating and not acceptable.

Canadians struggling with addiction deserve compassion, compassion that puts them on the path to recovery, compassion that leads them to the mental, physical and cultural health supports they need. Normalizing fentanyl is not compassionate.



• (1425)

### FILIPINO HERITAGE MONTH

**Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, *mabuhay. Maligayang Buwan ng Pamanang Pilipino.*

For decades, Filipino Canadians have contributed to the social and economic fabric of Canada, and throughout June we recognize their achievements and show our appreciation for this growing community. Among Vaughan's outstanding Filipino organizations actively building a more inclusive Canada are the Filipino-Canadian Association of Vaughan, founded in 1990 by Antonio and Erlinda Insigne, which will be celebrating its fifth annual Vaughan Fiesta Extravaganza this July 2-3; MCBN's Pinoy Radio, led by Von Canton, a great friend, keeping the community across Canada informed and connected; and the Filipino Seniors Club of Vaughan, offering regular cultural and educational activities to seniors.

For 26 years, the City of Vaughan has been a proud sister city of Baguio, Philippines, and it is home to more than 15,000 hard-working Filipinos, who are enriching our community every day.

I want to say *maraming salamat* to all Filipino Canadians, who embody the values of perseverance, selflessness and hard work, and wish them a happy Filipino Heritage Month.

**The Speaker:** Before proceeding, I want to thank all the members who kept their Standing Order 31 messages under 60 seconds. To those who went over, which was quite a number of them, I just want to remind them that I do not want to have to cut off their messages, so tomorrow when we are starting, they should make sure to keep them under 60 seconds.

---

## ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

### THE ECONOMY

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, 38% of Canadians are worried more about money than anything else in their lives, more than their health, their kids or their relationships. What does that tell us?

Over 20% of Canadians are skipping meals because they cannot afford to eat. They do not need a top-up cheque from these big-spending Liberals. They want the price of gas, food and housing to go down, or at least stop going up. What are these Liberals, who do not think much about monetary policy, going to do to stop the rising cost of everything?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when it comes to affording the cost of living for the overwhelming majority of Canadians, the most important thing is to have a job. That is why our government focused so relentlessly on a jobs-centred recovery, and it has worked. Canada has recovered 115% of the jobs lost to COVID compared to just 96% in the U.S. Right now, our unemployment rate, at 5.2%, is the lowest it has been since comparable records were kept. That matters to Canadians.

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Liberals are completely out of touch and denying reality.

### Oral Questions

That is why single parents, young homebuyers and seniors do not believe that they have a plan. Literally every single day, people are seeing the prices of everything go up. On fiscal policy overall, no one will trust the Prime Minister, who is in a very happy political marriage with the NDP. We should just ask the Parliamentary Budget Officer, or maybe former finance minister Bill Morneau, what they think of the government's fiscal policy.

All we see from the tax-and-spend Liberals is more taxing and more spending, and no plan to fight inflation. Is that not the truth?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am really glad that the member opposite spoke about seniors, parents and people struggling to pay the rent because, thanks to our policies in this year's and last year's budgets, there are measures directly focused at helping them. With the Canada workers benefit for low-wage Canadians, a family of three will get up to \$2,300 more this year. Seniors will receive a 10% increase in OAS, which is \$815.

\* \* \*

### PUBLIC SAFETY

**Hon. Candice Bergen (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, families and leaders across the country are tired of seeing repeat offenders in their communities terrorizing them with guns. Conservatives are tired of it, too. We are all tired of the Liberals' soft-on-crime approach. The Liberals' so-called gun ban is a joke and will do nothing to stop the violence. We just need to ask front-line officers.

Why do these soft-on-crime Liberals think it is okay for drug dealers to shoot up neighbourhoods using stolen and smuggled weapons and then be let out on the street, literally sometimes the next day, to do it all over again? Why?

• (1430)

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have a question about crime. I want to talk about Bill C-5 and mandatory minimums, and I want to offer a very personal story.

When I was a small child, my mother practised law in northern Alberta. She did a lot of legal aid work and the overwhelming majority of her clients were indigenous. She would take me to court and sometimes she would take me with her to reserves, and I saw first-hand how our criminal justice system treats indigenous peoples. Our government is fixing that and everyone in the House should be supportive of that.

### Oral Questions

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to share what I heard from the representative of a community that this government claims it wants to help. She says that eliminating these minimum sentences is not only a bad idea masquerading as a good one, but an idea that will further jeopardize the communities this initiative is supposed to protect. That is what we heard from Murielle Chatellier in a parliamentary committee.

On the one hand, the Prime Minister is abolishing mandatory minimum sentences with Bill C-5; on the other, he does not mention victims of gun violence even once in Bill C-21.

Why is the Prime Minister so intent on helping criminals rather than victims?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide a very personal answer to that question.

When I was a child, my mother worked as a lawyer in northern Alberta and did a lot of legal aid work. Many of her clients were indigenous people. When I was a child, I witnessed, in the courts and sometimes on reserves, how our country and our justice system treated indigenous people. We need to fix that. Our government will do it. I hope all members will help us.

\*\*\*

#### THE ECONOMY

**Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, allow me to share another story from one of my constituents who is worried about the cost of living. This person will not have enough to pay his bills and put food on the table at the end of the month. He will have to make some very difficult choices. Some members of his family will probably have to go hungry so that he can afford to pay his bills. This is the experience of someone from my riding, but it is similar to stories that many of my colleagues have heard in their own ridings.

Unfortunately, yesterday, the NDP-Liberal government, with the support of the Bloc Québécois, voted against our motion, which would have implemented concrete measures.

Why are they refusing to help Canadians?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we recognize that affordability is a very important issue for Canadians. I am wondering why the Conservatives are not supporting the targeted, concrete measures that will help Canadians, such as the increase to the Canada workers benefit. This will give the most vulnerable workers an additional \$2,300.

Why do they not support increasing old age security for seniors by 10%, which would provide a much-needed additional \$815.

\*\*\*

#### PENSIONS

**Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, seniors have been left to deal with the surging cost of living on their own. The Parliamentary Budget Officer confirmed it

yesterday. A total of 1.7 million seniors have seen their purchasing power slashed because the indexed increase in their old age security benefit is below the rate of inflation.

If the federal government does not fix this, it will be keeping a third of Quebec seniors from receiving \$660.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister commit to paying seniors back every penny they have lost, the next time OAS is adjusted?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have good news for the leader of the Bloc Québécois: Our government has already decided that, as of this summer, we will increase OAS by 10%.

This step, which we have already taken, will give seniors an additional \$815. It is a good measure, a targeted measure that will remain in place for as long as it is needed.

• (1435)

**Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister's response raises two questions.

How big is that increase in relation to current inflation, which is having a devastating impact on seniors' purchasing power? Also, we want assurances, which would certainly be a welcome change, that there will not be any discrimination based on the age of the recipients, so that people 75 to 80 do not get more than people 65 to 75. We do not want to see discrimination from a government that boasts about being against all discrimination.

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the most important programs for Canadians are indexed to inflation. That is very important.

As far as our seniors are concerned, we have already decided and voted in favour of the legislation to increase OAS for people 75 and older. That means 3.3 million people in Canada will be getting an extra \$815.

\*\*\*

#### THE ECONOMY

**Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, families everywhere are struggling because of the cost of living.

The Liberals' response is pathetic. They say inflation is not their fault and everything will be all right. Can the Liberals put themselves in the shoes of a family that is cutting back on groceries to make ends meet? There are things the Liberals could do right now.

Why are the Liberals not doubling the GST tax credit? Why are they not increasing the Canada child benefit by \$500? Why are they doing nothing to help people get through this crisis?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

I want to take this opportunity to point out that there is money that will be given out this year in a targeted way to those who need it. This year, we increased the Canada workers benefit. The people who need it most will receive an additional \$2,300 this year. We will also be making a one-time \$500 payment to people facing housing challenges.

[English]

**Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are going hungry. Perhaps the Prime Minister and the finance minister have never gone hungry. Perhaps they have never had to suffer through pain after not being able to afford their medication because they had to pay the rent. Maybe they have never had to walk to work because they cannot afford the gas to get there in their own car.

Those are the realities of Canadians across the country right now, while we know that the oil and gas industry is reaping extra mega profits. Canadians need urgent help today, not months from now.

Will the government finally step up for Canadians, make sure that they get double the GST and that—

**The Speaker:** The hon. Deputy Prime Minister.

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we looked ahead. Our government has already set in motion five important programs that will deliver supports starting this year to the Canadians who need it the most. With the Canada workers benefit, a family of three can get up to \$2,300 more. With the 10% increase in the OAS, a senior can get \$815 more. There is \$500 payment to people experiencing housing affordability challenges, dental care—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Fundy Royal.

\* \* \*

## JUSTICE

**Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians from coast to coast are worried about the rising rate of violent gun crimes in their communities. They are calling on the government for action. Instead of listening to Canadians, the Liberals are removing mandatory jail time for offences such as robbery with a firearm, extortion with a firearm and weapons trafficking, just to name a few.

Canadians do not want to see government bills that help dangerous criminals skip out on jail time. They want dangerous criminals taken off our streets. Will the Liberals reverse course on their soft-on-crime agenda?

• (1440)

**Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, serious crime in this country will always carry with it serious consequences. The kinds of situations that we are targeting with this legislation on minimum mandatory penalties are situations where public security and public safety are not at risk. It is being done to attack the systemic overrepresentation of Black and indigenous people in the criminal justice system.

## Oral Questions

The kinds of situations that he is describing are being attacked in Bill C-21, and we are raising the maximum penalties.

**Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, that is incomprehensible. Canadians simply do not buy this Liberal logic. According to Liberal logic, the justice minister's bill tackles racism by decreasing jail time for gun crimes, but the public safety minister's bill tackles racism by increasing jail time for the exact same crimes.

They cannot have it both ways, so which one is it?

**Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the—

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

**The Speaker:** I believe members were very excited to have two people rise to speak, so we will just calm down and let one proceed.

The hon. Minister of Justice can begin from the top, please.

**Hon. David Lametti:** Mr. Speaker, this attack on minimum mandatory penalties, coming from a lawyer, is something that is hard to understand. The situations that he describes are not the situations that would be touched by minimum mandatory penalties.

Minimum mandatory penalties are being abandoned because they fail. It is a failed so-called tough-on-crime policy. The jurisdictions in the United States that inspired the Harper government to bring in these minimum mandatory penalties are abandoning minimum mandatory penalties, one by one.

Serious crime will always be punished seriously. There is no threat to—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Sturgeon River—Parkland.

\* \* \*

## PUBLIC SAFETY

**Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 19, at the public safety committee, the Minister of Public Safety confirmed that he stood by his statement in Parliament on May 2 when he said, "At the recommendation of [law enforcement], we invoked the Emergencies Act".

We now know that police did not make this recommendation and his own deputy minister said yesterday that he was misunderstood. When did it become acceptable for a minister of the House to spread misinformation?

**Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, over the heckling of my colleagues who I know are—

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

**The Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Sturgeon River—Parkland asked a question and I think he wants to hear the answer.

The hon. minister.

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Marco Mendicino:** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to give an answer by refreshing his memory and the memory of all members in this chamber that, last winter, we experienced an unprecedented public order emergency in the opinion of law enforcement, which is why, prior to invoking the Emergencies Act, we sought their advice on the powers that were needed to restore public safety.

Let me quote from Commissioner Lucki's testimony before the committee when she said—

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

**The Speaker:** I am going to interrupt the hon. minister. I want to make sure we can hear that quote.

The hon. minister.

**Hon. Marco Mendicino:** Mr. Speaker, I was just about to say that Commissioner Lucki said the following: “the Emergencies Act did give us the tools that we needed to get the job done quickly.” We invoked the Emergencies Act to restore public safety. It was the right and responsible thing to do.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, our memories are very clear on this side of the House. The minister repeatedly stated that police recommended that the government invoke the Emergencies Act. However, now we know that not a single police force in this country made that recommendation. The minister has had multiple opportunities to clarify, but he stood by his statement. Now his deputy minister is saying that the minister was misunderstood.

Who is telling the truth, the public safety minister or his most senior public servant?

**Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to be absolutely clear that last winter when we saw an unprecedented public order emergency in the opinion of law enforcement, we filled the gaps that existed within authorities that were not effective at the time to restore public safety.

Prior to invoking the Emergencies Act, we sought advice, as any responsible government would do, prior to invoking the act. We heard Commissioner Lucki say that we needed, for example, power to compel tow trucks as a result of protesters who would not leave. I wonder why they would not leave. They would not leave because Conservatives were egging them on to stay. That was wrong and we invoked it to protect Canadians.

• (1445)

**Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Safety knows the severity of invoking the Emergencies Act, the historical significance and the impact on due process and charter rights. The details of why and how the government invoked the act are key. It will set a precedent in Canada on government powers. I am sure the minister would agree there is no room for being misunderstood when setting a historical precedent. There is also no room for hiding cabinet documents from Justice Rouleau's inquiry.

Will the Liberal government waive cabinet confidence and release the documents to Justice Rouleau?

**Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as we have said all along, the government will co-operate

with Justice Rouleau. We will co-operate with the joint parliamentary committee to be transparent because I agree with my colleague that we need to scrutinize the invocation of the Emergencies Act.

My point is that the facts are very clear. We were in the midst and in the throes of an unprecedented public order emergency in the opinion of non-partisan, professional law enforcement. When we sought their advice about which powers were needed to restore public safety, we listened to them and we invoked to restore public safety.

**Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the minister is being a bit vague answering my question on whether his government is going to release the documents. The question of cabinet confidence is critical to the Rouleau inquiry as argued by a former clerk of the Privy Council who said cabinet confidence “should not be utilized to impede the search for the truth where the validity of government action is seriously contested and the law demands that it be reviewed, as is the case with the recent declaration of emergency in response to the trucker convoy protests and blockades.”

In other words, this is a really big deal. Will the Liberals respect Justice Rouleau's request and hand over the cabinet documents, yes or no?

**Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when we invoked the Emergencies Act, we did it to restore public safety after we sought the advice of law enforcement. Following that, we commenced the public inquiry giving—

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

**The Speaker:** I am sure the hon. member for Kildonan—St. Paul missed the first part.

Please start right from the top, minister.

**Hon. Marco Mendicino:** Mr. Speaker, we invoked the Emergencies Act to restore public safety. We did it following the conversations and consultations we had with law enforcement, including on which powers were needed to restore public safety. At the conclusion of it, we revoked the Emergencies Act and, as part of that, we are now participating in an exercise of transparency, including with Justice Rouleau, who has the power to compel witnesses and documents, including classified information.

Of course, the government will co-operate because we agree that the act should be scrutinized so that it is never abused. We will always follow that principle.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**

**Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, a record number of complaints were filed with the Commissioner of Official Languages this year. He received 5,409 complaints, which is triple the number filed last year.

The main reason for this barrage of complaints is the Prime Minister's decision to appoint people who do not speak French, particularly the Governor General. The Prime Minister is personally responsible for one-quarter of these complaints.

Will the minister remind her boss that French is not a second-class language?

**Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Official Languages and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his question.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Théberge, the Commissioner of Official Languages, for his work and his report.

The House of Commons is still studying the bill to modernize the Official Languages Act. This is a very important bill because we want to do everything we can to protect and promote the beautiful French language. I hope that the Bloc Québécois will work with us to pass this bill as quickly as possible.

**Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the commissioner also courageously denounced the slippery slope that the federal government is on. He feels that French is seen as “an impediment to embracing diversity and advancing true reconciliation with Indigenous peoples”. He also said: “I believe that official languages and diversity are complementary, because they are both ways to be more inclusive.”

When will the federal government understand that the French language and diversity are two compatible assets and that it is not being inclusive when it undervalues French proficiency in the appointment process?

• (1450)

**Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Official Languages and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have been very clear that protecting and promoting the French language is a priority.

I am not here to pick a fight with the Bloc either. Quite the opposite, in fact. I want to work closely with the Bloc and ensure that Bill C-13 gets adopted, because it will make a difference in the lives of Canadians.

What we saw this week in committee was members wasting time. I hope that the Bloc Québécois and all of the opposition members will really work with us to pass Bill C-13 as soon as possible and to hear from the witnesses who have important information to share that will help us pass a good bill.

[English]

**THE ECONOMY**

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has ordered the release of their strategic reserve to help struggling families with record high gas prices at the pumps. There is an idea for our jet-setting Prime Minister for his meeting in Los Angeles. We know he likes to import American cultural problems to paper over his lack of leadership.

Could he instead import good ideas from our neighbours to the south, like taking action on high gas prices, instead of this habitual dividing of Canadians, or does he want to maintain his reputation as Canada's divider-in-chief?

**Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the same question as yesterday.

We certainly recognize the current impact that the invasion of Ukraine by Russia is having on global energy prices around the world. That is something that is of concern to all countries, all democratic countries. It is something that we are working actively on with our partners in the United States and in Europe to address. We have announced that we will be increasing oil and gas production by 300,000 barrels a day by the end of the year, alongside our American friends who are doing likewise. We are working to stabilize energy prices.

Here at home, we are working to ensure affordability for Canadians on an ongoing basis.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, he is the divider-in-chief and ditherer-in-chief.

Canadians have long appreciated that most groceries are exempt from GST. This keeps groceries affordable for families. Yesterday, when the Conservative opposition voted to temporarily do the same by suspending GST on gas and diesel to help Canadians with out-of-control prices at the pumps the speNDP-Liberals voted against it.

When will the Prime Minister put affordability ahead of Liberal tax-and-spend ideology?

**Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, from day one, this government has put affordability at the forefront. The opposition voted against middle-class tax cuts. They voted against the day care program to ensure affordability for Canadians. They have voted against affordability measures since 2015 and they continue to do so.

Here we are working on practical solutions to address the energy crisis that is facing the world. We are working to ensure that we are increasing our production, working with our partners around the world to address this issue, to stabilize energy prices and to ensure affordability for Canadians going forward.

*Oral Questions*

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the price of gas and diesel is hitting a record high across Canada, making it more expensive for Canadians to live their everyday lives. The Liberal government keeps blaming our oil and gas companies but it is the Liberal energy policies that have put us in this place. Energy workers build our communities, help the disadvantaged and provide billions of dollars to national programs.

When will the Prime Minister stop blaming our natural resources sector, take responsibility and suspend the GST on gas and diesel?

**Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I understand the important role that energy workers play in this country. I have spent much of my time, since being appointed to this post, in Calgary working with the energy sector.

I would actually suggest to my colleagues across the way that they perhaps meet with some of the energy sector workers to understand that they are focused, very much, on ensuring that we are doing what we need to do to address energy security issues, to address affordability issues and, yes, to fight climate change.

**Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is determined to phase out Canada's oil and gas sector, and now our labour minister is surprised that we do not have enough workers in this industry to keep up with demand. As prices for gas and diesel keep climbing, the Liberal government knows its policies have put us here. Its years of industry-killing legislation and laying off thousands of workers are ruining families and lives.

When will the government take responsibility for this cost-of-living crisis and provide Canadians with some relief?

• (1455)

**Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, certainly it is important that we are thinking about how we actually create good, economic prospects for people across this country and that we are creating jobs and economic opportunities.

I was very pleased last week to launch the regional energy and natural resource tables, which are about building, on a province-by-province, territory-by-territory basis, a future that is going to create those jobs and economic opportunities in a manner that would actually drive growth and prosperity and in a manner that is consistent with meeting our moral obligation to our children to fight climate change.

I certainly look forward to working with the energy sector as we move forward in that direction.

\* \* \*

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, when people lose their jobs, they count on employment insurance to keep their homes and feed their families while they look for new work.

However, the EI system has been broken for far too long. There are more people who pay into EI that do not qualify for benefits

when they need them than who do. After almost seven years in government, the Liberals finally tried to fix something about the EI system in the latest budget bill, and they fell flat on their face.

When are the Liberals finally going to fix the EI system and do right by Canadian workers?

**Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are working very hard to modernize employment insurance. Quickly, when we got into the pandemic, we recognized that the EI system had not kept up with the way Canadians work. That is exactly why we are working to improve the system in terms of adequacy, in terms of access and in terms of the individuals who pay in and who do not yet have access.

The member knows very well that we are working very hard on this file.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, today the Conseil national des chômeurs et chômeuses is launching its employment insurance campaign. It highlights this government's monumental failure to deliver on its promise to reform employment insurance.

The pandemic has shown that the current system is not working. For example, self-employed workers, freelancers and women are being forgotten. We need real reform so that workers have access to good benefits to make ends meet.

When will the Liberals finally fix the EI system to help struggling families?

**Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the pandemic has revealed that Canada must adapt its employment insurance system to the realities of the 21st century.

Our government is currently holding consultations on how to modernize the system to make it more responsive to workers and employers.

We need to strengthen the rights of workers hired through digital platforms and establish new provisions in the Income Tax Act to include that work in the calculation of hours needed to qualify for employment insurance and the Canada pension plan.

*Oral Questions**[English]***IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP**

**Mr. Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Russia's genocidal war on Ukraine has caused the largest refugee crisis in Europe since World War II, with 14 million Ukrainians having fled their homes and about six million having fled to other countries. In my community in Etobicoke Centre and across this country, Canadians have opened their arms to Ukrainian refugees, opening up their homes, collecting donations, offering financial support and more.

Could the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship please share with Canadians what the Government of Canada is doing to support Ukrainians fleeing Russia's genocidal war on Ukraine?

**Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the member for Etobicoke Centre, who has been a tireless champion for Ukraine and Ukrainian Canadians from the beginning of this war.

This unjust war of aggression is an affront to humanity and the very values that underpin the international legal order. Canada has opened its arms to provide safe haven so far to 30,000 Ukrainians or more, who have already landed in Canada. It is not enough that they get here. They need to be supported when they arrive. We have arranged federal charters, including last week in my home province of Nova Scotia. We have established income supports, temporary accommodation, reception supports at airports and settlement services, including language training. We are going to continue to do what we can to demonstrate this is not a European problem. It is a problem for the world, and Canada will continue to play a leadership role.

*Slava Ukraini.*

\* \* \*

**HEALTH**

**Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we have heard from the parliamentary secretary the tremendous risk for and from unvaccinated air travellers. However, is it not true that many unvaccinated Canadians can actually travel by air with a negative antigen test?

**Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, all Canadians are sick and tired of COVID, and we all agree on that, but just wishing it away or ignoring it will not simply make it go away. Over the past three months, we continue to see more deaths from COVID. There were over 1,700 in the month of May. The most important thing we can do to get through this pandemic is to drive up vaccination rates. We will continue to be informed by science and not the political games of the Conservative opposition.

• (1500)

**Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I find it fascinating. We do not want to wish away science. We want to wish away incompetence.

What is important here is to answer the actual question because, if an antigen test is good enough for some Canadians to get on an airplane, why is it not good enough for all Canadians? What is the difference between Canadians who are unvaccinated and who want to fly in Cumberland—Colchester, for instance, and those who live in northern communities? The answer is clear. The only difference is not medical science, but political science.

When will the government drop these vindictive mandates and let Canadians get back to prepandemic normal?

**Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the member for Cumberland—Colchester tried to minimize the COVID-19 deaths in this country by referencing deaths from other causes. Every lost life is tragic and, on this side of the House, we understand that it is the government's job to do everything we can to protect people and save lives, whether that is from COVID-19 or any other cause. We owe it to them and all Canadians to remain focused on keeping them safe and our communities healthy, and we will continue to do that.

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health needs to get in line with the rest of the countries, all 55 of them, that have dropped all the mandates. He was informed the other day that Canadians who are unvaccinated can travel on ferries as long as the journey is less than 24 hours, so why are unvaccinated Canadians not able to travel on flights within Canada since they are all less than 24 hours? When is the Liberal government going to get rid of the mandates and get us back to prepandemic normal?

**Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives just cannot seem to make up their minds about vaccinations. The member for Yorkton—Melville claims the government has a secret agenda after she refused to get vaccinated. Another Conservative, the MP for Niagara West, tabled a petition in the House to ban all mRNA vaccines. Those are the vaccines that have saved millions of lives around the world.

The science is clear that vaccines are safe and effective in reducing the spread of COVID-19, as well as severe cases, hospitalizations and death. I would encourage the members opposite in the Conservative opposition to get behind that and encourage their constituents to get a third or fourth dose.

*Oral Questions*

**Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, ArriveCAN provides a serious accessibility barrier to many Canadians, in particular those who may not own a smart phone or have the digital literacy to properly navigate the process. Not everyone is tech savvy. While the introduction of a paper form was a good first step, and one that should have been in place since day one, when will the government commit to listening to the thousands of Canadians experiencing problems at the border and stop the mandatory use of the ArriveCAN app?

**Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for underlining some of the issues which we have worked through with the CBSA.

With respect to ArriveCAN, I am pleased to report that, since the low point of travel during the pandemic, we are now seeing levels come back over 700%, which is good news. That is as a result of the modifications we have made for easing travel restrictions. That is also as a result of lowering some of the barriers that my colleague pointed out with respect to ArriveCAN. I am also pleased to report to the chamber that compliance with ArriveCAN is over 90% and, in the long run, will make the voyage of travellers that much more efficient. We will continue to work with all members on it.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

**Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, according to experts, the increase in cases of gun violence in Montreal in recent years is a new phenomenon. Gang members now appear to be firing multiple shots at buildings and cars to send a message and mark what they claim is their territory.

However, the guns they are using are not covered by Bill C-21. Will the minister admit that the solution to this scourge is about more than just making these guns illegal, as Bill C-21 proposes to do? More importantly, we need to prevent illegal guns from getting into our neighbourhoods.

• (1505)

**Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with my colleague. The cycle of gun violence is out of control.

We have already taken action by banning assault weapons. We will build on this initiative with our next step, which is implementing a mandatory buyback program.

The issue right now is Bill C-21. The Conservatives' delays and filibustering must stop. We need to start debating Bill C-21 to protect our communities. I am always willing to work with the Bloc and everyone else.

**Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to contradict my colleague, but my question was not on Bill C-21. As my colleague noted, the gunshots we hear in the streets of Montreal may not always result in deaths, but there is always a victim, and that is the public's sense of safety. Gun culture is taking hold in Montreal, as is gang culture.

The solution to the problem of illegal guns requires helping police forces deal with the gang problem. Bill C-21 is not a bad bill, but it does not offer any solutions to address the shootings. When will the minister realize that to deal with criminal organizations we need to start by having a registry of those criminal organizations?

**Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, our government has already done a number of practical things, such as establishing a \$350-million fund to provide resources to our police forces.

With all due respect to my colleague, Bill C-21 contains tangible measures to target organized crime, including by increasing criminal sanctions and giving new oversight powers to eliminate and prevent gun violence.

We will work with the Bloc and every member to get this bill passed. It is very important. It is essential for protecting our communities.

\* \* \*

**JUSTICE**

**Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, a 12-year-old girl found herself right in the middle of a shooting in Montreal. She was traumatized, of course. This is happening in our streets in Quebec.

Instead of tackling the problems of street gangs and illegal arms trafficking, this Liberal government is doing the opposite with its Bill C-5. It is eliminating mandatory prison sentences for gun crimes.

How can this government be so disconnected from reality that it is doing the opposite of what is obviously common sense?

**Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, serious offences will always be punished in a serious manner.

The situation that my colleague just described is not a situation targeted by Bill C-5. This bill addresses situations that are not a threat to public safety. Bill C-5 seeks to address the overrepresentation of Black and indigenous people in the justice system.

That is precisely what we are doing.

**Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we believe that serious and violent firearms offences warrant a mandatory sentence.

We stand on the side of victims. It is disappointing to see this government openly siding with criminals. It is even letting them serve their sentence at home for such crimes as armed robbery and extortion with a firearm. Those are quite serious crimes.

Why is this government being so soft on crime with Bill C-5?

**Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to watch the opposition continue to support Harper's tough-on-crime policy, which was a total failure.

What we are doing is continuing to punish serious offences in a serious way. What we are doing is taking a different approach when public safety is not threatened or at risk in order to help communities and victims.

**Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, let us hear what Stephan Fogaing, a member of Montreal's Black community, has to say about Bill C-5: "In short, when the federal government contemplates doing away with some of the minimum sentences in the Criminal Code, we can only wonder whether they are more interested in protecting criminals than the public and victims of crime."

Given what these people had to say, is the Prime Minister interested in listening to them, or does he prefer to protect criminals over victims?

• (1510)

**Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harper's tough-on-crime policy was a complete failure. We have managed to fill our prisons with indigenous people and Black people. We have prevented the system from working properly, because minimum sentences slow down the justice system.

Around the globe, and especially in the United States, where the Conservatives drew their inspiration 15 years ago, authorities are doing away with minimum sentences because they do not work. We are here to do a better job of protecting society.

\* \* \*

#### PUBLIC SAFETY

**Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, indigenous peoples and first nations organizations have long been calling for police reform. Security and protection are essential services. It is time for indigenous police forces to be considered as equally essential. Indigenous groups have been very clear about wanting a law that recognizes, funds and prioritizes first nations police services.

How is this government supporting culturally sensitive first nations police forces and recognizing the essential role they play on the pathway to reconciliation?

**Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, to begin, I want to thank my colleague for all of her hard work.

[English]

Protecting indigenous communities through well-funded, culturally sensitive indigenous police services is a top priority and vital to our commitment to walk the pathway to truth and reconciliation. We understand the importance of recognizing indigenous police services as an essential service, which is why our government is

#### Oral Questions

imminently launching a public engagement process to develop legislation.

In consultation with indigenous groups, provinces and territories, we will work to further protect indigenous communities all across Canada. We will do this work because it is in response to the calls to justice and the calls to action and because it is the right thing to do.

\* \* \*

#### HEALTH

**Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the 83-year-old father of my constituent was deported from Canada because of the government's draconian mandates. He arrived in Canada, and despite being doubly vaccinated, one of the vaccines he had was not approved. He co-operated and got the Pfizer shot. That did not help. After being held three days, he was sent back to Venezuela to return after a two-week quarantine. This involved unnecessary stress, extra expenses and zero common sense.

Will the minister apologize for the appalling treatment of this family?

**Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, back in 2020, the Conservatives claimed that we would not have enough vaccines for all Canadians, but let me be clear that Canada has sufficient supply to ensure all eligible Canadians are protected for primary, series, boosters and pediatrics. On this side of the House, our government will continue to make sure we are putting the health and safety of Canadians first because nobody wants another wave of this COVID-19 pandemic.

The member opposite raised a particular case. If he would like to discuss it personally, I would be happy to accept a call or an email anytime.

\* \* \*

#### HOUSING

**Mr. Scott Aitchison (Parry Sound—Muskoka, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada is in a housing crisis. Too many families are unable to find a safe roof over their heads and many young Canadians are just being forced to give up on the dream of ever even owning a home. There is a simple solution, though. It is to build more houses and increase the housing supply. All we see the government do is pose for photo ops at spending announcements, but there is a curious lack of ribbon cuttings.

My question is simple: When is the government going to get off the sidelines, demonstrate leadership to end exclusionary zoning and say yes to building more homes for Canadians?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Housing and Diversity and Inclusion, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt in saying they are facing a crisis of leadership, because the hon. member fails to mention his very leader refuses to help municipalities with supply. His member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon says that we should step back and not invest in provisional housing programs. He is opposed, on the record, to the foreign ban of Canadian residential real estate and has opposed funding for affordable housing for indigenous peoples. It is all rhetoric and more rhetoric.

**Mr. Scott Aitchison (Parry Sound—Muskoka, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there it is once again: more rhetoric, more talk, but no real action. If announcing billions of dollars could solve this problem, we would have a housing surplus in this country right now. In fact, the number of houses per 1,000 Canadians has gone down dramatically since 2016 under this government's watch.

Again I ask the minister: When is the government finally going to have the courage to do what is right and commit to working with provincial governments and municipalities to end exclusionary zoning and fix this crisis?

• (1515)

**Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Housing and Diversity and Inclusion, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are doing exactly that through the housing accelerator fund. The housing accelerator fund is all about supply, supply, supply, but they are on record as opposing the housing accelerator fund—

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

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Parry Sound—Muskoka asked a question and he wants to hear the answer, I am sure. I would ask members to keep it down.

The hon. minister, from the top, please.

**Hon. Ahmed Hussen:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should speak to his leader, who has trashed the housing accelerator fund, which is all about supply. His colleagues from Calgary Centre, Edmonton Riverbend, Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon and Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola have all said contradictory things about housing supply, about support for first-time homebuyers, about building more affordable housing in this country. They have no shame.

\* \* \*

**FAMILIES, CHILDREN AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Whitby, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as someone who spent years working with social purpose organizations, I have seen first-hand how social innovation and social finance are catalysts for positive change. Big challenges like climate change, energy security, poverty, systemic racism, food insecurity, housing affordability, reconciliation and more can all be addressed by harnessing the ingenuity of our social innovators and our social entrepreneurs. That is why I am proud of the work that our government is doing to implement Canada's first social innovation and social finance strategy, which will drive economic growth, build more inclusive communities and help transition to a low-carbon economy.

Can the minister update the House on the progress our government is making on building a stronger social innovation and social finance ecosystem?

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

**The Speaker:** Could I have everyone's attention, please? Can I continue?

Before the minister answers the question, I want to remind hon. members that when they are referring to someone, to please refer to them by their title or the riding they represent and not by their first name. Mocking someone in the House, regardless of what side members are on, is not an example we want to set for our children, who are watching today and wondering what is going on. I want everyone to reflect on what they are saying, please.

The hon. minister.

**Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking the member for Whitby, who is the hardest-working member in this House when it comes to social finance.

Social purpose organizations like charities and non-profits play a key role in addressing complex social and environmental issues. They are more important than ever, as many of these issues have been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. That is why we launched the renewed investment readiness program in the summer of 2021, which will provide another \$50 million to continue to support social purpose organizations in building capacity and increasing their investment readiness. This will also help the social purpose organizations take advantage of the \$755-million social finance fund.

I thank the member for Whitby for his excellent work.

\* \* \*

**PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

**Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, people with disabilities are relying on the government to fast track a Canada disability benefit to deliver support without delay. After years of a pandemic, the skyrocketing cost of living is leaving people with disabilities behind. We know emergency COVID payments reached less than one-third of these Canadians because the data was not available. That is unacceptable.

Will the minister fix this problem immediately to make sure no one living with a disability is left out of needed income supports ever again?

**Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, since 2015, our government has taken bold action to help persons with disabilities find and maintain employment and make Canada more inclusive. We have made significant progress, but persons with disabilities still face serious barriers in this country.

That is why we are introducing the historic Canada disability benefit, which is an income supplement for working-age Canadians with disabilities. Details of the CDB, including the benefit amount and eligibility criteria, will be informed by ongoing engagement with the community, in the spirit of “nothing without us”.

\* \* \*

● (1520)

### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, today is World Oceans Day, and our oceans are in distress. They are getting hotter. Acid levels are rising. Oxygen levels are dropping. The heat absorbed by our oceans due to global warming is equivalent to seven Hiroshima bombs every second of every hour every day.

Approving the TMX pipeline and Bay du Nord just makes matters worse. As it is, net zero by 2050 is not a goal; it is an epitaph.

When will the government take the climate crisis as seriously as the emergency it is?

**Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the member that we do take climate change very seriously. That is why our emissions reduction plan is an ambitious sector-by-sector path for Canada to reach our 2030 emissions reduction targets and go on to net zero by 2050. It has broad support from environmental groups, industry and farmers. It is going to deliver clean air, a healthy environment and a strong economy. That is what Canadians want and that is what we will deliver.

\* \* \*

### PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**The Speaker:** I wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Murray Rankin, our former colleague and current Minister of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation for British Columbia.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

### CANADA NATIONAL PARKS ACT

The House resumed from June 1, consideration of the motion that Bill C-248, An Act to amend the Canada National Parks Act (Ojibway National Urban Park of Canada), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Speaker:** It being 3:22 p.m., pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 25, 2021, the House will now proceed to the

### Private Members' Business

taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-248 under Private Members' Business.

Call in the members.

● (1535)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 137*)

### YEAS

#### Members

Aboultair	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Angus	Arnold
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Benzen
Bergen	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blaikie	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Block	Boulerice
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Collins (Victoria)
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	d'Entremont
Desilets	Desjarlais
Doherty	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Erskine-Smith
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri	Findlay
Fortin	Gallant
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Green
Hallan	Hughes
Idlout	Johns
Julian	Kelly
Kitchen	Kmieć
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Kwan	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lemire	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb

*Private Members' Business*

MacGregor  
Maguire  
Masse  
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)  
McCauley (Edmonton West)  
McPherson  
Michaud  
Morantz  
Motz  
Nater  
Paul-Hus  
Perkins  
Plamondon  
Rayes  
Reid  
Richards  
Rood  
Savard-Tremblay  
Schmale  
Shields  
Simard  
Small  
Steinley  
Stewart  
Stubbs  
Therrien  
Tochor  
Trudel  
Van Popta  
Vidal  
Viersen  
Villemure  
Vuong  
Warkentin  
Webber  
Williamson  
Zimmer— 169

MacKenzie  
Martel  
Mathysen  
Mazier  
McLean  
Melillo  
Moore  
Morrice  
Muys  
Normandin  
Pauzé  
Perron  
Poilievre  
Redekopp  
Rempel Garner  
Roberts  
Ruff  
Scheer  
Seebach  
Shipley  
Singh  
Soroka  
Ste-Marie  
Strahl  
Thériault  
Thomas  
Tolmie  
Uppal  
Vecchio  
Vien  
Vignola  
Vis  
Wagantall  
Waugh  
Williams  
Zarrillo

Iacono  
Jaczek  
Jowhari  
Kelloway  
Khera  
Kusmierczyk  
Lambropoulos  
Lamoureux  
Lattanzio  
LeBlanc  
Lightbound  
Longfield  
MacAulay (Cardigan)  
MacKinnon (Gatineau)  
Martinez Ferrada  
McDonald (Avalon)  
McKay  
McLeod  
Mendicino  
Miller  
Murray  
Ng  
O'Connell  
Petitpas Taylor  
Qualtrough  
Rodriguez  
Romanado  
Sajjan  
Samson  
Scarpaleggia  
Sgro  
Sheehan  
Sidhu (Brampton South)  
St-Onge  
Tassi  
Thompson  
Valdez  
van Koeverden  
Vandenbeld  
Weiler  
Yip  
Zuberi— 147

Ien  
Jones  
Kayabaga  
Khalid  
Koutrakis  
Lalonde  
Lametti  
Lapointe  
Lauzon  
Lebouthillier  
Long  
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)  
MacDonald (Malpeque)  
Maloney  
May (Cambridge)  
McGuinty  
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)  
Mendès  
Miao  
Morrissey  
Naqvi  
Noormohamed  
Oliphant  
Powlowski  
Robillard  
Rogers  
Sahota  
Saks  
Sarai  
Schieffe  
Shanahan  
Sidhu (Brampton East)  
Sorbara  
Sudds  
Taylor Roy  
Turnbull  
Van Bynen  
Vandal  
Virani  
Wilkinson  
Zahid

**NAYS**

## Members

Aldag  
Ali  
Arseneault  
Badawey  
Baker  
Beech  
Bennett  
Bittle  
Blois  
Brière  
Casey  
Chahal  
Chatel  
Chiang  
Cormier  
Dabrusin  
Dhaliwal  
Diab  
Drouin  
Duguid  
Dzerowicz  
El-Khoury  
Fillmore  
Fonseca  
Fragiskatos  
Freeland  
Gaheer  
Gerretsen  
Hajdu  
Hardie  
Holland  
Hussen

Alghabra  
Anandasangaree  
Arya  
Bains  
Battiste  
Bendayan  
Bibeau  
Blair  
Bradford  
Carr  
Chagger  
Champagne  
Chen  
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)  
Coteau  
Damoff  
Dhillon  
Dong  
Dubourg  
Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
Ehsassi  
Fergus  
Fisher  
Fortier  
Fraser  
Fry  
Garneau  
Gould  
Hanley  
Hepfner  
Housefather  
Hutchings

**PAIRED**

## Members

Anand  
Dowdall  
Guilbeault  
Jeneroux  
Ng  
O'Toole  
Boissonnault  
Fast  
Hoback  
Joly  
O'Regan  
Patzner— 12

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

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

\* \* \*

**INCOME TAX ACT**

The House resumed from June 2 consideration of the motion that Bill C-240, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (donations involving private corporation shares or real estate), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 25, 2021, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-240 under Private Members' Business.

*Private Members' Business*

● (1550)

[Translation]

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

*(Division No. 138)*

## YEAS

## Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Benzen	Bergen
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
d'Entremont	Desilets
Doherty	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Erskine-Smith
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri	Findlay
Fortin	Gallant
Garon	Gaudreau
Généreux	Genius
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lemire	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacKenzie	Maguire
Martel	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McKay	McLean
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrice	Motz
Muys	Nater
Normandin	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Plamondon
Poilievre	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Simard
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault

Therrien  
Tochor  
Trudel  
Van Popta  
Vidal  
Viersen  
Villemure  
Vuong  
Warkentin  
Webber  
Williamson

Thomas  
Tolmie  
Uppal  
Vecchio  
Vien  
Vignola  
Vis  
Wagantall  
Waugh  
Williams  
Zimmer— 146

## NAYS

## Members

Aldag	Alhabra
Ali	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	BibEAU
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney
Blois	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Garneau	Garrison
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gould	Green
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)

*Private Members' Business*

McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Miller	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
O'Connell	Oliphant
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh
Sorbara	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thompson
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi— 171	

## PAIRED

## Members

Anand	Boissonnault
Dowdall	Fast
Guilbeault	Hoback
Jeneroux	Joly
Ng	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzer— 12

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

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order.

I would like you to shed some light on the process for voting on private member's bills.

To my knowledge, it is customary to vote by row, not by party. Is the Chair allowing members to stand when their row has already voted and is she allowing members to vote by party? I would like some clarification on that.

**The Speaker:** That is a very good question.

The vote is by individual and by row.

A small mistake was made. I called the members of one row to vote and people rose after that. The clerk registered their votes.

This is a practice we have used before. That is why we registered their votes instead of starting all over again.

\* \* \*

## INCOME TAX ACT

The House resumed from June 3 consideration of the motion that Bill C-241, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (deduction of travel expenses for tradespersons), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 25, 2021, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-241 under Private Members' Business.

• (1600)

[English]

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

(Division No. 139)

## YEAS

## Members

Aboutaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Ashton
Bachrach	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Benzen
Bergen	Bergeron
Berthold	Bérubé
Bezan	Blaikie
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Block
Boulerice	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Chong
Collins (Victoria)	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
d'Entremont	Desilets
Desjarlais	Doherty
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri	Findlay
Fortin	Gallant
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Généreux	Genuis
Glady	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Green
Hallan	Hughes
Idlout	Johns
Julian	Kelly
Kitchen	Kmieć
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Kwan	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lemire	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacGregor	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
Masse	Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
McPherson	Melillo
Michaud	Moore
Morantz	Morrice
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin

*Private Members' Business*

Paul-Hus  
Perkins  
Plamondon  
Rayes  
Reid  
Richards  
Romanado  
Ruff  
Scheer  
Seeback  
Shipley  
Small  
Steinley  
Stewart  
Stubbs  
Therrien  
Tochor  
Trudel  
Van Popta  
Vien  
Vignola  
Vis  
Wagantall  
Waugh  
Williams  
Zarrillo

Pauzé  
Perron  
Poilievre  
Redekopp  
Rempel Garner  
Roberts  
Rood  
Savard-Tremblay  
Schmale  
Shields  
Simard  
Soroka  
Ste-Marie  
Strahl  
Thériault  
Thomas  
Tolmie  
Uppal  
Vidal  
Viersen  
Villemure  
Vuong  
Warkentin  
Webber  
Williamson  
Zimmer— 166

**NAYS**

## Members

Aldag  
Ali  
Arseneault  
Atwin  
Bains  
Battiste  
Bendayan  
Bibeau  
Blair  
Brière  
Casey  
Chahal  
Chatel  
Chiang  
Cormier  
Dabrusin  
Dhaliwal  
Diab  
Drouin  
Duclos  
Duncan (Etobicoke North)  
Ehsassi  
Erskine-Smith  
Fillmore  
Fonseca  
Fragiskatos  
Freeland  
Gaheer  
Gerretsen  
Hajdu  
Hardie  
Holland  
Hussen  
Iacono  
Jaczek  
Jowhari  
Kelloway  
Khera  
Kusmierczyk  
Lambropoulos  
Lamoureux  
Lattanzio  
LeBlanc

Alghabra  
Anandasangaree  
Arya  
Badawey  
Baker  
Beech  
Bennett  
Bittle  
Blois  
Carr  
Chagger  
Champagne  
Chen  
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)  
Coteau  
Damoff  
Dhillon  
Dong  
Dubourg  
Duguid  
Dzerowicz  
El-Khoury  
Fergus  
Fisher  
Fortier  
Fraser  
Fry  
Garneau  
Gould  
Hanley  
Hepfner  
Housefather  
Hutchings  
Ien  
Jones  
Kayabaga  
Khalid  
Koutrakis  
Lalonde  
Lametti  
Lapointe  
Lauzon  
Lebouthillier

Lightbound  
Longfield  
MacAulay (Cardigan)  
MacKinnon (Gatineau)  
Martinez Ferrada  
McDonald (Avalon)  
McKay  
McLeod  
Mendicino  
Miller  
Murray  
Ng  
O'Connell  
Petipas Taylor  
Qualtrough  
Rodriguez  
Sahota  
Saks  
Sarai  
Schiefke  
Shanahan  
Sidhu (Brampton East)  
Sorbara  
Sudds  
Taylor Roy  
Turnbull  
Van Bynen  
Vandal  
Virani  
Wilkinson  
Zahid

Long  
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)  
MacDonald (Malpeque)  
Maloney  
May (Cambridge)  
McGuinty  
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)  
Mendès  
Miao  
Morrissey  
Naqvi  
Noormohamed  
Oliphant  
Powlowski  
Robillard  
Rogers  
Sajjan  
Samson  
Scarpaleggia  
Sgro  
Sheehan  
Sidhu (Brampton South)  
St-Onge  
Tassi  
Thompson  
Valdez  
van Koeverden  
Vandenbeld  
Weiler  
Yip  
Zuberi— 148

**PAIRED**

## Members

Anand  
Dowdall  
Guilbeault  
Jeneroux  
Ng  
O'Toole

Boissonnault  
Fast  
Hoback  
Joly  
O'Regan  
Patzner— 12

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Finance.

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

\* \* \*

● (1605)

**CONSTITUTION ACT, 2022 (REPRESENTATION OF QUEBEC)**

The House resumed from June 6 consideration of the motion that Bill C-246, An Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1867 (representation in the House of Commons), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 25, 2021, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-246 under Private Members' Business.

● (1615)

[*Translation*]

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

*Private Members' Business**(Division No. 140)***YEAS**

## Members

Ashton	Bachrach
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Bergeron
Bérubé	Blaikie
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe	Chabot
Champoux	Collins (Victoria)
DeBellefeuille	Desilets
Desjarlais	Fortin
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Hughes	Idlout
Johns	Julian
Kwan	Larouche
Lemire	MacGregor
Masse	Mathysen
McPherson	Michaud
Normandin	Pauzé
Perron	Plamondon
Savard-Tremblay	Simard
Singh	Ste-Marie
Thériault	Therrien
Trudel	Vignola
Villemure	Vuong
Zarrillo— 51	

**NAYS**

## Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Aldag
Alghabra	Ali
Allison	Anandasangaree
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Atwin
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Battiste	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Benzen	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Block
Blois	Bradford
Bragdon	Brassard
Brière	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carr	Carrie
Casey	Chagger
Chahal	Chambers
Champagne	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Chong	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cooper	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dalton	Damoff
Dancho	Davidson
Deltell	d'Entremont
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Doherty
Dong	Dreeshen
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis

Epp	Erskine-Smith
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fergus	Ferreri
Fillmore	Findlay
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gallant	Garneau
Généreux	Genuis
Gerretsen	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gould	Gourde
Gray	Hajdu
Hallan	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Ien
Jaczek	Jones
Jowhari	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Kelly
Khalid	Khera
Kitchen	Kmiec
Koutrakis	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Kusmierczyk
Lake	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lantsman
Lapointe	Lattanzio
Lauzon	Lawrence
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lightbound	Lloyd
Lobb	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKenzie	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maguire	Maloney
Martel	Martinez Ferrada
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean	McLeod
Melillo	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Miller	Moore
Morantz	Morrice
Morrissey	Motz
Murray	Muys
Naqvi	Nater
Ng	Noormohamed
O'Connell	Oliphant
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Petitpas Taylor	Poilievre
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rood	Ruff
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Scheer	Schiefke
Schmale	Seeback
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shields
Shipley	Sidhu (Brampton East)

Sidhu (Brampton South)	Small
Sorbara	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
St-Onge	Strahl
Stubbs	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thomas	Thompson
Tochor	Tolmie
Turnbull	Uppal
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Van Popta
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Virani	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Weiler	Wilkinson
Williams	Williamson
Yip	Zahid
Zimmer	Zuberi— 264

### PAIRED

#### Members

Anand	Boissonnault
Dowdall	Fast
Guilbeault	Hoback
Jeneroux	Joly
Ng	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzer— 12

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

[*English*]

It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, International Development; the hon. member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, Health; the hon. member for Spadina—Fort York, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship.

\* \* \*

### POINTS OF ORDER

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order that arises from a question during question period, and I would appreciate it if the Speaker could confirm if my understanding of petitions is correct.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health referred in his answer to a petition presented by the hon. member for Niagara West with the presumption that the member for Niagara West supported the petition he presented. I have always taken the view that when I am asked to present a petition, it is not a statement of my position but it is doing what my constituents or other petitioners have requested. I worry that this is a poor precedent, but I would not want to make the presumption.

**The Speaker:** Technically, hon. members are not supposed to endorse the petition or show their support, but saying it does not nullify the petition.

### Routine Proceedings

When presenting petitions, I want to remind hon. members to be as concise as possible and very factual. We are not looking for their opinion. We just want to know what the petition is about.

The hon. opposition House leader has the floor.

**Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member from the Green Party raising this. It is convention around this place that petitions are presented by members, and I think the confusion may lie in the fact that the member for Milton referred to a member's support of the petition.

It is convention around this place that when a member presents a petition, it is on behalf of their constituents and does not necessarily reflect an endorsement of the petition nor whether they are contrary to the petition or not. They are doing the work on behalf of the people they represent. I think that is where the confusion may lie.

**The Speaker:** That is exactly it. Members are presenting their petitions on behalf of their constituents. That is their duty as members.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### CERTIFICATES OF NOMINATION

**Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to 53(1) of the Privacy Act and Standing Order 111.1, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the certificate of nomination and biographical notes for the proposed appointment of Philippe Dufresne to the position of Privacy Commissioner for a term of seven years.

I request that the nomination and biographical notes be referred to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

\* \* \*

● (1620)

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

**Mr. 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 three petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

\* \* \*

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### AFGHANISTAN

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey—Newton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Special Committee on Afghanistan, entitled "Honouring Canada's Legacy in Afghanistan: Responding to the Humanitarian Crisis and Helping People Reach Safety". In accordance with the motion adopted in the House on November 8, 2021, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

*Routine Proceedings*

I want to congratulate the members of the special committee from all parties and thank them for their dedication, teamwork and collaborative efforts over the past six months. I also want to thank the support staff, including clerk Miriam Burke and the analysts Julie Béchar and Allison Goody, for all their hard work in preparing this very important report.

**The Speaker:** I believe we have a dissenting report.

The hon. member for Wellington—Halton Hills.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the supplement to the report of the Special Committee on Afghanistan.

[*English*]

Our supplementary report adds the following evidence and observations not included in the main report.

While all NATO allies scrambled in the withdrawal and evacuation last August from Afghanistan, Canada performed particularly poorly. The war in Afghanistan was Canada's longest war. Canada's withdrawal from Afghanistan last August was not only a betrayal of our soldiers, diplomats and Afghans themselves, but it was a disaster that has damaged Canada's interests for years to come.

Allies and competitors around the world will question the strength of the Canadian government's commitments and whether the government is willing and able to back up these commitments with effective action. Afghans who worked for Canada were left behind and are being persecuted by the Taliban, precisely because they worked for Canada. The Canadian government had a moral duty to evacuate these Afghans and their families and failed to do so.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

**Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, entitled “Confronting Urgent Challenges and Building the Resilience of the Canadian Food Supply Chain”.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank our clerk, our analysts and, indeed, the witnesses who appeared before the committee. Their contributions have been very important, and I would like to thank everyone for their collective work.

\* \* \*

**FINANCIAL PROTECTION FOR FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLE FARMERS ACT**

**Mr. Scot Davidson (York—Simcoe, CPC)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-280, An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (deemed trust – perishable fruits and vegetables).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very excited today and I am pleased to rise to introduce the financial protection for fresh fruit and vegetable farmers act, which proposes to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act to support Canadian produce sellers.

Every time I see the dark soil and endless rows of vegetables in the Holland Marsh in my community, the soup and salad bowl of Canada, I see opportunity. In order for that opportunity to be fully realized in the marsh and across Canada, more must be done to protect Canada's fresh fruit and vegetable growers during the bankruptcy of a buyer. We know that fresh fruits and vegetables are highly perishable with a limited shelf life. Unfortunately, the existing laws do not take this into account.

This legislation would address this deficiency by establishing a deemed trust for fresh produce sellers, ensuring they have priority access to an insolvent buyer's assets related to the sale of fresh produce. I am glad to bring this initiative forward and champion fresh fruit and vegetable producers. I trust that all members in the House will support this bill.

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

\* \* \*

● (1625)

**PETITIONS**

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

**Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today I will be tabling two petitions.

The first petition is from a group of British Columbians calling upon the Government of Canada to strengthen the Protection of Communities and Exploited Persons Act to address Canada's significant shortcomings on human trafficking, which were embarrassingly highlighted by the U.S. Department of State's 20th Trafficking in Persons Report.

ADDICTION RECOVERY

**Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, and it calls upon the government to expand rapid detox programs and provide housing and skills training to those who are struggling with addiction to get their lives back on track. The petitioners state that harm reduction monies are being used to keep addicts on drugs, thus shortening their lives and providing no real help to those unfortunate individuals.

They need to get their lives back, so the petitioners call upon the government to stop giving free needles and drug supplies to addicts and to use those funds to establish rapid detox centres and provide the skills previously mentioned.

## FIREARMS

**Mr. Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a petition on behalf of my constituents with respect to the Liberal government's introduction on April 29 of, in their words, a "shadow registry" on licensed firearms owners in Canada. The petitioners are pointing out that this is unfairly going to target businesses and cost countless jobs and wages, and that it is unfairly targeting Canadian firearms owners, who are already the most vetted citizens in Canada. They are subject to daily screenings and are statistically proven to be less likely to commit crimes than non-PAL and non-RPAL holders.

The petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to immediately repeal the order issued on April 29, 2022.

## BANKNOTE REDESIGN

**Mr. Han Dong (Don Valley North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am here to present a petition on behalf of 75 Canadians and Canadian residents who call upon the Minister of Finance to select Won Alexander Cumyow to be featured as the face on the redesigned five-dollar Canadian banknote. We believe that this initiative will help fight the anti-Asian racism we have observed in the last few years.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Kevin Vuong (Spadina—Fort York, Ind.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by over 1,400 Canadians who call upon Parliament to ensure that the Government of Canada denies public funding to any domestic or foreign non-governmental organizations that promote or engage in acts of anti-Semitism.

## HONEYBEES

**Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise. I have two petitions to present today, and they are both related to the environment and the importance of being good stewards of our environment.

The first one is on honeybees, the importance of the 10,000 beekeepers in Canada and the important role bees play in our environment. The petition encourages people to consider ways we can help the bee population. There has been overwhelming support by the provinces and cities to support a day of the honeybee since 2010, and I am honoured to sponsor this petition, which 748 people have signed.

• (1630)

## NUCLEAR ENERGY

**Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, given the neglect of the environment by the Liberals, I have petition e-3912. It has to do with the exclusion of nuclear energy in the green bond framework. It classifies nuclear energy as a sin stock. The Liberals are grouping nuclear energy with arms manufacturers, tobacco, alcohol and gambling activities, which I think is a travesty and so do a lot of Canadians. Some 10,544 people across Canada signed the petition, hoping the Liberals would reconsider their position on nuclear energy.

I present these petitions to the House.

## Routine Proceedings

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 493, 496 and 499.

[Text]

Question No. 493—**Mr. Michael Kram:**

With regard to the government providing NDP members with special briefings in the days prior to April 7, 2022, about the content of the 2022 budget: (a) on what dates did these briefings occur; (b) which NDP members were invited to the briefings; (c) were any NDP staff allowed to attend these briefings, and, if so, which ones; (d) who from the government, including both elected and departmental officials, provided the briefings to the NDP members; (e) what precise information was provided in the briefings; (f) is it the position of the Department of Finance that none of the information contained in the briefings could have had any market implications, and, if so, who determined that position; and (g) if there was any possible market impacting information contained in the briefings, what written assurances, if any, did the government require to ensure that profits could not be made as a result of the advance information provided?

**Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Department of Finance did not provide any briefings on the content of budget 2022 to New Democratic Party members of Parliament or their staff prior to April 7, 2022.

Question No. 496—**Mr. Arnold Viersen:**

With regard to the Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) and information about former prostitution offences committed prior to 2014, in relation to section 210, former section 212(1)(j), and former section 213(1)(c) of the Criminal Code: (a) when these offences were committed, what information was entered by police services to the files of offenders in the CPIC; (b) are the circumstances of the commission of a prostitution offence recorded and visible in the CPIC; and (c) has the Parole Board of Canada studied the feasibility of the automation of record suspensions for these former prostitution related offences, and, if so, did the studies conclude that it is possible to automate these record suspensions?

**Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to (c), it should be noted that Public Safety Canada does not have input into parts (a) and (b) of this question. The feasibility of the potential automation of record suspensions is currently being studied and considered as part of broader record suspension program reforms. Public Safety Canada, in collaboration with portfolio partners the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Parole Board of Canada, is currently engaging with key criminal justice stakeholders and federal, provincial and territorial partners on the potential implementation of an automated sequestering of criminal records system in Canada. Former prostitution-related offences may be considered for eligibility, along with other offences, as the government moves forward with exploring a potential automated sequestering of criminal records system.

*Routine Proceedings*

With regard to (a), in relation to section 210, former section 212(1)(j), and former section 213(1)(c) of the Criminal Code and specific to the offences above, the Canadian Police Information Centre, CPIC, conducted a review on the investigative databank to ascertain what information was entered by police services into CPIC concerning former prostitution offences committed prior to 2014. Findings indicate that information pertaining to these offences remains available under several CPIC records categories, including “accused person”, “wanted person” and “prohibited person”. The criminal record in the identification databank on CPIC does not contain information as to when offences were committed. Only the final disposition information provided by the police of jurisdiction is entered into that criminal record, that information being disposition date, section of the Criminal Code and final disposition information. Charges that do not result in convictions, such as acquittals and withdrawals, are available only to Canadian law enforcement partners for limited criminal identification and investigative purposes and are generally not included in criminal record checks for civil purposes, per the dissemination of criminal record information policy.

With regard to (b), the circumstances of a prostitution offence, or any offence, are only available from the originating agency’s reports and/or record management system. However, there is an option when an individual has been added to the investigative databank of CPIC for an agency to add more information under the “Remarks” field. This field provides investigators with the option to indicate why an individual is of interest or wanted by the police, instructions to the person conducting the query when further action is required, or to clarify any other information related to the record, such as additional convictions, additional warrants, publication bans, failure to attend court, probation or release conditions, and firearms prohibitions. Information as to the circumstances of the offence is not recorded or visible on the criminal record in the identification databank on CPIC.

**Question No. 499—Mr. Dan Albas:**

With regard to COVID-19 vaccines thrown away due to spoilage or expiration: what was the available national wastage rate between May 1, 2021, and April 21, 2022, including the (i) percentage of doses wasted, (ii) number of doses wasted, (iii) number of doses administered?

**Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to (i) and (ii), of the vaccines held in the federally managed central inventory, 759,948 doses of the Moderna vaccine expired on March 21, 2022, and an additional 429,450 doses expired in mid-April of 2022. In addition, 3.8 million AstraZeneca doses held by the manufacturer and made available for donation by Canada to COVAX in 2021 expired in March 2022.

The Public Health Agency of Canada does not maintain provincial and territorial wastage figures. Provinces and territories are responsible for the management of wastage and for the disposal of vaccines that have been transferred to their jurisdiction to support vaccination campaigns.

With regard to (iii), as of April 21, 2022, approximately 153.4 million doses of COVID-19 vaccines have been procured and made available. Of these, more than 83 million doses have been administered.

[English]

**QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS**

**Mr. 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. 489 to 492, 494, 495, 497 and 498 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Text]

**Question No. 489—Mr. Rhéal Éloi Fortin:**

With regard to the government-owned building at the corner of Saint-Georges and Labelle streets in Saint-Jérôme, Quebec, that is used by the Correctional Service of Canada as the Laferrière Community Correctional Centre: (a) why did the centre close in March 2019; (b) when did the Correctional Service of Canada make the decision to close the centre; (c) what impact did the closure of the centre have on the mission of the Correctional Service of Canada and the services provided; (d) over the past 15 years, how many inmates (i) transited through, (ii) could be accommodated at, this centre, broken down by year; (e) what data (occupancy and growth statistics) warrant reopening this centre; (f) have other organizations working for community reintegration in the Laurentians or in the greater Montreal area been consulted about the need to renovate and reopen this centre, and, if so, which ones and when; (g) has the City of Saint-Jérôme been consulted about the planned renovations to this building, and, if so, on what dates and for which parts of the project; (h) has a study on the heritage value of the building been conducted, and, if so, by which organization and what are its conclusions; (i) does the government intend to respond positively to the request to transfer the building to the City of Saint-Jérôme in order to restore its heritage value and develop it as a place of culture and pride, as requested by the city council in its resolution adopted unanimously on January 18, 2022, copies of which were provided to the ministers of Public Safety, Canadian Heritage and Quebec Lieutenant, and Public Services and Procurement; (j) has a study been conducted on the centre’s location and have the City of Saint-Jérôme and community partners been consulted on this location, and, if so, on what dates and which individuals and organizations were involved in these consultations; (k) does the Correctional Service of Canada intend to comply with the City of Saint-Jérôme municipal by-laws with respect to the renovation of buildings within its city limits, particularly concerning the timeline for completing the work in question, and, if so, when; (l) since the closure of the centre in March 2019, what correspondence, emails and other communications have been exchanged between the Correctional Service of Canada and the City of Saint-Jérôme concerning this building and on what subjects, broken down by date; (m) since the closure of the centre in March 2019, how much public money has been invested in studies and work on this building, broken down by budget item, supplier and month; (n) what is the timeline for renovating the building, broken down by month and by major work completed and to be completed; (o) what are the total cost estimates related to the proposed renovation and restoration of this building; and (p) were any options other than the currently planned renovation considered, and, if so, what were they and what did they consist of?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 490—Mr. Kelly McCauley:**

With regard to the departmental acquisition cards and expenditures made in March 2022: (a) what is the total sum of all purchases made; (b) what departmental expenses were made, broken down by accounting code; and (c) what is the number of purchases made specifically between March 22 and March 31, 2022?

(Return tabled)

*Government Orders***Question No. 491—Mr. Dan Mazier:**

With regard to Parks Canada, broken down by each national park that is accessible to tourists: (a) how much money has each park budgeted for tourism promotion in 2022; (b) how much money did each park spend on tourism promotion in each of the last five years; and (c) what were the visitor attendance numbers, broken down by each of the last five years?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 492—Mr. Jeremy Patzer:**

With regard to the government's response to rising inflation across the Canadian economy: (a) is it the government's position that the high rate of inflation is entirely the result of temporary factors, such as supply disruptions, and, if so, does the government also maintain that the rise of inflation is unrelated to its economic and spending policies; (b) what specific analysis or data, if any, does the government have to support the position that inflation is entirely the result of temporary forces and not the result of its fiscal policy; (c) what specific actions in 2022, broken down by month or quarter, is the government taking or will take to ensure that temporary forces do not become embedded in ongoing inflation; and (d) does the government have any contingency plans to address other factors driving inflation for any rate higher than two per cent in late 2022, and, if so, what are the details?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 494—Mr. Michael Kram:**

With regard to reports of "March madness expenditures" where the government makes purchases before the end of the fiscal year so that departmental funds do not go unspent, broken down by department, agency or other government entity: (a) what were the total expenditures during February and March of 2022 on (i) materials and supplies (standard object 07), (ii) acquisition of machinery and equipment, including parts and consumable tools (standard object 09); and (b) what are the details of each such expenditure, including the (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) date of the expenditure, (iv) description of the goods or services provided, (v) delivery date, (vi) file number?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 495—Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval:**

With regard to the High Frequency Rail (HFR) project between Toronto and Quebec City and the funding for this project announced in the 2022 budget: (a) what is the expected breakdown of the \$396.8 million over two years, beginning in 2022-23, provided to Transport Canada and Infrastructure Canada for the planning and design phases of the HFR by (i) year, (ii) department, (iii) milestone description; (b) what specifically is the plan for the amount set out in (a); and (c) what will be the extent of VIA Rail's involvement in the project, especially regarding (i) train operations, (ii) ticket sales?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 497—Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval:**

With regard to the Lac-Mégantic rail bypass project: (a) what is the itemized breakdown of the projected expenditures by (i) year, (ii) department, (iii) project, of the \$237.2 million over five years, starting in 2022-23, provided to Transport Canada in the 2022 budget; (b) what, specifically, is planned to be done with that amount; and (c) what is Canadian Pacific's projected financial share of the project?

(Return tabled)

**Question No. 498—Mr. Garnett Genuis:**

With regard to the government's policy on Somaliland and reaction to requests for support to rebuild the Hargeisa market: (a) what is the government's position with respect to Somaliland's claim to independence; (b) have ministers or officials met with representatives or employees of the Government of Somaliland in the last seven years, and if so, what are the details of all such meetings, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) names and titles of the individuals in attendance, (iv) purpose of the meeting, (v) outcome; (c) did the Minister of International Development receive a letter from the Canadian Alliance to rebuild Hargeisa market requesting financial support for the rebuilding of Hargeisa market; and (d) what is the government's response to the request for financial support, including what amount, if any, the government will provide?

(Return tabled)

[English]

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

**MOTIONS FOR PAPERS**

**Mr. 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 Deputy Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

**BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2022, NO. 1**

**Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-19, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 7, 2022 and other measures, be read the third time and passed.

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to have the opportunity to talk about the budget implementation bill or the budget in general.

I want to spend a bit of time on what I believe is a very important issue to Canadians, something that I have not really spoken about for a while now and needs to be reinforced. For the first time in many years, we have seen a government that is genuinely committed to a national health care system. We have seen that virtually since day one from the government.

Many years ago, I was the health critic in the province of Manitoba, and I can say that back then, there was quite a bit of dialogue with Ottawa and many requests for money. Let there be no doubt that throughout every one of those years, the provinces were constantly asking for more health care dollars, and justifiably so, as the cost of health care has gone up. Our government has responded to that call in a very real and tangible way.

Back in the days when the Liberals were in opposition, the health care accord expired. We wanted a new health care accord to be reached, and it was through the efforts of this government that we were able to achieve that by going to the provinces and territories. Today we have agreements, and they will ultimately mean that health care transfers will increase over the next number of years. I see that as a very strong positive. In fact, if we look at the total amount of money we spend on health care today, it is at a historic high.

### *Government Orders*

One could easily stop there, but we take the Canada Health Act very seriously. We want to be sensitive to what is taking place. The Prime Minister has argued in the past that there are many things we can learn from the pandemic. One of those things is with regard to health care.

All of us, I am sure, can appreciate the concerns that were expressed regarding long-term care, and the federal government responded to them. There was the immediate response of providing the provinces hands-on support, whether it was through the Canadian Forces or the Red Cross, some of which went into my own riding of Winnipeg North. It is the idea of working toward stronger and healthier national standards for long-term care, something we are very much interested in doing and pursuing.

On the issue of mental health, we have seen a huge investment in mental health by the government. We also wanted movement in the area of pharmacare. It was not that long ago that we reached out to willing partners to start exploring how we could develop a national pharmacare program. I am very happy that in this budget we talk about a dental care program, at a substantial cost. If I had a choice, I probably would have wanted more emphasis on the pharmacare side as opposed to the dental care side, but that is a personal preference.

The commitment over the next number of years to establish a dental program is a very positive move. I do not think we should forget about the pharmacare program, but I understand that discussions continue to take place. I say that because I often have the opportunity, as we all do, to have discussions with people and constituents. It may be that as we get closer to Canada Day, people reflect on how fortunate we are to live in Canada, but when I ask people about this, especially newer immigrants, I find that one thing allowing them to identify with Canada, which they really appreciate about Canada, is our health care system.

● (1635)

I think that is something that often gets overlooked. That is why I thought I would start on that issue today by recognizing our investments as a government into health care, whether it was in our very first budget and the investments that we made in health care or the most recent budget, which expands investment into dental care while still looking at pharmacare, as well as investing historic amounts into health care transfer payments and giving a great deal of attention to issues like mental health and long-term care. I would encourage members to reflect on those activities over the last number of years, and I suggest that we are moving forward on the issue of public policy on health care. It is one of the things I am very proud of.

Another issue I want to comment on is housing, because there is a great deal of debate and discussion on it and it is often a topic in question period. We are all concerned about the costs of housing and the shortage of supply, but we have to look at what has actually transpired over the last number of years and what has been incorporated into this budget.

This government established the first housing strategy in our country, committing literally billions of dollars. We have looked at new initiatives, and I have always been a very big fan of housing co-ops. I remember many years ago playing a role in the start-up of

the Weston Housing Co-op. In my riding of Winnipeg North, we have Willow Park and Willow Park East. One of those is likely the oldest housing co-op in Canada, and some have suggested possibly even in North America. Our Minister of Housing has seen co-ops as a viable investment. It is an alternative.

There is a difference between living in an apartment and living in a co-op. In one situation we are a tenant and in the other situation we are a resident. There is a big difference. When we are a resident, we participate in ownership, whereas a tenant will never own the place they are renting. As well, there is a non-profit element in housing co-ops. The expansion of that program will do wonders, and I look forward to possibly seeing some new housing co-op start-ups.

We continue to support provincial governments and the many different non-profit agencies. We have literally tens of thousands of units across the country. I do not know the actual number in the province of Manitoba, but I suspect that probably around 20,000 units are heavily subsidized by Ottawa so that people who are financially challenged have an option in finding a home.

Initiatives within the budget include the intergenerational grants, a program that is going to enable people to look at their current home and maybe build on an addition, often referred to as a granny suite, or establish an independent unit in the yard for a parent to stay with them. The government is making it much easier to do that. It is a program that is very popular, and it will become even more popular once it becomes better known.

● (1640)

We can talk about the idea of renovations. There is the greener homes project, providing thousands of grants and involving tens of thousands of dollars, for people who want to fix up their homes by making their windows or whatever else more energy efficient. When I think of a program like that, I cannot help but think about our environment providing jobs just through the overall housing stock. Investing in home renovations, as we are doing, creates jobs. Renovations are very labour-intensive projects. They create opportunities to have more energy-efficient homes. With programs of this nature, we are improving the overall condition of Canada's housing stock.

We can talk about first-time homebuyers and enhancing that program so that people who are purchasing their homes for the first time have more financing that they can turn to.

We can talk about the millions going into the rapid housing initiative, not to mention the monies that have been there to support agencies like Main Street Project in Winnipeg and others, such as women's shelters. There is so much we have been able to do on the housing front.

Ultimately, I would argue that we have demonstrated that the national government is prepared to lead and work with others, because dealing with the housing crisis that we are in today is going to take more than just the federal government. We will need a higher sense of co-operation, whether it comes from municipalities or from provinces.

At the end of the day, we need to see more land being developed. I believe that we need to see individuals being able to acquire properties, as opposed to having to go through a developer, for example. I think there are ways to have provinces look at some of the reviews for housing condos, co-operatives, life-lease programs or the 55-plus types of programs that are out there. What we know is that there is a high need.

At the end of the day, when talking about housing and the costs of housing, I am very concerned, like all of my colleagues. However, I do not think we should give the false impression, as the opposition side often does, that the government is not taking action. The federal government today has taken more action on this file than many, many other governments before it. We are talking about generations, a historic amount of investment and an incredible number of programs that have been developed and ultimately administered.

I wanted to highlight those two areas because I do not really get to talk too much about those two areas of housing and health care, so I wanted to start off my comments on those.

Having said that, I believe that the big issues in regard to the budget can be rooted right back to having a consistent policy that recognizes that the backbone to Canada's economy is our small businesses, our middle class and those aspiring to be a part of the middle class. This is where the government has done incredible work. From the very beginning, going back to the 2015 election until today, the cabinet and caucus as a whole have been focused on Canada's middle class and their economy.

• (1645)

I would like to cite a few examples of that. Prior to the pandemic taking effect, there were over a million jobs created in those first four or four and a half years. Let us keep in mind that Canada's population is 37 million. It was a million jobs.

It was not just the Government of Canada alone. We worked with partners and stakeholders. That is where a good part of our focus was. We saw incredible amounts of effort put into trade agreements. This government has signed off on more trade agreements than any other government. That is the absolute truth.

In terms of North America and the European Union, those agreements were signed off. I can recall opposition parties saying that this process was derailed, that it was not going to happen.

Canada is a trading nation. We depend on trade. I understand that our trading deficit has virtually evaporated. For years, when I was in opposition, that was not the case. We understand the importance of international trade and we invested a great deal in that area.

Infrastructure is another thing. Infrastructure is so important to all of us. I would challenge any member to demonstrate another government that has committed as much in financial resources toward infrastructure in terms of real dollars. Again we are going into

### *Government Orders*

the billions of dollars. Not only was the government working with municipalities or provinces or other stakeholders, but we also created the Canada Infrastructure Bank.

**Mr. Pat Kelly:** How is that working?

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** It is interesting that I make that comment and then we witness the response coming from the Conservatives, as if it has been—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** It is a laughingstock of an organization.

**Mr. Pat Kelly:** A failure, yes.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** The member says it is a total failure. To my friend who just said that the Infrastructure Bank is a total failure, my recommendation is to maybe do a little Google search. I am sure he can get some high tech going there and find out what the Infrastructure Bank has done.

What will happen is that we will find that the Conservative talking notes are somewhat misleading. I will use an example that I used just the other day. In Brampton, we are seeing fossil-fuelled buses being converted into electric buses. That is happening because of the Canada Infrastructure Bank. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars.

You should think before you say something. You are the finance critic and you should know better—or rather, Madam Speaker, the member opposite who was just heckling should know better.

At the end of the day, let us take a look at the Infrastructure Bank and many of the projects.

**Mr. Pat Kelly:** Read what it says.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Well, do not read your Tory notes.

**Mr. Pat Kelly:** I am reading Wikipedia, and it is pretty good.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Look at the site. Look at the hundreds of millions of dollars that are being spent on this issue. The member might actually be surprised. He might even want to change his talking points on it, because it is delivering in a very real and tangible way.

Our government that has been there to support people, whether it is our seniors through increases to the GIS, one-time payments during the pandemic, the 10% to seniors 75 and over or, as I said yesterday, the hundreds of millions of dollars to non-profit organizations that support our seniors through all sorts of wonderful activities like New Horizons and so forth.

Whether it is supporting small businesses through tax cuts all through the pandemic, wage subsidies, rent support or easier access to loans, all of these have enabled Canada to do relatively well in comparison to the world.

*Government Orders*

• (1650)

I will get another chance, possibly in answers. You will find that Canada is doing exceptionally well.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I need to remind the hon. member to channel his comments, of course, through the Chair, because this has happened on a number of occasions.

\* \* \*

**CRIMINAL CODE**

## BILL C-5—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION

**Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the report stage and third reading stage of Bill C-5, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act.

Under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice that a minister of the Crown will propose at the next sitting a motion to allot a specific number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the respective stages of the said bill.

\* \* \*

**BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2022, NO. 1**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-19, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 7, 2022 and other measures, be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have to go there, because the member raised the Canada Infrastructure Bank, and I have no idea why this member would want to raise that.

Former finance minister Bill Morneau pointed out that the Canada Infrastructure Bank did not do what was intended. This member is trying to say that somehow, if the Canada Infrastructure Bank was not an entity, if it did not exist, municipalities would not be able to purchase electric vehicles or electric buses. That is simply not the case.

Would the member acknowledge that in this budget bill the government is changing the mandate of said institution? Really, all we have seen since this was proposed in 2017 is, year after year, scandalous stories about executives at the Canada Infrastructure Bank getting bonuses. In fact, the previous CEO and president left, and we still do not know what the former minister of infrastructure, Catherine McKenna, who has left this place, gave that member. This has been a complete failure.

Would the member at least acknowledge, with a little humility, that that particular institution put in place by his government has been a failure?

• (1655)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member is known as the shadow finance minister, and the shadow finance minister should know better. We are talking

about dozens of projects. We are talking about over \$30 billion in investments. The finance critic believes that it has not done anything. I do not know what world his mind might be in, but it is obviously not engaged in reality.

At the end of the day, the member is listening to the Conservative spin doctors in the back room. He needs to do some independent research. I would suggest to the shadow minister of finance to take a look at it. If he did that, he would see that it has invested millions. I will use the example of Brampton, which I think is a great example. Does the member not support what is happening in Brampton today because, in part, of what the Infrastructure Bank has done?

**The Deputy Speaker:** This is where I give my daily reminder to keep questions and answer as short as we can so that everyone can participate.

The member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

**Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for speaking about health.

One in five people in this country works in the care economy. Those health care workers and care workers are being exploited in this country. They are immigrants, more often women without secured status; seniors caring for seniors in long-term care homes without, in too many cases, proper PPE, adequate linens or lifting equipment; and nurses, who were not even mentioned in the budget speech. They deserve better.

When will the government respect the women in the care economy by paying them properly, give immigrant care workers immediate permanent status, and give long-term care workers the protection they deserve with legislation?

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, during the pandemic, the federal government gave a number of supports for nurses. They are the backbone of our health care system. Literally millions of dollars were allocated to the provinces to support our nurses.

On a couple of occasions, including the other day, I have had the opportunity to talk with Ambassador Robles from the Philippines. We talked about how many people of Filipino heritage have the skills to be health care providers and nurses, and those skill sets are not necessarily being recognized here, so they are not working as nurses.

There is a wide spectrum in the health care field that we need to improve upon. We have to respect the fact that there is provincial jurisdiction and there is a role for the federal government, but I do believe that the federal government is working with provinces as much as possible. Hopefully, we will be able to continue to have more dialogue on that.

Not recognizing immigrant credentials, in particular, is really quite sad, and it needs to be dealt with. They could contribute so much more to our health care system.

*Government Orders*

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Winnipeg North always gives lengthy responses, and I like that. I like his passion, and of course it is always a pleasure to ask him questions in the House.

My colleague talked about what is in Bill C-19. I am going to ask him about what is not in it.

What is not in Bill C-19 are the health transfers to the provinces and Quebec. These transfers have been requested by all provincial premiers and the Premier of Quebec, all the opposition parties in the House of Commons and all the parties in the Quebec National Assembly. The only ones saying no to health transfers are the Liberals.

My question is very simple. If someone is alone in thinking they are right, could it be because they are wrong?

[*English*]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I addressed that issue at the very beginning of my comments where I said that even when I was the health care critic in the province of Manitoba about 30 years ago, provinces we always asking for more money. It is just something that is an annual thing.

What I found was that during the early nineties, when I was heavily involved in the provincial legislature, there was this threat that we were going to see the federal government get out of financing health care because provinces wanted to continue with the tax point shift, as opposed to a cash over. That is ultimately what I would argue, that back in the late seventies and early eighties there was some consensus that saw tax point shifts. That was part of the problem.

Today, we have health care accords with the different provinces. We understand the importance of health care. That is why I spent the first six or seven minutes talking about health care. Today, we have record amounts of health transfers, and we are looking beyond those in how we can support issues such as mental health and long-term care.

• (1700)

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the Conservatives are not interested in the Infrastructure Bank because of the five objectives it focuses on. It focuses on green infrastructure, clean power, public transit, trade and transportation, and broadband infrastructure. With the exception of one of those, which they might be remotely interested in, the rest are just topics the Conservatives are not interested in.

The reality is that the Canada Infrastructure Bank, and anybody can go to its website to see the projects that are under way through that bank, is providing innovative solutions for municipalities, in particular, and private industry to work with the government, with the expertise that can come along with those partnerships, to deliver real, quite often large-scale, infrastructure projects throughout the country.

Could the parliamentary secretary further expand on the importance of these infrastructure projects right in our local communities

and what that means for the municipalities that are trying to build critical infrastructure for tomorrow?

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, in wanting to be fair to my colleagues across the way in the Conservative Party, I think we need to recognize that they are still trying to determine whether or not climate change is real.

Having said that, as my colleague points out, there is an issue where there is a bias toward the new economy and the importance of recognizing new energies. The point is that we have literally dozens of projects all over Canada. We are talking well over \$30 billion, not \$30 million, but \$30 billion, and the Conservative speaking points that come from the backroom are saying that there is nothing happening in that bank. They need to update their speaking points.

**Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, during the member's speech, he challenged the Conservatives to google the Infrastructure Bank, so I took the opportunity to do so. I found its Wikipedia entry, which has a table that lists the various projects. However, I noticed, according to Wikipedia anyway, that exactly zero of them have been completed. Could the member elaborate on whether the Infrastructure Bank has actually completed any projects since it was established by this government?

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I would think that the member might want to consider expanding his research capabilities and possibly look directly at the Canada Infrastructure Bank website. He will be amazed with how much information he will be able to find there. He will be able to identify the programs that are actually being financed today.

My recommendation is to expand his research capabilities. The Conservative caucus has a lot of money. Let us start doing a little more, and let us start saying some positive things about the Canada Infrastructure Bank.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to stand in this place on behalf of the good people of Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

Today, I am going to be speaking to Bill C-19, but I will also be speaking to some of the points that I am sure the Liberal government may not want to hear. Part of democracy means everyone having a say before a decision is made. As the previous speaker said, there are a number of things where the Liberals accuse us of having blind spots. I would simply say that the same goes for the Liberals. That is why it is important for debates to happen, for those ideas, and for the people at home to be able to make up their own minds. That is something I hope to do today.

*Government Orders*

One of the biggest challenges I believe Canada has right now is not debates over spending too much or not spending enough; it is credibility. There used to be a time when both Liberal and Conservative finance ministers spent considerable time and effort to come to this chamber and say that they had a path to balance. In our history, we have gone through world wars and pandemics. We have had cases where we have even survived Liberal government “spendathons” backed by the NDP, which put Canadian taxpayers on the hook for billions of dollars of debt that took decades to be straightened out, and a lot of pain.

When a finance minister comes to this place and says that the government has a path to balance or a balanced budget, that means a couple of things. Number one, it means that people know that the government has credibility when it lets out a bond and takes money from domestic lenders or from outside of Canada. It also says that the power of the government is in a very strong state, so if it decides to go with an infrastructure spending program or if it feels there is a hole in the safety net, depending on the needs of the day, there would be money for that, and taxpayers, both today and tomorrow, are going to be respected in those transactions.

When I go door knocking and speak to seniors or middle-aged people in my riding of Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, one thing I hear a lot is that they are very concerned that their children and grandchildren do not have the same opportunities they did at that period in their lives, and that in order to get a good job they need more and more education, which comes at great cost. Even if they get that great education, it is not always easy to find the work they need in their area of specialty. Now, there is a lot of work, and I appreciate meeting people who are doing whatever they can to get the skills they need so they can raise a family. However, people are feeling hurt. In all age categories, there is the cost-of-living crisis we are in right now. We have not seen groceries jump 10% since we had another divisive, big tax-and-spend Liberal prime minister in office. It almost plays to a T that we are somewhat repeating history. We have a big-spending government that makes bad choices and hits a debt crisis or oil shocks, and suddenly interest rates go up, inflation starts soaring and everyone is in a load of pain.

The pain people are feeling right now, where they cannot fill up their gas tanks or purchase the same amount of groceries they could just a few months ago, is pain enough, but young people are also feeling that the system does not work for them anymore because they cannot buy a home. They have given up on that. They are just trying to scrape by and do what little they can. Instead of putting their money into something that brings them equity, they are seeing their credit card bills go up to pay for those groceries and to have those little luxuries because they do not have a home. That is a real shame, and I think all of us here recognize that. This is not a partisan issue, when we recognize that a whole generation feels like it is not part of the economy. That is on all of us, and we have to work together to try to find ways to deal with that.

• (1705)

We will have debates in this place. I do not want to say that I have all the answers, but I will say that part of it comes with credibility. People need to know that their government is working for them, that it is not thinking for them but thinking of them. In question period, when I ask questions of the Minister of Finance, I do

not get the sense that she is thinking of Canadians; I think she is thinking for them. She may be well intentioned, but I would also say, and I have been very open with this criticism, that it is a bad decision by the Prime Minister to give so much responsibility to a single individual: to be Deputy Prime Minister, which is an honour, I am sure, and to also be finance minister.

Being a finance minister is a full-time job. I remember seeing Minister Flaherty and how hard he would work. It was good and meaningful work. However, to add to that, by a Prime Minister who seems to be more about the jet-set life and seems to be more about playing a Prime Minister on TV than being a Prime Minister in this place, putting so much responsibility onto one individual, that is not fair to her and it is not fair to this place.

In my experience on the finance committee, we saw large sections of the budget bill just cut. The EI component, which is an incredibly important part, was cut. Why? Everyone agreed the government had botched it. There is so much in this budget bill. There are other things the Liberals have botched, but unfortunately the government members just nod and say they lost something and just keep going on like nothing has happened. That is the problem. The finance minister is too busy, the Prime Minister is too busy doing his own thing, and there is not a focused government in place.

Credibility is so important that when the finance minister says something, it can move markets. Having credibility is so important in a Minister of Finance and in a Prime Minister. Yesterday, Yves Giroux, the Parliamentary Budget Officer who works for all of us in this place, was at a Senate committee, the national finance committee. In response to being asked about whether the government's fiscal position and its numbers were credible, this is what he had to say: “I personally don't believe it is credible that there will be that level of spending restraint in the period 2024 to 2027, given all the expenditures that remain to be implemented by the government over that period of time.” When asked if these planned savings in that time frame were still feasible, he said, “If we were to believe the government's numbers, that would mean that in 2024 to 2027, operating and capital spending would grow by 0.3% per year, which is a level of growth that we have not seen in a long, long time.”

What did I say about moving markets? Actually, the Royal Bank of Canada just put out its macroeconomic outlook, and it said that the bank expects GDP to go down to 1.9% in 2023, which is a marked drop. What we have is very optimistic numbers that are not meeting the test of time. We have inflation shooting up. We have growth dropping down. People are tightening up their wallets so they can pay for filling up their tank, let alone anything else. This is not a good situation. For our Parliamentary Budget Officer to be saying that he cannot trust the numbers and that those numbers seem overly optimistic, that is a big alarm bell.

*Government Orders*

The Liberals are not credible on their budget implementation act. The minister is too busy. There is so much happening, and the Liberal government tries to portray a rosy outlook, that everything is good.

Even today, when the finance minister rose in this chamber, she did not want to talk about inflation, but she said to look over there, that employment is at an all-time high and unemployment is at an all-time low. The Liberals were trying to take credit for baby boomers, who, as we have known for well over a decade, eventually would retire, starting in 2016, and leave en masse. The Liberals are trying to take credit for something the baby boomers are doing themselves, something we all know as the demographics are changing.

• (1710)

This is where the Liberals are at. They are again trying to point away, telling us to look at a number because they do not want us looking at these other numbers. RBC is questioning the economy, and the Parliamentary Budget Officer is questioning the assumptions in the budget. It is up to parliamentarians to ask if what the Liberals are saying is credible. Are they treating government as a serious responsibility or are they going by the seat of their pants? It is sad for me to say that, because I would want any government in power to be credible, especially at times when there is crisis or tumult or trouble.

What else does “credible” mean? It means being credible on the small things and not just on the big macroeconomic level. Never have I seen, and many of my constituents have told me they have not, so much spent by any government in the history of Canada, or at least in their lifetime, with so little to show for it.

Economist Tyler Cowen has been speaking about this a lot in the United States, and it is a great concept for us to look at. It is called “state capacity”. In my mind, state capacity is having a military that can blow things up, having hospitals that can handle a pandemic, and having the ability to do everything in between. It is having a Service Canada office that can get us passports in a timely manner. It is having a military that can replace a 50-year-old Browning pistol without having to go through multiple procurements. This is something the Minister of National Defence is going to have to wrestle with.

I know the Liberals do not want to talk about health care transfers. They talk about how they are doing all these other things. However, premiers unanimously say that the one thing they ask for from the federal government is to supply them with more health care transfers. Given what we have seen in our health care system, we can see why they are asking for that. I personally believe that our health care system needs to change. A lot of those arguments need to happen at the provincial level, because a one-size-fits-all, Ottawa-knows-best policy is not good for this country. There is a reason provinces have the responsibility for health care.

If the Liberals do not want to give health care transfers, then maybe they could stick to their promises from 2019, and again in 2021, when they said they would hire and bring in all these doctors and nurses. In British Columbia, it is critical. There are places like Merritt and northern parts of the province that need to shut down

the only emergency clinics they have because they do not have health care professionals.

If there is one thing the government can do, it is to just own up to its own commitment. It made the commitment, and if it cannot keep it, it should stand in this chamber and tell us that it cannot do that, and why. Was it a bad idea to begin with, or was it just being used as a way to get votes?

Yesterday I was on a show, and an esteemed Liberal colleague was also on it. He accused Conservatives of using a gimmick. He said that our motion to take the GST off home heating, electricity, gasoline and diesel was just a gimmick. For so long, groceries have been exempt from the GST, because they are life-sustaining. I do not think any political party disagrees that we should not be applying GST to foodstuff, which allows families to feed themselves. I think that is a consensus and I do not see anyone ever changing that.

We are telling the government, during this period of time, to just stop. It is getting windfall monies from oil and other commodities going up and it is getting all sorts of money coming in from inflation. In 2017, the government made all user fees by the Government of Canada go along with inflation, with the CPI, and what happened? That is inflationary policy. The government has never had so much money.

• (1715)

A little bit of work on the health care front would be helpful. A little bit of help by supporting common-sense, pragmatic suggestions, like suspending the GST, would go so far, yet the NDP-Liberals voted against that. Those members will say that we have all of these programs, like CPP and the Canada child benefit, which are all indexed to inflation. That means it is going to come down the road, and it is not here now at the time of the emergency.

The government has the money to do this, but the Liberals just do not want to use a Conservative suggestion, and that is wrong. It should not be based on who proposes an idea to decide whether or not it has merit. It should be whether the idea itself has merit. That is a problem in this chamber. I would hope that members in caucus would speak to it when they hear a good idea, and whether it comes from the NDP, the Bloc, the Liberals, the Conservatives or the independents, that they would take it to their caucus and try to work with it.

I will continue to go through a couple of things quickly. Let us take capacity. In the port of Vancouver, we know we that we have supply chain issues from the COVID pandemic. We can look at what happened in Shanghai. All those ports were shut down, with thousands of boats waiting to take products to other countries.

*Government Orders*

The port of Vancouver was rated recently by the World Bank in a survey as being one of the worst in the developed world. The Minister of Transport needs to get out to Vancouver and start looking at how to fix this. He cannot just say that it is someone else's responsibility. Yes, there is an independent authority, and I am sure it is trying its best, but at some point the government has to be accountable. If we want to deal with inflation, we should expect that our ports are able to run. Again, the survey did not call out many of the other ports in the United States. We should at least be at the same level as those other ones.

Look at the shemozzle at Pearson airport. It is terrible what people are having to go through. Blacklock's Reporter did a story on this today. The government decided it did not want to hire people back as aggressively and now we are at this particular stage. Yes, the mask mandates, and as I like to say "my way or the highway" mandate for travel are causing all sorts of issues. However, the Liberals are not showing up when it counts. They are not putting their hands on the wheel like we would expect a minister of the Crown to do.

I want to talk about productivity. Recently there were some comments from Bill Morneau, the former minister of finance. I am going to read what he said:

So much time and energy was spent on finding ways to redistribute Canada's wealth that there was little attention given to the importance of increasing our collective prosperity — let alone developing a disciplined way of thinking and acting on the problem," Morneau said in prepared remarks.

That says what this government has done on productivity. In its own budget, the government is saying that in Canada, it expects investment levels to remain low because people do not see us as a credible place to invest. The NDP wants to add all sorts of new taxes, and this government actually put a retroactive tax last year on the banks. We can have arguments about that, but when the government does those kinds of things, it sends out a chill on investment.

To conclude, this government needs to get serious, and this government needs to focus. It has not done that, but I hope it does.

I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:

Bill C-19, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 7, 2022, and other measures, be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Standing Committee on Finance for the purpose of reconsidering the clauses in Division 15 of Part 5, amending the Competition Act, with the view to incorporate the consultation measures industry has been asking for.

I would appreciate hearing what members have to say and answering a few questions.

• (1720)

**The Deputy Speaker:** The amendment is in order.

Questions and comments, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate).

• (1725)

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I hope the Conservatives are aware of the fact that the only thing their amendment does when it is moved right after a bill

is introduced is give the member for Winnipeg North another opportunity to speak. That is great for the member for Winnipeg North, but I am feeling really left out, because I will only have one opportunity to speak on this.

The Conservatives are relentless in talking about, to quote the member, "a path to balance" in terms of the budget. Personally, I like to focus more on our debt-to-GDP ratio, and I will say why. It is more important because our country has added a million more people to it since 2015. Why is that important when we consider the debt-to-GDP ratio? That is a million more people who require services, a million more people who require infrastructure, but a million more people who, for decades to come, will be helping to fund the tax base that this country relies on.

Can the member not accept the fact that the debt-to-GDP ratio is more important? I would remind him to look back at the Conservatives' platform from last fall, where the Conservatives proposed to run a higher deficit than we did. That was the member for Durham, who is no longer the leader, but nonetheless—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Madam Speaker, it is excellent to hear the member complain about the member for Winnipeg North.

I would simply say this. First of all, we proposed in the last election to shore up our health care system. It is something that every province wanted, including my own province. John Horgan, on behalf of all of the provincial premiers, asked that there not be any new spending or new social programs and to help provinces sustain their health care system. We put that forward because we felt it was a bedrock thing to do. Right now in my riding, emergency rooms are closing in certain communities on very short notice.

I would also say that the net debt-to-GDP ratio is going to be affected. RBC, in its macroeconomic outlook, is downgrading Canada's growth. That is huge. If we cannot build new homes, we are going to see it continue. Two out of five new Canadians who were surveyed said they were thinking of leaving Canada because they could not find a home, that it was not affordable.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I heard my colleague say that one solution to helping people deal with the rising cost of living could be to lift consumption taxes, which was part of the Conservative motion yesterday. However, I wonder if the government is even prepared to lift or lower these taxes.

Does my colleague agree with me that these taxes are there for a reason? Taxes are paid and sent to the federal government so that we receive services in return.

I feel that the public is not being provided adequate services right now, as demonstrated by the incredible delays in processing passport applications. The same applies to resolving EI fraud cases, with people spending hours on the phone before they get service.

Does my colleague not think that if the federal government is not prepared to lift or lower these taxes, it should at least provide these services to the public in a timely manner?

[English]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** I am afraid the time is a bit too short for the hon. member to answer the question fully, so we will return to him after Private Members' Business hour. The hon. member will have six and a half minutes remaining in questions and comments. I do not want to cut the member off when he is answering.

It being 5:30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1730)

[English]

### CONSERVATION OF FISH STOCKS AND MANAGEMENT OF PINNIPEDS ACT

The House resumed from April 28 consideration of the motion that C-251, An Act respecting the development of a federal framework on the conservation of fish stocks and management of pinnipeds, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Mike Kelloway (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to debate private member's Bill C-251, an act respecting the development of a federal framework on the conservation of fish stocks and management of pinnipeds.

Let me start by saying that I appreciate the passion of the member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame on the issue of seal predation. It is something that almost all of us from Atlantic Canada are deeply concerned about, but like most things in the House, it is one where the details really matter.

To date, our approach to pinniped management has focused on a sustainable, well-regulated seal harvest that supports Canada's indigenous, rural, coastal and remote populations. This approach is informed by the best available scientific evidence.

Let us focus on those words: scientific evidence. Would it shock members of the House to learn that the member's bill does not mention the word "science" once? Perhaps not when you consider that during the time of the last Conservative government, a great deal of cutting and slashing was done in science and to scientists. Indeed, it was what many people in my part of the world called a decade of darkness when it comes to science.

Instead of basing this proposed framework of pinniped management on science, the member suggested an annual census of all pinnipeds. There are 11 different types of pinnipeds in Canada and an

### Private Members' Business

annual census would cost the government approximately \$30 million a year. I know this was likely not the intent of the member when he wrote the bill, but as I said earlier, in this House details matter, and the bills we pass have consequences.

It is concerning that Bill C-251 does not mention science, not only because of the \$30-million-a-year census, but because of our trading partners and what they expect in terms of our management decisions based in science.

Take, for example, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the MMPA, in the United States. The MMPA contains important measures to reduce the impact of commercial fishing on marine mammals. It is one of the reasons we have worked so hard to protect the endangered North Atlantic right whale and one of my key concerns with the bill.

With no reference to science and an expectation that the government regulate the population of pinnipeds to acceptable levels, this bill could expose Canada and the fish and seafood sector to economic risk that a more protectionist American administration could take advantage of.

Seventy per cent of Canada's fish and seafood exports went to the United States in 2021. I cannot in good conscience support a bill that could create numerous vulnerabilities to this critical industry, an industry that I cherish, that we cherish.

That is why when the sponsor of Bill C-251 moved a motion at the fisheries and oceans committee this past January that we study the issue of pinniped predation, I was pleased to vote for it.

The motion read, in part:

That the committee undertake a comprehensive study of pinnipeds that would examine the ecosystem impacts of pinniped overpopulation in the waters of Quebec, eastern and western Canada; international experience in pinniped stock management; the domestic and international market potential for various pinniped products; social acceptability; and the social cultural importance of developing active management of predation for coastal and first nations communities with access to the resource;

It was to my surprise actually when the member opposite, who said we needed to study this issue in order to address it, came forward with a solution without ever having done the work for it. We would not accept this anywhere else, and it should not fly in Parliament.

*Private Members' Business*

There is a clear need for us to grow the market on seal products. I think we would all agree with that. The issue is that last year we had a total allowable catch for harp seals. In 2016, the TAC that year was 400,000 for harp seals, but only 68,317, which is 17% of the quota, were caught. Since 2016, so few have been caught that there no longer is a TAC. In 2021, only 26,545 harp seals, less than half, were caught.

We know that more work needs to be done to address this issue. That is why last month we released the Atlantic Science Seal Task Team report and set out a plan of action on this issue to grow our research capabilities, listen to harvesters and invest in the marketability of seal products.

The right way to address this issue is a whole-of-government approach, which I hope the member opposite will support, rather than through a private member's bill that would have potential serious ramifications.

• (1735)

When we get down to it, the intent of the bill, in my opinion, is flawed. It is not only unnecessary; it is an issue we are already addressing right now in a comprehensive way thanks to the hard work of the Newfoundland and Labrador caucus. We should be talking about how we strengthen the summit that is coming up in the fall, what will come out of the summit and what we are doing to address the report, rather than sending this bill to committee.

Clearly, as has been said before, seals eat fish. They are not vegans. We now have the tools to fill in the knowledge gaps that the task force team identified and invest in the marketability of seal products.

I think we can all agree that we need to tackle this problem thoughtfully, comprehensively, tactically and strategically, with a focus on outcomes, because like everything in the House, the details matter. Sadly, Bill C-251 is just not ready for prime time.

**Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP):** *Uqaqtittiji*, I am very pleased to represent Nunavut, and I thank my constituents for their continued faith and trust in me to represent them in matters as important as those contained within in this bill.

I take this opportunity to share the meaning of my surname Idlout, pronounced in Inuktitut as *illauq*. Translated into English, it means “embryo of marine mammals”, like walrus and seals. Indeed, seals have always been important in my life.

Before my main points, I must acknowledge the great work of my colleague, the member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith, who sought my advice on this bill and understands the importance of protecting indigenous people's rights. I must also share my appreciation for the member for Labrador. I have tremendous respect for the effort she has made to destigmatize all seal hunts. I appreciate all her efforts in showing how we all can use seal products in everyday life, including in clothes and jewellery, as a part of our diet and as sources of important vitamins, like omega-3s.

Of course, I thank the sponsor of this bill, the member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, for putting this matter before the House and beginning the dialogue.

I would like to talk about three key points regarding this proposed legislation. First is that seal harvests in Canada by non-indigenous people are as important as seal hunts by indigenous people. Next is my personal belief that wildlife harvesting and management must be founded upon and practised through an indigenous lens. Finally, the sustainable management of our natural resources can and should support local and regional economic development.

To give a brief history, after the drastic impact of the anti-seal hunt campaigns, the next link in this chain of damage to our reliance on the seal hunt has been the many comments that I hear from Qallunaat. While Qallunaat translated into English means “white people”, I will use it for all non-indigenous people.

Basically, what we hear from Qallunaat is that they support the indigenous seal hunt, but they do not support the east coast seal hunt. I am quite sure many Inuit are told this. I am quite sure that many Inuit say that this is just as damaging as the initial anti-seal hunt campaigns that decimated the Inuit economy in the 1980s.

What many people do not realize is that the discrimination against the east coast seal harvest is damaging the opportunities to support the economy of Inuit as well. It should not be this way. We are a large, diverse and rich country with enough for everyone. We should support one another in all matters, including the seal harvest or hunt, and the sustainable management of our fish stocks, other wildlife and other natural resources.

For that reason, I am happy to support those who would be directly affected by this legislation, just as I hope they would support Nunavummiut in our pursuit of a healthy, sustainable and prosperous future, and the successful and sustainable management of our natural resources.

I turn now to the need to use the indigenous lens for better wildlife management.

Throughout Canada's first nations, Inuit and Métis communities, people will find a wealth of local knowledge and traditions related to sustainable living and the harvesting of wildlife. This knowledge and these traditions have helped us successfully and sustainably manage our natural resources for millennia in our territories.

• (1740)

In Nunavut, we have *Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit*, Inuit traditional knowledge, which is the body of knowledge and unique cultural insights of Inuit regarding the workings of nature, humans and animals. The Nunavut Impact Review Board applied the principles of *Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit* in its decision-making on economic development projects that impact Nunavummiut and recently rejected phase two of the Mary River Mine's proposal to expand the project, which clearly violated these principles.

I encourage the use of similar local indigenous knowledge and principles elsewhere in Canada and for the east coast seal harvest, in particular. However, there is no mention of such traditional and sustainable practices in this bill, and I worry that if it is passed, it would do nothing more than promote a cull of seals instead of a useful harvest that benefits the local populations while ensuring the sustainability of their way of life moving forward.

Finally, my third point is the importance of sustainable management of our natural resources to support local and regional economic development. This final point is where I think the member's well-intentioned bill is far too narrow in its focus.

In the 1970s and throughout the 1980s and 1990s, individuals and groups targeted the livelihood and well-being of Inuit and others living in the north and mounted a fierce campaign against commercial seal harvests. Markets for seal products in the United States and the European Union were practically eliminated overnight thanks to these well-intended but badly misguided campaigns.

To its credit, in 1985, Greenpeace apologized for the unforeseen and negative impact that these campaigns had upon Inuit and non-Inuit harvesting communities, but the damage done has been lasting and severe. I fear that this bill, if passed, would simply encourage more campaigns against our way of life and inflict even more lasting economic damage on our communities since it would likely result in a simple cull rather than a harvest of seal populations.

I think there is a better approach. We should apply the indigenous lens that I spoke of earlier, which embraces the more modern ecosystem approach, to manage our natural resources. Indeed, the indigenous-led approach and ecosystem approach are practically one and the same. By sustainably managing our precious natural resources, such as the various seal populations in our oceans and the fish they consume, we can build confidence in the international community that we are not wastefully killing animals but ethically harvesting them in a sustainable manner that makes use of every part of these beautiful creatures: the fur to keep us warm, the meat to keep us fed and the omega-3 rich oil and other parts that keep us healthy.

We should be better regulating seal products, creating and growing markets abroad, particularly in Europe and China, and using the trade and sale of these products to help Inuit and non-Inuit northern communities improve their standard of living, while protecting our traditional way of life. As this bill proposes, we should conserve fish stocks as well.

Because of these and other issues with the bill, I will not be voting in support of it, but I want to thank the hon. member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame for sponsoring this legislation and

### *Private Members' Business*

beginning this important dialogue in this 44th Parliament. I hope we can work together to support our communities and work toward successfully managing seal and fish populations in a way that embraces and protects our traditional ways of life and improves the standard of living of those we represent for generations to come.

• (1745)

**Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is a real privilege to stand in support of a colleague who is sitting right in front of me, the member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame. I am honoured to support the bill, and I want to speak to how it would positively impact our northern communities if it passes.

Pinniped harvesting has a long history in Canada, especially for our indigenous and northern communities, and I want to get into exactly that. I will first read one little part of the bill, which explains what we are supporting here tonight. The bill would establish “a federal framework on the conservation of fish stocks and management of pinnipeds.”

There is a bit of a longer paragraph. Subclause 3(1) of the bill states, “The Minister must, in consultation with representatives of the provincial governments responsible for fisheries, the environment and trade, with Indigenous governing bodies and with other relevant stakeholders, develop a federal framework on the conservation of fish stocks and management of pinnipeds.”

Many in the House know I have been working on the conservation of threatened stocks, especially when it relates to my home province of British Columbia, but I also have a role as the northern affairs shadow minister, and I am very concerned about the negative effects on those communities.

I am going to speak about, first of all, our indigenous communities. My NDP colleague down the way already referenced the right to harvest pinnipeds, so I am just going to read something out. This is from a government document from 2017. It is a backgrounder for pinniped harvesting. It states, “Nevertheless, subsistence harvests are in effect for these three species because Indigenous peoples in Canada have a constitutionally protected right to harvest marine mammals, including seals, as long as the harvest is consistent with conservation needs and other requirements.”

Supporting the member down the way, we absolutely support those rights, and we support that way of life and the ability to continue on.

*Private Members' Business*

We have a long history of harvesting in Canada, and another quote from that same document states, “[f]or thousands of years, seals have provided food, clothing and heat for people living in challenging northern regions’ and continue to do so for many Indigenous peoples and northern communities.” It continues, “In the Arctic, sealing continues to play an important role in Inuit life, which can be seen in ‘the rich vocabulary in the Inuktitut language for different species, varieties and characteristics of seals.’”

I think we all recognize this is an important part of culture in our country and it is an important part of our future. Again, the member is wishing to have it come back to the way it once was, but let me speak to the problems with what happened to the industry.

Back in 1972, the U.S. had the Marine Mammal Protection Act, which basically closed out access of the pinniped harvest and pinniped products to the North American market and our American friends. There were huge impacts to that industry. Most of the folks affected were in northern communities and indigenous communities that made their living from harvesting pinnipeds. That was the first blow to the industry.

I am going to get into some numbers in a minute, but I want to talk about the second blow, which was really dramatic. In 2009, we had the European ban on pinniped products. What I am getting at is that, even though we had rights that were protected by our constitution for indigenous communities to harvest pinnipeds, we saw the market absolutely collapse. That really collapsed the entire economy around pinnipeds in this country.

I have some evidence of what happened. In 2004 there was a landed value, which is for Canadian pinniped values. In 2004, it was \$14,862,415. By 2006, it had grown to \$30 million, and then there was the absolute collapse. By 2015, it had gone down to \$1,126,912. It was absolutely a massive collapse of the market.

• (1750)

The member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame is trying to get that industry back on its feet again. The reason we are talking about this tonight, and I am about defending the bill, is the effects of having an out-of-control pinniped population on our coasts.

We have members on all sides of the House that say they care about salmon and southern resident killer whales and all the rest, but guess what eats a lot of fish. Killer whales eat fish too, but when pinnipeds are absolutely collapsing stocks of other fish, sometimes there is not much left for those other species to eat because there is an overpopulation, a massive imbalance in the ecosystem as a result of this harvest basically ceasing to exist. It still happens, but on a much smaller scale.

The member is trying to have an answer to the imbalance in the ecosystem and for an industry that has been flattened and the communities that have been negatively affected by this collapse. How about we do something in Parliament? We have that agreement across the way, but I am hearing from the Liberals and NDP now that they are pulling back their support, which is interesting because this industry is so key in their communities. It is so easy to support, and I am surprised that they would be pulling back their support at this time.

Again, what the member is trying to do is a positive change for not only the pinniped industry but also the communities that benefit from it. I want to read one part of the bill to highlight a specific section for those who say they care about conservation and threatened stocks. Subclause 3(1) reads, “The Minister must, in consultation with representatives of the provincial governments responsible for fisheries, the environment and trade, with Indigenous governing bodies and with other relevant stakeholders develop a federal framework on the conservation of fish stocks”, which is the crux of the whole bill.

First of all, we are going to help fish stocks big time. For salmon, we call it the brick wall of pinnipeds on our coastlines, and not many get through. Again, if the government is talking big about conservation and really doing something positive for the ecosystem and for salmon as an example on both coasts, this is the answer to that. The other benefit that benefits both communities in a huge way is that we would get our pinniped industry back again.

My hope is, especially for members affected in Newfoundland and in the north in the territories, which are affected by having a positive pinniped industry, that they will have some really long thoughts about the consideration of supporting the bill. It is great. It is going to be good for every coastline that we have. It will be positive for the communities that reside on the coastlines and in our north.

For the sake of my fellow member on fisheries and oceans, Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, my hope is that we can all come to an agreement and support the bill.

• (1755)

**Ms. Yvonne Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and to the Minister of Northern Affairs, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, there is nothing like a good motion on seals to get some debate going in the House of Commons.

I think this has been the story of our legacy in Canada since the 1980s whenever the word “seal” popped up in the context of Atlantic Canada, northern Canada or Quebec. The fact that people depended upon it for their livelihood or the potential for product has always stirred tremendous amounts of debate. The member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame has stimulated some good debate around seals again.

I am happy to speak to this motion, because I really believe that this bill comes from a place of wanting to do something to protect the ecosystems of the ocean and to build upon a good product that could be a very good source of protein and oil for many around the world. We see that as well. We see that as members. I listened to my colleague, the member for Nunavut, when she spoke very eloquently about the industry. Like me, she grew up in this industry. It has been the source of food, clothing and heat for so many generations and centuries of Inuit people, coastal people and people around different ocean areas of Canada.

Since 1986, we have had more than 20 particular studies, reports and committees on seals, starting with “Seals and Sealing in Canada”. The whole purpose of that first report was to identify the dependency upon on seal and sealing in Canada, and the people who depended on that resource.

Unfortunately, since 1986 nothing has really generated out of the sealing industry because of the activist groups, the protests and animal rights groups that identified indigenous people and people who hunt for seal as barbaric. They were identified as people who had no respect for the ocean or for the environment. That was completely wrong.

Their actions not only caused us to have a problem of the overpredation of seals we have today, but also their actions erased the livelihoods of so many people in northern and coastal communities who depended on the hunt, and so many indigenous people as well.

Today, we have a problem in Canada where our ocean ecosystem is not being protected. Our ocean ecosystem of fish species is being depleted by the overpredation of seals. I want to give some information that comes right from DFO reports. It says that, commercially, in Newfoundland and Labrador, we take a little over 200,000 metric ton of fish in a commercial year in a fishery. Gray seals alone are eating 1.6 million metric tons of fish.

That is 1.6 million metric tons being taken by seals, but only 200,000 metric tons being taken by commercial fishers. That is why we have a problem in the ocean ecosystem. That is why we have capelin stocks that are going down. That is why, for 30 years in Newfoundland and Labrador, we have cod stocks that have not rebuilt. That is why fishermen are constantly sending pictures of crab grounds where crab stocks are falling, but seals are being found with their stomachs full of small crab and full of shrimp. They are consuming the shellfish populations, which is now provoking a decline. Where I live, the most beautiful rivers in the world for salmon, we see seal in the salmon rivers. It is a problem.

● (1800)

I know where my colleague is coming from in identifying the problem and that it needs to be fixed. That is why the minister had the task force on seals. She actually commissioned a number of people across Newfoundland and Labrador. The task force was completed and the recommendations are in. I have to say that she is the first federal fisheries minister I have ever heard stand up and admit that seals eat fish.

At one time we had a minister named John Efford from Newfoundland and Labrador in this honourable House. He was not the minister of fisheries at the time, but he told people over and over again that seals eat fish, that they do not eat turnips. Like my colleague from Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame said, “They don't eat Mary Brown's.” No, they do not. They eat fish. Finally we have a minister who has recognized that and agrees. Now we need to do something about it. The summit that will be launched by the Government of Canada through the minister is to deal with just that.

I support the premise of my colleague's bill. I think it comes from a place of recognition. He recognizes there is a problem, as I do. We also know that we cannot have a bill that talks about man-

### *Private Members' Business*

aging the industry and that talks about “year-round control of pinnipeds in order to manage their numbers and mitigate the detrimental effect these marine mammals are having” on the ocean. I think that is where my colleague from Nunavut was coming from. Yes, that concerns me as well.

I think that whatever we do has to be based on science. It has to be with input from indigenous people and from the industry. I believe it has to be linked to product development and to markets. That means there is a lot of work to do. I am finally pleased to say that we are prepared to do that work. I am pleased to see that my colleague is interested in working with us to make that happen, as I am pleased to see the member for Nunavut is willing to work with us to make that happen.

I want to appeal to all of those out there who want to act on conservation and who have a conscience when it comes to conservation. We live in a country today where our ocean ecosystem is in danger. Today is World Oceans Day, a day when we stand up to protect the oceans. Since the 1980s, no one has stood up to protect the people who fell through the cracks due to the activism against the seal industry. Our people suffered. They suffered and they suffer today. Today we would have an industry and we would not have an ocean predation problem, but because the activists won out and beat down the ordinary individuals who live in northern indigenous and coastal communities, that did not happen.

Today here in this House we have a problem and we need to deal with that problem. I say to the member opposite that if his bill passes second reading and goes to committee, I will be happy to propose some amendments to the bill that would include consultation with indigenous peoples, that would include the industry and that would make sure that it is based on science.

In the meantime, I will be there to support the Minister of Fisheries in the work that we are doing as a government because it is important work. It will involve engaging the industry. It will involve developing good markets for seal proteins, seal oils and seal products. It will include making sure that we have good products, good markets and a good industry that will support all of the people in Canada who depend upon seals.

For us, seals are sacred, so we take this seriously, but so are our oceans. We need to protect them and create balance. There is a lot of work to do here. I hope that my colleagues will see that important work and support the options that the government has laid out.

● (1805)

**Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to speak to Bill C-251 put forward by my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame.

*Private Members' Business*

The hon. member continues important work undertaken by his predecessor, Mr. Scott Simms, who served in the House from 2004 to 2021. In addition to being chair of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, Mr. Simms was also instrumental in the passage of Bill S-208, in 2017, to establish a national seal products day.

It has been and continues to be an honour to work with the members for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, and I am grateful for their unyielding commitment to conservation and sound fisheries management for indigenous and coastal communities in Newfoundland and Labrador and beyond.

Bill C-251 proposes to establish a requirement for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to develop a federal framework on the conservation of fish stocks and management of pinnipeds.

At the outset, I note that this bill's proposed requirement, I believe, is necessitated by the refusal of successive Liberal fisheries ministers to make management decisions needed to conserve and restore Canada's fisheries. In particular, I am talking about fisheries being decimated by populations of pinnipeds, like seals and sea lions, that government inaction has allowed to grow unmanaged.

What is the problem that this bill is seeking to remedy? Well, pinniped populations on Canada's coasts have been allowed to expand unchecked through decades of anti-use and anti-harvest ideologies. As pinniped populations have increased, their impacts, especially predation, have caused a domino effect of imbalances throughout ecosystems and food webs. What my colleague is seeking with this legislation is what I believe all parties want: timely and effective fisheries management to restore balance and to conserve and rebuild Canada's fish stocks.

In the face of sound science, this government has refused to accept or produce a plan to manage pinniped populations that are exacting a great toll on fish stocks, including some that are in critical states. It is as if successive fisheries ministers of this government have chosen to ignore the reality that has been described and defined by scientists, experts, indigenous and non-indigenous fishers and Canadians across our country.

For instance, three years ago, in 2019, the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, known as FOPO, received testimony from Mr. Robert Bison, a fisheries biologist with the Government of British Columbia. Mr. Bison spoke to the plight of steelhead in B.C. and stated that the “evidence to date suggests that the most likely causes responsible for the decline and survival of abundance include an increase in predation in the inshore marine habitats; increased predation from marine mammals, particularly pinnipeds”.

Mr. Bison went on to testify that all factors of steelhead declines are partially or wholly human-induced effect and that the increase in pinniped populations particularly is largely attributed to marine mammal protection in both Canada and the U.S. He also testified that, in terms of the evidence of causal factors, pinniped predation in the inshore waters actually ranked among the strongest causal factor, not only for steelhead, but for many salmon populations as well.

At the fisheries committee's meeting on June 5, 2019, Dr. Eric Taylor of the University of British Columbia also appeared. In his

testimony, Dr. Taylor stated that he supported bold action required to deal with the pinniped issue. He said, “That there may be some uncertainty as to the exact effect of pinnipeds is exactly why bold action is needed.” He went to say, “Instead of residing in this sort of atmosphere of speculation, we can actually provide some management actions to reduce numbers in an experimental approach to try to understand the situation better.”

Here we have two experienced fisheries experts describing to parliamentarians how increased pinniped populations are directly damaging fish populations, including some that are in critical or worse conditions.

● (1810)

At the same meeting in which Mr. Bison and Dr. Taylor provided their testimony, DFO's director for the Pacific region, Ms. Rebecca Reid, also appeared as a witness and provided testimony that clearly reflected the government's refusal to manage known and detrimental ecosystem factors, such as pinniped predation in order to support conservation and recoveries of wild fish and marine species.

In her testimony, Ms. Reid told the committee:

In our view, the question about pinnipeds is outstanding. We have done some work. There has been a recent symposium. There is some additional work going on. I would say that the impact of pinnipeds on these species is not entirely clear.

That was three years ago, and the government and its officials continue to stonewall pinniped management actions to save fish populations like Fraser River steelhead and Pacific salmon from being wiped out by out-of-control populations of pinnipeds.

In 2020, Dr. Carl Walters from the University of British Columbia's Institute for the Oceans and Fisheries appeared at the fisheries committee. Dr. Walters has been doing research on Pacific salmon populations for over 50 years, focused particularly on understanding why there have been severe declines in salmon and herring populations.

Dr. Walters testified how he has come to believe that the declines have been substantially due to massive increases in seal and sea lion populations and their predation impacts as the number of pinnipeds on the Pacific coast today is probably double what it was for the last several thousand years, when first nations people harvested them intensively.

Dr. Walters described how major increases in Steller sea lion populations in B.C. waters outside the Georgia Strait have contributed to Fraser sockeye declines and collapses of two of B.C.'s major herring stocks on the west coast of Vancouver Island and Haida Gwaii. Scientists like Dr. Walters are not only raising the alarm over pinniped populations but they are also proposing viable solutions.

Dr. Walters contributed to one such proposal that he helped the Pacific Balance Pinniped Society develop for commercial and first nations harvesting of seals and sea lions, which is aimed at reducing these pinniped populations and sustaining them at the levels that existed when first nations harvesting maintained balances at ecosystems levels.

As Mr. Bison testified, increases in pinniped populations particularly are largely human induced and attributed to marine mammal protection in both Canada and the U.S. I assume the human decision-makers of the day had good intentions when they introduced protections for marine mammals, but as the decision-makers of today, what are our intentions?

Should we be following science data? Should we take action as pinnipeds in B.C. waters drive our steelhead and salmon populations to extinction? Should we expect the government direction to drive recovery of cod and mackerel stocks in Canada's Atlantic waters? Should indigenous communities have the right to participate in restoring ecosystem balance through predator management?

From my Conservative colleagues and me, the answers to these four questions are yes, yes, yes and yes. As we see many of Canada's fish stocks continue to decline under the current management regime of preservation based on ideologies instead of conservation based on science, I hope members from all parties will agree that action, not just more studies and talk, needs to happen in our waters to rebuild fish stocks.

I hope hon. colleagues from all parties will support this bill and vote yes, because it is necessary. Timely and effective pinniped management is necessary to restore balance in ecosystems to give our fisheries, the fishers and the communities that depend on them a chance to survive.

• (1815)

**Mr. Clifford Small (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for engaging in this very important debate on the future of balance and biodiversity in our ocean ecosystems and the impact that it has on the coastal and indigenous groups who rely on them.

Since the 1970s, pinniped populations have risen exponentially on the east and west coasts of Canada as harvesting virtually ended. The indigenous communities that relied on selling pinniped products saw their markets disappear as a result of foreign sanctions on Canadian seal products and witnessed the destruction of their way of life. As pinniped populations rose, commercial and sport fishers took vast conservation measures, and in fact completely stopped harvesting some species, such as Atlantic salmon and northern cod. These conservation measures have not worked, because pinnipeds know no seasons and have few natural predators.

In Atlantic Canada, for example, Canadian science says that seals consume 24 times the total commercial yearly catch. Norwegian science suggests seals consume double that amount. Seal populations in Atlantic Canada total over 10 million; once, that figure was less than two million. Seals now live in our estuaries, waiting to clean out what is left of our struggling Atlantic salmon.

On the west coast of Canada, seal and sea lion populations have increased tenfold. These populations now consume 50% of young

### *Private Members' Business*

salmon and steelhead as they enter the ocean and millions of returning adults every year. This destroys the livelihoods of indigenous fishers, the vast sport fishing industry and the commercial fishery. Even southern resident killer whales that rely on salmon to survive and feed their young are being out-competed for food.

Bill C-251, an act respecting the development of a federal framework on the conservation of fish stocks and management of pinnipeds, is meant to address these issues and help restore balance by managing pinniped populations. With indigenous involvement, we can educate the world about the ecological and cultural disaster that is taking place. The framework that gets developed under this bill will ensure that the government works to break down trade barriers to our products so that we can harvest pinnipeds and have full utilization to supply healthy protein, oil and eco-friendly clothing to world markets.

I have listened to questions and concerns raised by my parliamentary colleagues regarding aspects of Bill C-251 and I am open to amendments when this bill gets to committee. Some have suggested that this bill could result in a cull. There is no language in this bill calling for a cull, but at committee the language can be firmed up to ensure this.

Others have mentioned they do not like the clause about anti-predator mechanisms. That clause can go.

The minister said she cannot support the bill because the yearly cost of the census will be over \$30 million. The clause calling for a yearly census can be amended out of this bill as well.

A minister from my province recently said that harvesting seals could lead to sanctions against our seafood products; Norway hunts seals and whales and is the second-largest supplier of seafood to the U.S. market, but activists mislead our politicians to believe that if we harvest pinnipeds, we will be sanctioned. Right now Russia is pumping unsanctioned crab into that very same market, so we should have no fear of hollow-threat sanctions.

Another MP told me I should be happy that this bill has raised awareness, that the minister has committed to another study and a conference, and that the bill is not needed now. Awareness will not restore indigenous livelihoods or return balance to our oceans.

### Government Orders

Governments come and go. They make promises to take action, to complete more science and the like, but indigenous and fishing industry stakeholders have witnessed the results of years of empty promises, inaction and lack of direction in pinniped management.

Our coastal and indigenous communities are counting on all members of this House to support this bill at second reading so that they can come to the table and fine-tune it at committee. The framework it would create would restore our culture, our livelihoods and the biodiversity of our oceans, and bring this ecological disaster to an end.

I encourage all members of this House to put party politics aside and vote for the greater good of all our coastal and indigenous communities.

• (1820)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The question is on the motion.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

**Mr. Clifford Small:** Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 25, 2021, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, June 15, 2022, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

SITTING SUSPENDED

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** We will suspend until 6:30 p.m.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 6:21 p.m.)

SITTING RESUMED

(The House resumed at 6:30 p.m.)

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1830)

[*English*]

### BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2022, NO. 1

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-19, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 7, 2022 and other measures, be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, on reply to a comment.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I certainly appreciate the question from the hon. member from Quebec. In her question, she asked whether I support less taxes and at the same time strong services being provided by government. It reminds me of an answer I received at a

business luncheon from my predecessor, the Hon. Stockwell Day, before I was elected.

He actually said at that business lunch that he was a strong proponent and that he thought Canadians felt that usually a government is either a fit or a flabby government. It does not matter about the size; what matters is the health of government, and if it is fit, it is able to supply services at a reasonable level. If it is flabby and unable to healthfully be able to respond to things, it just is not as effective.

I support, again, that kind of fit government, and I think Canadians would too. They want their passports and they also want to get value for their dollar.

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I will go back to the amendment that the Conservatives have put forward.

I will note that it is the role of the opposition to oppose, but it is not the role of the opposition to be on a relentless crusade of obstruction. Unfortunately, that is what we have seen at every step of the way with respect to this bill. I will recap that.

The Conservatives put forward amendments at second reading to not allow the BIA even to be scrutinized. Then they went on to move motions of concurrence to delay the debate at report stage. They moved multiple motions of unanimous consent, again to delay the debate on this bill. They put in 62 amendments at report stage, and some of those were to cancel the luxury tax and health care rebates. Now there is another motion to amend the bill at the final reading.

Would the member not agree that perhaps it would be in the better interest of Canadians for Conservatives to actually play a constructive role in scrutinizing this bill, as opposed to being on this relentless crusade of obstruction?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Madam Speaker, there are two sides to every coin. We have a job to do, which is to present views and to be heard. The government also has tools, such as time allocation at report stage. The Liberals imposed time allocation almost right away, before many members, including members in their own caucus, had a chance to speak. We could talk about process here, but what I am going to talk about is the actual bill.

In this amendment, we would send back to committee elements of the changes to the Competition Act that have been proposed by the government. We did not have a lot of time to scrutinize them. Even when we had the Canadian Chamber of Commerce appear, one of Canada's most trusted industry associations, they said they had not had time and had not been able to consult. We just asked the government to stop on this issue and consult with industry before proceeding with those amendments.

While this member may want everything to go his way 100% of the time, this is a democracy and people should be heard.

*Government Orders*

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Madam Speaker, many points of my hon. colleague's speech prompted me to want to ask a question, but I was very pleased to hear his analysis of what is going on at the port of Vancouver.

In my riding in Saanich—Gulf Islands, the inefficiencies in loading bulk goods in the port of Vancouver have resulted in a real crisis of freighters basically getting free parking in the waters of the Salish Sea, all the way up as far as off of Ladysmith. They are stuck waiting there, because they have several holds and the delivery of grain and other bulk goods like coal is not efficient.

Given that the harbour authorities have been created as stand-alone agencies at arm's length from the minister, what does the Minister of Transport need to do to ensure that we get the port of Vancouver working efficiently? It hurts everyone from grain farmers in the prairies all the way through to my constituents in Saanich—Gulf Islands.

• (1835)

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Madam Speaker, this is where I have always said that leadership is everything. If something is not working, we would expect the minister to be there and to be immediately working with all the force that they can to identify where the gaps are and how to close them.

As my fellow member from British Columbia has said, there are externalities that are being created by the slow processing times. In my community, there are small business owners who are suddenly receiving bills from the port in large amounts that are causing them to raise their prices because they cannot afford to sell the furniture or items that they have brought in, with the shipping included, at the rate that they originally promised. This is causing inflation and it is causing aggravation.

As the member said, there are some environmental externalities that are causing negative spillovers. We should be asking the government, but unfortunately this Minister of Transport is missing in action when it comes to the port.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate and thank my colleague for his speech and his very honest, but unfortunately sad, presentation of the financial reality of this government.

[*English*]

The big issue of the day is inflation. It has hurt every family, especially when we talk about the price of gas. We all realize and recognize that elsewhere offshore we see great countries applying positive action to reduce taxation, such as the United States, Germany, Great Britain, Australia and South Korea.

I want my colleague to talk about why the government is not doing the same as our allies.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Madam Speaker, every economy is different, but the member is 100% right. Those G7 countries and other OECD countries are doing what they can to protect not only their consumers from the issue of high gas prices, but their economies.

If we look to Alberta, it has reduced its gas tax when it is above \$90 a barrel. Trevor Tombe, a University of Calgary economist, has said that this reduces inflation in Alberta by half a percentage point. It not only helps consumers put food on the table and drive to work and helps small businesses cope; it protects the economy from rising inflation. That is what the government should be doing. It is not doing it.

**Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak during third reading of Bill C-19, which of course is the budget implementation act. I thought I might treat it as a bit of a case study, because in the debate about our electoral system we often hear that Canada needs strong majority governments in order to have decisive decision-making and action and to not end up with a hung Parliament. This is one of the main motivations for some to oppose electoral reform, and particularly forms of proportional representation, which tend to lead to more instances of minority Parliaments and minority governments.

My view is that the process around this budget bill, without being a perfect process and without the bill being a perfect bill, was actually a decent process, so I want to talk a bit about some of the improvements that were made to the bill during the course of it and some of the ways that it suggests we can make progress on other issues in this Parliament through members of various parties working together, and not only members of the same party working together. I think this process, in fact, showed that members can be nimble in terms of whom they are working with on particular issues and still get outcomes that make sense for Canadians and that benefit a lot of Canadians. We do not need one party having 100% of the power here in Parliament in order to make substantial progress for Canadians.

The first example I would point to is related to changes to the disability tax credit. We heard a fair bit of testimony at committee on this point. A Conservative colleague of mine on the committee brought forward an amendment, and the way this happens, as I am sure members will know but folks listening at home may not, is that parties will typically submit their amendments independently. Sometimes there are pleasant surprises when we receive the package. In this case, it was an identical amendment.

I was happy to work with Conservative colleagues and my Bloc colleague on the committee to pass an amendment that would change the disability tax credit requirements. A person has to show that they spend 14 hours a week tending to their condition, as somebody with type 1 diabetes does, whether that is injecting themselves with insulin, going to the pharmacy to get insulin, monitoring their blood sugar or doing other things that folks living with type 1 diabetes have to do. Then they often have to prove this every year, despite the fact that type 1 diabetes is not a condition that simply goes away and despite the fact that the requirements of the condition do not simply go away. Nevertheless, people have had to constantly show they have it, again and again.

This is reminiscent of some of the stories we have heard over the years out of Veterans Affairs Canada about veteran amputees who have to demonstrate every so often that, in fact, their leg is still missing and they are still an amputee and continue to require the same help. Folks with type 1 diabetes were having to continually show this.

*Government Orders*

We were able to bring forward an amendment, pass it at committee and even overcome some procedural wrangling, after the amendment was initially ruled out of order. We were happy to overrule the chair at committee on that point and very pleased that the Speaker saw fit to uphold the will of the committee in respect of that amendment when it came back to the House.

What that means concretely for people who are living with type 1 diabetes is that they will no longer have to do all of the paperwork, with the bother and expense that comes with it, in order to qualify for the disability tax credit. Once they have qualified as having type 1 diabetes, that will be sufficient to qualify them in the future.

I think that was a really hopeful exercise, and not just hopeful for Parliament in general, but also hopeful because we know that when it comes to Canadians living with disabilities, there has not been enough meaningful action on the part of the current government to serve that community. We saw that last June, when the government presented a bill for a Canada disability benefit that had absolutely no details about what the benefit would be, how much it would be, what the eligibility criteria would be and how it might impact other benefits that people living with a disability already receive. There was a lot more work to do, and since the new Parliament was elected in the fall, an ongoing priority of the NDP has been to call on the government to present new legislation and better legislation that would actually tell Canadians living with disabilities what the government has in mind and would provide far better ongoing income support for people living with disabilities.

• (1840)

Why is that important? It is because under the current federal programs and under provincial programs across the country, people living with disabilities have been consistently legislated into poverty to the extent that someone with a disability has to rely on existing disability pensions of various kinds across the country, none of which provide an income that brings them to the poverty line. This means that as soon as they have to rely on those things, people know they are going to be living a life of poverty with all of the challenges that come with that. Those are challenges of poverty over and above the challenges people living with disabilities already face.

With the great work from my colleague, the NDP disability critic in this Parliament, to press the government to bring legislation forward, we finally got wind on the Notice Paper that legislation was coming. It was an exciting moment. We had hoped to get more detail, just as we had hoped that certain changes to the disability tax credit in this legislation might have meant that finally the government would act on the long-standing call by people living with type 1 diabetes to make their lives easier and make their access to the disability tax credit available.

That was a disappointment, initially. However, by working together across party lines, we were able to remedy that, similar to the tabling of the Canada disability legislation. I almost said the “new” legislation, but I think I would have misspoken because it is pretty much the same legislation and has the same problems, therefore. It does not spell out what the program is supposed to look like. It does not let Canadians living with disabilities know what

kind of financial help there is and the extent of financial support they could hope to receive from the federal government.

I would go further and say that part of the problem with legislation like this, and there are a couple, is it essentially just empowers cabinet to design a program and fund that program by statute, without having to return to Parliament. There is a procedural question, which I think may be less interesting to a lot of Canadians, but that procedural question is important to the extent that Parliament is a place that is meant to provide oversight on government spending. This bill would empower the government to create a program without having any idea what the price tag is, when it should be quite clear with Parliament on how the program is going to be designed. Parliamentarians should be able to authorize a new program like that knowing those things. That is a problem.

The other problem with setting up that program in legislation without actually legislating it is that a future government and a future cabinet that does not agree with the program or that wants to change it would not have to come back to this place. There would be no legislative process. This would also mean that the time it normally takes for a bill to go through the House of Commons and through the Senate would not be there. That is the time civil society often uses to mobilize in order to influence the content of legislation and government policy. It is an opportunity lost. It would make it very easy for a future government to undo whatever the current government does. If it finally gets around to creating a program for the Canada disability benefit, it would be far too easy for it to be undone.

Our experience at committee with the initial disappointment around the disability tax credit shows that a minority Parliament can come together and can have a positive influence on government policy and legislation. It can get things done for people that a majority government clearly would not have done because it was not in the Liberals' proposal.

I would also point to the example of employment insurance reform, something the government promised in its election campaign in 2015. We have had two elections since. The government has been in power now for coming on seven years, yet we have not seen any meaningful EI reform. We have to bracket a lot of what happened in the pandemic, because there were substantial changes to the EI program during the pandemic, but the speed with which those reforms occurred shows that it is possible to make meaningful reform quickly. Also, the nature of many of those reforms shows that what workers have been asking for in their EI program is in fact possible. This is not pie-in-the-sky stuff. Most of what they have been asking for are things the government did through the EI program during the pandemic.

*Government Orders*

• (1845)

As the pandemic recedes somewhat, at least for the moment, certainly the Liberals are of that view when they are talking about their financial support programs, less so when they are talking about public health restrictions. As the pandemic recedes somewhat, the government is going back to its regular inaction on the employment insurance file.

The Liberals finally did try to do something important but relatively minor in the grand scheme of systemic employment insurance reform: They presented a proposal to change the EI appeal board and undo some of the damage that was done by the Harper government to the EI appeal board. They fell flat on their face. It was not well received, even by the very people the Liberals sought to please with those reforms. They were lambasted for it, and they themselves sought to remove that part of the budget bill.

New Democrats were pleased to support that removal, for two reasons. One was that we agreed that those reforms were misguided and did not represent what I would dare to call a consensus among EI stakeholders about how the system, and particularly the appeal board, has to change. However, we were glad to support the reforms on a condition, which was satisfied, which was that the minister declare publicly that they would bring legislation back in the fall in order to make better changes to the EI appeal board system that people would actually welcome. Having secured that commitment, we were happy to support the removal of those appeal board changes that were quite ill-conceived.

However, it does raise a question of trust in the government. After being in government for well over six and a half years and having not really made any major reforms to EI except those that were forced by pandemic circumstances, when they finally came out of the gate to do something, how could they get it so terribly wrong? I take some solace in the fact that we have a minority Parliament, that Canadians did not entrust the Liberals with a majority of seats here in the House of Commons, that they do not have 100% of the power in this place and that negotiation is possible, because I think it is leading to better outcomes.

There is another example that is a little outside the scope of this bill, but it is an important one when we are talking about the pandemic. Early on in this Parliament, one of the first things that the finance committee did was to deal with Bill C-2, which established the new pandemic benefit regime that has now expired. It was instituted in December and was effectively the pandemic support regime that saw us through the omicron wave, with some notable changes by order in council right after the legislation passed, because as New Democrats said at the time, the reason we voted against that legislation was that we thought it would be inadequate to the task. I want to zero in on an important change that was made to those programs, particularly the wage subsidy program that was conceived in that bill.

Working with members of the Bloc and the Conservative Party, we were able to pass an amendment that said that companies that were receiving wage subsidy money under the authority of Bill C-2 would not be allowed to pay dividends to shareholders while accepting money from the government that presumably they needed because they did not have enough revenue to stay afloat. Clearly, if

they were making big dividend payments to their shareholders, they did have the money, so that was an appropriate reform. It was the kind of thing that New Democrats had called for at the inception of the wage subsidy program that the government would not agree to initially, but we finally found a way, again working across party lines. That is not always an easy thing to do, but it is always a worthwhile thing to try to do. This was again an example of Parliament being able to correct course for a government that had got off on the wrong foot.

It really matters and it serves Canadians well that we are in a Parliament that does not have a majority government. I do hope that is something Canadians will consider in the next election. I also hope that they will consider electoral reform when organizations like Fair Vote approach them to talk about it. I will remind some of my Conservative colleagues—and we have gone into it a little over the budget debate—that reform is the want of folks around here, and it is not a bad thing. Conservatives will know that they had more share of the popular vote than the Liberals, who are in power, but they got far fewer seats.

• (1850)

We just saw, in the Ontario election, the New Democrats get about 30 seats to the Liberals' eight, approximately, despite having roughly an equal share of the popular vote. We saw the Ford government form a majority with a very small amount of support when we consider how low turnout was and how the way we vote under the first-past-the-post system can generate very distorted electoral outcomes.

I raise all these things to contribute to the debate on this bill, but I also hope to contribute to a larger debate about how we elect Parliaments that select governments here in Canada and show that we have been doing good work in this Parliament. We have been correcting course for the government when it got it wrong on the first go, and that has been made possible by virtue of having a minority Parliament. It is exactly because we do not have a majority government that these corrections and some of the good things that came out of the committee process have been possible.

### *Government Orders*

One of the things I hope we may yet make progress on, which I will be looking to colleagues in other parties for support on, is the call for a low-income CERB repayment amnesty. This is something that has come up at the finance committee. It heard compelling testimony, and there is an important moral dimension to this issue. We are talking about people whose incomes are already below the poverty line. CTV did a piece on this last week, but it is not new. It has been a running story and has had various permutations through the pandemic, with the CRA sending letters to Canadians already in very difficult financial straits even before the current round of inflation hit us. It is all the more so now that people are struggling with the cost of groceries. The cost of housing has been an issue—let us not kid ourselves—for a long time. The rate of acceleration of the problem got worse during the pandemic, but the problem was getting worse even before the pandemic.

People who applied in good faith for help and were told to apply, in some cases, by their very own Liberal MP are now getting letters saying that they have to pay the money back, that they did not qualify and were not eligible. In some cases, they are people who applied for employment insurance and would have preferred just to get EI, but were told no, they could only get CERB. Then they got the CERB cheque and figured that was what they were entitled to. They applied for EI, were told no, and got the CERB. CERB sent them the cheque; they did not ask for it, so they thought it must be okay. They spent the money because they had lost their jobs and were trying to get through a global pandemic, which I think we can all agree was not an easy thing to do no matter what people's incomes were, let alone if they had just lost their jobs, and now the government is asking them for that money back. They do not have the money, and the efforts to collect that money, particularly from people who are already below the poverty line, are not going to bear fruit.

There is the moral dimension in terms of the anxiety and the financial harm that it is causing, but there is also a very real financial dimension. We heard a bit about that at committee. The government is planning to spend around \$260 million chasing after a CERB debt that is a function of how it publicized its own program and encouraged people, and in some cases forced people, into the CERB system as opposed to the employment insurance system. For the \$260 million that the government is going to spend over the next three or four years chasing that debt, how much is it actually going to get back? I think it is unlikely that it is going to get back \$260 million.

I would love to know. I would love to have the government tell us how much it thinks it is actually going to get back. I have asked the question. I asked it at committee and I asked in a number of different fora and I cannot get an answer. It is shocking to me that the government would decide to invest \$260 million to collect a debt that it does not know the value of, let alone the likelihood of succeeding. When we talk about investing over a quarter of a billion dollars in collecting a debt, we would want to be darn sure we are actually going to get that money back. Even if it makes its money back and calls it a wash—spend \$260 million and get \$260 million, which I think is very unlikely—it would not be worth it. It would not be worth it because the time and expense that it is spending chasing after low-income Canadians who are already in dire straits, particularly in this context of inflation, is time and expense that it

could spend chasing tax evaders who are hiding their money out of the country and using other means to not pay their fair share. It would get a better return.

• (1855)

There is a good financial argument for a low-income CERB repayment amnesty, and I hope that in the context of this Parliament that I have been talking about, we will find support among enough other parties to convince the government to do the right thing, which is to not chase that debt and try to wring it out of low-income Canadians but instead divert the CRA's resources to chasing the people who are really getting away with something, people who are not paying their fair share and who have the resources to pay it back.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I want to commend and congratulate my colleague on another very interesting speech. He always has something constructive to say, both here in the House and in committee.

I am concerned about the length of the budget implementation bill currently before us. Bill C-19 is a mammoth bill that amends numerous laws and deals with many issues that have nothing to do with the budget, including, for example, enforcing the justice system in space and conducting strip searches in prisons.

What does my colleague think of the fact that the government regularly resorts to such mammoth bills that lump together so many issues? Can committees and parliamentarians study all this thoroughly?

On top of that, the paper version of the bill that was given to the opposition was some 420 pages long, while the official PDF version that was posted online was over 440 pages long. Could my colleague comment on that?

**Mr. Daniel Blaikie:** Madam Speaker, I will start with the second question. The fact that the version of the documents tabled in the House is not the full version is obviously a problem, and it is part of a broader issue that bothers me a bit. We no longer see paper copies being tabled these days. For example, as a parliamentarian, I was unable to get a copy of the blue book of the estimates. The government and the House of Commons only work on computers now, whereas I work better with a paper copy, so I am having a tough time adapting.

As for omnibus bills, that is something that has been highly criticized, and rightly so in my opinion. If governments want to keep introducing massive bills, then I think we might need a separate process for budget bills.

*Government Orders*

• (1900)

[*English*]

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for Elmwood—Transcona for a thoughtful discussion of what minority parliaments can do together.

I also lament the failure to provide the disability tax benefit, as does my colleague, the member for Kitchener Centre. We expected it. It should have been in the budget and it should have been in Bill C-19. I appreciate that we have made some progress for people with type 1 diabetes, but it is not nearly enough, nor is it fast enough.

The member will not be surprised that I will ask him to expand on his points about proportional representation. It is certainly timely, given the results from Ontario, where the election had the lowest voter turnout, as I understand it, in the history of that province. Barely 43% voted, which means that nearly 60% of Ontario voters did not vote.

I was taken with a column in *Rabble* newspaper by Karl Nerenberg on all the fetishizing and coverage by the media in just looking at the polling and kind of announcing that Doug Ford was going to win before the campaign started. Does the member feel that this played a role in reducing voter turnout?

**Mr. Daniel Blaikie:** Madam Speaker, I do often worry about the extent to which the publishing of polls can affect public opinion, but it is something that is accentuated in a first-past-the-post system. If there is a proportional system of some kind, then in spite of whatever polling is saying about who is going to win the most seats, people can still feel they are contributing to electing people they agree with and who are going to speak on their behalf and raise issues that are of importance to them.

That effect is amplified by the voting system we have. Unfortunately, getting information about where people are at and the kind of attitude pundits have when they are predicting outcomes can affect voter turnout. I would hope that by moving toward some kind of proportional system we could diminish those effects, because people can still go and vote with confidence.

I was quite disheartened by the recent comments of the Prime Minister about proportional representation and some rewriting of history in what he presented to the electorate in 2015. Perhaps someone else will want to ask me a question about that and I can elaborate a little further.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Madam Speaker, coincidentally, I was going to ask my brilliant colleague from Elmwood—Transcona about the Prime Minister's recent comments, which I was shocked to hear, frankly. I thought they were flippant and really did not do justice to the commitment he made to Canadians. It is a broken promise that really betrayed so many people in this country, especially young people.

Could the member speak to his own reaction to the Prime Minister's recent response?

**Mr. Daniel Blaikie:** Madam Speaker, I was flabbergasted, frankly. I think that is a proper parliamentary term. I could express my feelings a few other ways, but they may not be as parliamentary.

I was surprised in two senses, first of all, at the fact that he kind of made the blanket statement, "Well, any time you have proportional representation you have bitter disagreement and polarizing" as if that is something that is not happening here in Canada. I wish it were not, but I do not think any competent follower of politics could pretend that we do not have real issues of polarization, division and excessive antagonism in Canadian politics. That is a real thing. It was an interesting kind of blind spot. Also, for a Prime Minister who has shown up at rallies where there has been that on display in ways I condemn and think are inappropriate was also a little much. It was a little much to somehow pretend that there are not countries with proportional representation that are not doing at least a good job of managing polarization within their politics.

I was also surprised that the Prime Minister would try to say he only ever advocated for a ranked ballot and that he was never really interested in proportional representation—

• (1905)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** I need to allow other members an opportunity to ask questions.

The hon. member for Red Deer—Mountain View has the floor.

**Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC):** Madam Speaker, these have certainly been interesting discussions.

As far as proportional representation goes, I guess a lot of people are not overly surprised with the Prime Minister being somewhat flippant about anything he thinks might cause a bit of consternation for people.

A week or so ago we heard from former minister Bill Morneau about some of the constraints and the concerns he had when he was trying to present budgets and look at competitiveness. He basically said that it is not happening here with the present government.

I am curious whether the member has some ideas on how we can move forward to encourage competitiveness here in Canada.

**Mr. Daniel Blaikie:** Madam Speaker, it may not surprise the member that I may have a different take on what constitutes building a kind of competitive culture, but I do want to offer some remarks to that effect.

When companies are looking to locate, we often hear about the importance of the tax regime. Other things we know they look for is a well-trained and available workforce, and so investing in people can also increase our productivity and our competitiveness. The government should be looking at investing in training and connecting workers who currently do not have work and are not able to be hired into the kinds of jobs they want with particular jobs and with real employers who are asking for that so there is a clear pathway through their education to a job that is already waiting for them at the end.

*Government Orders*

Things like a national pharmacare plan and dental care also help attract talent. When they are provided on a universal basis, that is something companies benefit from because they do not have pay for them, but they help attract talent. That is also an important component of building a competitive environment here for Canada to attract investment.

I know that where the economy is going, and not just here in Canada but globally, has to do with reforming our energy infrastructure. Public investment can help lead the development of talent not just for workers but for companies as well, which can then be exported out of Canada to help other countries build—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** That is all the time we have.

[*Translation*]

Resuming debate.

The hon. member for Joliette.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ):** Madam Speaker, we are now at third reading of this omnibus bill.

In fact, there are all kinds of statutes stuffed into Bill C-19, with topics ranging from strip searches to justice in space. That might be helpful for addressing all the mischief Brad Spitfire could get up to, but it does not belong in a budget implementation bill. This is a half-baked omnibus bill. It is no wonder it is full of problems.

To start, the paper copy we were given was missing more than 20 pages. We were working with the wrong version for far too long. That is unacceptable, and it seriously undermines the government's credibility and our trust in it.

A lot of changes were made to this bill at the Standing Committee on Finance, and I applaud the work we did. However, it is so big that there was no way the committee could do an in-depth study of the entire bill.

I will have to criticize the government's approach once again. The government promised that it would not introduce any more omnibus bills, but only the willfully naive are buying Liberal promises these days.

Regarding our study, I am sincerely grateful for the help we got from the other House of Commons standing committees: Justice and Human Rights, Citizenship and Immigration, International Trade, and Industry and Technology. Let me add an honourable mention for the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities and our superhero there, the member for Thérèse-De Blainville.

Bill C-19 put forward a lot of changes to the employment insurance system, including the EI board of appeal. The government did not do its job properly. It did not consider the consultations and the needs expressed by stakeholders, such as unions. It is rare for the employer and the union to agree that something like this was poorly done. The member for Thérèse-De Blainville was very efficient at bringing all those people together with the finance committee and the human resources committee so parliamentarians could hear from them. Their message was clear. Better to strike the issue from the bill altogether rather than pass flawed measures.

We in the Bloc Québécois prepared for both eventualities. We introduced several amendments and asked that the section be deleted. In committee, I pressed the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance to lobby his government to have it removed.

I tabled a motion to that effect. My colleague from Thérèse-De Blainville got the human resources committee to adopt a unanimous motion to delete it. The Conservative and NDP members also requested the same thing. The government listened to reason. It backed down and committed to tabling something a little better in the fall.

This is what we MPs are here for. It is what the House and the parliamentary committees are here for as well. We study government bills. We review them with the people they would affect. If the bill is good, we support it. If it is bad, we reject it. We work tirelessly to improve the bills.

We know the government is tired and worn out. The pandemic took its toll on us all. The Prime Minister gave an election a shot in the fall. That tired out his government, which is still a minority. We had the blockades in the winter, followed by the war in Ukraine, which has been going on for over 100 days. That has kept everyone busy.

The Prime Minister is overwhelmed and exhausted. The Minister of Finance is playing the roles of both prime minister and minister of foreign affairs, especially with respect to the war. All the work she is doing is very honourable. The problem is that she is caught up in all these fast-moving issues, so she no longer has enough time to do her job properly as finance minister.

We saw that with her budget. We saw that with the crisis facing specialized businesses that convert trucks into ambulances, armoured vans and other specialty trucks. They are affected by the semiconductor shortage, which has shut down truck manufacturers in the United States. This input shortage is hitting our businesses hard. We cannot afford to lose these good niche jobs.

In December, the finance minister promised that the shortage was over. We supported Bill C-8 based on her assurances. She had agreed to provide us with the statistics showing that things were getting better. We believed the Liberals' promises, but we never got the statistics, and the situation of these businesses is getting worse and worse as the weeks go by. We have been pressing the minister on this issue since January, but we have still heard nothing.

The only response we received came in her fall economic update, when she committed to subsidizing semiconductor manufacturers. However, this is a far more complex market, and she has completely missed the mark. We were unable to secure a meeting with her to discuss this subject. We were also unable to get her to come to committee to talk about inflation, even though we officially invited her in January to come testify sometime before May 31. It is now June 8, and we have still heard nothing.

*Government Orders*

• (1910)

We know that the Minister of Finance is very busy with the war and all of the other files she manages for the Prime Minister. The only problem is that that does not leave her any time to take care of finance. The associate ministers and parliamentary secretaries have not been delegated to follow up on this or other files. It is a serious problem that will have harmful consequences for our economy.

I have another example. In Bill C-19, the budget implementation bill, the government presents the details of its luxury tax. It is 170 pages long. We agree in principle that people who buy luxury cars, planes or boats should pay a luxury tax. That is one way to redistribute wealth. However, the tax needs to be well constructed and the situation properly assessed.

For example, this tax will have serious repercussions on the entire economy and on jobs related to the use of personal boats. When I asked the Department of Finance to show us its impact studies for this new tax, the departmental officials told me that they had not done any studies. There is nothing. This has a real boys-in-short-pants feel about it. Santa Banana could have done a better job of this.

What we have here is an ideological tax. It is all about the principle, and no one cares about how it will be implemented. In any case, the minister does not have time to waste on that.

This tax will be disastrous for the aerospace industry, which has been in a complete panic for almost a year now, not because the wealthy will no longer be able to afford to buy private jets, but because the tax will apply to companies and exports, even though it is not supposed to.

This whole thing is a big mess. The government gave the Department of Finance carte blanche, and it did not do its job properly. It did not feel like doing it, so it did a poor job. Because the Minister of Finance is busy dealing with the situation in Ukraine, the government is letting this slide. That is unacceptable. This measure is so poorly thought out that unions and employers, along with some members of the House, have banded together to warn us about how serious this situation is.

Canada is already the only country that has an aerospace industry but no industry strategy, not even for government procurement. Now the government is imposing poorly designed taxes that are harmful to the industry without even doing an impact study. That undermines Canada's credibility with the industry.

I would remind members that greater Montreal is the third-largest aerospace hub on the planet. Such a high value-added sector helps drive our economy. Anyone in the world would be very careful to preserve such a cluster—anyone, that is, but Ottawa. Is this all because the industry is in Quebec? That is unacceptable, and it reminds us of the repercussions of being under our neighbour's thumb.

Working with the unions and employers, we submitted several amendments to correct the poorly drafted tax measure. For instance, one amendment stated that the tax must not apply to exported aircraft. Another would have excluded businesses from the tax, which is how it is supposed to work. The Liberals and NDP voted

against all those amendments. Yes, the NDP voted against what the unions were calling for. Why? It is because of their deal with the Liberals and their promise of unwavering support, to the point of compromising their principles.

The Conservatives voted with the unions on the luxury tax in Bill C-19, and the NDP and the Liberals voted against the unions. They were so quick to compromise their principles for a promise that benefits only the party that wanted it in the first place.

All of this will undermine our important aerospace industry and its unionized, well-paying jobs. This is all because the tax is ill-conceived and fails to meet its objective of taxing people who purchase luxury vehicles. Instead, the bill will tax airplane and helicopter manufacturers on aircraft that they export, over 90% of their output, or sell to businesses. This comes at a time when the industry is barely recovering from being hard hit by the pandemic. This is all because we have a finance minister who is no longer doing her job, since she is doing the Prime Minister's job and nothing is delegated. This is all because the government is not putting more effort into supporting and developing our economy.

In a normal democracy, a government like that would be overturned and replaced, but not in Canada. This government is supported by a party that is afraid of losing seats and is facing an opposition that is torn apart by extreme and polarizing ideologies. This is the price of following our neighbour's lead. It has little concern for our economic issues and has its own fish to fry.

• (1915)

With respect to the problems that the ill-conceived luxury tax will cause for the aerospace industry, I spoke numerous times with the finance minister, members of her team, her parliamentary secretary, her department and several other government members. That accomplished next to nothing. All we were able to get passed was an amendment that allows the government to delay implementation until after September at its discretion.

In addition, we had to wait until the report stage. My colleague from Saint-Jean and I introduced the amendment, as did the member for Elmwood—Transcona. This is the last glimmer of hope. If the government can take its head out of the sand and does its homework, we are offering it the opportunity to not implement the tax and to come back with a better bill in the fall. I urge the government to take us up on our offer.

The government is proposing a vast array of legislative changes in this mammoth bill. It has cut corners and done a poor job. The government is patting itself on the back for holding lots of consultations on everything. The only problem is that it is not taking the feedback into account. The Liberals' idea of democracy is letting everyone talk without listening to a word they say.

*Government Orders*

Luckily, we got the government to backtrack on its ill-conceived employment insurance amendment. We told it to go back and do its homework and listen to stakeholders. Unfortunately, we did not get the government to backtrack on its new tax that is 170 pages of poorly written text, but we did get one amendment passed that will create a window for changes in the fall. That will depend on whether the government sees fit though. I am very worried, as are the industry and union members. The government has not seen fit for quite some time now.

We managed to fix another of the government's egregious errors on another subject entirely in Bill C-19. Australia took its dispute with Canada over an excise tax on wine to the World Trade Organization. Obviously, it was about wine made from grapes. However, because wine is not just grape wine to Ottawa, the tax applies to many other products too. In committee, we heard from cider and mead producers. The tax would have really hurt them and undermined a rapidly growing sector. We worked with them to propose an amendment that would exempt them from the tax. I think we made some important progress that will enable these passionate people to keep improving their quality products so that we can enjoy the fruits of their labour. I think we deserve congratulations.

More generally, let me say that I am very proud of every member of the Standing Committee on Finance. We spent many hours working constructively and collaboratively. From my perspective, we engaged in successful dialogue and made progress. I am sincerely grateful to every member of the committee, including its chair and the parliamentary secretary. I believe we made substantial improvements to Bill C-19, and that is down to how well we worked together.

I also want to commend the work done by the other committees that studied parts of Bill C-19. I thank them for their insights. Lastly, I want to once again commend the hard work of my esteemed colleague and friend from Thérèse-De Blainville, who helped force the government to commit to redoing its homework on EI. I salute her for that.

Despite all my criticisms, Bill C-19 does include many good measures. Even though the government introduced a mammoth bill, even though it cut corners, even though we were not able to improve the bill as much as we would have liked, the fact remains that, when we weigh it all out, there are more pluses than minuses for the Quebec economy. That is why we decided to support the bill.

• (1920)

[English]

**Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC):** Madam Speaker, part of my colleague's speech addressed the fact that the present finance minister has been somewhat overwhelmed with what she has to deal with. I think that is sort of what the former finance minister, Bill Morneau, talked about, that there really is no direction. There have been a lot of statements about what they might like to do, but if we try to drill down as to whether there have been any studies or whatever, we find out that this really has not happened. I think this has become one of the critical aspects.

I am just wondering if the member could comment on this. I asked the NDP earlier how we can get competitiveness so we can

bring in investments. The member mentioned the aerospace industry. If we get to a stage where nobody trusts that we can get anything done, those dollars are then going to leave this country and we will all be in worse shape.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Madam Speaker, the Minister of Finance is hard-working and a fierce fighter who never stops. However, since the start of this year, with the conflict in Ukraine and all the Prime Minister's files she is juggling, I have noticed that she does not have the time she needs to do her job as finance minister properly. That is to be expected given the circumstances.

One of the things I like about being an MP, and this is the case for each one of my colleagues, is dealing with specific issues that are brought to our attention by businesses or individuals. We can make a request of the minister responsible, work together and, quite often, solve the problem behind the scenes without garnering media attention. It is very gratifying and we feel as though we are improving people's lives.

Of all the ministers, the Minister of Finance is usually the quickest to respond. Since January, however, she has been overwhelmed by other matters and there is no longer any follow up, which is understandable. We see it in the lack of vision and direction for the budget and in this bill, which is very problematic. It is not the person who is the problem, but the way the government is configured. What is needed is someone who can be more focused on the finance department.

As for the competitiveness and productivity of our economy, it is clear that more needs to be done, and that takes vision. There are several possible avenues the government could take, but if it does not take any of them, then of course it is going to lose. Every economy is in competition with all the others to attract good jobs and develop this or that niche, such as artificial intelligence, aerospace or the green economy.

Whatever the niche, it takes vision. For example, in aerospace, Canada is the only country that does not have an industrial policy or comprehensive strategy to support and develop this sector in order to demonstrate that we value this cluster, these companies and this expertise. This is missing from the budget and it is a massive oversight.

• (1925)

[English]

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I heard the member's critique of the luxury goods tax, and some of that may indeed be fair. He did not mention that the NDP was able to negotiate a carve-out for the aerospace industry so that the cabinet, if it so chooses, can address the concerns of the industry prior to the tax coming into effect.

My question is about the larger issue of wealth inequality and the idea that those among us who are doing the best for themselves should also do their part and pay their share so that we can have a strong country and a strong future. I think this is a concept that the Bloc supports, the overall concept of reducing wealth inequality.

What are some measures he would have liked to see in this legislation that would go further and do a better job of addressing wealth inequality in our country?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Madam Speaker, the issue that is most important to me in this Parliament is the fight against the legal, yet immoral, use of tax havens by large corporations, Bay Street banks, multinationals and the wealthy. This government is doing very little to combat tax evasion, and Canada lags behind other countries in this respect.

I want to respond humbly to my colleague's question. As I said in my speech, the amendment that the member for Elmwood—Transcona, my colleague from Saint-Jean and I proposed at report stage was not extensive and was merely intended to give the government an opportunity to delay the implementation of the luxury tax. This might have given the government time to address some problems, if it had been willing. I remind the House, however, that unions and machinists, among others, told us to make sure that this tax does not apply to exports or to sales to companies.

Because of its deal with the Liberal government, the NDP voted against the unions' amendments, while the Conservatives voted in favour. In this type of deal, compromises always have to be made. Since the vote in committee, however, I have been wondering whether the NDP is starting to compromise its ideals.

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoine, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, all the Quebec MPs saw what happened in the province's long-term care facilities during the pandemic. What does my colleague think about the multi-generational home renovation tax credit? Instead of putting a senior in a nursing home, a family can renovate their own home to accommodate the senior and have them live there. The goal is to keep families together. I would like to hear his opinion on this tax credit.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Madam Speaker, there are a number of good measures in Bill C-19, and this tax credit is certainly one of them. It is important, and that is why we will be supporting Bill C-19.

However, I would ask the government to implement this tax credit more quickly than the one they gave to teachers in last fall's budget. It is still not in effect because Bill C-8 is still before the Senate. Normally, when a bill is winding its way through Parliament, tax credits can be put in place more quickly. It appears that because the opposition parties are against Bill C-8, they are being blamed for not granting this tax credit, which several teachers have asked me about.

I would therefore ask that the tax credit to help seniors stay in their homes be implemented more quickly than the tax credit for teachers.

I do not know if I have enough time to respond, but I would add that the situation in the long-term care facilities was carnage, a real disaster. The long-term care facilities are the poor cousin of Quebec's health care system, which brings to mind the chronic underfunding of the health care system. Obviously this goes back to the years of Jean Chrétien and Paul Martin who, in order to balance Ottawa's budget, massively cut transfers to Quebec and the provinces.

### *Government Orders*

The situation has never been rectified since, and we expect Ottawa to send massive transfers to the provinces to respect each one's ability to pay.

● (1930)

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Joliette, who is our excellent finance critic. One file overlaps both of our critic roles: the luxury tax.

One of my parliamentary files is aerospace. For over a year now, I have been hearing about this tax, which we agree with in principle. In the Bloc Québécois, we are big fans of better distribution of wealth. We gladly support that goal, since the ultrarich have to pay their share. However, often the devil is in the details, and that was the case with this luxury tax.

A year ago, it was only natural that we did not necessarily understand all the implications of the description of this luxury tax. However, the stakeholders contacted the government. How is it that a year later they continue to—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Order. I have to give the hon. member for Joliette a few seconds to respond.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Madam Speaker, the government does a lot of consultation. The aerospace industry was consulted. Its representatives raised their concerns all year, but no changes were made to the tax. When we attended the Department of Finance's information session about this tax, departmental officials answered all of our questions by saying that it would depend on how it was interpreted by the Canada Revenue Agency.

The committee summoned experts and stakeholders, who said that the tax made no sense and that it needed to be changed. However, at the end of the process, the Liberals rejected all of those amendments, with the support of the NDP.

What we have is 170 pages of extremely complicated text that does not target the right people, namely the wealthy who purchase luxury products. Instead, the tax targets an industry, manufacturers and their unionized workers.

**Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here with you and all of my colleagues this evening to debate Bill C-19.

[*English*]

I will be splitting my time with my colleague, the member for Kitchener Centre this evening.

It is a pleasure to be here this evening to reflect and offer a few thoughts on a piece of legislation that is important not only for those in the chamber but also for all Canadians, coast to coast to coast. It is important in the fact that I, like many of my colleagues here, have children at home, or grandchildren for that matter, and everything we do, as legislators and as members of Parliament, should be through the lens of ensuring that we leave a strong economy and a clean and healthy environment for our children and grandchildren.

### *Government Orders*

I do have some thoughts on where we are in Canada and in the world, and where we are with the economy today. Bill C-19 would continue to put us on a path for strong economic growth, good jobs and employment prospects for Canadians. We would also ensure we are leaving behind a very healthy and clean environment, including reaching our net-zero goals by 2050 and the interim targets which were defined and which we became accountable for through Bill C-12.

As we look at the Canadian economy, with an unemployment rate of 5.2%, we, as a country, through the hard work of Canadians from coast to coast to coast, have recovered 116% of the jobs to where to were pre-COVID. We are on the right path. Our AAA, the big A's and the small a's, for our credit ratings have both been affirmed by all three major agencies: DBRS Morningstar, S&P and Moody's. Our fiscal framework and the finances of this country are strong and continue to be guided by the Minister of Finance, who is doing an incredible job.

We know that in the world today, Canadian families are facing an affordability issue. We have inflation, and we know what has caused the inflation. We do know that COVID-19 has disrupted and continues to disrupt supply chains. Some of them have been fixed, and some of them will take longer. We know the barbaric, unprovoked invasion by the Russian Federation and President Putin into Ukraine has disrupted commodity markets, food markets and, obviously, energy security and affordability. We acknowledge that.

I see it when I go to the grocery store. My wife sees it when she goes to the grocery store to shop for our three children. It is a conversation at home. We all know it. We must be steadfast and resolute as a government to maintain the backs of Canadians as we move forward through this environment, and as we move forward ensuring that Canadians have the resources they need for them and their families.

We can look at our measures for affordability over the years. We have Bill C-19 and the BIA, as well as bills on past budget measures that we have implemented. We can think about the Canada child benefit being indexed, which benefits more than 9 out of 10 Canadian families. It is literally thousands of dollars, tax free, arriving monthly to Canadian families. We can think about the Canada workers benefit, something I have championed day after day, literally helping millions of Canadians and lower-income workers. We can think about early learning and child care plan we have put in place with all provinces and territories. It is something we said we would do. It is a promise made and a promise kept.

My family is going to be putting our almost eight-month-old daughter into day care in the fall. It is something we will see a benefit from. I know that in the province of Ontario, by the end of this year, December 31, we will see a 50% reduction in child care fees. For the area I represent, the York region, just on top of Toronto, this would represent a 50% reduction in child care fees. It would represent literally thousands of after-tax dollars to families in York region and in the city of Vaughan. That is something I applaud.

I am proud to be part of a government that signed on and collaborated with provinces and governments of all political stripes in the provinces. Unlike the Conservative Party of Canada, which wishes to tear up the early learning and child care agreements, we will

maintain those agreements. We will continue to work with those provinces and territories across Canada to maintain these agreements because it is the right thing to do. We will not buy into the gimmicks offered by the Conservative Party of Canada when it comes to affordability.

● (1935)

Our seniors will receive a 10% increase in their old age security in July. That is roughly \$800 a year, which will continue to be indexed, for roughly 3.5 million seniors. Again, that is a promise made and a promise kept by this government. I look forward to seeing our senior groups over the summer at the bocce courts, picnics and gatherings.

In the city of Vaughan, we have such a vibrant senior population. I love my seniors. They built this country, and they built the community. Many of them immigrated here with very little education and very little money. They came through Pier 21. They never complained. They worked hard. They saved, and they created a better future for themselves and their families. I just love and applaud them. They have my utmost respect as an individual and as a parliamentarian.

We have committed to dental care, and that is something that I have a very granular story on. A senior came into my office and said she needed help with her dental care. She had an infection. We sent her to York Region where there is a program to assist low-income seniors. Something like that for a senior who is on a very minimal income can really bankrupt them. It could really set a person back.

We cannot have that in our country. We cannot have that in modern-day Canada. That is why we have committed to ensuring that Canadians from coast to coast to coast, such as young children, seniors and all Canadians, will have some sort of coverage or insurance through a \$5.3-billion dental care plan that will ensure vulnerable Canadians do not have an issue with getting dental care. The BIA and Bill C-19 really invest in growth, in people and in the green transition.

Of course, I would be remiss if I did not talk about the tradespeople who build this country from coast to coast to coast. My father was a tradesman. He was a carpenter, a labourer, a sheet-metal worker and a roofer. I remember working on weekends with him, when we would do odd jobs for our neighbours and friends, and that was something that taught me the values of hard work, sacrifice and putting aside that dollar, and I see that in our budget.

We came through on a promise made and kept on a labour and mobility tax deduction for tradespeople. Obviously, they have to fit the criteria. This would be \$4,000, and it would be a deduction and not a credit. A deduction is very powerful. It would allow tradespeople to move from one jurisdiction to another jurisdiction and cover those expenses, which is something I know the Canadian Building Trades Union, LiUNA and the carpenters have advocated for.

*Government Orders*

I mention those two organizations because both of their training facilities are located in the city of Vaughan in my riding of Vaughan—Woodbridge. I meet with those members, and those are the folks who every day, rain, shine or sleet, warm or cold, get up to build our communities and build our critical infrastructure. They are great people.

We need more of those apprenticeships, and when we talk about apprenticeships, our government rolled out a program called the UTIP, the union training and innovation program.

We have committed another \$80 million, which is within Bill C-19, to ensure we train literally thousands and thousands more apprentices. I went on a visit to a carpenters union, and I was looking at CCAT. They had their apprentices there, and they were high school students. They were being funded through this UTIP program. It was so great to see these young folks so excited about their futures and so excited about what they are going to do in this country, building the homes and the infrastructure for tomorrow.

The same thing takes place, whether it is at the LiUNA 506 training facility in York Region or LiUNA 183's training facility, with the operating engineers, the painters, and the HVAC and the electrical workers. The same thing takes place, and we are partnering with all of these organizations.

Members will remember that the Conservative Party from prior years attacked private sector unions with Bill C-525 and Bill C-377. The first thing we did in 2015 and 2016 was repeal those bills. We will always stand beside working Canadians, and we will always stand beside those tradespeople who go to work every day to maintain and build and repair our critical infrastructure.

When it comes to homes, I have spoken before about them in the House. I am blessed to live in a very entrepreneurial area. I have to hand it to the entrepreneurs in my area. The Mayor of Vaughan, the hon. Maurizio Bevilacqua, was a member of Parliament for many years. He committed to raising \$250 million for our hospital, so this city of 330,000 people has the spirit of generosity.

• (1940)

We, the city of Vaughan and the entrepreneurs, hit the target of \$250 million last week. I applaud them. They are entrepreneurs who have taken risks, invested, made money and contributed to their hospital. With that—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** We have run out of time for the member's speech.

Continuing with questions and comments, the hon. member for Sturgeon River—Parkland has the floor.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I noticed that the member was talking about the government's early learning and child care promise to create a \$10-a-day day care system in this country.

What we are seeing on the ground is a very different story. It looks like the government is creating a two-tier day care system in this country. I am getting messages from day cares across the country saying they cannot even apply for the government's subsidy because of the amount of red tape the government is putting in place.

For example, the government is saying it is only going to fund the program up to \$18 an hour. We know child care workers get paid way more than \$18 an hour, so they cannot afford to hold onto these programs at \$10 a day. We are going to have some families get into \$10-a-day day care and some families paying \$2,000 a month.

How does the member support a two-tier day care system?

**Mr. Francesco Sorbara:** Madam Speaker, we need to put the early learning and child care system in place and sign agreements with every single province and territory. We need to make sure it is affordable and accessible, and that we hit the target within each individual province that signed. With the Province of Ontario, we got to \$10-a-day day care. My understanding is now, after the provincial election here in the province of Ontario, the Government of Ontario will be implementing that accord. It is a very detailed accord from what I understand. We definitely do not want a two-tier system on day care.

• (1945)

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I was really glad to hear the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge talk about dental care. Our old friend Jack Harris was in town today, the former member for St. John's East. It was less than a year ago on June 16, 2021, that the House voted on the motion that Mr. Harris brought forward, Motion No. 62, which would have extended dental care to families making under \$90,000 a year.

Unfortunately, that member voted against that motion, so I am glad to see that the Liberals have made an about-face and come to understand the importance of dental care for low-income families. Is the member now happy that the NDP pushed the Liberals to see the light of day, do the right thing and put forward this important program for low-income families?

**Mr. Francesco Sorbara:** Madam Speaker, dental care was actually mentioned in the prior throne speech. It has always been a priority of our government to help all Canadians, middle-class Canadians and those who are vulnerable, who do not have access to certain services. On this dental care program we are rolling out, I am glad to see we are working together with other parties to get things done for Canadians so we can leave a better future for all Canadians, and that is what we will continue to do.

As well, I love the province of British Columbia. It is my home province, where I was born and raised.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Madam Speaker, I get two questions in a row. My second question for the member is about the first home savings account, we know that young, working families simply cannot afford to put away \$40,000 into a savings account. What we are going to see with this program is the children of very wealthy people whose parents are giving them the money to put into the first home savings account will be the ones who benefit the most.

Does the member think it is appropriate for taxpayers to be subsidizing the children of the wealthiest 1% to buy their first homes?

**Mr. Francesco Sorbara:** Madam Speaker, on the situation with housing affordability in Canada, we need more housing supply. The plan we have put forward is a holistic plan. It is a plan that will need collaboration with provinces municipalities and regions to increase housing supply. It is a plan that targets the froth in the housing market with banning foreign purchases, the anti-flipping measures that we have put in place, and the \$4-billion home accelerator fund. We have put in place a lot of measures in the BIA, including the measure the member talked about, to allow first-time homebuyers to actually save.

If someone is a young, downtown professional and they need to save for a first home, this is going to be a great measure and great vehicle for them to do that. This is much like the tax-free savings accounts, which millions of people have used year after year. This is going to be another measure for Canadians to utilize and leverage, and I am so happy to see it in Bill C-19.

**Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP):** Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise again on Bill C-19, the budget implementation act, this time at third reading. I would like to start with what I appreciate, specifically about the work that was done at committee. If Canadians and neighbours in my community watch only question period, they might wonder whether anyone here gets anything done at all. The fact is that there are plenty of opportunities at committee for parliamentarians from all sides to come together to improve legislation. That is really important to highlight.

First, I want to point out one really critical amendment that was unanimously passed, which would ensure that all Canadians living with type 1 diabetes, of whom there are over 300,000 across the country, will now be able to access the disability tax credit. This is going to help ease the financial burden caused by unavoidable and necessary life-saving expenses.

The original bill had the foreign homebuyers ban, but there was no date set for when it would come into force. It was left up to the governing party's discretion. Through committee, there is now a hard date set. It is longer out than I would prefer, all the way out to January 1, 2023, but it is an improvement at least to have a date within the legislation. As I have said before, in my community, the extent to which all levels of government work to address the skyrocketing cost of housing will define us over the coming years.

I wish there was more in the budget implementation act, and certainly we need more. Investments like those in co-op housing in the budget, for deeply affordable and dignified housing, are a step in the right direction. Having a date in place for when this foreign homebuyers ban will come into force is an improvement.

That being said, these tweaks are insufficient, given the moment we are in. I would like to take this opportunity to share five significant and urgent priorities of my neighbours that are still missed by Bill C-19 and are the reasons why I cannot support it.

First, when it comes to the climate crisis, no doubt this is our last chance at a livable planet. The most recent report from the IPCC defines it as “an atlas of human suffering”. We know that if we want even a 50% chance of staying below a 1.5°C increase in global average temperatures, which, as scientists from the IPCC tell us, is required if we want to hold on to the possibility of a livable future for our kids and grandkids, and if we are to do our fair share, that means 86% of Canada's proven fossil fuel reserves need to remain unextracted. The UN Secretary-General went on to say that “the truly dangerous radicals are the countries that are increasing the production of fossil fuels. Investing in new fossil fuels infrastructure is moral and economic madness.”

Of course, I was disappointed that in Bill C-19 and in the budget there is nothing for a prosperous transition for workers, which we so desperately need when it comes to retraining and career support, when it comes to pension bridging, and when it comes to compensation. In the budget, instead, what we saw was \$7.1 billion between now and 2030 for a new subsidy in the form of a tax credit for carbon capture and storage. A recent study of this technology from the Netherlands found that in 32 out of 40 projects they looked at worldwide that implemented carbon capture and storage, emissions actually went up. It is one of the reasons why 400 academics penned a letter to our Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance saying this is a false climate solution.

Unfortunately, the only time climate is even mentioned in Bill C-19 is when it speaks about the fact that an annual climate incentive is now going to be received by Canadians once a quarter, certainly not the kind of change that reflects the moment we are in, that reflects the crisis we are in, and that reflects the urgency of action required to meet this moment.

*Government Orders*

• (1950)

The second priority that continues to be missed is with respect to addressing the disproportionate number of Canadians with disabilities who are living in poverty across the country. We know that back in 2020, the governing party first promised the Canada disability benefit, a guaranteed livable income for every Canadian with a disability across the country, which would lift up, or it could if done well, 1.5 million Canadians with disabilities across the country.

We already know that 89% of Canadians support the Canada disability benefit. They are way ahead of parliamentarians here. However, we also need to recognize that emergency funds are required to address the very real, direct and urgent needs of Canadians with disabilities who are living in poverty across the country. Both in the budget and in this budget implementation act, there is no mention of emergency funds. There is no mention of the Canada disability benefit. It was, instead, introduced as Bill C-22. The same as last year, though, all of the major decisions on eligibility and the amounts are left to regulation.

It is going to be really critical for all of us to continue to put the prioritization, the urgency and the advocacy behind ensuring that we get support to Canadians with disabilities across the country, the Canadians who need it the most. We already know that it has support. In fact, 103 parliamentarians from all parties have now asked not only to bring it forward in the legislation that has now been done through Bill C-22, which I am glad to see, but to fast-track it and ensure that the experiences of Canadians with disabilities are heard every step of the way.

The third priority I want to mention tonight is with respect to mental health. In the budget, the only real mention was with respect to a wellness portal. So many parliamentarians in this place recognize, as is so important to do, that mental health is health. If that is the case, we need to be looking at organizations like the Canadian Alliance on Mental Illness and Mental Health and their calls for legislation that would put in place a framework for the Canadian federal government to collaborate with and support provinces and territories and bring about parity in mental health support and funding. That is not in Bill C-19. As I mentioned, it was only tangentially mentioned in the budget. I will continue to advocate and encourage the governing party to meet the moment when it comes to addressing mental health.

Just last week, I spoke about the need to honour promises made when it comes to long-term care. This is because so many neighbours of mine have shared their stories, whether they are caregivers who are not in a position to deliver the care that is necessary or those who have a parent waiting in a hospital bed for months on end, hoping that their parent might one day have a spot in long-term care. We have to recognize the wait-lists. The research I saw last summer said that there were 52,000 people on a wait-list. We still have not seen this promised safe long-term care act. It was mentioned in the confidence and supply agreement between the NDP and the Liberal Party, and I continue to encourage the urgency to be placed on that legislation being moving forward, given that it is not in Bill C-19. In fact, long-term care is mentioned in the budget only once, as it relates to funding that was promised back in 2021.

In closing, the last critical priority that is urgent and needs sufficient prioritization in this place relates to addressing indigenous reconciliation, specifically following through on the 94 calls to action from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. According to the Yellowhead Institute's most recent report on the calls to action, only 11 of 94 have been completed to date. In my view, that is another significant gap. If we are not doing enough to move sufficiently quickly to follow through on all of the promises made, to follow through on all 94 calls to action, this is another critical moment to do so.

• (1955)

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC):** Madam Speaker, my friend from the Green Party touched on mental health. We see all the time the Liberal government members say they have thrown this many millions of dollars at it. I would like to hear from somebody who I feel is very passionate about mental health and youth. Let us put the partisanship aside. What can we do as community leaders together? How can we use that money, the many millions that we hear all about? What can people do to use that money properly, equitably and fairly among youth so that we can help with the pandemic that is going on in mental health?

**Mr. Mike Morrice:** Madam Speaker, I really appreciate not only the question but the person who asked it, because the member for Calgary Forest Lawn has brought up the Canada mental health transfer many times, without anything that I read in it with respect to partisanship but with an interest in really moving ahead.

We know the governing party has promised the mental health transfer. When I go home and reflect back to neighbours of mine some of my aspirations for this place, what I often share is that there are examples where so many parliamentarians do agree, and mental health certainly is one of those. While I am glad to share more about the obvious needs in communities like mine, and his as well, as a newer parliamentarian here, I see this as an example where, as we continue to bring up mental health in this place, we could put pressure on the government, which has said that it intends to move forward. Let us ensure that it follows through on doing so.

• (2000)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I thank my dear Green Party colleague for his speech. I want to acknowledge his hard and heartfelt work on matters of social justice, the environment and persons with disabilities. He shows such compassion for people in vulnerable situations and I commend him for that.

I heard him say that he was disappointed that there was nothing in the budget about standards for long-term care.

*Government Orders*

Long-term care falls under the jurisdiction of the provinces and Quebec. Would my colleague not agree that the best way to support long-term care is for the federal government to transfer the money that the provinces and Quebec need?

[*English*]

**Mr. Mike Morrice:** Madam Speaker, I will answer in English, only to ensure that I get my words right.

Yes, I would agree that funding is critical. National standards for long-term care that are brought about in collaboration and consultation with provinces and territories, in my view, are also really critical to ensure that we address what we strongly agree on, which is that there is a crisis in long-term care, that we have not moved through that crisis yet, and that we need to ensure that we do so much better by our elders right across the country.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's thoughtful and articulate speech. I share his dismay at the \$2.6 billion in this budget for carbon capture and storage, not because I do not believe that this technology will likely play some modest role in reaching our climate targets, but because this is a direct subsidy to some of the wealthiest and most profitable corporations in our country. The \$2.6 billion is not pocket change. Could my colleague perhaps provide his thoughts on where that \$2.6 billion could be better spent in meeting our climate targets and ensuring a healthy future for our kids?

**Mr. Mike Morrice:** Madam Speaker, I will recognize that it was the NDP that brought forward a motion just last week calling for repealing and ending all subsidies at a time when, under various names, we continue to see new ones added.

To answer the question, we know exactly where those funds should go. They should be going to workers, to invest in their long-term future and a prosperous transition for workers to ensure that they know that they are going to be a part of the economy of the future.

**Mr. Ryan Williams (Bay of Quinte, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time today with the hon. member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

It is my greatest honour and privilege to rise on behalf of the people in my riding of Bay of Quinte and the region.

I have found in my time as a member of Parliament that as an MP, I get to use my voice to speak for those people in the riding. My wife Allyson and I have met with so many great people, especially in the last few months. We have had nothing short of amazing experiences in listening to them and representing them here in Ottawa. It is my privilege to act as their voice in this place.

Today I talked with Katie, who cannot travel within her own country. She has an allergy and she cannot get out to see her family. I talked with Josh, who cannot afford a house. He has bid on seven houses now, and has been outbid each time. He is having a really tough time. I also spoke with Jane, who cannot afford either groceries or gas right now.

I am using this privilege to speak on behalf of people who are struggling and asking for help, and to ensure that we see a budget that makes sure that Canadians get to take control of their lives

through uncertain times. Each and every Canadian wants equality of opportunity, to have a place to live and work, the opportunity to marry whom they want, to travel where they want, the opportunity to live freely and to pursue that which motivates them most, and not because government tells them it is the right thing to do, but because it is their right as Canadians.

It is my belief and my party's belief that the government's job is to provide equality of opportunity for Canadians to take control of their lives, as they have for the last 155 years, and to lead this planet with that Canadian innovation, entrepreneurship, creativity, hard work, passion, and yes, even politeness. We need to lead Canada in standing as a symbol of democracy and freedom. That is not to say government does not have a role, but it is not the role of government to lead; it is the role of government to empower our citizens.

We have the worst housing crisis in this generation in the whole history of Canada right now. We have an inflation crisis, a war in Ukraine and an energy crisis with gas as high as \$2.50 a litre in some parts of the country. We have a food unaffordability crisis, with fertilizer up 42%, and in my riding, food prices have been up 30% in the grocery store, which is correlated to a 30% rise in food bank usage. We have 1.03 million jobs unfilled in this country. People are screaming for employees. We have clogged airports, lineups for passports and unstaffed Canadian border entry locations. I think it is safe to say that we just wish we could live through some precedented times. However, these unprecedented times need major action.

No matter the party in the House, I think we can all agree that these are trying times and that it is our responsibility to do what is best for Canadians, and not just in trying times but truly unprecedented times. We need new ideas. We need to make new stands. We need to inspire all Canadians to believe in themselves to start to solve the biggest issues that plague us.

While budget 2022 speaks to three main pillars, my objection to the budget, and my party's objection to the budget, is not just to the pillars but that it speaks to a government solving these issues instead of instilling that power to Canadians to solve those issues and get government out of the way.

*Government Orders*

There is pillar one, which is about investing in people. We certainly need people to fill the over one million jobs that are open, and there is a price to unfilled jobs in this country, which is \$30 billion. Let us equate that to the tourism industry, which is worth \$34 billion to Canada. Unfilled positions, which include in the tourism sector, are causing major backlogs. They are causing bottlenecks. We are short factory workers, skilled trades to build homes and software engineers who go to some of our universities but then get taken up by the U.S. We are short 25,000 truckers whom we depend on to take our goods across our country and across our borders. We are short 60,000 nurses and 14,000 doctors and specialists.

There are currently 1.5 million unemployed Canadians under the age of 66 and there are one million jobs available. Do members know who is not short of employees? It is the federal government. Since 2015, this Liberal government has added 62,000 federal employees to the federal payroll, which employs just over 319,000 employees right now. In spite of that, we have unprecedented backlogs in federal departments.

We know about the IRCC backlogs. Did members know that it is two million people? Do members know that we are waiting for 45,000 skilled trades to come to this country? It was just launched yesterday, or the day before, that we have hired 500 more employees. Why not just add more employees to try to solve the issue, and \$85 million? There are two levers that we can pull. One is bringing more skilled immigrants in and the other is helping to get money to train skilled workers into better jobs. Members can excuse my constituents if they do not believe that budget 2022 will do anything to change that.

• (2005)

The alternative puts control into people and more money into colleges so that Canadians can choose to train for jobs that the regions need. As we have been studying this in science, research and industry, colleges have programs that work for the employers that have empty jobs so they end up getting the employees they need to put into those jobs, such as nurses and PSWs. Colleges also do training for skilled trades and technical jobs. That works in remote communities. Some 95% of Canadians live within 50 kilometres of a college in Canada. This also works for the rural communities and first nations communities.

Employers themselves, as well as economic development organizations, can train employees. My local organization, Bay of Quinte Economic Development, has a great program called Elevate Plus. It takes students and trains them in six-week cohorts in a classroom. I have been to the graduations, which are often emotional, because for many of these students it is the first job they have ever had. It is empowering and powerful. How incredible it has been for those students who were on Ontario Works social assistance, to come off of that system and get themselves jobs.

Housing can be a major driver. If we look at immigration, we should make sure we put the skilled trades we need first, such as plumbers, electricians and well drillers. We need at least 600 in my riding alone. We look at the million jobs needed filled across Canada, and many of them could be filled, which would build homes and create GDP and economic development.

The member who spoke earlier talked about investing in people's mental health, because when we help people, they help themselves. It is a major empowerment.

Pillar two in the budget is the green transition. This is obviously very important. We want a green future for our children. Given the choice, Canadians will make choices that allow them to make the planet greener, but the hidden danger of a green energy transition is ignoring affordability, security and reliability, which need to be a key plank in the green transition, but are not part of budget 2022.

The Russian invasion of Ukraine has changed the world and has also triggered an energy crisis that is exposing the world's dependence on not only Russian energy, but green energy that is not yet available to replace it. We know the future is going to be green with hydrogen, modular nuclear energy and Canadian natural gas and converting the world from coal. It is going to be a big transition that we need to make as Canadians, and Canada is going to play a big role in that. When we ignore affordability, when people need to heat their homes and make a choices that are good for their family, we are ignoring the choices they can make. We are actually hurting them with those energy policies, not helping them. We need to include affordability, choice, jobs, income investment and productivity when including a green transition, none of which are in budget 2022.

Pillar three is about productivity and innovation. We have to work hard at the new economy. We have so many great jobs. We have never seen a time like this since 1900s, with the introduction of electricity, automobiles and the telephone. Now we have five major technologies converging. When the government talks about investing, we need to invest in mentorship and allow Canadians to bring that innovation to the forefront, such as AI, blockchain, robotics, energy storage and DNA sequencing, which are all working together.

I agree with the three pillars in the budget, but I believe that it is people, not government, who need to be empowered. People need to invest in it. I will say right now that Canadians are going to be the ones to lead this country out of inflation, out of all of our crises and lead Canada and the world forward.

• (2010)

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague is from Bay of Quinte, which also has CFB Trenton in his riding. He did not mention anything with respect to the additional \$8 billion in funding for the Canadian Armed Forces in the budget. I know that he has brought forward the issue of Canadian Armed Forces housing and the issues that are facing the PMQs across Canada.

*Government Orders*

I would like to ask the member opposite for his opinion on the additional \$8 billion in funding for Canadian Armed Forces members, which can include funding for housing. I know he has had some investments recently announced in his riding for Canadian Armed Forces housing. As a parent of two Canadian Armed Forces members and a mother-in-law of one, this is something that is very important to me, so I would like his opinion on the additional funding for the Canadian Armed Forces.

**Mr. Ryan Williams:** Madam Speaker, I have so much respect for the Canadian Armed Forces. I think the member and members of her family have also served in the Canadian Armed Forces and I thank her for her service.

There is a funeral on Friday for John Smylie who followed my father as honorary colonel on the base. It is very emotional. The base is worth so much to our region.

We thank the government for the investment in the base. Sixty homes is where the money went, as well as for an emergency response unit, which is so needed. Canada has a great role to play in the world. We still need a lot of housing in the military. Of the 6,000 homes, we are short 360 there.

I know the government is committed to investing in the military, as well as in NATO and NORAD. I very much thank all of those who are supporting the military.

• (2015)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I want to salute my colleague and thank him for his speech.

There is all kinds of stuff in this omnibus bill, which deals with such topics as space jurisdiction, strip searches in prison and whatever else, but 170 pages are dedicated to the new Liberal luxury tax.

This tax will have a significant impact on entire sectors of our economy. One example frequently mentioned by Conservative members on the Standing Committee on Finance is the whole boating and pleasure craft industry. When we asked finance officials to table the impact studies for this tax, they turned to us and said they had nothing, they did not know about it, and they had not done anything.

Does my colleague think it is acceptable for the government to implement a new tax that is going to affect whole sectors of our economy without doing any economic impact studies?

[*English*]

**Mr. Ryan Williams:** Madam Speaker, Winston Churchill said that taxing oneself into prosperity is akin to standing in a bucket while trying to lift oneself up.

We have industries that are just coming out of COVID. We know that industries are lacking labour. We know that industries have taken on massive loans, apart from the government, but they are trying to claw their way out. Every industry in Canada, every business and every Canadian is trying to get out. They are fighting just to get back up on their feet. This is not a time for new taxes. This is a time for tax relief.

We have certainly offered solutions for tax relief to Canadians. We certainly have to look at helping Canadians with tax relief. This is not a time for taxes.

**Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I sit on the defence committee and we heard a lot about the need of those in the armed forces who are struggling with the cost of living, with having to move all the time. Families are struggling with housing costs. One of the things that was offered up was a reinstatement of the cost of living differential for Canadian Armed Forces members.

I would like to hear the member's thoughts on how that would help.

**Mr. Ryan Williams:** Madam Speaker, anything that can go to the military is great. I think I have already said that.

There are a couple of things happening right now. When a military member moves from Cold Lake, Alberta, to CFB Trenton, the house price differential can be \$500,000, so it is not helping with that. The \$500 is there. On northern Vancouver Island, being offered Habitat for Humanity as a solution is not right.

We have to build homes. The least the government can do is to put homes up. We can get the army to help out. Let us get homes built and let us take care of our military, 100%.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I really want to thank my colleague from Bay of Quinte for such a great speech.

I am honoured to speak to Bill C-19, and I want to take this opportunity to speak to concerns about Canada becoming a country that is known for backlogs.

Immigration, passports, seniors supports, Veterans Affairs, Service Canada and so many basic services the government provides are in a tailspin of growing backlogs. We see that very clearly in the Canadian immigration system. The Liberal-made backlog at IRCC has now reached 2.1 million applications.

What does the minister and department think about that? The minister told the immigration committee, "I hesitate to describe [it] as a backlog, because it's normal to have an inventory of cases." If that is normal, I would be very concerned to see what they consider abnormal. This is the biggest backlog we have ever seen in Canada's history in immigration.

These are not just numbers. That is the key here. These are family members who cannot be reunited with each other. There are parents who are missing their kids' first birthdays, their first steps and their first words.

There is also mental anxiety and many mental health issues. We hear about people being divorced. The suicide rates are going up because of this backlog. Employers cannot find labour fast enough. They are suffering, which means, ultimately, that our economy suffers. This is something we wish the government would take seriously, but we do not see much inside the budget that would help address the issue.

The government is now okay with stranding 2.1 million people and their families in bureaucratic limbo because it thinks this is normal. When did it become okay to normalize poor performance? Canada is welcoming record numbers of immigrants, all the while not dealing with labour shortages and the refugee crisis.

We also have a very concerning report that came out about racism at IRCC. There is nothing, whether in the budget or practically, being done by the government to address that racism. The most concerning thing is that, of the managers and employees who displayed racism, not a single one was reprimanded or fired. Rather, they were given bonuses. That is super shameful. It really is bad for our country to be known as a country that has an issue with racism within IRCC. This is on top of the backlog, and it is partly contributing to that backlog as well.

When the minister appeared at the immigration committee in February, he committed to returning processing times to the 12-month service standard and investing \$85 million to fix the immigration backlog. However, after four months, the backlog grew from 1.8 million in February to over 2.1 million, and processing times are two to three times longer than what the service standards say. I would bet that every single MP in the House agrees with me that their offices are burdened because of the immigration backlog that was created by the government after it refused to address the core issues that are plaguing our IRCC department.

IRCC has even indicated that there was no plan to use backlog funding for the existing backlog, which is more proof that there is a lot of talk of throwing money at the problem, but there is no actual plan to do anything with that money. Backlogs are not just about paperwork and frustration. Despite IRCC treating everyone as a file number to be processed, real people are affected by the Liberals' mismanagement of the immigration system.

I hear this from constituents all the time. Our office receives correspondence and phone calls from people ready to give up. We fear that people are contemplating suicide because after months of being separated from their loved ones, newcomers lose hope. They lose faith that they will ever be able to see their loved ones again.

Too many immigrants and too many newcomers waiting for their cases to be processed end up unable to see their children's first steps, as I said. They miss funerals; they miss weddings. According to IRCC's posted processing times, family sponsorship applications alone take 23 months for spousal sponsorship and 34 months for parents and grandparents, instead of the promised 12 months

We saw throughout this pandemic that getting help from family members was needed in certain instances. One mother was at home with a child who had severe disabilities and she needed either her spouse here or a caregiver. However, because of the backlog, that mother, who was in my riding, suffered. She cried many nights,

### *Government Orders*

wrote many emails and was on the verge of just giving up. There were many times when she would email my office and say, "This is it for me. I cannot handle this anymore." It is sad to see that the caregiver program is so badly neglected that all caregivers now see no hope they will ever get here.

● (2020)

We wish the government would take these things seriously. Again, I know I am not alone in this chamber in talking about the problems in our immigration system. We have other Liberal MPs on record who are also tired of the backlog. One of them said in an article that this is messed up, and it is. It truly is. Lives are being ruined because of this backlog.

When we look at budget 2022, I do not see much in there that is going to address the issues, address the mental health problems that come with the issues being created or tackle in any way this backlog, which has burdened our businesses, Canadians and newcomers alike.

How do we fix a system that is so severely mismanaged? One suggestion, obviously, is to elect a Conservative government. Let us get things back on track. In the meantime, let us start with some common-sense reforms. For example, let us create a framework for better foreign credential recognition. It is an essential thing we could do today. There are many people in this country, and we all know some of them, who are either doctors or engineers back home. However, when they come here, because of credential recognition, they waste their talent. They are underemployed.

Why can we not work together? Why can the government not work with our provincial partners to do a better job in making sure we are recognizing credentials? That way we can fill the labour gaps. Our rural areas, especially in Quebec, are suffering the most. There are people who are retiring in our rural areas and it is so hard to find doctors. This is one way we could help address some of the labour shortages. There are many very talented electricians, plumbers and all sorts of tradespeople in this country who have so much to contribute.

Newcomers come to this country with a Canadian dream, much like me and my family did. This country gave us an amazing opportunity to become successful. I am the son of a taxi driver and of a mom who worked multiple jobs. This country gave us everything. I am so proud to represent a riding that has other such hard-working people.

*Government Orders*

I grew up in the riding I get to represent today. I stood in line to get low-income bus passes in my riding. We lived through that poverty. However, this country, through the grace of God, gave us everything to become successful. I am the son of a taxi driver who gets to stand here today and represent my constituents and be their voice in the house of common people.

Would it not be great if we could let everyone, newcomers and Canadians alike, feel free when they come here? That is what I want to speak to. I wish the budget would attempt to address more of that. How can we help unleash people's talents? How can we get government out of the way, get these backlogs out of the way and get the red tape and bureaucracy out of the way? How can we work together in this Parliament to address some of these issues? That is what I wish we could all work together on.

When we come to this chamber, there is a lot of partisanship, but there are practical, common-sense solutions being put forward on the table. I have only listed one. We could once again make Canada the great destination that it was known for. Canada was once known to be at the top of the list. When anyone wanted to immigrate, Canada was a beacon of hope. It was a beacon of freedom at one point. Today, people are skipping over Canada and it is really sad to see. I hope that, whether it is through this legislation or through this budget, the government uses the money to make this country a beacon of hope once again.

In closing, I move, seconded by the member for Bay of Quinte:

That the amendment be amended by adding the following:

and that the committee report back no later than June 20, 2022

● (2025)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** The amendment to the amendment is in order.

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

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is interesting that the Conservative Party is once again proposing another subamendment. I understand the Bloc is supporting Bill C-19 and the New Democrats are supporting Bill C-19. However, the Conservatives, in their internal wisdom, have made the decision to try to prevent good legislation from passing.

Given we have so many progressive measures that are going to help Canadians coast to coast to coast, why does the Conservative Party feel so compelled to move a subamendment when it has moved amendments, subamendments and all sorts of other stuff on the main budget?

● (2030)

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Madam Speaker, given the track record of the government of the day, of course we need to raise questions and debate subamendments and amendments. There is a lack of trust with the government. We want to make sure we have the best legislation coming out of this place. That is why we have to do what we are doing.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I want to commend my colleague on his speech and thank him for it. I agree that the immigration department is having a lot of problems. Cases are not being processed in a timely fashion, and all of our constituency offices are all swamped, trying to help these people.

I agree with my colleague that immigration is one solution to the skilled labour shortage. However, there is currently a debate between France and Algeria, and I would like to hear his thoughts about it.

There is a shortage of doctors in France. Doctors are retiring, so France is recruiting heavily in Algeria. Now Algeria is starting to say that it needs more doctors, that France is stealing all its doctors. This then creates the issue of displaced resources.

I would like my colleague to comment on this phenomenon.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Madam Speaker, I hope I understood the question right. It speaks to the point I brought up about foreign credentials.

We could do a better job, as a collective, in making some type of standard or striking a royal commission. We could create a standard, not just with the provinces but with other countries, for the shortage of labour or highly skilled workers such as doctors and nurses, whom we are going to need. We need them now, but we are going to need them later on too.

I know Quebec is really suffering when it comes to its numbers. We could help address some of those issues. Also, we need to do a better job with the provinces to help address their unique challenges. Communication is missing. There is a big gap in that, and I hope we can collectively work to help address it.

**Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I agree with a lot of what my hon. colleague just spoke about. I agree that foreign credentials are a huge issue, as is the immigration crisis we are seeing through the IRCC. My office is constantly battling with the fact that we are only allowed to ask about five cases every day, which is absolutely ludicrous.

The member did not speak too much about international students. In my community, at Fanshawe College, there are incredible students coming forward, yet they are limited in being able to find a pathway here after they finish their degrees. If he could comment on that, it would be great.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** The hon. member has one minute to respond.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:** Madam Speaker, on this topic, I do not think a minute is enough. I totally feel for my hon. colleague and her question.

*Government Orders*

I consider one of my wonderful colleagues an older brother. My older brother from Surrey—Newton is very passionate about not just this issue but immigration as a whole. I met with some international students today in my office. I believe my older brother from Surrey—Newton did as well.

This is a big issue. On top of the hurdles they have, there is the incredible amount of money they spend to come to this country and the struggles their parents go through just to send them to this country. I think we do a disservice to hard-working, talented and energetic international students when they come here and do not have enough to survive and are left to fend for themselves. There are some really concerning things going on with them, such as human trafficking and abuse by employers. We need to work together to help address those issues, on top of the mental health issues that international students struggle with.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I want to begin by saying that I am pleased to be speaking to Bill C-19, which seeks to implement certain provisions of the budget.

Today I want to talk not so much about the measures that have been set out in this bill, but rather about those that have been left out. Believe it or not, despite the size of this bill, there is still a lot missing. Trying to understand this omnibus bill is quite the undertaking. Bill C-19 is 466 pages long and it has 32 divisions and 502 sections.

At the very least, we would have liked to see the government devote a substantial part of this massive piece of legislation to employment insurance reform. Here is a spoiler alert for those who have not had the time to read these 466 pages of pure joy: This bill contains virtually nothing about EI reform, and what little there is does not live up to expectations.

I want to share my disappointment and concerns. However, before I begin, I would like to say that I have tremendous respect for the Standing Committee on Finance, which had the monumental task of studying this bill. I want to mention that and commend the members of the committee. They were sent on an expedition, a journey, an adventure that they had to complete in record time. I do not know how many witnesses they heard or how many briefs they received, but I want to acknowledge my colleague from Joliette for his work on the Standing Committee on Finance, as well as his fellow committee members.

I am not in a position to lecture anyone about procedure. I am not an expert on House procedure. However, when I look at this bill that we have to debate in a hurry under closure, and I realize that we are going to be here until midnight talking about what is good about it, what we wish were in it, and our expectations, I just end up wondering what the point of this is. In these circumstances, would it not be better to give parliamentary committees time to study the issues thoroughly and come up with a bill that would do a much better job of meeting expectations? It is a suggestion.

I will now talk about workers. I want to talk about gaps in the bill and the lack of EI reform. It is not because I am a former union leader and still a union supporter. With all due respect and in all

honesty, it is mostly because out of all the people who have called my office, not one has asked for a universal dental care program. I doubt I am the only MP in that position. No one has called me about that. Now, I am not saying it is not important.

My office has received calls about the labour shortage, the temporary foreign worker program, wait times for our businesses, immigration and payroll services. We are getting calls from our federal public servants, who are exhausted after two years of the pandemic. They are in negotiations and worried about what lies ahead for them. They have done their part, and continue to do so, but they are a little worried. All this to say that the federal government has a major issue to address: the employment insurance system.

That system is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government. It has not been updated in 15 years; rather, it has been the subject of counter-reforms. Workers and employers alike have been demanding for years that this system be updated to ensure that it meets the needs of those who pay into it.

● (2035)

Nevertheless, successive Liberal governments have spent the last seven years promising to reform the system, but there is no sign of any intention to keep that promise in this budget. This is actually more like a step back for workers.

Let us review those broken promises. In 2015, the mandate letter for the minister at the time gave instructions to undertake “a broad review of the EI system with the goal of modernizing our system of income support for unemployed workers that leaves too many workers with no unemployment insurance safety net”. The fact that the system does not work properly is not news. That was from 2015, but the review never happened.

In 2019, the current minister was tasked with strengthening employment insurance through measures such as new special benefits models. That included improving the current pilot project for seasonal workers, which was supposed to become a permanent program that provided consistent and reliable benefits. She was even tasked with creating a new EI disaster assistance benefit. Well, that disaster happened. The COVID-19 pandemic stressed the system like never before. There is a reason why the government had to make up benefits from scratch.

There are some serious flaws in the system. We have known that for many years. In 2020, the President of the Treasury Board told Le Soleil the following, and I quote: “We knew that the EI safety net had a few too many holes in it and did not provide sufficient coverage, but we did not move forward quickly enough with our reform.” I could not have said it better myself. It is really too bad that the government waited until it was backed into a corner before taking action. However, as the saying goes, it is never too late.

### *Government Orders*

The reason I am so disappointed today is that, once again, the government has been making all sorts of other nice promises since the beginning of the pandemic. The minister's 2021 mandate letter states that it is up to the minister to, "by Summer 2022, bring forward and begin implementing a plan to modernize the EI system for the 21st century, building a stronger and more inclusive system that covers all workers, including workers in seasonal employment and persons employed by digital platforms, ensuring the system is simpler and more responsive for workers". However, summer 2022 is in 13 days.

On January 1, the day of new year's resolutions, the minister stated in the Canadian Press that she was confident she would meet the timelines set out by the Prime Minister. She also indicated that in addition to instituting new rules and new benefits, the government was going to have to update its technology because the system is still running on code from the 1960s. In that regard, some Service Canada officials told us that they are still working with DOS. That is from another era, the era of the dinosaur.

If the minister was confident that she could meet the summer 2022 deadline, we can say without hesitation that she has failed. Where is the minister's plan? It is not in Bill C-19 or in the budget. I am very disappointed to see that nothing is being presented before we adjourn for the summer.

I am also concerned. As the minister knows full well, at this time certain requirements have been temporarily relaxed. These adjustments are not perfect, but they have made it possible for several thousands of workers to access their benefits. Many have seen these flexibilities as a potential basis for reform. However, they will come to an end on September 25.

● (2040)

What will happen then? There is no plan. The most important thing is to avoid losing ground, because the status quo is not an option.

When we say that reform is needed now, that is not just some political slogan. As I said earlier, the pandemic has exposed the failings of the system and has demonstrated how urgently reform is needed for workers. There are many failings, but I will just talk about a few.

First, EI coverage must be expanded to as many workers as possible. It is a matter of fairness. As members know, just 40% of workers who contribute to EI qualify for benefits. Non-standard and part-time workers, the majority of whom are women and young people, are not eligible for the program even though they contribute.

Another problem is how EI fails sick workers. Organizations that specialize in this area are calling for a significant increase in the number of weeks of sickness benefits. A worker who has cancer, for example, needs at least 40 weeks of benefits to receive proper care and recover in dignity. This is what all studies have shown. These workers should be able to focus all their energy on healing, not on trying to make ends meet.

The government plans to extend the benefit period to 26 weeks. That was supposed to happen in July, but because of the computer

system, it may only happen in the fall. Now we can say it is too little, too late. It is not enough. What sick workers need is 50 weeks. After 10 years of fighting and seven bills, this still has not happened yet.

When I was a union official, I defined my unionism in two ways: It was proposal-based and action-based. The Bloc Québécois continues to make proposals. We are asking the government to act, because the government is showing a real lack of ambition and keeps bringing in half-measures.

The Social Security Tribunal recently ruled that the current system consistently discriminates against women on maternity leave. A woman who loses her job during or after her maternity leave is no longer entitled to regular EI benefits. Once again, one would expect this self-professed feminist government to rectify the situation, but instead it has decided to appeal the ruling. That is outrageous.

The employment insurance spring gap is another major concern. We like to eat crab and lobster in eastern Quebec and in the Maritimes, but the plant workers in those regions are seasonal. It is not okay that in 2022, when the season is over, they end up without a job or enough income until the next season. We have to do something about that. We have to end the spring gap. We are talking about the vitality of our regions and seasonal industries such as tourism, forestry, the fishery and others. We cannot abandon these people.

The government has been regularly questioned on this issue over the past few years. However, all it did was simply renew the pilot project that provides for a maximum of five weeks of benefits, which is not enough. It is shameful to not go further than that. Honestly, this lack of political courage is disappointing.

Madam Speaker, I could keep listing the flaws in the system for the rest of the sitting until you stopped me. The thing to keep in mind is that these are major flaws that have direct consequences for the thousands of workers who contribute to employment insurance and are entitled to it. These workers are calling for an immediate reform of employment insurance.

I have been touring all the regions of Quebec for three months now. I have not visited them all yet, but I will. What I am hearing from people on the ground speaks for itself.

● (2045)

I have met with municipal officials, advocacy groups representing unemployed workers, local unions, national unions, consumer rights groups, women's rights groups, regional development corporations, youth employment centres, government officials, seasonal workers, and more. I have attended some incredibly enlightening meetings. I have seen the various regional and local realities. All the people I spoke to agreed that the EI program needs to be overhauled immediately.

They urged reforms that would strengthen the rights of workers, but I also heard countless stories about wait times. We have all heard such horror stories in our constituency offices. Workers who have paid into the program and are entitled to EI have been waiting months for their benefits because they are victims of fraud. They cannot pay rent or child support, and they still do not have their EI cheque.

At the last meeting we had with the minister to discuss this at the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, she said yet again that Service Canada answers calls. It seems to me that Service Canada should be answering calls more and that the minister should stop going on about how the department is meeting service standards. Workers waiting for their EI cheques could not care less about service standards. They want their rights to be recognized, and they want to collect all the benefits they are entitled to.

The last thing I want to touch on is division 32 of Bill C-19. Actually, I would like to thank all members of the committee who accepted the Standing Committee on Finance's invitation to dig into the four or five clauses covering EI in Bill C-19. Division 32, which is about the Social Security Tribunal, was the main issue that was discussed. There was nothing in the budget about reforming this significant aspect of the program, so news of this government legislative measure came as quite a surprise.

• (2050)

In a mammoth bill of over 400 pages, there is a section that deals with the board of appeal, which is tripartite in name only. It does not in any way meet the objectives and commitments the government announced in 2019. Both the finance committee and the human resources committee heard from representatives of the major unions and representatives of unemployed workers' groups.

I would like to quote a representative of the Mouvement autonome et solidaire des sans-emploi, or MASSE:

Let's first point out that MASSE is disappointed that the government chose to reveal its intentions regarding the new board of appeal for the first time when it introduced Bill C-19, that is, nearly three years after it announced reforms. By breaking its silence in this way after so many years, not only is the government now presenting stakeholders with a *fait accompli*, but it's also admitting that it deprived itself of a wealth of expertise, and this will undoubtedly influence the people's confidence in the quality of administrative justice.

Union representatives, so labour, and employer representatives were unanimous in telling us that we needed to get rid of this division of the bill. The Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities and the Standing Committee on Finance were unanimous in their recommendation: We must remove division 32 from the bill. We worked hard, we listened to people, we listened to employers, we listened to workers and we succeeded, because the minister announced that she would withdraw division 32 from Bill C-19 and make it a separate bill.

I hope that the new bill that will be introduced will respond to the consultation that was unanimous three years ago and to the needs expressed by the community. This does not bode well for the comprehensive employment insurance reform if the intention is to introduce it in the same way—

### *Government Orders*

• (2055)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Order. I apologize to the member, but her time is up. Twenty minutes went by rather quickly. I would also like to suggest that she use a lectern for her notes in future. The noise made by the paper near the microphone makes it hard for the interpreters to hear.

The hon. member for Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne.

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, my colleague focused on employment insurance. The government has made invested a lot in reforming EI. With unemployment at its lowest since 1976, I would like to know what my colleague thinks of the investments we have made in training workers and helping them re-enter the workforce.

**Ms. Louise Chabot:** Madam Speaker, what worries me is that we are in the midst of a crisis, during which the government took action quickly. During this crisis, we saw the flaws in the EI system. However, the government is telling us that unemployment is down so it can wait a little longer to reform the system. We cannot afford to wait any longer.

Clearly, training is necessary. It might be a good idea to increase training budgets so that workers can update, recertify and develop their skills. However, that work must be entrusted to the provinces, because it falls under their jurisdiction.

In Quebec, this responsibility should be given to the labour market partners commission, a unique commission that engages in social dialogue.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I thank the member for her speech.

The Standing Committee on Finance found that the government and the Minister of Finance did not show the necessary willingness to reform EI.

Does my colleague have a theory to explain why she is right about the government and about what, exactly, happened with this budget bill?

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I congratulate the member for speaking in French. It was great.

The hon. member for Thérèse-De Blainville.

**Ms. Louise Chabot:** Madam Speaker, I want to add that it was a pleasure to work with my colleague on the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, or HUMA. I miss him. I congratulate him on his French and hope he will return to the committee, even if his colleague from Joliette wants to keep him on the Standing Committee on Finance.

*Government Orders*

He asked a very good question, but I am not sure whether I can answer him properly. The Standing Committee on Finance decided to assign some sections of this omnibus bill to other committees to make use of their expertise. EI reform falls under the purview of the HUMA committee, and therefore the Minister of Employment.

In spite of that, I had a hard time convincing the HUMA committee to study these issues. I was originally told that the Standing Committee on Finance would study them, but HUMA wanted to contribute.

The minister will present a reform because she committed to doing so in a bill she is to introduce in the fall regarding the board of appeal. In my view, these issues should be examined at the HUMA committee.

• (2100)

[*English*]

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I too would like to recognize the members on the Standing Committee on Finance. I see the member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, the member for Joliette and the member for Elmwood—Transcona. It was a huge task. Before this bill, we did have some great measures to help seniors with an increase to the guaranteed income supplement, and in this legislation, the Canada housing allowance did have a supplement added to it.

However, Canada still has some very great problems. We have problems with money laundering. We have problems with tax evasion. At a time of very high inflation, we also have a problem with excess profits. At a time when so many people are struggling and when we know that ongoing poverty costs our country much more, we need to make significant investments to address this situation.

I wonder if my hon. colleague can maybe inform the House of some of the measures she thinks were missing in this opportunity that could have levelled the playing field and addressed those serious financial inequalities that exist in Canadian society, not only for hard-working members of her constituency but right across this country.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Louise Chabot:** Madam Speaker, a number of measures can affect equal opportunity: strong public services, key social programs and, most importantly, a fair redistribution of wealth.

What is glaringly absent from the most recent budget are efforts to crack down on tax avoidance and tax havens. This is a battle that my colleague from Joliette has been fighting for years, a battle that must one day be settled here. Given that we have the capacity to fight, it comes down to political will. Things cannot go on like this.

I do not subscribe to the dogma that the rich must be made to pay for the poor. I believe that we need to have fair taxation to make sure that people cannot legally run off with bags of money while others are left behind. We need to address this issue. It should be a priority.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to the excellent speech by my colleague from Thérèse-De Blainville.

I have to say that this has really affected me. When I was young, I remember seeing the signs at election time asking who had stolen money from the unemployed. Movements like the Sans-Chemise coalition spoke out election after election, reminding us that workers were always worse off after EI reforms, especially the poorest and the oldest ones. What is more, the government was going to dip into the EI fund to finance far different priorities.

I do not know if my colleague can give me a little hope today, but what good could new EI reforms do us after everything we have seen over the past 30 years?

**Ms. Louise Chabot:** Madam Speaker, my colleague is right. There have been no reforms, just the opposite of reforms really and the gutting of employment insurance.

The government has hollowed out a social safety net program, reducing it to a mere insurance program that is essentially funded by workers and employers. The government even pillaged the fund to erase deficits and make cuts.

Reforming employment insurance means fixing what was done and making sure it will never be done again. Most importantly, it means guaranteeing stronger, more equitable rights for everyone.

[*English*]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would like very much if the member could provide some clearer thoughts in regard to something that goes beyond EI. We have some of the lowest unemployment rates in generations. The federal government is providing more opportunities for people to gain employment through educational programs such as apprenticeship and through programs we support in our community colleges and our universities. Does she see that as a good thing?

• (2105)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Louise Chabot:** Madam Speaker, with respect to training, I did not see anything in the budget about climate change, the environment or the just transition we need for workers. That is a gaping hole.

With respect to employment insurance and existing training programs, I completely agree. However, I would ask the federal government to transfer money to the provinces because this falls under provincial jurisdiction, as I said earlier. I applaud the work being done right now to have employers contribute a portion of their payroll to cover—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** Resuming debate.

The hon. member for Flamborough—Glanbrook.

*Government Orders*

[English]

**Mr. Dan Muys (Flamborough—Glanbrook, CPC):** Madam Speaker, let me say up front that I will be splitting my time with my colleague, the hon. member for Sturgeon River—Parkland.

It is always an honour to rise in the House to speak on behalf of the people of Flamborough—Glanbrook, and today it is to speak on the ways the 2022 federal budget is failing Canadian, as we consider Bill C-19, the budget implementation act.

The number one issue facing Canadians is the cost of living. We have heard that time and time again. As summer approaches, perhaps the first summer without some sort of the COVID restrictions that we have seen the past couple of years, Canadians are looking forward to enjoying the aspects of life that are so great about Canadian summers, whether they are the warm weather; the longer days; our beautiful parks, beaches and trails; bike rides with the family; or the Blue Jays playing at the Rogers Centre.

Instead, Canadians are stressing out about paying their bills. They are worried that they really cannot afford that summer road trip with gas prices over two dollars per litre across the country, and for that picnic in the park, the groceries are going to be at least 9.7% more and probably higher. The price of food, the price of gas, the price of home heating and the cost of life are what I hear about every single day from constituents in Flamborough—Glanbrook.

This is especially true for people in rural parts of my riding. They need to drive to get to work and school, to engage in social activities and to get to medical appointments, and the price at the pumps is leaving them feeling that they are going in reverse, which is why a budget with no plan to address the cost of living is really no plan at all.

The federal government took in \$39 billion more in additional revenue because inflation swelled its coffers, but it did not return any of that to Canadians struggling to get by. Instead, it piled on an additional \$50 billion in inflationary spending. What is worse is that the NDP-Liberal coalition has rejected any reasonable common sense suggestions we made to bring relief to Canadians.

In March, the government rejected our motion to pause the GST at the pumps on the eve of a carbon tax increase and the excise tax increases that were going to take effect on April 1, which were certainly going to do harm to seniors, families, small businesses and everyone. Just yesterday, our motion to provide relief to Canadians in several practical ways was also rejected by the Liberals and the NDP.

We proposed two things that would have brought immediate relief at the pumps: a temporary suspension of the GST on gas and diesel, and a suspension of the carbon tax. These would be things that would actually be tangible in combatting high gas prices, which is what Canadians want and what people in Flamborough—Glanbrook are asking me about every day.

They cannot make ends meet, and that is not surprising when the price of gas is, as we said, over two dollars a litre and the price of food is up 10% or more. It is the highest rate of food inflation we have seen since 1981, so obviously making ends meet is getting harder and harder.

I want to share a few stories of conversations I have had with constituents in the past couple of months because I think these are the very real and concerning cost-of-living issues Canadians are facing. Sal is a constituent in the Stoney Creek Mountain community in my riding, and he tells me his single-income family is having a lot of trouble. In his words, they are having “serious financial struggles as the cost of living is exceedingly high”.

Heinz is a senior living on a fixed income in West Flamborough. He shares with me his home heating bill every single month. He is always shocked and dismayed, and he questions the amount of tax, including carbon tax, on that bill. As a senior on a fixed income, he finds it to be a monthly challenge to his budget.

There is also Gerrit, who lives in Mount Hope in my riding. He commutes to work, and he could not believe the increase in the carbon tax on April 1 at a time when gas prices were already going up. He notes that this cost of fuel is really a challenge for him and his household as they commute to work every day.

These are just a few examples of the very real concerns from the lives of ordinary Canadians. That is why it is puzzling to me that the Liberals did not use the windfall in revenue the government received from rising inflation to address the cost-of-living crisis Canadians are facing. Maybe they could use some of the pragmatic suggestions we have proposed.

● (2110)

Instead, the 2022 federal budget includes another \$50 billion, as I have said, in uncontrolled spending. If we add that up, that can only be paid by higher taxes in future years.

The size of the federal government, we know, has grown 25% since before the pandemic, yet one cannot get a passport in a timely fashion. As the member for Calgary Forest Lawn articulated earlier this evening, one cannot get other government services or IRCC either, so that really begs the question.

The government’s lack of concern about the cost of living contrasts with our neighbours to the south where U.S. President Biden and treasury secretary Yellen have acknowledged that inflation is a real problem and they are acting. Here we have no plan.

I also want to talk about another issue I am hearing about from my constituents in Flamborough—Glanbrook. I have had a number of conversations about the tariffs on fertilizer. It is a frustration for farmers in my riding who have done all the right things. They ordered their fertilizer over the fall or winter. They work hard as stewards of the land, yet they were slapped with a punitive tariff on fertilizer just at the time when they are looking to plant their crops for this year's season.

*Government Orders*

In fact, I met with family farmers who run a grain operation in Glanbrook a month ago. They took time from their very busy planting season to discuss this issue. They had pencilled it all out. On handwritten pages, they showed me their calculations, and I was astonished. Their fertilizer costs grew from \$900 per tonne in 2018 to over \$2,300 this year. On top of that, they showed me their gas prices, their diesel prices and their propane costs. They are all up, so the economics of their operation are increasingly out of whack.

These are the people who produce our food. They assure the food security of our nation, as well as our world. Yes, I understand and support the need to combat Putin's illegal invasion of Ukraine. We are doing that in many ways, but we cannot do that on the backs of our farmers.

Canada is the only G7 country to apply a tariff directly on imported fertilizer from Russia, and it is a large one at that, at 35%. Conservatives have called on the government to exempt farmer and suppliers who ordered fertilizer before or on March 2. However, the minister of agriculture told the agriculture committee that the government would neither exempt these orders nor offer compensation to farmers to offset the costs of these tariffs. Yesterday, the Liberals and NDP voted down our motion on affordability, which included a provision to eliminate the fertilizer tariffs.

I know my time is winding down, so I want to conclude with a conversation I had a few Fridays ago with Darlene. Darlene is a senior living in the Upper Stoney Creek community in my riding. She was incredibly frustrated and concerned because she could no longer make ends meet on her fixed income with the cost of groceries. In fact, other costs that were unforeseen included some medications that she needed to take that were certainly exacerbating the problem, as well as just running her household. She unfortunately had to make the decision to sell her house and move in with her daughter. How sad is it that a senior who worked all her life and contributed to this country, while living in a modest home in a modest neighbourhood, could not make ends meet? She questioned what the government is doing to help her and all Canadians dealing with this affordability crisis.

This is the question that Darlene has for the government: Does it understand? Does it know that cost of living is the number one issue facing Canadians? If so, why is fixing it not the number one priority in the budget and for the government?

• (2115)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the member referred to the United States and compared it to Canada. He says that he wants the government to deal with inflation and then referred to how the United States is doing something, yet Canada's inflation rate is less than the United States.

We can look at what the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has done in managing our economy. Our debt-to-GDP ratio shows we are doing well compared to the United States. We can take a look at job creation. We are at 115% of pre-COVID jobs, those being the jobs we lost because of the coronavirus. We are at 115%, while the United States is still less than 100% in terms of recovery of jobs.

If the member does that comparison, I suggest it would show that we do have a plan and that plan is working. Would he not agree?

**Mr. Dan Muys:** Madam Speaker, as a new member in the House, I am always impressed with the number of interjections by the member for Winnipeg North and the sense of humour that he often adds to his questions.

The member cited a number of different metrics. Whether the cost of inflation is a couple of points higher in the United States, I do not think that answers Darlene's question. I do not think that answers Sal's question, Gerrit's question or Heinz's question. Despite the debt-to-GDP and the number of jobs, they are still dealing with that daily struggle of the price at the pumps. They are still dealing with that daily struggle of the prices at the grocery store.

If we want to talk about employment, we know the labour shortages are exacerbating the inflation crisis in the country, so I would not agree that we are on the right path.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Madam Speaker, my question for my colleague from Flamborough—Glanbrook is this.

How can he remain so calm when dealing with issues as fundamental as the dignity of our seniors? These individuals are in distress right now because they cannot make ends meet. The government is not doing anything, nor has it done anything over the past year, except one small gesture for a certain category of seniors. It has created two classes of seniors and refuses to give additional income to those aged 65 to 74. It is shocking.

How can my colleague remain so calm when discussing this issue?

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Muys:** Madam Speaker, maybe I will be a bit more animated in my response because we should not be calm about this. That is the generation that built our country and made it strong. We are doing a disservice to them when they have to struggle. Some have to sell their houses and move in with their children, and Darlene is not the only example. I have heard this from others. My parents are seniors, and I hear directly from them.

There was your point about the two categories of seniors that have been created. That should not be. It was, in my view, politics to offer \$500 on the eve of an election to seniors over the age of 75. I knocked on doors in the last election and seniors who receive that said it is unacceptable. They asked why are they getting it and not others. They donated it, in fact—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes):** I would remind the hon. member to ensure that he addresses his questions and comments through the Chair.

We have time for a brief question. The hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Madam Speaker, the member for Flamborough—Glanbrook spoke a bit about carbon pricing. This is an interest of mine, particularly because the experts say that there are really two approaches to driving down emissions: either a market-based carbon pricing approach, which is more efficient and less expensive, or a regulatory approach, which is less efficient and more expensive. The Conservative Party, in the last election, supported a carbon pricing approach, albeit a bit of a strange approach, under the leadership of the member for Durham.

I am curious if my colleague can tell me where the Conservative Party currently stands on using market-based carbon pricing approaches to address the climate crisis.

• (2120)

**Mr. Dan Muys:** Madam Speaker, I enjoy my work with the hon. member on the transport committee.

Conservatives did support a carbon pricing scheme in the last election. I served on the board of directors for the Royal Botanical Gardens, which is responsible for many sensitive and important ecological lands within the greater Hamilton area. The environment is important to me, and I take that question seriously.

Our point is that at a time of inflation, at a time when Canadians are struggling, why are we increasing the carbon tax?

**Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC):** Madam Speaker, today we debating Bill C-19, the budget implementation act, and I will be coming at this debate from the perspective of somebody who is a member of a young family, a father of a young child and an Albertan.

For the past seven budgets, we have seen a Liberal government that has always blown through its self-imposed fiscal guardrails. It has always spent far more than what its members originally told Canadians they were going to spend. I remember the Prime Minister's 2015 election talk about small \$10-billion deficits, but we all know where that ended up. This government has racked up more debt than all the prime ministers in our country's history combined.

One would think that as we are getting out of the pandemic, the government would be wanting to look for ways to pull the throttle back on its stimulus spending. Some of the stimulus spending was definitely necessary during the pandemic, but as we are seeing high inflation, it is quite clear that there is not a need for further stimulus in our economy and that this government should be looking for ways to pare back some of the spending. As a father, I do not want to see my children and my grandchildren burdened with the debts of today in future generations. This would hinder their ability to chart their own futures.

I am not against government spending, but I always ask if we are getting a high return on investment for Canadians. That is why I have been really watching this Liberal government's much-flaunted, by themselves, early learning child care plan with a great deal of interest. The minister never fails to take an opportunity in the House to tell us about how successful this new program is, but the facts that we are beginning to see on the ground are telling a very different story.

I have reports from numerous day care centres across this country, not just from one province, that are saying that they cannot apply for this one-size-fits-all government program and that the amount of red tape is insurmountable. I have seen statements from day care operators that they will be required to submit expenses for food and craft supplies to a government agent for approval. Some are even being told that they need to cut their expenditures on nutritious food and educational programming in order to meet the government's stringent funding requirements.

Another huge issue is that this government's day care scheme seems to ignore the fundamental basics of economics: supply and demand. We know that when there is an increased demand, which the government is creating by promising affordable \$10-a-day child care, there will be an increase in the cost of supply, and those supplies can take the form of, most significantly, the wages of child care workers, the cost to build new facilities and to rent out new facilities, and the cost to provide the programming. We know that as the demand increases, the cost of these supplies is going to increase.

I had a child care centre say to me that the government's proposed program will only subsidize the wages of child care workers up to \$18 an hour. The average child care worker in this country is paid over \$23 an hour, and in this tight labour economy, people are lucky to even get a child care worker at \$23 an hour.

Also, the government is not being flexible with child care centres. It is saying that if they apply for the subsidy, they need to achieve \$10-a-day child care on its timeline. If they cannot find a way to cut their spending in other areas, whether it is the cost of the building or the cost of the labour, then they will not be able to get the subsidy for this program. As a result, we are seeing that a lot of day cares are just throwing up their hands and are really sad to tell the families that as much as they would like to apply for the subsidy, the government is simply making it too difficult for them to do it. That is fundamentally because the government is ignoring the laws of supply and demand.

This is going to result in is a two-tiered day care system in this country. We will have a few \$10-a-day day care spaces, and if a family is lucky enough to get on a list and get their child in there, it will be wonderful for them. However, many other families are going to be paying upwards of \$1,600 to \$2,000 a month for child care, and that is not fair. It is not right.

• (2125)

In fact, a Globe and Mail story on December 27 of last year said that a minority of parents are going to reap the benefits from this Liberal child care plan. It said that currently over seven in 10 children under the age of six do not have access to licensed child care and that in the best-case scenario, in five years from now, the government is anticipating that only six in 10 children will have access to care. We are seeing in this country that in the best-case scenario, 40% of children will not be able to access the government's program.

*Government Orders*

This is not a universal system. This is a two-tiered system.

Conservatives, I believe, had a far better plan. We had a universal plan, because we wanted a refundable tax credit, meaning that regardless of whether someone had taxable income, that person would receive a direct financial benefit for their child care expenses.

I also believe that as Conservatives we should add onto that, because I have talked to a lot of day care operators who want to operate in rural areas, and it is very difficult to find appropriate spaces. We have seen, at the provincial level in some provinces, that funding to help day care entrepreneurs find appropriate child care centres—for example, in an empty classroom in a school—can be very valuable, because we know that we need to create spaces in rural areas, where often people do not have access to child care. The fact is that the government is really missing the mark.

The other aspect is that we hear the government saying that the Conservatives used to send child care cheques to millionaires under the universal child care program. The fact is that under this so-called \$10-a-day child care program, it does not matter what someone's income level is. If a millionaire parent can get their child on the list for a \$10-a-day day care spot, the government is essentially subsidizing the children of millionaires by thousands of dollars. Meanwhile, a shift worker working for minimum wage, a single parent who cannot get access to this \$10-a-day day care because of a huge waiting list, could be stuck paying \$1,500 a month for child care. That is a two-tiered child care system that does not reflect the needs of Canadian families.

I also want to talk as an Albertan in moving on to another aspect, which is what is not in the budget implementation act.

In the budget, the government had a much-vaunted carbon capture tax credit. I have been a proponent of a carbon capture tax credit for a long time, because my riding is a critical area for carbon capture. We have the Northwest Redwater Sturgeon Refinery, which sequesters 1.2 megatonnes, 1.2 million tonnes, of carbon dioxide every year. There is a fertilizer plant next door that also contributes to the pipeline. This carbon is taken through a pipeline and is put into the ground for enhanced oil recovery.

There are numerous other enhanced oil recovery projects in Canada, but unfortunately the Liberal government was so blinded by its ideology that it chose to exclude enhanced oil recovery projects from its carbon capture tax credit.

I will say that a carbon capture project that purely captures carbon and puts it into the ground and does not have any enhanced oil recovery should get a better tax credit, because they are not making money by getting oil out of the ground, while a project should not get as good a tax credit if it is making money through enhanced oil recovery.

The government keeps talking about the climate emergency, saying that we need to take action now, and I agree; I love the environment. We need to get carbon out of the atmosphere as quickly as possible, and one of the ways that the government could have done that is that is by removing its ideological aversion to working with our energy industry, which is primarily located in the western provinces, and working with them to develop a carbon capture tax

credit that would support enhanced oil recovery. I think companies would be spending billions of dollars today if they knew they could access this program. We would be sequestering many more megatonnes of CO2 today and we would be getting much further toward our carbon capture and our Paris climate change accord goals.

Finally, I want to talk about the first home savings account. It sounded like a great idea during an election when we are trying to buy votes from Canadians, but we know that working families cannot afford to put \$40,000 in a savings account, so which families are going to benefit from this? It is going to be the families of the wealthiest 1% in the country. The parents are going to give their children the \$40,000, which taxpayers will then subsidize, because when one puts the \$40,000 in, one gets a break on taxes. This government policy is going to disproportionately benefit the wealthy and is not going to help young families get affordable housing.

With that, I cannot support Bill C-19.

• (2130)

**Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to the member's speech and I found it quite concerning that he was disparaging a Canada-wide early learning and child care agreement that the Alberta government signed on to, with \$4 billion going to Alberta families. Those in registered child care have actually seen a 50% reduction in fees since January.

He talked about the importance of building new spaces and going into rural areas. In fact, that is exactly what the Alberta government is doing in partnership with the Government of Canada. I wonder if he is actually directing his criticism to the Government of Alberta and its policies.

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Madam Speaker, I want to say that I have been receiving complaints from day care centres across this country about the red tape in the government's early learning and child care plan. I watched this very closely because I want an early learning and child care program to succeed in this country, but the government is not creating a program that will succeed. Even *The Globe and Mail* recognized that in a best-case scenario, only six in 10 children will be able to access the licensed care.

The government is creating a two-tiered day care system in this country, and that is unacceptable.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Madam Speaker, our colleague is talking about child care. We do actually get a sense that he really cares, that he is truly concerned about people in need.

*Government Orders*

One of the things that really bothers us about this budget and its implementation act is, first, that health care is being completely ignored. When I say that, I am not talking about an intrusion. We are not talking about dictating standards to the provinces. We understand the division of powers. We are talking about sending money to the provinces, which are struggling because of underfunded health care. We are also talking about seniors who deserve more than just a one-time pre-election cheque, and only for those aged 75 and over.

Does our colleague share our indignation about these two major omissions?

[English]

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Madam Speaker, I agree with the member. We know that in the constitutional order of this country, it is not the federal government but the provincial governments that are primarily responsible for the delivery of health care, and I was very disappointed to see yet another broken Liberal promise from the last election. The Liberals promised a special Canada mental health transfer that would be immediately afforded to provinces this fiscal year. That was not put in the budget.

I have talked to so many constituents. We are facing a mental health tsunami in this country, and the federal government is not being proactive in putting the funding forward to the provinces to address our mental health needs.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I am really intrigued by the carbon capture topic that the member brought up and I look forward to learning about the facility in his riding.

The concern I have about this approach, though, is that we are heavily subsidizing a very profitable industry. Our general approach to subsidies is that the government should be stepping in and helping those companies and those Canadians who are struggling the most, the ones who do not have the funds available to make the changes that need to be made.

The polluter pays principle seems like an inherently Conservative principle. Would my colleague not agree that we should not be giving billions of dollars to the most profitable companies, which very clearly have the funds available to invest in the kind of research and development that is required in this area?

• (2135)

**Mr. Dane Lloyd:** Madam Speaker, the fact of the matter is that even before the government brought forward this tax credit, oil and gas companies in this country were already investing in carbon capture. Companies in Saskatchewan and Alberta have been sequestering carbon for enhanced oil recovery purposes and non-enhanced oil recovery purposes. We have Whitecap Resources' Weyburn project, the Shell Quest project, the Redwater Sturgeon Refinery in my riding and the Nutrien fertilizer plant. They did receive some government support under the previous Conservative government, but I think the difference is that we want to see much more. We want to unlock the potential for carbon capture in this country, and if it means putting up a billion dollars to leverage \$10 billion of private investment and it achieves real reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, I do not see why the NDP would not support it.

**Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to speak to the investments mentioned in the budget that we are making in the defence and security of our country.

Before I get into specific issues, I would like to mention two things: first, the importance of defence and security industries from the economic point of view; and, second, how Ottawa, as a city, is very well placed to be the hub of companies involved in the ISR, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, segments of the defence and security industries.

The Canadian defence and security industries are an essential service and a critical sector in Canada's economy. These companies are highly innovative, export intensive and provide high-wage employment. These companies export 54% of their total sales. These companies provide employment to 64,000 people whose salaries are about 60% above the average Canadian manufacturing salaries.

During the last couple of decades, we have seen most of our manufacturing jobs outsourced to low-cost manufacturing countries across the world, but the jobs and manufacturing facilities of Canadian defence and security industries will never be outsourced. Also, for the U.S. defence purchases, which run into hundreds of billions of dollars every year, Canadian companies are considered to be U.S. domestic companies, offering a huge advantage to the Canadian defence and security industries.

Ottawa, as a hub, can be home to ISR companies, similar to hundreds of small companies around Washington, D.C. and the Annapolis beltway. Also, we are just few hours away from the centre of defence establishment in the U.S. We already have several companies in defence and security industries in Ottawa today. We also have Defence Research and Development Canada. Decision-makers on technology and procurements are also located here. All of these make Ottawa an ideal location for promoting it as the hub for ISR industries.

Canada is geographically well placed, with the powerful and friendly United States as our neighbour, who also is our major economic partner. The physical security threats to the country from outside our borders are minimal, and Canada was never worried much about physically protecting our land.

National defence is a fundamental responsibility of the federal government. In addition to protecting Canada from international threats and defending our sovereignty, the Canadian Armed Forces play an important role in making the world a safer place.

### *Government Orders*

Budget 2022 recognized those challenges and proposed new action to respond to them. It invested in Canada's defence capabilities, and in the alliances that will ensure a strong and coordinated global response to the ongoing challenges that the world faces today. Based on recent events and the changing global environment, the government acknowledged the requirement to reassess Canada's role, priorities and needs in the face of a changing world.

Budget 2022 announced a defence policy review to allow Canada to update its existing 2017 defence policy, "Strong, Secure, Engaged". In my view, merely updating the current policy is not enough. There has been a paradigm shift in the kinds of threats facing our country.

First, we have cybersecurity threats, including those that come from foreign actors, that target Canadians, Canadian businesses and our critical infrastructure. As Canadians grow more dependent on digital systems, the potential consequences of cyber-incidents continue to increase, and Canada needs to be ready.

Second, we have the spread of misinformation and disinformation that is directly challenging the stability of even the most long-standing democracies. Foreign threats to democracy, including state-sponsored disinformation, which is misinformation that is deliberately targeted to deceive people, have continued to grow amidst rising geopolitical tensions, a global pandemic and the rapid evolution of technology.

● (2140)

Third is biological threats that know no boundaries. The nature and severity of biological threats has grown in recent years. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the potentially catastrophic impacts of a deliberate biological event. Concerns are growing that the pandemic's unprecedented scale and reach could inspire terrorists to turn to biological weapons. United Nations Secretary-General Guterres has understood this threat. He warned:

The weaknesses and lack of preparedness exposed by this pandemic provide a window onto how a bioterrorist attack might unfold – and may increase its risks. Non-state groups could gain access to virulent strains that could pose similar devastation to societies around the globe.

The threat due to domestic terrorism is on the rise due to increasing hate and due to the spread of misinformation and disinformation. During the latest occupy movement, the cross-border connections between the extremist groups were alarming. Based on these threats, in my view, merely updating the current policy is not enough. We need a change in our approach to national security. We need a unified approach to defence. We need a unified approach between all government departments to seamlessly share the information for a unified response. We need a unified command to address the modern needs of security.

The existing policy document, "Strong, Secure, Engaged", stated:

This policy is deliberately ambitious and focuses, first and foremost, on the heart of the Canadian Armed Forces – the brave women and men who wear the uniform.

We know how this worked out.

The document was geared more toward the big-ticket items like ships and fighter aircraft, which, while important, do not address the major threat that Canada and Canadians are facing.

In the current policy document, "Strong, Secure, Engaged", which is 113 pages long, the word "misinformation" is mentioned only once. Similarly, the word "disinformation" is also mentioned only once. Also in this policy, the investment in cybersecurity was under "Joint Capabilities". It was grouped with IT and communications, signal intelligence, chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive detection and response capabilities. All of these had just a \$4.6-billion investment over 20 years out of about \$164 billion in proposed spending.

We should stop saying threats involving guns and bullets or ships and fighter planes from foreigners invading our land and sea are the only responsibility of the Canadian Armed Forces; or that cybersecurity threats are the responsibility of the Communications Security Establishment alone; or that biological threats should be handled by the Public Health Agency of Canada and the Canadian Armed Forces role is limited to providing a few medics; or that threats posed by misinformation and disinformation are the responsibility of maybe Canadian Heritage or the Canadian Security Intelligence Service; or that the threat from domestic terrorism is the responsibility of the RCMP, CSIS and local law enforcement agencies.

We should stop compartmentalizing the threats and divide the responsibility. We need to act cohesively.

We need generals who have a Ph.D. in artificial intelligence and other leading technologies. We need generals with a Ph.D. in biology. We need to completely start afresh and come up with a comprehensive strategy and policy. The existing policy document "Strong, Secure, Engaged" focused on a \$164-billion investment in procurement of traditional assets and tools, including ships, fighter aircraft, etc.

*Government Orders*

• (2145)

When we review this policy, it may be a good idea where the new high-technology companies are going. As an example, a Silicon Valley company called Anduril is succeeding commercially in transforming the U.S. and allied military capabilities with advanced technology. It says that the next generation of military technology will depend less on advances in shipbuilding and aircraft design than on advances in software engineering and computing. Unlike traditional defence contractors who focus primarily on hardware, its core system is an autonomous sense-making and command and control platform that serves as the core platform for its suite of capabilities.

Ideas are turned into deployed capabilities in months, not years, saving the government and taxpayers money along the way. The company combines military veterans with engineers who are experts in artificial intelligence, robotics, advanced sensors, secure networking, aerospace, virtual reality technology, aircraft modelling and simulation. We should look at companies like this to see what is happening elsewhere and where the defence systems are going.

I would like to quote extensively from the report, “A National Security Strategy for the 2020s”, prepared by the Task Force on National Security and the University of Ottawa’s Graduate School of Public and International Affairs.

It said:

We are living in a time of intense global instability when the security of Canada and other liberal democracies is under growing threat. An increasingly aggressive Russia is only one of a series of threats, both old and new, that endanger national security in Canada. It exemplifies the worrying re-emergence of great-power rivalry. It also interacts with or amplifies other threats, such as the use of new technologies to wage cyber-warfare, an increase in ideological extremism at home and abroad, attacks on democratic institutions, and transnational threats such as climate change and pandemics. We witnessed a different constellation of such threats in the protests that blocked border crossings and disrupted Canada's capital in early 2022. Where once the state was the focus of these threats, individuals and societies have also become targets.

When these and other threats reach the scale and potential to endanger what matters most to us as a country - our people, our democratic values and institutions, our economy, our society and our sovereignty - Canadians expect their government to protect them. Yet Canadians and their governments rarely take national security seriously. Taking shelter under the American umbrella has worked well for us.... We have not experienced a direct violent attack against our citizens in recent memory on the same scale as some of our allies, with the last major one being the Air India attack of 1985. This has made us complacent and paved the way for our neglect of national security....

Our peers, including our partners in the Five Eyes partnership (Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States) are reacting to this rapidly changing situation by revamping policies, identifying new tools and authorities, reforming institutions, devoting new resources to security and seeking new partnerships. They possess not only a deeper appreciation of the threats facing the West but also a more sophisticated national security culture writ large.

The report makes the case that Canada is not ready to face this new world. As a country, it says we urgently need to rethink national security.

• (2150)

The best part of the report is that the core recommendations do not require massive amounts of new spending, but, rather, focus on making better use of the tools we already have and improving co-operation among key partners.

The report makes recommendations in four broad categories.

Number one is to develop new strategies. Canada needs a national security strategy that reflects today’s realities. We can no longer count on some of the traditional pillars that have guaranteed our security and prosperity for decades. The essential first step is to hold a public review of national security. A thorough and transparent review would help inform the public, highlight priorities, identify the policies and tools required to address them, and point to the required changes to governance. In reviewing its national security strategy, the government should also take a hard look at whether its foreign, defence and development policies are adequate. This does not mean an isolated update in each case, but a holistic approach that examines all our national security assets in a coordinated fashion.

Number two is to strengthen existing tools and create new ones. Canada must build new tools and make better use of existing ones to deal with this diversifying and intensifying range of threats. More specifically, Canada should invest more in the following areas: sharing information within government, sharing information with other levels of government, reviewing outdated legislation, enhancing the use of open-source intelligence, strengthening cybersecurity, protecting economic security, guarding against foreign interference, and deterring organized crime and money laundering.

Number three is to enhance governance. Canada needs to rethink its national security governance framework: how decisions are made, policies developed and information shared.

Number four is to increase transparency and engagement. Many Canadians today mistrust government. This has major implications for national security. This erosion of trust opens space for misinformation and disinformation to spread, which weakens democratic institutions and contributes to a vacuum that hostile actors do not hesitate to fill. In this context, the national security community’s tradition of secrecy is outdated and counterproductive. As such, the report strongly recommends that the national security community’s recent engagement efforts be significantly ramped up, both with the public, including civil society, the private sector, the media and academia, and with Parliament. The community, moreover, must continue and intensify its efforts to increase diversity within its ranks.

It has been over 15 years since we produced a national security or foreign policy statement. We have not seriously reviewed the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act since CSIS was established in 1984. We need to have an integrated approach involving the Canadian Armed Forces, the Canadian Security Establishment, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Public Health Agency of Canada and other agencies dealing with defence and security.

*Government Orders*

I will conclude with a quote from Alex Deep. In his article “Hybrid War: Old Concept, New Techniques”, in the Small Wars Journal, he mentions that we need “an adaptable and versatile military” to overcome the complex threats posed by the modern hybrid war, which combines all the conventional and irregular components.

• (2155)

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, section 48 of the Constitution Act, 1867, requires the presence of 20 members in this House, including the Speaker, in order for business to be conducted.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** I would remind the hon. member that there are no quorum calls following Motion No. 11.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Madam Speaker, I am not making a quorum call. I am just making the point that the Constitution Act, 1867, section 48, requires the presence of 20 members. I count the presence, including yourself, of 17 members. Surely, the government would want to ensure that if the process by which this bill were to be adopted in this House were ever to be challenged in court, it would be upheld. That is the simple point that I would like to make.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, first and foremost, the member should probably recount the members who are actually in the House, and he will find that there is a quorum, even under the old rules. As you have pointed out, Madam Speaker, we are under Motion No. 11 rules, which received support from a majority of members of the House.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** To make it very clear again, before members go any further with this point of order, I would remind them that on May 2, the House duly adopted an order prescribing that the Chair shall not receive any quorum calls after 6:30 p.m.

[Translation]

The Chair rendered a decision on the admissibility of the motion, including the section on quorum calls during extended sitting days in May and June.

[English]

The ruling can be found in the Debates of May 2, 2022 at pages 4,577 and 4,578. I would invite the member to read the ruling of the Speaker to find that this matter has already been settled.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I know it is getting a little late, so I first want to thank the member for being here to participate. It sounded a bit like a canned speech, but I will leave that to the member to decide whether it was by his own hand or someone else's.

I think it was around this time five years ago that the former minister of national defence tabled a new national defence policy. I have been listening to what this member wants for national security. I would simply ask him to speak with his caucus because, quite honestly, the government has been terrible on these large policy reviews in other areas of government.

If we look at the mess that the current Minister of National Defence has inherited and how our Canadian Armed Forces is under-prepared in so many different ways, it is woeful. It is shameful. The member may want to consider that, rather than proposing new policies, perhaps the government should actually start filling the gaps that exist right now.

**Mr. Chandra Arya:** Madam Speaker, as I mentioned in my speech, in 2017 we had a policy document, but things have changed tremendously in the last five years. Misinformation and disinformation, while not a major factor five or six years back, have now become a major factor. We did not have the pandemic then, but now this pandemic has shown that a man-made virus could create havoc throughout the entire world. These are the reasons why the government has said, rightly so, that we are going to review the policy and update the existing policy document.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his speech, which did not have the slightest connection to Bill C-19.

I know that when a point of order is raised to have the Chair ask members of the House to ensure their speeches are on topic, it is always interpreted very broadly. In this case, however, my colleague's speech had absolutely nothing to do with Bill C-19.

First the government introduces a special motion forcing us to sit until midnight every night, at its whim, under time allocation. The normal process of debate in the House is not being followed. Now the government is sending in Liberal members who, as interesting as their speeches are, are more or less filibustering on Bill C-19.

My question for him is—

• (2200)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** I am sorry, but I must leave time for a response.

[English]

The hon. member for Nepean.

**Mr. Chandra Arya:** Madam Speaker, if the hon. member had read the budget, he would know that there is an entire chapter on this. Not only has \$8 billion been invested on the basis of the policy that was published in 2017, but I can go on to read what the government has announced in investments.

The government has provided \$875 million to address the cyber-threat landscape, based on Canada's first comprehensive cybersecurity strategy. On misinformation and disinformation, the government has provided \$13.4 million for the G7 rapid response mechanism. The government has provided \$10 million for the Privy Council Office to coordinate, develop, and implement government-wide measures designed to combat disinformation and protect our democracy. The government has also provided \$385 million for IR-CC and CSIS, plus the—

*Government Orders*

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** We have to proceed with questions and comments.

The hon. member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC):** Madam Speaker, although I appreciate that the member gave a lot of anecdotes of what Canada should be doing and could be doing, I was wondering if the hon. member would commit to getting whichever ministry he thinks is responsible for that long speech to get to work on the work he just said Canada should be doing. If he is okay with that, can he please tell us which minister he will approach and when he thinks this will take place?

**Mr. Chandra Arya:** Madam Speaker, in fact, that is the entire big mistake, what the member is doing. It is not the responsibility of one minister; it is a whole-of-government approach. If he had listened to what I was saying, he would know I said that we need a coordinated, comprehensive policy to tackle the new threats Canada is facing, which were not there five or 10 years back.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Madam Speaker, to pick up on what my colleague from Joliette was saying, there was indeed not much of a connection between our colleague's statement and the subject at hand, which has me wondering if he is tacitly acknowledging that there is nothing in the budget.

[*English*]

**Mr. Chandra Arya:** Madam Speaker, absolutely, if the member had taken some time to read the budget, there is a whole chapter on this. As I mentioned, there are many investments on many different levels that deal with the defence of our country and the security aspects of our country. Every single one of these things has been derived from the budget.

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoine, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I just want to respond to the previous comments that were made by my colleagues across the way. I take a lot of offence at the fact that they were stating there was nothing in the budget with respect to cybersecurity and nothing in the budget with respect to defence, which my colleague spent 20 minutes highlighting.

I sat on the national defence committee during the first mandate, and I know full well exactly what the threats facing Canada are today. The fact is that we had to look at “Strong, Secure, Engaged” and shift and pivot, given the new realities.

That is what the member just mentioned, and he spent 20 minutes highlighting the new realities here, so I find it quite offensive that people are accusing the member of not discussing what is actually in the budget, on page 136.

[*Translation*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The member for Joliette on a point of order.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Madam Speaker, I would like to remind the House that we are talking about Bill C-19, the budget implementation bill, not the budget itself. Not everything in that speech

is in Bill C-19. My colleague may take offence, but that speech had no connection to Bill C-19.

[*English*]

**Mr. Chandra Arya:** Madam Speaker, I completely agree with my colleague, and everything I talked about is part of Bill C-19.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Madam Speaker, maybe the member could clarify and clear the air. Did he write that speech, or did he literally just take sections of chapter 5 out of the budget? I would just like to know.

● (2205)

**Mr. Chandra Arya:** Madam Speaker, I take offence at the remark asking whether I wrote the speech. In fact, I spent quite a number of hours today preparing for the speech and have read so many documents, including the recent document on national security that was published by the University of Ottawa and the major leading experts on security and defence of our country. I completely take offence at these comments.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I listened to my colleague from Nepean's speech in hopes of finding some connection with Bill C-19.

Beyond that, I also picked up on some criticism, constructive criticism, about his government's proposals relating to things that had kind of been forgotten. That is why I want to ask him if he plans to support Bill C-19.

[*English*]

**Mr. Chandra Arya:** Madam Speaker, I have a simple answer. I do support Bill C-19.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I did enjoy the member's comments, and I wanted to ask him something a bit different. When we take a look at the budget implementation bill, one of the things we talk a great deal about is the ways in which we are supporting Canadians, and the national child care program is something that is universally very well received. The only political entity in Canada that is actually in opposition to it is the Conservative Party of Canada. We have Progressive Conservative provincial parties that are supporting it.

I am wondering if the member could just provide his thoughts as to why this is an important program for our children and parents across Canada.

**Mr. Chandra Arya:** Madam Speaker, that is a very important question.

The child care policy across Canada is very important because it equalizes everybody from coast to coast to coast. We have signed agreements with every single political party, from the Progressive Conservatives in Ontario to the Liberals in Atlantic Canada to the Conservative government in the west to the NDP government in B.C. Every provincial government has joined. That will give much-needed support to middle-class families who are burdened with the very high cost of child care. Child care at \$10 a day is a boon to most middle-class families.

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

**Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Niagara Falls. Niagara is a beautiful spot in Canada, but not as beautiful as Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup.

I am very pleased to rise in the House this evening to share my thoughts on Bill C-19, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 7, 2022 and other measures.

The first thing that came to mind when I read the budget was the phrase “out of touch”, because I was really upset to see how out of touch the government and the Prime Minister were with the reality of Canadians and their daily concerns.

Inflation is at its highest in 30 years. Absolutely everything costs more. The price of gas has skyrocketed. In my riding, the price per litre of regular gas is around \$2.03 right now. The price of food has climbed by 9.8% since last year, and house prices have doubled since the Prime Minister came to power.

All these increases have a direct impact on ordinary Canadians, but the government is doing absolutely nothing to help. We pored over the budget, but we did not find anything that would help families cope with these three key issues.

The government is just as out of touch with two important sectors of our economy that are especially important to me and that are being hit hard right now: the agri-food chain, which is severely affected by inflation, and the tourism industry, which suffered tremendously during the pandemic. The budget offers only a few crumbs for these two sectors.

Madam Speaker, there is so much noise I cannot hear myself speak.

*[English]*

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member is quite correct. He has a lot of difficulty understanding and so do I in hearing what the member is saying. I am asking members to respect the fact that he has the floor.

• (2210)

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Bernard Généreux:** Madam Speaker, I seldom rise in the House, and so I hope that you will listen to me, as my colleagues obviously will.

The Conservative Party proposed very concrete solutions to address inflation and the cost of gas, food and housing. Yesterday, our interim leader moved an opposition motion that was debated and voted on. The motion called for the implementation of simple, sensible and concrete solutions. It was a motion full of empathy and compassion, which demonstrated our support for Canadian families, workers, youth, families and seniors.

The motion would have given farmers some breathing room and allowed the tourism sector to grow after two years of misery. Unfortunately, all these solutions were rejected outright by the Liberal-NDP coalition. I would like to come back to these matters today

and show how arrogant, out of touch and petty the Prime Minister is.

In the past, Canada has gone through periods of high inflation that often resulted in recessions. At present, we are clearly in a period of inflation, and red flags are being raised. Has the government learned from the past, and will it do everything in its power to prevent history from repeating itself? I am not so sure.

There are currently huge wait times for passports. It is insane. Canadians want answers about the services they are getting.

Then there is the skyrocketing price of gas. In Rivière-du-Loup, in my riding, gas is currently around \$2.24 to \$2.30 a litre. That is the highest price in a year, or ever. We have never seen gas prices so high.

Summer is almost here, and people are planning vacations. We need to put ourselves in the shoes of an average Canadian who wants to leave home after two years of the pandemic. They want to visit regions all across Canada, especially Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, of course, and drive through all of our magnificent scenery.

How can they plan a family vacation when they cannot even make ends meet? They were thinking of travelling 700, 800, 1,000 or 2,000 kilometres, but they now have to reconsider since that is nearly impossible, considering the cost of gas. When it costs \$100 to fill the tank, it makes a person think twice about taking a road trip.

When we ask the government about this, it blames international circumstances and the war in Ukraine. The budget should be providing solutions, but it has none to offer. We in the Conservative Party put ourselves in the shoes of our constituents and share their fears. That is why we proposed concrete solutions. We asked the government to drop the GST on fuel as a priority to give Canadians a break, just as several countries have done. We called for a pause on the carbon tax hike that took effect on April 1. The government refused our requests.

Let us talk about food. The cost of groceries has risen at an unprecedented rate, the highest in 40 years. Some families have already paid over \$1,000 more for groceries since the beginning of the year. Other families have to make an agonizing choice between buying groceries, paying the rent and filling up their car to get to work. I myself have employees who are asking if they can work remotely because it costs too much to go to work. This is not a joke.

Food banks are now providing food to people who have full-time jobs, not just disadvantaged, penniless folks. These are people, families, couples who are working, but who are still being forced to turn to food banks in order to eat.

*Government Orders*

The government has no short-term solutions in its budget, only crumbs, to help these people, and it voted against the motion we put forward. The Conservatives argued for solutions to the supply chain issues and for farm taxes to be eliminated to help bring down food prices.

Let us now talk about housing prices. Since the Prime Minister came to power, housing prices have doubled in Canada. Young families are watching their dream of home ownership drift further and further out of reach. The budget mentions a \$1,500 tax credit, but that will not even pay the lawyer's fees. This amount is nothing when the average price of a home in Canada is about \$800,000.

In my riding, some sellers are getting four or five offers on their homes, which has never happened before. Houses are obviously less expensive in my riding than in Toronto or Vancouver, but sellers are receiving multiple offers, pushing the selling price above the asking price.

• (2215)

The government had six years to solve the affordability problem, but it did nothing. It left the real estate market in the hands of foreign buyers and unscrupulous speculators, who drove up the price of housing. We proposed an amendment to budget 2022, demanding that an inquiry into money laundering be launched immediately in order to curb speculation. Surprise, surprise, that amendment was rejected too.

Concerning the tourism sector, I am pleased to be part of the shadow cabinet on tourism together with my colleague from Peterborough—Kawartha, who is not here.

In a region as picturesque as mine, tourism plays an important role in economic development. This is particularly important to me. As members know, the pandemic devastated the tourism sector, especially during the two years of recession when many restaurants had to close their doors and performance venues sat empty. These are incredibly sad stories.

There was some emergency assistance, and the Conservatives supported a number of government measures. We even helped find solutions in some cases, because the assistance was not all that well adapted to many businesses or economic sectors. We therefore helped the government.

The government stubbornly insists on maintaining the COVID-19 measures at airports, leading to very lengthy lines. Many people have had their entire vacations cancelled. That is completely ridiculous. There are some important things to be done about this, as well.

The luxury tax imposed by the Liberals is another measure in the budget that has an impact on this sector. The owner of a flying school in my riding buys 25-, 30- or 40-year-old aircraft second-hand for teaching purposes. Planes are not toys. They can be quite expensive. Because the planes are worth more than \$100,000, this man will be forced to pay a luxury tax, which means that he will have to charge all of his students more. There are some measures in this budget that make no sense. I sincerely believe that this threshold needs to be reviewed. We have proposed amendments to the legislation.

Agriculture is essential to my riding. The price of gas and fuel is one thing, but the price of fertilizer has also gone through the roof in the past few months. It is unbelievable that none of the measures in the budget provide assistance for these sectors.

I could go on for another 12 pages.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** I am sure you could, but your time is up.

The hon. member for Kings—Hants.

[*English*]

**Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague mentioned the importance of agriculture. I share that too in my riding. I am trying to get to the bottom of what the Conservatives' position might be on fertilizer tariffs. Yesterday they had an opposition day motion that said the 35% tariff we are imposing on fertilizer imported from Russia and Belarus should be eliminated completely.

At the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food on Monday, we heard from Yulia Klymenko, a member of Parliament from Ukraine, who said that this is a really important measure to not be supporting Russia and for trying to dissuade buying products from there.

The Conservatives have made clear they feel that farmers who purchased prior to March 2 should be exempt, and I share that view, but moving forward the tariff is in place. We think it is a reasonable and responsible thing to do to support Ukraine. Conservatives have been calling on that since day one of this war.

What is the member's position on this and can he explain what the Conservative position might actually be?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Généreux:** Madam Speaker, we often hear that we cannot do indirectly what we cannot do directly. Nevertheless, the government has all the options in front of it to help the agricultural sector and farmers through this crisis.

The Conservative Party fully supports the idea of Canada imposing tariffs on Russia as a result of the situation in Ukraine. That is not the issue. Farmers agree with that decision, but the government has to find a way to compensate farmers for these higher costs, and it is not doing that.

• (2220)

**Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup for his speech.

I would like to remind him that he also cannot do indirectly what he cannot do directly. He referred to someone who was not in the House, and I should have risen on a point of order.

*Government Orders*

I was disappointed with certain aspects of my colleague's speech. He was going to talk about tourism and solutions. I thought that he was about to share something meaningful, but then he moved on to the next page. It left me wanting to hear more.

I would like to hear his ideas on how to save tourism in his region.

**Mr. Bernard Généreux:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague.

I did not say my colleague's name. I did say the name of her riding, which I am entitled to do.

One solution is to give people a break on the cost of gas. We need to have a tax rebate or cut taxes right before the construction holidays. We will be on summer vacation soon. The weather is really nice here tonight in Ottawa. We are starting to see tourists in the nation's capital, but we would love to see them back home, too. Would people be able to come visit us?

They would stand a better chance if we reduced the taxes on the price of gas, except for the carbon tax, because that does not really apply in Quebec. We could have a GST rebate, for example, on the price of gas. That would be an incentive for people. That way, they could vacation in our beautiful ridings, in Abitibi or the Lower St. Lawrence.

**Mr. Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks. He is passionate about his riding and invited us to go there to learn French. I am actually learning French myself. I look forward to seeing his region.

A few days ago, I had the opportunity to ask the Liberal member for Whitby a question. I talked about the rising cost of living and of gas, and I told him how hard this is for people. He replied that we should get used to it because of climate change and the war. I thought he was very out of touch.

I would like my colleague's thoughts on that.

**Mr. Bernard Généreux:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for that excellent question.

Grocery bills for an average family of four are out of control because of food prices. I saw the same thing when I was young. That was 40 years ago, and the fact that young families are going through this again is outrageous.

Government revenue is growing exponentially. The government is in a position to give all Canadian families a break so that they can not only buy groceries, but also take vacations and visit our wonderful regions.

[*English*]

**Mr. Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise in this place today to debate Bill C-19, an act to implement certain provisions of budget 2022.

I will say from the outset that I will be voting against this high-spending federal budget, which proposes to dig Canada deeper into debt and drive our deficits ever higher. It simply hurts and squeezes middle-class Canadians even more through the Liberals' inflationary policies, which have created a cost-of-living crisis for Canadi-

ans in this country and a competitiveness crisis for Canadian businesses.

The Liberals and NDP often rise in this chamber to claim that they have the backs of Canadians, but their actions, as demonstrated by this reckless budget, prove otherwise. They will argue that it helps Canadians, when in fact it does the exact opposite.

If people were hoping for a return to some form of fiscal responsibility in this most recent federal budget, I am sure they were as disappointed as I was when the Liberal government revealed its \$452-billion spending plan on April 7. If there was any cut in this budget, it was in the size of the document itself, which went from 725 pages in last year's budget to 304 pages in budget 2022. Perhaps that is progress, but only for a Liberal, I would presume.

Let us think about this for a moment. Federal government spending is now 25% higher than it was pre-pandemic. According to the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, each Canadian's share of the national debt is now \$31,700, and it is growing quickly.

It is clear throughout budget 2022 that the Prime Minister, his Minister of Finance and his NDP friends have failed to deliver on a plan that is fiscally responsible. Instead, they have added another \$50 billion in uncontrolled borrowed spending. This will only fuel inflation and result in higher taxes, because one day these costs will have to be paid.

Despite all this new spending, there was very little support announced for our hardest-hit tourism sector. There is no mention of repayment extensions for CEBA or RRRF, and there was no extension to the tourism and hospitality recovery program, which ended already last month. These were key requests made to the government by the tourism industry to assist in its recovery, yet they were all rebuffed by a government committed to the talking point that it invested \$1 billion in tourism. They fail to mention that this was in last year's budget, and it was still grossly insufficient given the economic toll the pandemic raged against this industry.

At a time when tourism recovery is still very much an aspiration for many and not yet a reality or certainty, the Liberal-NDP government, through this budget, has pulled the rug from under the feet of the tourism sector by not listening to its concerns and input on these important federal business support programs.

My riding of Niagara Falls, which includes the beautiful towns of Fort Erie and Niagara-on-the-Lake, is Canada's top leisure tourism destination. Before the pandemic, Canada's national tourism industry generated \$105 billion, which is 2% of our country's GDP, and it employed one in 10 Canadians. Meanwhile, Niagara Falls alone contributed \$2.4 billion in tourism receipts, and it employs nearly 40,000 workers in Niagara in our local tourism sector.

For tourism businesses in Niagara, the 2022 summer tourism season is its first real chance at recovery in two years. The sector, which will generate 75% of its income in the next four months, will be challenged to achieve recovery in 2022, specifically as a result of the government's policies. By not listening to the concerns of the tourism sector, the government has essentially tied one hand behind the sector's back by ending important relief programs, all while continuing to have in place restrictive travel mandates, which serve to depress visitors from travelling to Canada for business, to visit family or for vacation.

Instead of allowing tourism to do what it does best, which is to welcome visitors from throughout the world, the Liberal-NDP government has decided to double down on its efforts to hurt the Canadian tourism and travel sector. In fact, through budget 2022, the government is allocating an additional \$25 million to support the disastrous ArriveCAN app at our international border crossings and ports of entry for travellers coming into Canada.

• (2225)

From a tourism perspective, which is so important to Niagara, it makes no sense that this is a funding priority of the government in this budget. Instead, the Conservatives are calling on the government to scrap this app. We did not need this app to travel or welcome tourists before the pandemic. Surely, we will not need it to travel or welcome tourists after the pandemic. As the world reopens from COVID, these questions and criticisms of ArriveCAN are important and necessary to highlight and press the government about.

It was astonishing to hear the recent testimony of the Parliamentary Budget Officer in the Senate yesterday. When asked if the finance minister's long-term deficit reduction plan was believable, he said it was not. To quote media reports from the Senate hearing, the Parliamentary Budget Officer stated, "I personally don't believe it's credible that there will be that level of spending restraint in the period from 2024 to 2027, given all the expenditures that remain to be implemented by the government over that period of time." Well, I have a suggestion for the government. Perhaps it can save the \$25 million it has allocated to the ArriveCAN app in this year's budget, which will do nothing to help our tourism sector recover.

Another issue that is hampering the recovery of the Canadian tourism and travel sector is the massive backlogs at our local passport offices. Simply put, constituents of mine are experiencing nightmare conditions of service that are completely unacceptable. Obtaining a passport and renewing a passport are basic services that Canadians can rightly expect from their federal government as citizens and taxpayers, but the incompetence of the Liberal-NDP government has been laid bare by this example of mismanagement. This strong demand for Canadian passports and passport renewals as this pandemic ends was completely predictable, yet the government is clearly unprepared to deal with it, which again proves it does not have a plan to actually help Canadians or our travel and tourism sector, which my riding depends on.

Budget 2022 also raises far more questions than it provides answers for regarding businesses and workers in Canada's wine industry, which is so important to Niagara and Niagara-on-the-Lake in my riding. First, this budget provides zero details about what the important trade legal excise exemption replacement program will

### *Government Orders*

look like. The expensive new excise tax will be hitting Canadian wineries on July 1, which is about three weeks away, just 22 days from now. Wineries across the country badly need to learn these program details so they can prepare and brace against the impact of this new tax.

Interestingly, while no program details have yet been revealed, the federal government does show it expects a revenue windfall, forecasted at \$390 million over the next five years, after the excise exemption is repealed. How they arrived at this forecast is unexplained, and it does not indicate whether they expect the industry to grow, remain stable or contract as a result of this new expensive excise tax.

Then there is the question of the \$34-million difference between the \$101 million of federal support over two years promised in budget 2021 and the \$135 million of departmental revenue forecasted for the first two years after the excise exemption is repealed. We know that the wine industry said the \$101-million commitment in budget 2021 fell way short of what was needed to offset the costs of repealing the excise exemption in order to keep the industry whole as it is.

Will the federal government commit to returning to the wine industry the \$34 million that it expects to generate in tax from the wine industry? Again, we do not know. The expensive new excise tax and all these unanswered questions risk future prosperity in Canada's wine sector, which is so important to Niagara's identity and economy.

Budget 2022 fails Canadians and fails Niagara. It proposes to grow the federal government even bigger, when the most basic of federal services, such as passport offices, are already failing and dysfunctional. More importantly, it fails to support our important tourism and wine sectors. For all these reasons and more, I will be opposing budget 2022.

• (2230)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that the member does not recognize many of the things that were done to enhance and protect our tourism industry. It amazes me. It is as if he is not listening to what is happening in the community.

We can talk about the tens of millions of dollars, about \$100 million, going to support our wine industry in the last year or more.

**An hon. member:** Did you listen to the speech?

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I did, which is why I am pointing this out. At the end of the day, talk to hoteliers. Ask them about the government support through programs like the wage subsidy program. Those programs supported our tourism industry when it needed the support, unlike the Conservatives, who said that we spent too much to support small businesses.

We have been there to support the tourism industry in the past and we continue to support it today in the 2022-23 budget, because it is an industry that is critical to our economy. We know that. It would be nice to hear the member recognize some of the facts regarding how that is being done.

**Mr. Tony Baldinelli:** Madam Speaker, to my colleague's point, during the pre-budget consultation period, all the tourism stakeholders came forward to the government and indicated some of the programs they needed to continue moving forward going into the 2022 tourism year, including the extension of CEBA and the tourism and hospitality relief fund. However, what happened was they all ended. The government committed \$1 billion to the tourism sector, but that was in the last budget for the tourism sector. That was last year.

This year, it has all ended. If the government is going to tie the hands of the tourism sector behind its back, it should allow them to do what it is they do best, and that is to welcome tourists from throughout the world. One way it could do that is by getting rid of the disastrous ArriveCAN app. That is one thing the government could do, and it could do it right now.

• (2235)

**Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC):** Madam Speaker, my colleague just gave an excellent presentation on one of the top tourist areas of Canada.

Could the hon. member inform us what concerns the duty-free shops have in his area? If they are anything similar to mine, they have been undermined by the fact that they have had to turn in a lot of their inventory, which they had to carry themselves, and they could not even carry it because of expiry dates.

Could the member expand on what he has heard? Maybe he could even expand on the relief that he was speaking about.

**Mr. Tony Baldinelli:** Madam Speaker, yesterday we had an opportunity to meet with representatives from the Frontier Duty Free Association. Two of the three representatives at that meeting were from my riding.

They told us that during the pandemic the revenues generated by these duty-free operations were down 90% to 95%. They approached governments for support, and at every turn they were rebuffed in trying to get support to continue their operations. Now that things are beginning to open, after the first two long weekends in both Canada and the United States, they are still 50% down.

Again, we are tying the hands of our tourism sector behind its back. We need to allow them to do what they do best and let them welcome visitors from throughout the world. In my community alone, 23% of the visitor base is American, but they generate over 50% of the revenues. When they go home, they have an opportunity to visit a duty-free store, make purchases and then export that back into the United States. We are not allowing them to do that. It

is time we make changes so we improve the tourism and hospitality sector.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to the speech by the member for Niagara Falls.

I have always believed that in opposition, we should also be parties of proposition. That is why I am proud the NDP has brought forward tangible programs that would improve the lives of Canadians, things like a public dental care program that would help millions of people.

I wonder if the member could talk a little about what tangible gains he hopes the Conservatives would be able to leverage in this minority Parliament that would help real Canadians who are struggling with the cost of living and all of the pressures we have been hearing so much about. I heard a lot of complaints but not a lot of solutions.

**Mr. Tony Baldinelli:** Madam Speaker, one of the things I have been doing in my role, for example, is to bring forward the concerns of those residents in my community of Niagara Falls.

They are telling me that they need us to scrap the ArriveCAN app. I have 40,000 people who work in the tourism sector in Niagara alone, and they need to go back to work. One way we could help them is to get rid of the ArriveCAN app.

For my grape and wine sector, the government proposed last year to provide \$101 million when the excise exemption is repealed on July 1. The government forecast is showing \$135 million. What is it going to do—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Resuming debate, we have the hon. member for Yukon.

**Mr. Brendan Hanley (Yukon, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, first, I would like to say that I am sharing my time with the hon. member for Kings—Hants. I am pleased to add my perspective on the budget implementation act and discuss some of what this budget would achieve for the Yukon while having something for all Canadians.

According to the 2021 census, the Yukon is Canada's fastest-growing territory or province. It is a wonderful place to call home as a steady influx of new residents will attest, yet like everywhere in Canada, we are experiencing an acute housing crisis. This is felt keenly in Whitehorse, Dawson City and communities across the territory.

I recently spoke to constituents from the village of Mayo who expressed alarm that the lack of housing was a key part of their inability to keep health care workers in the community, particularly those trained to address the opioid crisis we are facing. Our government is taking action to address this national issue through budget 2022 by making a historic \$10-billion investment in housing in Canada, including \$30 million to the Yukon specifically, for housing. Yukoners will be able to benefit from the measures we are introducing to make housing more affordable and accessible for all Canadians, including expanding the first-time homebuyer incentive and making property flippers pay their fair share.

Housing measures in this budget also include an expansion of the rapid housing initiative by \$1.5 billion. This fund has already made a positive mark in Whitehorse and Yukon communities. Already, 149 units are being created in the Yukon, and I look forward to that number continuing to grow.

• (2240)

[*Translation*]

These are just a few examples of the investments we are making to ensure Canadians have a safe place to live and feel at home. While the housing crisis affects people from all walks of life, we know that first nations communities face unique obstacles.

[*English*]

Adequate housing and infrastructure are both critical determinants of community health and well-being. We will not achieve our goals in reconciliation without ensuring first nation citizens have access to adequate, safe and affordable housing.

In the last Parliament, the human resources committee conducted a study on rural, urban and remote indigenous housing. Its report, “Indigenous Housing: The Direction Home”, included several recommendations to address this crisis. One was to establish a distinct urban, rural and northern indigenous housing strategy, co-developed with CMHC, created for, created by, and led by indigenous peoples. Budget 2022 commits \$300 million to create this very important program.

It also commits \$565 million to support housing for self-governing first nations and modern treaty holders. Eleven of the 14 first nations in the Yukon are self-governing. They are nations such as Little Salmon Carmacks First Nation, Teslin Tlingit Council or Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation.

These are important investments for Yukoners and Canadians in their journey toward reconciliation. It is a journey that is well under way but with much yet to accomplish.

[*Translation*]

Providing access to affordable housing is not the only mission we are embarking on today. We must also take bold, decisive action to mitigate and adapt to the impact of climate change on our living environments.

[*English*]

Canada's homes and buildings account for 13% of our GHG emissions. It is imperative that we work to support retrofitting our homes and places of work and adjusting our building standards so

### *Government Orders*

that Canada's buildings can be as energy efficient as possible. Greening our homes not only reduces impacts on the environment, but also has substantial savings for Canadians through reductions in heating and other costs.

[*Translation*]

The government has long been committed to greening our homes and communities. This year, we are providing \$150 million to Natural Resources Canada to develop the Canada green buildings strategy.

[*English*]

We are also investing \$458.5 million in the Canada greener homes loan program through CMHC to provide low-interest loans and grants to low-income housing providers to support a green retrofit.

[*Translation*]

Greening our homes and buildings goes a long way toward reducing our emissions and fighting climate change, and it is also a way of dealing with the housing crisis. However, we still have a lot of work to do if we want to succeed in bending the curve of emissions.

[*English*]

The recent IPCC report was clear: We have not been doing enough to combat catastrophic climate change. We are not taking big enough steps to avert a worst-case scenario. If we do not expedite and expand our efforts, we will not be leaving a livable planet for our children.

I look around the House and see a welcome array of ages, but by 2050, when we should have reached net-zero emissions and when we are supposed to have kept global temperatures below a 1.5°C increase, many, even most, of the members making decisions for Canada now may no longer be here.

The decisions we make now will determine the options our successors in the chamber have at their disposal, and it is critical that we do not shortchange them simply because the timelines we are keeping are 30 years into the future.

As a father of two teenagers, I cannot stand by. We are seeing the effects of climate change daily, from severe flooding and devastating fires to dramatic declines in biodiversity and an Arctic warming at two to three times the global rate. Our land, our people, our economies risk devastation across Canada.

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

We can hope. Although we are behind, we have momentum. What is more, we have an ambitious plan to reduce emissions complete with objectives, timelines and especially obligations that are set out in the legislation.

*[English]*

Since January, I have been pleased to take part in announcements totalling more than \$1.5 million to expand zero-emission charging stations across Yukon. Transportation is another key source of emissions, and with \$400 million announced in budget 2022 to further expand ZEV infrastructure in suburban or remote communities, I look forward to taking part in more of these announcements, which will support making all road-accessed communities in our territory accessible by ZEVs by 2027.

Our government has committed \$9.1 billion in new investments in our emissions reduction plan to build upon the investments we have already made with a road map for economy-wide measures to drive reductions while creating new job opportunities for Canadian workers and businesses as we work to achieve our climate goals.

In doing so, we will be working closely with indigenous communities, utilizing and applying their leadership, their deep understanding of the land and their traditional knowledge to help us move forward together. That is why part of our plan includes almost \$30 million to co-develop an indigenous climate leadership agenda to support indigenous climate priorities.

*[Translation]*

It is a long haul, but essential. With this plan as a guide, the government does not plan to compromise on the means to build a cleaner, greener future.

● (2245)

*[English]*

To return to Yukon specifics, budget 2022 also commits \$32.2 million to the Atlin hydro expansion program, which will literally help power Yukon into the future. Our investment in the Atlin expansion will bring power from an expanded hydro power facility in northern B.C. to further build a reliable and diverse supply of renewable winter energy for the north.

Mining has been a part of Yukon since before the Klondike gold rush. We had to learn the hard way, though, that a mine's impact on a fragile Arctic environment can be permanent and profound and prohibitively expensive to rectify, yet we can literally reap the riches of the earth to fuel a green and revitalized economy with modern regulation, technology and processes to mitigate mining impacts.

The world is watching, and Yukon is full of opportunity for investments and responsible, sustainable mining of critical minerals. More than \$1.5 billion has been committed to developing critical mineral supply chains over five years, and we are introducing a new 30% critical mineral exploration tax credit.

While I am pleased to support this budget, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge that there is much more work that needs to be done on many of these files, particularly on creating a pan-Canadian mental health strategy and an aggressive and comprehensive re-

sponse to the toxic drug crisis, as well as putting necessary investments toward our struggling health care workforce.

Nevertheless, this budget, part one of a series of four progressive and ambitious yet prudent budgets, is great news for Canada and for Yukon.

**Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Yukon. I visited his area of the world, and it truly is one of the most beautiful places that I have ever visited.

He mentioned zero emission vehicles. Coming from Oshawa, I know that it is extremely important that we support the industry as we transition. One of the challenges I have with this budget is a lack of investment for charging stations. According to the European Union, we would need about one charging station for every 10 electric vehicles, which means we would need about four million charging stations for 40 million vehicles, and this budget really does not put any plan forward to fulfill that necessity.

I am wondering if my colleague could comment on the lack of investment for charging stations as well as the lack of investment for the provinces and territories to upgrade their grid in order to handle the huge influx of zero emission vehicles by 2035.

**Mr. Brendan Hanley:** Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Oshawa for his comments, particularly with regard to the Yukon.

Certainly there are challenges ahead of us to pave the way for the infrastructure needed for zero-emission vehicles, including expansions to the grid. Our budget announced a further \$400 million to expand ZEV infrastructure in suburban and remote communities.

In the Yukon context, I am very pleased to see the investments made to the Atlin hydro expansion project, which will provide the equivalent power for almost 4,000 homes in Yukon once it is operational. We are well on the way, but there will undoubtedly be more that we need to invest in and coordinate, particularly with grid harmonization across the country.

● (2250)

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I salute my colleague and thank him for his speech, especially for his extraordinary use of French. I also salute Yukon's francophone community.

In Bill C-19, there is a part about the luxury tax that targets boats and aircraft, including planes, small planes and helicopters.

I would like to know whether my colleague has been contacted by any of his constituents about this and whether he is concerned that this may have a negative impact on the economic activity in some parts of his territory.

**Mr. Brendan Hanley:** Madam Speaker, I often hear people in my riding talk about access to health care, mental health, their housing needs, and investments to fight climate change. Those are Yukon's priorities. I am very pleased to see investments in these areas in budget 2022.

[*English*]

**Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP):** Madam Speaker, throughout this debate on the budget we have been talking a lot about the affordability crisis and people being able to make ends meet. Throughout the member's speech he was talking about his constituents, meeting a lot of targets and helping indigenous people in his riding.

One of the proposals the New Democrats have put forward is for a guaranteed livable basic income, which meets the requirements of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. I wonder if the member would be supportive of our colleague's bill, Bill C-223, which would support a guaranteed livable basic income.

**Mr. Brendan Hanley:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member's question is an interesting one. I think there has been a lot of discourse and I know there is interest in my own riding about exploring this option. I am looking forward to learning more about the particulars of that bill and what the pros and cons are of such an approach.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, we are debating this evening, it is late, and I have the utmost respect for my other colleagues here in the House. I commend their dedication to democracy.

We are here to debate the 2022 budget implementation bill. I would like to begin by thanking the interpreters for their service, especially when I am giving a speech in broken French.

This is the second or third time I have spoken about the budget initiatives. As is typically the case when I rise in the House, I have chosen to focus my speech on certain topics. Tonight, those topics are Ukraine, affordability and the energy transition, new technologies and the importance of modernizing our regulatory system.

First, though, I want to say that I am a member of the House of Commons soccer team, which was started by my hon. colleague from Parkdale—High Park. This evening, we played a game against the British High Commission. Unfortunately, our team lost, but I think it is very important to put the match on the record. We lost by a score of three to one, with our only goal scored by the member for Lac-Saint-Jean. The Bloc Québécois members were very proud of their member, who got an assist from a Liberal, the hon. member for Parkdale—High Park. Future historians will understand what happened on the grounds of the Supreme Court during that game, a little break from the serious activities taking place here.

### *Government Orders*

There have been many conversations here in the days and weeks following Russia's invasion of Ukraine. In this bill, I am very proud of the assistance our government is providing in the form of an estimated \$1-billion loan. This is an important loan, of course, but so is military equipment and humanitarian aid. I think that it is very important for this government and all parliamentarians to continue supporting Ukraine, because Ukraine is fighting for us right now and for international order based on respect for western values. I am very proud of this reality.

The Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food studied the issue of global food insecurity. I think it is very important for all parliamentarians and all Canadians to understand that Russian soldiers targeted infrastructure in Ukraine that is crucial for the agricultural system. The consequences of this destruction represent a threat for many people around the world, whether in Canada, in countries with weak systems such as Egypt, or various countries in Africa and Asia.

• (2255)

With respect to our diplomatic efforts around the world and our capabilities and expertise in the agriculture and agri-food sector, I had the idea that the Minister of Foreign Affairs could appoint a special envoy to work with our allies and coordinate efforts in this area.

With respect to affordability, we currently have a strong economy, our GDP growth is impressive and, with the current economic recovery, the hardships we faced during the pandemic are well behind us.

I believe that this budget strikes a good balance between the importance of bringing forward different projects and measures to meet the needs of Canadians and the importance of keeping the fiscal framework intact. The budget looks solid.

Of course, inflation is a problem. Yesterday, on opposition day, the Conservatives proposed various measures to address inflation. However, inflation has multiple causes and is a global problem.

First, there are supply chain issues. Second, there are major demographic changes across Canada and in other western countries. Baby boomers will soon retire. Some already retired during the pandemic. According to a Statistics Canada survey, there are approximately one million job vacancies. It is therefore important to facilitate immigration. Temporary foreign worker programs are also very important.

The war in Ukraine, rising food prices and disruptions in trade exchanges have also exacerbated inflation. There are also problems with liquidity. At the height of the pandemic, governments around the world responded in a reasonable way to help their citizens. Naturally, injecting liquidity also drove up inflation.

*Government Orders*

● (2300)

[English]

On some of the Conservative proposals we saw yesterday, it is important to raise the question of affordability but they were not very targeted. The Conservative Party certainly brands itself as being very fiscally mindful of the situation. What it proposed yesterday on the GST really was going to be rewarding individuals who do not need it. It would be rewarding individuals in this House who make, in some cases, four times the average Canadian salary. Why should we be eligible for that? Why should high-income Canadians be eligible? They are not the ones who need help right now.

The government needs to look at addressing affordability as we move forward. Of course, the budget was introduced a number of months ago. We need to address situations as they evolve, but we need to be mindful of balancing the fiscal framework and being targeted at Canadians who really need the help and not have these broad tax relief measures for Canadians who do not necessarily need them.

It is important we understand the Bank of Canada is responsible for helping control inflation. We will see increased interest rates in the days ahead. It is something we should all be mindful of, and frankly, be bracing for. There are some Canadians who hold a lot of private debt and that will be a challenge in the days ahead.

The government should focus on the supply side. Part of the challenge right now is the fact that there is not enough supply for certain demand, which is also driving some of these different prices higher.

I did not get much of a chance to talk about it, but let me just say how important the Atlantic Loop is. As a Nova Scotian MP, this is crucial for our energy future. It is great to see initiatives in the budget that will focus on grid transmission and upgrades. I am going to continue to talk about small modular reactors. We need to continue to drive that. I was pleased to see some initiative in the budget for it.

Hydrogen, biofuels and natural gas are all going to be important elements as transition fuels and in the longer term to 2050.

I am going to leave it at that. I cannot wait to hear from all of colleagues. I know they have been captivated by my remarks.

**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC):** Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague mentioned immigration. We did not see a single thing in the budget that had to do with tackling the racism issue that is happening in IRCC. What we are seeing in IRCC under the Liberal government is unaddressed racism, which is also affecting Quebec in a big way. We are seeing African countries with almost 90% rejection rates under the Liberal government. For two years, they have had an anti-racism task force. Not a single person has been fired. Not a single person has been reprimanded. What we do see is that those people who have that kind of racist behaviour have gotten raises under the government's watch.

What does the hon. member have to say regarding that and why have the Liberals refused to address racism in IRCC, which is affecting many people?

**Mr. Kody Blois:** Madam Speaker, I believe the member opposite asked my hon. colleague, the Minister of Immigration, a question on this and he said that this was something they were looking at internally in the department. I do not have the specifics on that.

What I will say is that I am proud of the government's record on immigration. We have been tabling important numbers in terms of levels. We have brought in 15,000 Afghans. The minister has made it very clear that we are going to continue to drive forward toward our goal of 40,000. We have brought in 80,000 Ukrainians and we have, I think, close to 200,000 applications that we are going to continue to focus on.

I have Syrian immigrants in my riding who are so thankful and proud to be in Canada.

It has been this government that has taken this approach. The member opposite ran on a platform that did not even support government-assisted refugees. That program was going to be cut.

● (2305)

[Translation]

**Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Madam Speaker, let me begin by complimenting my colleague from Kings—Hants on his French. I would also like to tell him that he is as solid as his play on the field. He is dedicated to his team and I can attest to his determination. I would like to commend my colleague from Lac-Saint-Jean, too. When he uses his head, he really gets results.

My question is about agriculture, which my colleague spoke about at length in his speech. Back home, members of the Union des producteurs agricoles have made a number of proposals and recommendations, including abolishing the gas excise tax of 4¢ per litre, but just for the agricultural sector, not for everyone. There is also a proposal to abolish the 35% tariff on inputs from Russia. This affects farmers, but in other countries this tax is not passed on to farmers; therefore, it ends up on our plates.

Could the government set up an emergency account, like it did during the pandemic, but especially for farmers, with loans as well as grants and subsidies? Could the advance payments program be increased to \$200,000 to provide some breathing room? These are all possible solutions, and to that list I would add accelerating the temporary foreign worker program to ensure that workers are available to work our farmland.

**Mr. Kody Blois:** Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question and for his efforts on the soccer field.

The issue with fertilizers is a very important one. My opinion on this is clear. The government must find a solution to the costs that farmers are facing if they purchased fertilizer from Russia or Belarus before the war. The tariff must be maintained for purchases made after March 2 to discourage farmers and companies from buying from the Russians. We also need to find other ways to help our farmers cope with the cost of fertilizer. The advance payments program is a good initiative, but we must do more.

[*English*]

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I enjoy serving on the agriculture committee with the hon. member.

While it was not necessarily in the BIA, I am extremely proud to see the \$5.3-billion investment in the budget for dental care in Canada. It is going to start at the end of the year with children under the age of 12 and it is going to make a considerable difference in Canadians' lives, no matter in what part of Canada they live.

It was less than a year ago that the Liberals voted against a motion that would have done the exact same thing. My colleague Jack Harris brought forward that motion.

Is the hon. member happy that the NDP was able to push the Liberals to do the right thing and is he going to be proud of showcasing this amazing program to constituents in his riding?

**Mr. Kody Blois:** Madam Speaker, let me say to the member opposite that he is not only a great member on the agriculture committee, but he also plays soccer on this wonderful team that we have.

Our job as a government is to respond to the needs of Canadians. We work with all parliamentarians in this House to be able to advance them, and on this particular initiative, we were pleased to see support from the NDP on the budget to be able to introduce this measure that we think is extremely important for all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I would like to inform you that I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue.

We are heading into the final hour of Wednesday, June 8. I am pleased to be spending the final moments of this day with my colleagues. I want to thank them in advance for their rapt attention.

We are here tonight to discuss Bill C-19, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 7, 2022 and other measures. I would like to review the timeline. This bill has come back from committee. First, there was the budget. There were many things about it that bothered us, so many, in fact, that we could not support it. Voting against it was our only option. The bill contained a significant amount of intrusion, interference, and federalism pervaded. That rampant federalism would have steamrolled our jurisdictions and dictated the terms. There would have been interference here, there and everywhere.

There were also some things that were frustrating because they were not in the budget, such as health. I am not big on whataboutism. People cannot just say there is this thing but not that thing. They cannot just say that there is no actual debate on health.

### *Government Orders*

They cannot say that we have not moved forward, that we have not pressed the issue, that we have not been talking about it for quite some time. When I say “we”, I am not just talking about the Bloc Québécois. I am talking about all the provinces, which are united. It is Quebec too. The National Assembly has passed so many unanimous motions on this. They cannot say the government might be surprised when we raise this issue. They cannot say we are coming out of left field. No, we have been talking about this for a long time. It is a problem.

We are at the tail end of a public health crisis—or let us hope so, anyway—that did not create the situation. No doubt it exacerbated it, but we have long been aware of skyrocketing health care costs. We have known for some time that it is up to the provinces to hire doctors, nurses and PSWs and that the money is tied up in Ottawa.

As we know, funding has been cut for quite some time. In the 1990s, Ottawa made its surpluses on the backs of the provinces. Since then, the provinces have had to fight like hell to be able to fund their health care services and social services in general.

There was nothing for seniors, either. As everyone knows, there was the infamous last-minute pre-election cheque last summer, but only for those aged 75 and over. Because of inflation, the cost of living is going up, so pensions also need to increase permanently. By the way, one is a senior as of age 65. A permanent increase in the pension is needed, but there is nothing about that in this legislation.

One could argue that some funding has been allocated to housing, but we are a long way from sustainable, significant and really strong investments that would actually compensate for the current crisis.

The Bloc Québécois advocated for an annual reinvestment of up to 1% of public funds. I do not think that is unreasonable. Money also needs to be diverted so that it does not always go just to private developers, but also to groups that are familiar with the real needs on the ground, such as not-for-profits, housing co-operatives, and community organizations. The whole financial structure needs an overhaul. There was nothing on any of that. We were unable to support the budget because of what was in it and what was not in it.

Then came the budget implementation bill. We supported it, but with reservations, saying that we would see what came out of it. We would study it, look at it, analyze it. There are committees for that, such as the Standing Committee on Finance. I commend my colleague from Joliette, who is our finance critic and did this work patiently and conscientiously. He did some extremely serious work on this issue.

● (2310)

Several irritants were removed from this implementation bill, which contains some things that we want to improve and that make it possible for us to continue supporting it.

*Government Orders*

Let us talk about the excise tax. I am the Bloc Québécois critic for international trade, and the excise tax is a subject that I am very familiar with.

As a result of a complaint filed by Australia, the excise tax will once again be charged on all Canadian wines, effective July 2022, after having been exempt since 2006. This tax does not distinguish between grapes, apples and honey, but why should it apply to all wines, including mead and cider, when these last two products were not the target of Australia's complaint?

Mead production is small. The association of cider producers was established in 1992 and has 81 voluntary members. It testified before the Standing Committee on Finance.

Cider production rose from 3.2 million litres in 2016 to 5.1 million litres in 2021, an increase of 60% in five years. The market for cider is booming. This is a nod to the past, because, I remind members, cider was popular in New France. People started drinking beer after the conquest. The beer was not always good, but we have made up for that with microbreweries, which make very good beers.

Cider and mead, or honey wine, will suffer because of the excise tax. I do not understand how the government was unable to make a distinction between honey made by bees in their hives, apples and grapes. It makes no sense to me, especially because, in a similar legal battle with Australia, the Government of Quebec was able to exclude different products that were not standard wine varieties.

Clearly, each country is going to want to promote and protect its own producers and wines. However, Canada should not be penalizing an entire industry because of the government's incompetence and inability to differentiate. We would usually talk about not comparing apples to oranges, but in this case, it is a question of not comparing apples to grapes. What a ridiculous farce.

In the little bit of time I have left, I would like to talk about an unresolved issue, the infamous luxury tax. We support the principle of the luxury tax, taxing the ultrarich, banks, oil companies and their profits as inflation rises. As I said yesterday, our inflation is their loot. The issue we have is that the tax is flawed and very poorly designed, as it will penalize SMEs and the aerospace industry, which is flourishing in Quebec.

I started hearing from the industry about this a year ago. I realized at the time that there was a problem with the wording of the tax. Since then, stakeholders have asked the government to do an impact study, but it has refused. Now, the government can no longer justify pursuing this fallacious, erroneous, catastrophic plan that will penalize an industry that is just as important to Quebec as the auto industry is to Ontario.

• (2315)

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, my understanding was that the Bloc actually supports the principle of a luxury tax. I would not mind getting some clarification on that matter. Both with the \$100,000 for automobiles and the \$250,000 for boats, I think most Canadians recognize the luxury

tax for what it is. As I said, my understanding was that the Bloc members support the principle. They might have some issues regarding the timing, but they support the principle of it.

Can the member provide his comments? Does the Bloc support the principle of a luxury tax?

[Translation]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Madam Speaker, as I said several times, we support the principle. We support the underlying idea. Even industry stakeholders tell us that they agree with the idea, but they are asking us to do things properly.

It has nothing to do with momentum and everything to do with how this is deployed and how the targets are set. It would have been a good idea to do an impact study for something this big.

• (2320)

[English]

**Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I want my colleague from the Bloc to know that I agree with him very much on the luxury tax.

Oshawa builds automobiles and we want to build the electric vehicles of the future. I think he is aware that with inflation and everything like that over the next few years, people may not get much of an electric car for \$100,000. We want to increase the manufacturing jobs here in Canada.

I am wondering if the member would be in favour, for example, as the automotive industry has been asking, if we want to promote more manufacture of green vehicles, electric vehicles in Canada, of removing the luxury tax from electric vehicles?

[Translation]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Madam Speaker, we believe in the idea of having more green vehicles. I understand that this is a general question on green vehicles.

Canada has long presented itself as a leader, but it was not one. In 2019, Canada was the last western country to bring in rebates on the sale of individual electric vehicles. That is bad, if we think about it.

The delay is unfathomable, considering how many things need to be done about transportation electrification. Furthermore, most of the programs encourage industries that are often multinationals based in Ontario, instead of SMEs based in Quebec that are making a real effort to electrify transportation.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC):** Madam Speaker, in my riding, carbon capture and storage is very important. It is a technology that is working, that is being supported by the private sector.

The NDP has constantly attacked carbon capture and storage, claiming that it is not working, when we know that, in fact, it already is working. It is an important way of working with industry to support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

I wonder if the Bloc could share its perspective on the important role that carbon capture and storage can play as part of our efforts to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased that someone has finally found a riding where that technology works, because we have been searching for one from the start.

In any case, we do not believe in that. The best carbon capture facility is a tree. There was a strategy for that. The government was supposed to plant billions of trees, but it has yet to plant a single one. I myself have planted more than that.

Let us say that this is a carbon capture strategy that has shown that this technology has not worked so far and that it would cost a fortune. It would be pretty sneaky to make taxpayers foot the bill.

**Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his speech. I am a bit concerned by his comments about the amount of money paid to the provinces and territories for health care.

I think the bill gives the provinces and territories \$2 billion to help reduce wait times for certain surgeries. The Government of Canada obviously worked very hard with all of the provinces and territories during the pandemic.

Why is my colleague opposed to the government's initiatives to collaborate with his province, Quebec?

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Madam Speaker, the amount that the member is referring to had already been announced. It was then put into the bill, so it is nothing new. It was not specific to this bill.

It also falls well short of expectations, given inflation and skyrocketing costs. I remind members that this amount is far from what was promised in the Canada Health Act.

We could ask the provinces what they think about working with Ottawa. They all say that Ottawa is not doing enough. The Government of Quebec is unanimous on this.

**Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to share my thoughts on Bill C-19. Like many members in the House, we have carefully examined the many clauses included in this piece of legislation, which implements many of the changes announced by the government in its budget.

The devil is in the details, and I would like to thank my Bloc Québécois colleagues for their vigilance, because the amendments were important, and the organizations that contacted us wanted to be heard loud and clear. I particularly want to congratulate my colleague from Joliette and my colleague from Thérèse-De Blainville.

There are times when our actions really matter. Small industries, especially our SMEs, often bear the brunt of measures that are not

### *Government Orders*

adapted to their reality, and we must be vigilant. I can assure the House that we have put a great deal of effort and resources into reviewing the proposed changes and doing the necessary checks. The Bloc Québécois believes that it is possible to be prudent, rigorous and innovative at the same time. While our goal is to get everything for Quebec when the current crises are over, the Bloc Québécois is determined to secure as much as possible for Quebecers.

The Bloc Québécois carefully went through every clause of the bill, as it always does. It voted in favour of the parts that are good for Quebec and voted against the parts that are not good for Quebec, and it tried to improve the parts that could become good for Quebec, in particular for charities.

Last week I spoke about some of the challenges that charities told us about during recent consultations. I am very happy that we were able to build on a solid foundation to make it easier for charities to sign co-operation agreements with organizations not recognized as charities. This will ensure that charities are not needlessly overburdened and can concentrate on their missions.

With Bill C-19, the version amended by the Bloc Québécois, we join other countries that have taken similar measures to support charities better. The original version of Bill C-19 introduced by the Liberal government did not adequately respond to what charities had asked for.

I now want to talk about mead and cider. I want to acknowledge David Ouellet, from Miellerie de la Grande Ourse in Saint-Marc-de-Figuery, and the folks at Verger des Tourterelles in Duhamel-Ouest.

I would like to clearly explain the importance of the amendments made by the Bloc Québécois to Bill C-19, especially in response to the request by mead and cider producers to exempt these products from the excise tax. Many members here in the House urged the government to help the restaurant and tourism industries, as well as our honey producers, maple syrup producers, berry farmers and many other sectors of our economy.

This is a fine example of a Bloc Québécois amendment that provided desperately needed breathing room. I am certain that we managed to stave off the closure of many businesses across Quebec. Peripheral sectors and businesses such as apple farmers, bee farms, the tourism industry and the restaurant sector will be the better for it.

I have a word of caution for fly-in, fly-out workers. One of the measures I am worried about is the labour mobility deduction for tradespeople who temporarily relocate to a job site. This measure would let people who temporarily work away from their home deduct a portion of their travel and accommodation expenses. It will reduce the pressure that the labour shortage is putting on several sectors in Abitibi-Témiscamingue in the mining industry and construction.

*Government Orders*

What we do not want, however, is for our region to become a fly-in, fly-out destination. We need to ensure that people settle in our area, that they live there and become proud and strong Témiscamingue people. The wages paid must be spent in local businesses. That is how we develop our territory, how we live in it and how we help small and medium-sized businesses become large corporations.

I already explained all the effects of this kind of measure when we studied another member's bill in the House. I would remind everyone that there is a serious housing shortage in Quebec and that these kinds of measures can put additional pressure on the rental market.

If we make it easier for these temporary workers to come to our regions, they will surely want to stay after getting a taste of what we have to offer. I can assure the House that that is definitely the case in Abitibi—Témiscamingue, where people want to stay and build their dreams with their feet on the ground. There they can live it up in Sainte-Germaine-Boulé, attend a secret show in an alley in Rouyn-Noranda at the Festival de musique émergente, enjoy the view of the majestic Lac Témiscamingue in Ville-Marie or taste the incredible quality of the agri-food products of the Amos region.

Another thing I would like to talk about is division 15 of Bill C-19, which is about the Competition Act. On May 20, after I moved a motion in this regard, the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology studied this section and heard from numerous witnesses. I think reluctance on the part of those who just spoke has to do with the fact that there were no real public discussions about the measures the government is imposing in this budget bill. As a matter of fact, all the witnesses were surprised to see this section in a budget bill instead of in a bill of its own.

• (2325)

As for the public debate, some people simply want to maintain the status quo in terms of competition. Others say that it is high time changes were made. I think my colleagues know where the Bloc stands. The message needs to be tailored and crystal clear. There must be strict rules that allow for real competition. We are in favour of meaningful reform of the Competition Act as long as it is a comprehensive, transparent process.

Where are things going in the realm of competition? Here are some thoughts from the Commissioner of the Competition Bureau:

An important conversation is taking shape about the role of competition in the Canadian economy. It's occurring against a backdrop of increasing concerns about the rise of corporate titans and the changing nature of our digital marketplace. New thinkers have engaged in the debate.

As MPs who are members of this committee, we noted the deep concern of some people who testified. We did not change the coming into force date of this section of the bill, in order to give the Competition Bureau the opportunity to include all the elements required to implement these changes. Everyone expects a firm commitment and swift action from Commissioner Boswell, and everyone agrees that it is urgent that the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry introduce a new bill on competition.

Significant amendments were proposed as a first step. They would enhance the Competition Bureau's investigative powers, criminalize wage-fixing and no-poach agreements, and increase

maximum fines and administrative monetary penalties. They would clarify that incomplete price disclosure is a false or misleading representation. The amendments also would expand the definition of anti-competitive conduct, allow private access to the Competition Tribunal to remedy an abuse of dominance and improve the effectiveness of the merger notification requirements.

In conclusion, it is getting late, so I would like to sum up my thoughts on this bill. I wish I could say that all these measures will achieve the results that our constituents are hoping for. With the time I was given, I discussed only a few of the measures set out in the 400 pages of this bill. In this case, we tried to improve it as much as possible in the limited time we had, due to closure. We will have to be twice as vigilant and listen even more to the people in our communities.

Fortunately for the people in my riding, the Bloc Québécois is able to promote its recommendations. Again, the government was caught off guard. It tried to bury measures in a 400-page tome. I can guarantee that, especially under the watchful eye of my colleague from Joliette, anything we missed this time will get picked up during the next round of legislative amendments.

I want to mention that introducing elements in a massive bill instead of having substantive, transparent debates in parliamentary groups always has dangerous consequences. Many people came to the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology to tell us that.

• (2330)

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, one of the issues I have always comes up when members opposite stand in their place and share some thoughts. The member who spoke before this one indicated that the federal government has not planted any trees, for example, but we know for a fact that tens of millions of trees have been planted.

**An hon. member:** After how long?

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, a tree starts from a seed, and it takes time to get it into the ground. The point is that the Bloc, much like the Conservatives do time and time again, tried to give a false impression.

I am wondering if my friend across the way would recognize that maybe the Bloc is wrong and we have planted literally millions of trees.

[Translation]

**Mr. Sébastien Lemire:** Madam Speaker, the program to plant two billion trees is a perfect example of a flawed federal program. The vision may be good in theory, but it is terrifying for residents in the regions.

Abitibi—Témiscamingue is a forestry and mining region, but it is also an agricultural one. Where are the two billion trees going to be planted? They will not all be planted in the city. If the government wants to meet its target, it will have to plant trees in the regions, and half of the trees that the federal government plans to plant in Quebec are in Abitibi—Témiscamingue. These trees will be planted on land that is not being farmed. Our ancestors, my grandparents, removed tree stumps from that land. Now the government is going to replant trees there? The people who cleared out these stumps are still alive. Could the government show a little respect and come up with a well-thought-out plan? Why not just develop an equivalent program to bring more land back into production? That would be a long-term solution.

• (2335)

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Geniuš (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC):** Madam Speaker, it does appear that the parliamentary secretary was barking up the wrong tree here. The problem for the Prime Minister is that he appears to think that trees will plant themselves. The parliamentary secretary knows that trees can plant themselves under certain circumstances, so they are unlike budgets, which cannot balance themselves, as we have demonstrated.

I know that other members, such as myself, would have liked to speak to this bill at greater length. We will not be able to because we are under a very draconian programming effort by the government to limit debate on this bill.

I wonder if the member can comment on the overall fiscal framework of the government. Its spending is out of control, with more debt run up under the Prime Minister than all previous prime ministers in the country's history up until now. There is great concern. Members of the government think this is funny. It is not funny. My children are going to have to pay off the debt being run up today by the NDP-Liberal government. Can the member comment on the lack of any targets for any balanced budget at any point in time?

[Translation]

**Mr. Sébastien Lemire:** Madam Speaker, planting trees is not all bad. I would like to applaud the initiatives of Ramo and of Francis Allard, who are providing solutions in Abitibi—Témiscamingue to ensure that mining and other sites are reclaimed. This is an example of how sustainable development can be achieved by planting trees. There is some good happening.

Looking ahead, yes, I have concerns as well. If we look at the consequences of inflation, I am concerned about the government's lack of engagement. I am concerned about the government withdrawing from areas of intervention under its responsibility. Health care is the main one.

At least 50% of health expenditures should be covered by the federal government. What we have seen over the past 50 years is that this is no longer the case. Now the federal government is paying only 22 cents per dollar. That has consequences. Every problem in our health care system can be traced back to federal underfunding. That is one example of why I am so concerned about how much this government is spending.

### Government Orders

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Madam Speaker, in any case, one could argue that my colleague from Abitibi—Témiscamingue can bury the government better than the government can plant trees. I salute him for that.

My colleague spoke at length about competition. There is a basic rule: The more competitors, small suppliers and small businesses there are, the better the prices. He talked a bit about solutions to create more competition.

I have the impression, however, that the Investment Canada Act favours monopolies, not to mention takeovers by foreign companies, which lead to price increases and often push businesses to relocate their head offices.

**Mr. Sébastien Lemire:** Madam Speaker, one need not be as clever as the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot to see that we need solutions. The Competition Act, like the Investment Canada Act, clearly needs to be reformed.

I think this is a perfect opportunity to figure out how, and I am willing to work on it with the minister, as he knows.

[English]

**Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it gives me great pride to rise in the House of Commons to talk about the budget and how it would strengthen communities like mine in Windsor—Tecumseh.

Budget 2022 is first and foremost a jobs budget and a workers budget, and it is a budget that would make life more affordable for millions of Canadians.

This spring, I was proud to stand on stage with the Prime Minister and the Minister of Innovation to announce two once-in-a-generation investments in my community. The first was a \$5-billion investment by Stellantis and LG to create a battery plant that would create 3,200 good-paying auto jobs. The second announcement was a \$3.7-billion investment at the Windsor assembly plant that would bring back the third shift and create another 2,000-plus auto jobs.

Taken together, this almost \$9-billion investment represents the largest auto investment in the history of Canada, and it represents the largest-ever investment in the history of Windsor—Tecumseh. Those two investments would create over 5,500 jobs in my community, cement Windsor-Essex as the automobile capital of Canada, and secure the prosperity of Windsor-Essex for generations. That was made possible, first and foremost, because we have the best and most skilled workforce that builds things better than anyone else in the world, and second, because our federal government has made historic investments in fighting climate change, well over \$100 billion, and that includes investments in the transition to a zero-emission future.

### *Government Orders*

This budget continues those historic investments, which are transforming Windsor—Tecumseh into a leader in the green transition. That includes a \$15-billion Canada growth fund to leverage private sector investment in the clean-tech sector. We could ask our friends at WEtech Alliance and Invest WindsorEssex how important capital is to growing and attracting good, clean-tech jobs and businesses. It also includes \$1.7 billion in incentives for the zero-emission vehicles program, because we want to encourage Canadians to buy electric vehicles built by Canadians in communities like mine.

More than just electric vehicles, our community has an opportunity to be a leader in the protection of Canada's lakes, rivers and oceans, including the Great Lakes. There is an awesome opportunity for Windsor—Tecumseh in Canada's blue economy. The Great Lakes Institute for Environmental Research at the University of Windsor is Canada's leader in Great Lakes and clean water research. It will have a key role to play in the newly established Canada water agency, which would be up and running in 2022, thanks to this budget. The potential to build a modern research and innovation hub for clean water technology in Windsor—Tecumseh is enormous. This budget opens that door through the clean water agency and the creation of a Canadian innovation and investment agency.

Speaking of water, I had the opportunity recently to tour the docking, fuelling and warehousing facilities of companies operating along the Detroit River at the port of Windsor, companies like Morterm and Sterling Fuels. Through this budget, and the last, we are investing \$2.4 billion in the national trade corridors fund that has the potential to supercharge ports like Port Windsor into a true multimodal transportation hub in the North American supply chain. That means more jobs and more investments back home.

As we create thousands of jobs locally and generate billions of dollars of investment across Windsor-Essex, we will have to turn our attention to two growing challenges. The first is affordable housing. Like many communities across Canada, Windsor—Tecumseh has a housing crisis. One important piece of the puzzle is to build and renovate more affordable housing. In just the last two years, I was proud to announce over \$200 million for affordable housing in Windsor-Essex. That is a record for affordable housing in Windsor-Essex. We know that more needs to be done, and more needs to be done faster. This budget launches a new \$4-billion housing accelerator fund to help municipalities like ours build more homes faster. To help more people purchase their first home, we introduced the tax-free first-home savings account and a homebuyers' bill of rights.

The second challenge we will face, especially as our local economy ramps up, is the need for skilled workers. We are seeing labour shortages across Canada. We will need more apprentices and more skilled workers to construct homes and build electric vehicles, batteries, charging stations and other infrastructure. I was proud last week when our government announced the \$247-million investment to establish a new apprenticeship service that would create over 20,000 new apprenticeships by providing small and medium-sized businesses with up to \$10,000 to hire a new apprentice. At the same time, in this budget, we are doubling the union training and innovation fund, because we know that unions like the IBEW, LiU-

NA, UNIFOR, and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners know how to train skilled workers for today and tomorrow.

• (2340)

Since my election, I have been pushing hard to put more money into the pockets of skilled workers, including those who have to travel out of town to a job site. I am pleased to see a labour mobility deduction in this year's budget that will allow skilled workers and apprentices to deduct \$4,000 of travel and temporary relocation expenses.

Of course, what is going to make life more affordable for so many families and allow so many moms and dads to go to work or go back to school to gain the skills they need is our federal government's historic \$10-a-day child care plan.

Communities like mine in Windsor—Tecumseh are entering a golden age of prosperity. No doubt there are many challenges ahead, but we are a community that pulls together, neighbour looking after neighbour. With historic investments and leadership by this federal government, we are ready to meet those challenges and take full advantage of the opportunities. That is why I suggest we support Bill C-19.

• (2345)

[*Translation*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** It being 11:45 p.m., pursuant to order made on Monday, June 6, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

[*English*]

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the subamendment be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Longueuil—Charles-LeMoine.

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado:** Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

[Translation]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 25, 2021, the recorded division stands deferred until Thursday, June 9, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

[English]

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I suspect if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent to call it 12 o'clock so we could begin the late show.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[English]

### INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the Minister of International Development assumed his role after significant concerns were raised about the approach he took while he was defence minister to respond to sexual harassment and assault allegations within Canada's military. It is important that he be willing to take a different approach in his new portfolio and raise the bar in calling international organizations to account for instances of sexual violence that occur within them.

International development can involve situations of significant power imbalance, so measures to prevent exploitation and to hold perpetrators accountable are crucial. We have seen too many instances of failures in this regard.

Earlier I asked the minister about serious allegations of exploitation and violence at the World Health Organization in Congo and also at UNWRA. He noted in response that he had raised those concerns with the WHO, saying, "they assured me that they are working on this." I would suggest that a serious response to sexual violence requires more than taking the WHO at its word.

It is important to review the context. During an Ebola outbreak in the DRC between 2018 and 2020, over 150 women came forward to report facing sexual exploitation by those involved in the WHO response, and 150-plus victims going on record suggests a deep and wide systematic failure of the WHO. The WHO's own report found at least 21 alleged perpetrators who were directly employed by them, including international and local staff.

Various countries have pushed the WHO to improve its procedures, and the EU responded by halting funds to the WHO in the DRC. This shows how serious our allies and partners are taking this matter, and rightly so.

Despite this scandal, Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus was re-elected as the head of the WHO earlier this year. Now, Ghebreyesus has not exactly had an auspicious time as WHO head. In 2017, he announced, and then rescinded, an offer to make Robert Mugabe a

### Adjournment Proceedings

WHO goodwill ambassador. It is hard to argue that someone is interested in taking a firm line against corruption and exploitation when they want to make Robert Mugabe a goodwill ambassador for their organization. So much for setting an example to employees. Notwithstanding all of the things that have happened since, such as cozying up to the Chinese government and launching baseless attacks against Taiwan, this issue of Robert Mugabe revealed enough.

International development should be about empowering everyday people who are victims of violence and oppression to take control of their lives and not about cozying up to dictators who claim that building their profile will somehow make the world a better place. The WHO needs to change, but does not seem to have the capacity or the leadership to turn itself around, and our response has not been as strong as our allies.

I would like the government to clarify how it plans to hold the WHO, leaders at the WHO and individual perpetrators of violence to account. It is not good enough for the minister to say that the man who wanted to make Robert Mugabe a goodwill ambassador has assured him of his personal goodwill towards victims.

My original question also mentioned allegations of sexual misconduct at UNWRA. These allegations were the subject of an investigation by the UN Office of Internal Oversight Services, which provided an internal review. The report concluded that there was no evidence of sexual misconduct, contrary to the allegations, however the report remains confidential and internal to the UN.

Although it is fair to acknowledge that not all allegations are borne out by a full investigation, I wonder if the government finds it acceptable that these allegations were dismissed on the basis of an internal investigation or that the resulting report was never made public. A full, unredacted version was never even shared with member states. Does this way of dealing with such allegations conform to what the government considers an appropriate standard for responding to allegations of sexual assault?

I hope that the minister or the parliamentary secretary will be able to provide a more detailed response about the position of the government and concrete action taken on these important matters.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

• (2350)

**Mr. Darren Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Seniors, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, Canada has zero tolerance for all forms of sexual misconduct and sexual violence, including sexual exploitation, abuse, sexual harassment and all forms of gender-based violence. We are deeply concerned with the power dynamics that allow for any form of sexual misconduct to occur, and we stand strong in our unwavering commitment to respond to these acts and continue working toward their prevention. Canada respects the courage of the survivors who come forward and speak out.

Global Affairs Canada has taken a number of steps in order to prevent sexual exploitation and abuse from happening in the first instance and when it does happen, to address it, end impunity and increase accountability. GAC pursues a coordinated approach across programming, analysis and advocacy, and expects its funding recipients not only to have measures in place to prevent and protect, but also to respond and investigate using a survivor-victim-centred approach.

Canada responds to complex international crises through an established international humanitarian response system comprised of United Nations agencies. This mainly involves providing financial assistance to help meet urgent needs on the ground. The flexibility provided by monetary assistance is essential in complex, fluid operational environments like the one we saw in the Democratic Republic of Congo and what we are seeing today in Ukraine, which is allowing humanitarian organizations to procure relief items and to deploy key equipment and trained personnel quickly and efficiently through established and coordinated humanitarian networks.

Canada has taken a number of steps to hold the World Health Organization accountable and to ensure that incidents of sexual misconduct by staff are prevented in the future. When the allegations surfaced in the media in late 2020, Canada called on the WHO to initiate an immediate thorough and detailed assessment of the institutional policies, operational processes, leadership culture and circumstances that allowed sexual misconduct to go unreported to leadership and member states.

Internal investigations of WHO staff are currently under way. Canada is monitoring this situation closely to ensure that staff are held accountable and face consequences for any sexual misconduct that may have occurred once investigations into allegations have been concluded. When sexual misconduct and violence occur, such as in the DRC, Canada's immediate priority is to take a victim-survivor-centred approach safely and securely in a manner responsive to the complex environment.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Madam Speaker, respectfully, the member shared general values but did not respond to important specific questions.

Our allies have taken stronger responses to ensure that the rubber meets the road here, for instance, by withdrawing funds to the WHO in the DRC. Expressing these aspirations and concerns is not lining up with the strong measures being taken by our allies.

I also asked the member a specific question following up on the issue of UNWRA. Does the government believe it is acceptable when there is an internal investigation where we are told the allega-

tions are without merit, and yet there is no publication of that report and it is not even made available to member states?

The same question applies in the case of the WHO scandal. When there are scandals involving alleged sexual misconduct at UN agencies, they have internal reports done and the reports are not made public or even shared with member states. Is that really a victim-centred approach? Does the government think that is an acceptable approach?

• (2355)

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Madam Speaker, I do want to thank the member for coming here at close to midnight tonight. I begrudgingly say that the member has been finding a way to grow on me over the last seven, eight, nine, 10 months, which I thought several years ago would probably never be possible. I want to thank him for the work that he does. I do get a kick out of him every now and again. I have found in the most recent months that he has quite a good sense of humour.

Canada closely follows the WHO's work to strengthen its capacity to prevent and respond, and monitors WHO- and UN-led investigations, including those focused on the role that senior management played in preventing and addressing sexual misconduct during the Ebola crisis.

Canada remains committed to working together with donors to ensure that any culpable staff are held accountable and face consequences once investigations into allegations have been, as I said, concluded.

The UN Office of Internal Oversight Services, the OIOS, conducted an investigation into allegations of misconduct among several—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member for Spadina—Fort York.

## IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

**Mr. Kevin Vuong (Spadina—Fort York, Ind.):** Madam Speaker, we are here this evening because the government has made a commitment to resettle 40,000 Afghan refugees, a commitment that we are failing to deliver on. How many have we actually welcomed? It is only 15,000.

While the minister pats himself on the back for welcoming 37.5% of our commitment, people are suffering. While the minister pats himself on the back for a failing grade, people are dying.

How many people are hiding in abandoned buildings trying to evade the Taliban's wrath, who would kill not only them but everyone they hold dear, like women and children? It does not matter who, because the Taliban are a group of people who have put individuals into cages and set them on fire.

The government is keeping 25,000 terrified people waiting. Canada made a commitment. The government is not delivering, and people are dying because of it.

Even of the 15,000 who have made it, how many were because of the government and how many were because of the heroic efforts of civil society organizations like the Veterans Transition Network? It stepped up in the absence of government leadership to help resettle at least 2,061 refugees. Sadly, as even the CBC reported, even it has had to stop its efforts because its staff were so exhausted by “logistical nightmares” and “bureaucratic red tape”.

Since November of last year, I have had the extreme privilege of working with the Cassels law firm in Toronto in the hopes of saving the lives of people who have assisted Canada in Afghanistan. They were our nation's lawyers in Kabul, but right now it seems their lives do not matter very much. Enough with the excuses; bring them to Canada now.

A short time ago, my hon. colleague, the member for Calgary Forest Lawn, raised in this House the tragic death of Nazifa, who was a 10-year-old girl murdered by the Taliban because her father worked with our military in Kandahar. How many more children will die before the government honours our nation's word?

Just two weeks ago, I was in Warsaw and met with a number of Afghan refugees who were rescued by Poland. Poland has also welcomed 3.6 million Ukrainian refugees. The Afghan refugees need our help. They want to resettle in Canada.

I met with an Afghan couple, he a journalist and she a teacher. He showed me the messages that he had received from the Taliban telling him they would kill him and his wife and any family members they could find.

I also spoke with a former justice of the Supreme Court of Afghanistan. She told me about how she cannot go back because when the Taliban took over, they opened the doors of the prisons and released all the criminals, criminals she had convicted of heinous crimes.

What happened to the government's feminist foreign policy? Canada made a commitment. People's lives are at risk, and the government must honour our nation's word.

What is the plan for the 25,000 people who are waiting for the government to honour its word? Give us a timeline. Please.

We are at 15,000 now. When will we hit 20,000 or 25,000? When will we hit 40,000 refugees?

• (2400)

**Mr. Darren Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Seniors, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, following the humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan last summer, the government initially committed to resettling 20,000 vulnerable Afghan refugees. We have now increased that commitment and will bring at least 40,000 Afghans to Canada.

On July 23, 2021, the Government of Canada announced special immigration measures for individuals with a significant and/or enduring relationship with the Government of Canada, along with their accompanying family members. On August 13, we announced a special humanitarian program focused on resettling Afghan nationals who are outside of Afghanistan and who do not have a durable solution in a third country. This program focuses on women leaders, human rights defenders, LGBTQI individuals, and journal-

### *Adjournment Proceedings*

ists and people who assisted Canadian journalists. We have also created a pathway to permanent residence for extended family members of former Afghan interpreters who previously immigrated to Canada under the 2009 and 2012 public policies.

IRCC has mobilized its global network, and all available resources are being devoted to this effort. IRCC is also prioritizing the processing of privately sponsored Afghan refugees. The department is harnessing the generosity of Canadians, including through sponsorship agreement holders and through individual and corporate donations for private sponsorship.

Yesterday, as the member said, we marked an important milestone by welcoming our 15,000th Afghan refugee to Canada. Hundreds more are arriving each week, including 300 privately sponsored refugees today.

I think it is important to put Canada's commitment to Afghans into a global context. Per capita, our goal of bringing at least 40,000 Afghan nationals to Canada places us among the top countries in the world when it comes to resettlement, second only to the United States on numbers alone. In terms of raw numbers, our commitment of 40,000 is larger than that of the United Kingdom and Australia, and is the same as the one being pursued by the European Union, which has ten times the population of Canada.

We remain firm in our commitment to resettle at least 40,000 Afghan nationals as quickly and as safely as possible, and we will not stop until the work is done.

**Mr. Kevin Vuong:** Madam Speaker, as the son of refugees, I applaud the government's commitment to 40,000, but my question for my hon. colleague is, when? He has spoken about the importance of supporting members of the LGBTQ community and activists. There is Rainbow Railroad. When are we going to be able to support them to come over?

I talked about Canada's law firm in Kabul and Mr. Shajjan. His 28 lawyers are still stuck in Afghanistan. When will they be brought over?

I have talked about a number of journalists and a justice, but there is also an Afghan interpreter who is now seven months pregnant. She is wife to a veteran of our nation and is in a third party country right now, Pakistan. She has still not been able to make her way here.

When can they come to their new home?

*Adjournment Proceedings*

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Madam Speaker, we are one of the only countries in the world to have implemented a humanitarian stream to welcome even more Afghan refugees based on their particular vulnerabilities. Individuals are referred by designated partners that are trained and experienced in assessing vulnerability and operating in situations of mass displacements and humanitarian hardship. Our referral partners include the United Nations Refugee Agency, Front Line Defenders, ProtectDefenders.eu and Canadian private sponsors.

In light of the current situation in Afghanistan, we will waive the requirement for a refugee status determination for private sponsorship applications. Also, our government is going to work with partners to utilize the economic mobility pathways pilot, an innovative program designed to help skilled refugees resettle in Canada, to welcome even more Afghan refugees.

We have not wavered in our world-leading commitment to resettle at least 40,000 Afghan refugees in Canada. As I said, earlier today Canada welcomed another 300 Afghan refugees.

• (2405)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes not being present to raise during Adjournment Proceedings the matter for which notice has been given, the notice is deemed withdrawn.

The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until later this day at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12:05 a.m.)

---





# CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 8, 2022

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Richmond Cares, Richmond Gives</b>	
Mr. Miao .....	6309
<b>Leucan Shaved Head Challenge</b>	
Mr. Généreux .....	6309
<b>Seniors</b>	
Ms. Hepfner .....	6309
<b>Roger Barrette</b>	
Ms. Chabot .....	6310
<b>Laurentian University Lunars</b>	
Ms. Lapointe .....	6310
<b>Women's Institutes</b>	
Mr. Chong .....	6310
<b>Birthday Congratulations</b>	
Mr. Naqvi .....	6310
<b>Canada-Ireland Relations</b>	
Mr. Maloney .....	6310
<b>Canadian Walk for Veterans</b>	
Ms. Findlay .....	6311
<b>Portuguese Heritage Month</b>	
Mr. Fonseca .....	6311
<b>North Nova Scotia Highlanders</b>	
Mr. Ellis .....	6311
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Vis .....	6311
<b>Canadian Environment Week</b>	
Mrs. Brière .....	6312
<b>Justice</b>	
Ms. Idlout .....	6312
<b>French at Work</b>	
Mr. Blanchet .....	6312
<b>Bill C-5</b>	
Mrs. Gallant .....	6312
<b>Filipino Heritage Month</b>	
Mr. Sorbara .....	6313

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>The Economy</b>	
Ms. Bergen .....	6313
Ms. Freeland .....	6313
Ms. Bergen .....	6313
Ms. Freeland .....	6313

<b>Public Safety</b>	
Ms. Bergen .....	6313
Ms. Freeland .....	6313
Mr. Berthold .....	6314
Ms. Freeland .....	6314
<b>The Economy</b>	
Mr. Berthold .....	6314
Ms. Freeland .....	6314
<b>Pensions</b>	
Mr. Blanchet .....	6314
Ms. Freeland .....	6314
Mr. Blanchet .....	6314
Ms. Freeland .....	6314
<b>The Economy</b>	
Mr. Julian .....	6314
Ms. Freeland .....	6314
Ms. Blaney .....	6315
Ms. Freeland .....	6315
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Moore .....	6315
Mr. Lametti .....	6315
Mr. Moore .....	6315
Mr. Lametti .....	6315
<b>Public Safety</b>	
Mr. Lloyd .....	6315
Mr. Mendicino .....	6315
Mr. Lloyd .....	6316
Mr. Mendicino .....	6316
Ms. Dancho .....	6316
Mr. Mendicino .....	6316
Ms. Dancho .....	6316
Mr. Mendicino .....	6316
<b>Official Languages</b>	
Mr. Beaulieu .....	6317
Ms. Petitpas Taylor .....	6317
Mr. Beaulieu .....	6317
Ms. Petitpas Taylor .....	6317
<b>The Economy</b>	
Mr. Albas .....	6317
Mr. Wilkinson .....	6317
Mr. Albas .....	6317
Mr. Wilkinson .....	6317
Mrs. Kusie .....	6318
Mr. Wilkinson .....	6318
Mrs. Kusie .....	6318
Mr. Wilkinson .....	6318
<b>Employment Insurance</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	6318
Ms. Qualtrough .....	6318

Mr. Boulерice .....	6318
Ms. Qualtrough .....	6318
<b>Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship</b>	
Mr. Baker .....	6319
Mr. Fraser .....	6319
<b>Health</b>	
Mr. Ellis .....	6319
Mr. van Koeverden .....	6319
Mr. Ellis .....	6319
Mr. van Koeverden .....	6319
Ms. Gladu .....	6319
Mr. van Koeverden .....	6319
Mrs. Kramp-Neuman .....	6320
Mr. Mendicino .....	6320
<b>Public Safety</b>	
Ms. Michaud .....	6320
Mr. Mendicino .....	6320
Mr. Fortin .....	6320
Mr. Mendicino .....	6320
<b>Justice</b>	
Mrs. Vien .....	6320
Mr. Lametti .....	6320
Mrs. Vien .....	6320
Mr. Lametti .....	6321
Mr. Paul-Hus .....	6321
Mr. Lametti .....	6321
<b>Public Safety</b>	
Mrs. Shanahan .....	6321
Mr. Mendicino .....	6321
<b>Health</b>	
Mr. Brock .....	6321
Mr. van Koeverden .....	6321
<b>Housing</b>	
Mr. Aitchison .....	6321
Mr. Hussen .....	6322
Mr. Aitchison .....	6322
Mr. Hussen .....	6322
<b>Families, Children and Social Development</b>	
Mr. Turnbull .....	6322
Ms. Gould .....	6322
<b>Persons with Disabilities</b>	
Ms. Zarrillo .....	6322
Ms. Qualtrough .....	6323
<b>The Environment</b>	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6323
Mr. Duguid .....	6323
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	6323

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Canada National Parks Act</b>	
Bill C-248. Second reading .....	6323
Motion agreed to .....	6324
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	6324
<b>Income Tax Act</b>	
Bill C-240. Second reading .....	6324
Motion negated .....	6326
<b>Income Tax Act</b>	
Bill C-241. Second reading .....	6326
Motion agreed to .....	6327
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	6327
<b>Constitution Act, 2022 (representation of Quebec)</b>	
Bill C-246. Second reading .....	6327
Motion negated .....	6329
<b>Points of Order</b>	
<b>Oral Questions</b>	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6329
Mr. Brassard .....	6329

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Certificates of Nomination</b>	
Mr. Holland .....	6329
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6329
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Afghanistan</b>	
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	6329
Mr. Chong .....	6330
<b>Agriculture and Agri-Food</b>	
Mr. Blois .....	6330
<b>Financial Protection for Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Farmers Act</b>	
Mr. Davidson .....	6330
Bill C-280. Introduction and first reading .....	6330
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	6330
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Human Trafficking</b>	
Mr. Vis .....	6330
<b>Addiction Recovery</b>	
Mr. Vis .....	6330
<b>Firearms</b>	
Mr. Ruff .....	6331
<b>Banknote Redesign</b>	
Mr. Dong .....	6331
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Vuong .....	6331

<b>Honeybees</b>	
Mr. Tochor .....	6331
<b>Nuclear Energy</b>	
Mr. Tochor .....	6331
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6331
<b>Questions Passed as Orders for Returns</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6332
<b>Motions for Papers</b>	
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6333

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Budget Implementation Act, 2022, No. 1</b>	
Mrs. St-Onge .....	6333
Bill C-19. Third reading .....	6333
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6333
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
<b>Bill C-5—Notice of Time Allocation</b>	
Ms. Gould .....	6336
<b>Budget Implementation Act, 2022, No. 1</b>	
Bill C-19. Third reading .....	6336
Mr. Albas .....	6336
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6336
Ms. Zarrillo .....	6336
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe .....	6337
Mr. Gerretsen .....	6337
Mr. Kelly .....	6337
Mr. Albas .....	6337
Amendment .....	6340
Mr. Gerretsen .....	6340
Ms. Michaud .....	6340

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Conservation of Fish Stocks and Management of Pinnipeds Act</b>	
Bill C-251. Second reading .....	6341
Mr. Kelloway .....	6341
Ms. Idlout .....	6342
Mr. Zimmer .....	6343
Ms. Jones .....	6344
Mr. Arnold .....	6345
Mr. Small .....	6347
Division on motion deferred .....	6348
<b>Sitting Suspended</b>	
(The sitting of the House was suspended at 6:21 p.m.) ...	6348
<b>Sitting Resumed</b>	
(The House resumed at 6:30 p.m.) .....	6348

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Budget Implementation Act, 2022, No. 1</b>	
Bill C-19. Third reading .....	6348
Mr. Albas .....	6348
Mr. Gerretsen .....	6348
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6349
Mr. Deltell .....	6349
Mr. Blaikie .....	6349
Mr. Ste-Marie .....	6352
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) .....	6353
Mr. Bachrach .....	6353
Mr. Dreeshen .....	6353
Mr. Ste-Marie .....	6354
Mr. Dreeshen .....	6356
Mr. Bachrach .....	6356
Mrs. Romanado .....	6357
Mr. Savard-Tremblay .....	6357
Mr. Sorbara .....	6357
Mr. Lloyd .....	6359
Mr. MacGregor .....	6359
Mr. Morrice .....	6360
Mr. Hallan .....	6361
Ms. Chabot .....	6361
Mr. Bachrach .....	6362
Mr. Williams .....	6362
Mrs. Romanado .....	6363
Mr. Ste-Marie .....	6364
Ms. Mathysen .....	6364
Mr. Hallan .....	6364
Amendment to the amendment .....	6366
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6366
Mr. Ste-Marie .....	6366
Ms. Mathysen .....	6366
Ms. Chabot .....	6367
Mrs. Romanado .....	6369
Mr. Albas .....	6369
Mr. MacGregor .....	6370
Mr. Savard-Tremblay .....	6370
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6370
Mr. Muys .....	6371
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6372
Mr. Lemire .....	6372
Mr. Bachrach .....	6373
Mr. Lloyd .....	6373
Ms. Gould .....	6374
Mr. Savard-Tremblay .....	6374
Mr. Bachrach .....	6375
Mr. Arya .....	6375
Mr. Albas .....	6378
Mr. Ste-Marie .....	6378
Mr. Hallan .....	6379
Mr. Savard-Tremblay .....	6379
Mrs. Romanado .....	6379
Mr. Lemire .....	6379
Mr. Lamoureux .....	6379
Mr. G�n�reux .....	6380
Mr. Blois .....	6381

Mr. Lemire.....	6381
Mr. Dalton.....	6382
Mr. Baldinelli.....	6382
Mr. Lamoureux.....	6383
Mr. Maguire.....	6384
Mr. Bachrach.....	6384
Mr. Hanley.....	6384
Mr. Carrie.....	6386
Mr. Ste-Marie.....	6386
Ms. Mathysen.....	6387
Mr. Blois.....	6387
Mr. Hallan.....	6388
Mr. Lemire.....	6388
Mr. MacGregor.....	6389
Mr. Savard-Tremblay.....	6389
Mr. Lamoureux.....	6390
Mr. Carrie.....	6390
Mr. Genuis.....	6390

Mr. Blois.....	6391
Mr. Lemire.....	6391
Mr. Lamoureux.....	6392
Mr. Genuis.....	6393
Mr. Savard-Tremblay.....	6393
Mr. Kusmierczyk.....	6393
Division on amendment to the amendment deferred.....	6395

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

### International Development

Mr. Genuis.....	6395
Mr. Fisher.....	6396

### Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Mr. Vuong.....	6396
Mr. Fisher.....	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>